

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
Office of Energy Projects

- x
- NEXUS Gas Transmission, LLC Docket No. CP16-22-000
- Texas Eastern Transmission, LP Docket No. CP16-23-000
- DTE Gas Company Docket No. CP16-24-000
- Vector Pipeline L.P. Docket No. CP16-102-000
- x

NEXUS GAS TRANSMISSION PROJECT and
TEXAS EASTERN APPALACHIAN LEASE PROJECT

Wadsworth High School
James A. McIlvaine
Performing Arts Center
625 Broad Street
Wadsworth, Ohio 44281

Wednesday, August 17, 2016

The DEIS oral comment collection meeting, pursuant to
notice, began at approximately 5:00 p.m., with FERC Staff
assisting.

Court Reporter A

1 MRS. MILLER: NEXUS use the City of Green
2 reroute. We are much in favor of that.

3 JACOB SIESEL

4 MR. SIESEL: Good evening, my name is Jacob
5 Siesel and I am here to speak on behalf of the Operating
6 Engineers Local 18 and our 15,000 members. Local 18 has
7 already electronically submitted to FERC our official
8 support letter on the NEXUS pipeline; however, I am here
9 this evening to add additional comment and testimony for the
10 Nexus pipeline project.

11 I wanted to say that first and foremost, Local 18
12 supports the NEXUS pipeline project and recognizes the need
13 for the pipeline. Local 18 and its members ultimately
14 support the portions of the project that their fellow
15 members and local work force will be working on. Members of
16 the IUOE are the most qualified, best trained, and
17 importantly the safest workforce in the industry.

18 The NEXUS pipeline will be a safe method of
19 transporting gas, and will be a significantly less impact on
20 the environment than transporting gas by road or rail. All
21 the requirements by the FERC and other agencies involved
22 will not only be followed by NEXUS, they will be over-
23 followed. This will prove to the communities and groups in
24 question of the project that they care about what they
25 operate, and will maintain a safe and efficient pipeline.

1 If the NEXUS pipeline is approved, the pipeline
2 spreads installed by our members and fellow tradesmen and
3 women will be installed safely, efficiently, and correct the
4 first time. This is their, fellow family, and community
5 members back yards, so they will take pride in their work.

6 As it stands now, The NEXUS, if approved, will be
7 installed by local union members on at least three of the
8 four proposed spreads. The only concern Local 18 has on the
9 project are the portions to be installed by contractors who
10 utilize some one other than an operating engineer or fellow
11 tradesmen or women on the project. The beginning pipeline
12 spread is scheduled to be installed by MG Dyess from
13 Bassfield, Mississippi. MG Dyess will utilize a workforce
14 that is 100 percent out of state and has no ties to Ohio at
15 all. Local 18 does not support this decision by NEXUS and
16 questions whether or not they are qualified to be involved
17 with the NEXUS project.

18 Although we are not happy with the overall
19 contractor selection, we support the NEXUS pipeline. Please
20 join Local 18 in supporting the NEXUS pipeline and approve
21 the project.

22

23 PAUL A. BOSELA, SR. and PAUL A. BOSELA, JR.

24 DR. PAUL BOSELA: I am a registered professional
25 engineer. I am a professor emeritus from Cleveland State

1 University, and I have a Ph.D in civil engineering and I am
2 a Fellow in the American Society of Civil Engineers.

3 MR. PAUL BASELA: I am also a registered
4 professional engineer and also an accredited professional.

5 We wanted to specifically talk about the
6 Waterford compressor stations. If you go to the Ohio EPA
7 news release from February 16th, in the news release, which
8 is the first page of that attachment, it lists the allowable
9 emissions for compressor stations. And in the table here.
10 nitrogen oxide is 31.2, carbon monoxide 7.8, particulate
11 matter 6.2, sulfur dioxide is 3.2, and volatile organic
12 compounds is 29.2. They also list HAP, but they don't list
13 the allowable for that.

14 If you go to table 9-2 of the NEXUS Gas
15 Transmission Project Resource Report Number Nine, and that
16 is the second page in the handout -- to clarify, that is
17 Table 9.2-7. -- it lists the emissions they project they
18 will have in that compression station. 32.7 nitrogen oxide,
19 10.2 the carbon monoxide, 6.3 of the particulates, 3.2 of
20 the VOCs, and 3.6 of the HAP.

21 Here's their report and here's the table in
22 their report where it comes from. And that's 3.2 for the
23 SO₂, and 32.2 VOC. If you look at those values you can see
24 that their projected NOX exceeds the allowable by 4.8
25 percent. Carbon monoxide exceeds the allowable by 30.8

1 percent. Particulates exceed the allowable by 1.6, and VOCs
2 exceed the allowable by 10.3. None of those are our
3 numbers; those are the numbers in the Ohio EPA and the
4 numbers in the NEXUS report.

5 Again, I have given you attachments that show
6 both of those, it shows their table and shows the other. So
7 knowing that they expect to exceed the allowables up to 30
8 percent for the carbon monoxide, what do they say in their
9 environmental impact statement?

10 Well, I have included that part of their
11 environmental impact statement in the attachment, and I will
12 quote what it says:

13 Emissions from the new and above ground
14 facilities including the proposed meter and
15 regulatory stations would not have a significant
16 impact on local or regional air quality. Based
17 on the analysis in the EIS and compliance with
18 federal and state air quality regulations we
19 concluded that operational emissions would not
20 have a significant impact on local or regional
21 air quality.

22 So they say based upon compliance yet they're
23 indicating that they're not going to be in compliance,
24 they're going to be up to 30 percent above the allowable.
25 They simply state that it doesn't matter; operational

1 emissions won't have a significant impact. In other words -
2 - and these are my words -- They're saying don't be
3 concerned with the facts, we promise it won't hurt you.

4 Now there's a Medina Gazette article. a NEXUS
5 spokesman, Mr. Parker, opined in that article -- I didn't
6 include that article -- But basically he opined that
7 stakeholder considerations in generic design, geographic
8 suitability, environmental resource impact, and
9 constructible terrain are considered for compression station
10 location.

11 So let's look at each one of those criteria.
12 Stakeholder consideration, this was considered. It was
13 likely the lowest cost property from a willing seller which
14 helps minimize their cost. However, the relative cost of
15 the property for this one Waterford compression station is
16 relatively minuscule compared to the cost of the entire
17 project and their anticipated profits.

18 The next item they said they considered,
19 engineering design. Now, there's flexibility on where they
20 locate a compressor station according to Spectra Energy, who
21 owns NEXUS. Affiliates of Spectral Energy. Quote:

22 Compressor stations are placed typically 40 to 70
23 miles apart which would provide some flexibility
24 with location of the compression station.

25 Therefore engineering design certainly did not

1 dictate that they had to build the compressor station right
2 there in close proximity to a residential area. They
3 probably could have moved it 30 miles if they wanted to.
4 They certainly could have moved it a mile or two.

5 The next item was geographic suitability and
6 construction terrain. Now we are talking about the
7 construction of a small commercial building for that
8 compressor station in Medina County. Are we to believe that
9 that location immediately adjacent to a residential
10 development is the only location in Medina County where the
11 soil conditions are suitable to build a small building? Or
12 are we to believe that due to soil conditions and terrain it
13 is the only buildable lot within a 30 mile stretch of that
14 pipeline? Doesn't make sense.

15 Then, the next item was environmental resource
16 impacts. When a compressor station which will have
17 emissions significantly exceeding the allowable is proposed
18 to be located adjacent to a residential area, we are at a
19 loss to see how the environmental resource impact was
20 considered. It appears to have been placed at a location
21 where it would have the most adverse environmental impact.
22 You are in basically a rural area with one residential
23 development in that area, and they choose to put it right up
24 next to the residential development.

25 In NEXUS's environmental impact statement, this

1 is after we see the proposal is going to far exceed the
2 allowable, here's what they say in their environmental
3 impact statement:

4 We reviewed two or more alternative sites for
5 each new compressor station and did not find a
6 substantial environmental advantage over the
7 proposed site in any of the cases. Therefore the
8 alternative sites were eliminated from further
9 consideration.

10 It goes on to say:

11 We received comments suggesting that some of the
12 compressor stations should be relocated to less
13 populated areas because of concerns about air and
14 noise pollution. However, our analysis concluded
15 that locating the compressor station at the
16 proposed site would not have a significant impact
17 on air quality or noise."

18 Now, correct me if I am wrong. Their analyses
19 show that they are going to exceed the allowable by up to 30
20 percent. How is that not a significant impact on air
21 quality? Allowable emissions are set for a reason. They
22 should not be exceeded, not by 1 percent, certainly not by
23 30 percent.

24 Hence, it's obvious the location of the
25 compressor station is purely a stakeholder decision

1 maximizing their profits without any attempt to mitigate
2 environmental impacts, with complete disregard for the
3 health and safety of nearby residents. So how will the
4 public know when the emissions are exceeding the allowable?

5 The emissions will be monitored by NEXUS and
6 violations of allowable will be self-reporting. In other
7 words, they are required to report when they exceed the
8 emissions.

9 As previously demonstrated, they intend on
10 significantly exceeding the allowable emissions and don't
11 see that as a problem. The only way the public and EPA will
12 know when that occurs is when NEXUS chooses to report it.

13 Federal highways and other public projects
14 require environmental impact statements that consider
15 social, economic, and environmental impacts. Most projects
16 have some positive economic benefits. Economic benefit alone
17 most certainly is not intended to be the only criteria.

18 When adverse environmental impacts exist, they
19 must be mitigated. In this case it appears obvious that the
20 adverse impacts which will be caused by the Waterford
21 compression stations are being blatantly ignored.

22 Finally, the proposed Medina County charter is
23 intended to allow the county and its residents to have a say
24 in land use planning rather than simply being at the mercy
25 of out-of-state corporations with no concern for the

1 negative impact they have on our local environment and the
2 residents.

3 There was one thing I may not have said that I
4 quoted earlier about their anticipated emissions in their
5 draft environmental impact statement where they said:

6 The emissions from the new above ground
7 facilities modifications including the proposed
8 meter and regulatory stations will not have a
9 significant impact on local or regional air
10 quality.

11 Then it says:

12 Based on the analysis in the EIS in compliance
13 with federal and state regulations.

14 What do you mean 'in compliance'? You have
15 already said you're not going to be in compliance; now
16 you're saying 'Well, if we were in compliance there wouldn't
17 be a problem.' But you've said you're not going to be in
18 compliance.

19 MR. BOSELA: I agree with everything. You have
20 regulations for a reason, they should be followed. Just
21 because they are a corporation shouldn't allow them to not
22 follow the rules.

23 Medina County is a County that has E Check and
24 residents are required to pass the E Checks. If they don't
25 pass, they fail. They are not going to allow somebody that

1 is over it say "well, it's okay." I don't understand how in
2 this case for a compressor station that's going to have gas
3 emissions daily, be permitted to violate those regulations.
4 And choosing to put it next a residential neighborhood
5 really questions how any kind of environmental impact was
6 even considered.

7 DR. BOSELA: On a personal note, I have two
8 daughters and five grandchildren that are going to be living
9 close to the compressor station. The children are young, and
10 they will probably have to move. When it would be so much
11 easier to move the compressor station than affect all the
12 kids and all the families in that development.

13

14 JAY RICHARD EMENS with the law firm of Emens and Walford of
15 Columbus, Ohio.

16 MR. EMENS: We have represented landowners in
17 connection with pipelines and oil and gas matters for more
18 than 50 years, and currently represent numerous -- more than
19 250 landowners on the Rover pipeline and numerous landowners
20 on the Leach Express, and also on the NEXUS pipeline.

21 I have personally read the NEXUS draft EIS -- it
22 took me awhile -- the two major comments that we have -- I
23 have three law partners and an associate who are involved,
24 plus a paralegal and an administrative assistant who are
25 trying to help landowners.

1 The first is with the City of Green Alternative -
2 - And I will get into the specific pages later -- Our
3 concern is that the landowners who are on the alternative
4 route are not getting sufficient notice. Some of them have
5 gotten letters. Some of them actually have the Rover
6 pipeline going across their land. And of course they don't
7 want the pipeline, they don't want Rover, they don't want
8 NEXUS. But we even have people who don't have the Rover
9 pipeline who have called us because we know them. And they
10 say "I'm not going to do anything with this, they're not
11 going to take that alternative."

12 We think that it is NEXUS's obligation to go on
13 television, to be doing newspaper advertising, to be on the
14 radio. A single letter is just not enough to let these
15 people know what may be happening with the land, and we
16 think that there needs to be a period of time if the final
17 EIS will say something stronger than it currently says about
18 that, and then have some period of time where these people
19 have a chance to get noticed and make some additional
20 comments.

21 The second overall comment is that the drain
22 tile language in the draft EIS is insufficient. The fact
23 that NEXUS submits something that they call a draft and says
24 "Well, we are going to amend it later" just doesn't give the
25 landowners the opportunity to know what to do. They should

1 have what they say they are going to do, and then that can
2 be amended by what the comments are that come in.

3 I would say even the draft, this is the NEXUS
4 gas transmission proposed pipeline project draft drain tile
5 mitigation plan that i'm looking at, Page four and five
6 talks about where the Black Swamp used to be, even though
7 the draft EIS doesn't even talk about the Black Swamp, which
8 to me is a gross oversight. The word "swamp" I think is
9 only in the draft EIS one time. But this talks about
10 several of the counties and then it says the counties in
11 Ohio expected to have the greatest density of drain tile
12 include Erie, Sandusky, and Wood. That leaves out Henry and
13 Fulton, which is where the Black Swamp was, and Fulton is
14 what goes right up into Michigan. In the following sentence
15 it says in Michigan, Lenawee County is expected to have the
16 greatest density. We also have clients in Lenawee County
17 Michigan, I practice in Michigan also.

18 On page nine, it says "During and after the post
19 construction monitoring phase the NEXUS right-of-way agent
20 will remain the landowner's point of contact." And it says
21 on the same page in the summary, "NEXUS will monitor drain
22 tile restoration for three years."

23 My first comment on the NEXUS right of way agent,
24 in most all of the pipelines we've dealt with as soon as the
25 pipeline is put in the right of way agents are gone. And the

1 landowners are going to need to have the name of somebody,
2 and know who it's going to be, and what their location is.
3 As to this three year monitoring, that's clearly
4 insufficient, because of the heavy equipment -- and we will
5 put much of this in our written comments -- The heavy
6 equipment that they have to use, the pipeline contractors,
7 to put in a 36 inch pipe, is heavier than farm equipment,
8 and it will compact the soil. Terribly. And if any of this
9 work is done when the land is wet, the compaction will last
10 for at least twenty years and longer.

11 We have photographs of pipelines that were put in
12 40 and 50 years ago, and you can see where the pipeline is,
13 and the crop records show that the yield is less in the area
14 where the pipeline is. I think it is very important, and I
15 just mentioned this to the project manager, and she said she
16 would talk with Kevin Bowman about this.

17 But after working very, very hard on the Rover
18 pipeline and making voluminous comments we really appreciate
19 the staff including in the final EIS some very important
20 recommendations in the final part, for example, and these
21 are what I think need to be in the NEXUS final EIS:

22 Number 36 on page 523, prior to construction will
23 file with the Secretary a five year post day meaning Rover,
24 post construction monitoring program to evaluate crop
25 productivity impacted by the construction. Then it goes on

1 specifically with some other provisions that are helpful.
2 The staff recommendation number 37, again of the Rover final
3 EIS on page 524 consulting with the Ohio Department of
4 Agriculture -- I am not going to read each of these -- but
5 I am urging the staff that is working on NEXUS to One, read
6 these and then include them in the final EIS on NEXUS.

7 Number 38 on page 524: Rover shall file with the
8 Secretary its final drain tile relocation and reclamation
9 plans including landowner concurrent with the plans.

10 Number 39 on page 524, prior to construction
11 Rover shall commit to hire local drain tile contractors to
12 install repaired drain tiles that are damaged or need to be
13 rerouted due to construction activities.

14 Number 40 on page 524: Upon completion of
15 construction Rover shall provide information on encountered
16 severed and/or damaged drain tile line to the landowner,
17 local county soil water confirmation etc.

18 Number 42 on page 524: Rover filed with the
19 Secretary prior to construction for review and written
20 approval of the director of the Office of Energy Projects a
21 complete list of all CRP controlled enrolled lands, and then
22 it goes ahead to work to have those lands continue to be
23 eligible.

24 45 on page 524, documenting complaints Rover
25 files with the Secretary, landowner complaints.

1 Number 47 on page 525, this goes to the weekly
2 construction reports regarding the corresponding DHDD entry
3 -- that one may be in there, I will look at that when I get
4 there.

5 So, those are specific recommendations. We also
6 would like to request that in the executive summary, which
7 is of the draft EIS on page ES 1 where the statement says,
8 "We have prepared this EIS" -- and it says in the footnote -
9 - "we as the staff of FERC, we believe it is important to
10 recite there that we, us, and our, also refer to the
11 contractor Merjent.

12 Many people don't know how small FERC staff is
13 for environmental matters and that it is important and
14 necessary to have these contractors, and that should be
15 listed in there.

16 On page ES 4 and throughout there's information
17 about water testing, but landowners don't really know about
18 this. They should get notice of that, that they can have
19 their water tested.

20 On page ES 9. We appreciate FERC's
21 recommendation that NEXUS provide evidence of landowner
22 concurrent for residences within 10 feet of the construction
23 area. but we request that 10 feet be changed to 50 feet.
24 That's only 100 feet from the pipeline.

25 And the landowners should have to concur, and if

1 they had the right to concur then NEXUS might pay attention
2 to them.

3 Rather than what is happening, we like NEXUS
4 plans described on page ES 10 for agricultural monitors, but
5 the landowners are going to need to know who those people
6 are and how they reach them.

7 On page 216 and further we are surprised and
8 disappointed there is no mention of triple ditching.
9 Throughout the draft EIS there is no mention of triple
10 ditching. Some of this soil is very valuable to dips farther
11 than 12 inches and it really needs to have NEXUS do some
12 triple ditching to protect that soil.

13 On page 219 there's no discussion of extreme
14 adverse compaction that's going to occur, which I mentioned
15 earlier. Page 226, we requested pre-construction drain tile
16 planning and work be done on much of the agricultural lands
17 in order not to damage the soil. Especially if the
18 construction is to be done in late winter or early spring,
19 as now appears likely.

20 And going back to page 219, we request that the
21 final EIS provide that NEXUS will remove all rocks that are
22 over three inches in diameter. We have seen that in other
23 final environmental impact statements. And we think that
24 NEXUS should do that.

25 On page -- this is in the alternatives pages --

1 on page 323 of the draft EIS the language mischaracterizes
2 what occurs when a pipeline company operates on landowners
3 land. The description there says use of landowners land.
4 This is really a taking. These easements that the pipeline
5 company is, including NEXUS, they own an easement and they
6 take the land. And on page 324 It wrongly describes and
7 omits problems with drain tiles and wrongly describes
8 impacts on agricultural land as quote "mostly minor and
9 temporary to short-term." The damage to agricultural land
10 from compaction alone will occur and persist for many, many
11 years.

12 I mentioned earlier the necessity of -- Now i'm
13 into the environmental analysis on pages 415 subsection
14 413.4.1.3.6 -- focuses on flash-flooding and streams, but
15 nowhere in the EIS is there a necessary discussion of the
16 Black Swamp area.

17 On pages 416 and 417 we're requesting that
18 notice to landowners of blasting be changed to at least 72
19 hours rather than just 24 hours.

20 We would also request -- these are on pages 4-110
21 and 4-111 -- that the acreage for tiles and related
22 equipment and fencing be included in the chart. There's at
23 least a half acre, at least with our clients that have these
24 valve sites. And these are going to be eyesores and they are
25 going to be there for at least 50 years. People should know

1 that. And know that it's important that the amount and size
2 be designated. Pages 187, 188, 189 we think are
3 blatantly unfair and we believe that the Merjent people must
4 have written all of this, and they are clearly designed to
5 prejudice the courts against landowners by going into
6 lengthy discussions about how a 36 inch pipeline doesn't
7 reduce the value of land. I mean, no rational person will
8 pay as much for land near a large pipeline as she or he
9 would pay for the same property. And it's fine that the
10 industry has done a lot of studies and paid for a lot of
11 studies to contradict that, but it's all designed to have
12 the landowners get paid less when they get sued for eminent
13 domain by the pipeline companies.

14 On page 4-205: "We appreciate the recognition
15 that while precipitation extremes are common in the region"
16 -- although we question whether precipitation is generally
17 distributed evenly throughout the year, we are very
18 concerned because in the areas that this pipeline is going,
19 we understand that most of it occurs during February and on
20 into the spring.

21 On pages 4-236 and 237 we think there needs to
22 be something done now about getting more information about
23 safety to the landowners. We recommend that NEXUS
24 immediately prepare and communicate to all that live, work,
25 and play within several miles of the pipeline all the

1 information that's described in the last paragraph on page
2 4-236 and completed at the top of page 4-237. It's fine to
3 say NEXUS would develop, would use, would mail, but these
4 people really need to know now, to be ready for this and if
5 they had that information you would probably get a lot more
6 valid comment.

7 On page 4-241 we appreciate that "FERC's staff
8 or its contractors would routinely inspect construction
9 activity to ensure environmental compliance." But, we have
10 not seen, either in this draft EIS, or in that of other
11 pipelines, how the landowner gets ahold of FERC's staff and
12 what might happen. Especially since the environmental
13 inspectors in the draft EIS at NEXUS don't have the
14 authority to stop construction even based on the
15 recommendations of the staff.

16 In the conclusions and recommendations beginning
17 on page 5-1 we disagree with the statement: Most of these
18 environmental impacts would be temporary or short-term.
19 We've given our reasons previously.

20 On page 5-2 we believe the compaction impacts on
21 agricultural land will be long-term, as stated previously.

22 On page 5.5 we disagree that "Impacts on
23 agricultural land would be short-term."

24 On 5.9, we disagree with the statement:
25 "Agricultural land would be restored to previous use

1 following construction."

2 We do appreciate FERC's staff's recommended
3 mitigation in the 47 recommendation on pages 5-18 to 5-28.

4 We request that those comments we have made and
5 especially those about the Black Swamp, notice to people who
6 are on the Green Route, the alternate City of Green Route,
7 and the specific provisions on Green town that we talked
8 about in the beginning of our comments.

9 We appreciate very much our opportunity to
10 comment and we are happy to discuss any of these. We will
11 file a written comment that covered most of these points and
12 some others. If there's any information that the FERC staff
13 or Merjent would like, we work closely with the farm bureau
14 and the soil and water conservation experts in the land
15 areas where our clients are and we would be glad to provide
16 additional information. Thank you very much.

17

18 RICHARD ADAMSON SR. and SANDRA ADAMSON

19 MR. ADAMSON: On the maps, it says on the
20 alternative route crossing on my property or very near. The
21 map isn't detailed enough that I can tell whether it is
22 going across my property or not. North of West Salem, Ohio,
23 there was a replacement gas pipeline going across several
24 years ago, and ever since then the crops in these fields are
25 very depleted right where it was replaced.

1 I am very concerned about me and my Amish
2 neighbors and friends that live next door to me. They got
3 the same letter and disc although they can't do anything
4 with the disc. They have no computers. They have no
5 electricity. So I am kind of asking questions for and
6 commenting with them, too. We don't know where this line is
7 going, where it's going to cross the back of our properties,
8 or not. And that's what we're concerned with. I have three
9 acres of woods where it's potentially going to cross. If it
10 crosses those three acres of woods, I have no woods left.

11 Because of the scope of this huge gas pipeline.
12 A big farm neighbor of mine, he has 1400 acres, he's
13 organic, 100 percent organic. Those crops will not return to
14 normal for many years, if this pipeline goes through.

15 There's no one here to speak up for the Amish
16 community. They can't attend because it would take them
17 forever just to get here by buggy. They are not allowed to
18 come by car to something like this, they have to come by
19 buggy only. There's no facilities for them to park a buggy
20 here. It would take them hours upon hours to get here. They
21 are nearly 30 miles away.

22 MRS. ADAMSON; It's difficult for us to
23 understand the language of the literature that we are
24 getting, so I am sure with an eighth grade education that
25 it's really nearly impossible for them to really know what

1 really is even happening.

2 MR. ADAMSON: That is correct. Amish only go to
3 the eighth grade. They don't go beyond that or they have to
4 leave the Amish community. The language is very difficult.
5 The disc is over 1,400 pages. I am lost at page 20. I'm sure
6 a lot of college graduates would be lost too. I'm sure you
7 two people would be lost.

8 This meeting is really not a meeting. You are
9 dragging people aside in rooms by themselves away from all
10 other people. So everybody else does not hear everybody
11 else's comments. To me that's like a kangaroo court. You
12 know what a kangaroo court is, I'm sure.

13 I want to talk again about the depleting of
14 minerals in the soil because the plants -- the agricultural
15 plants -- including organic grains, wheat, corn, they do not
16 come back. For many years after the soil has been disturbed,
17 such as it will be if this pipeline goes through.

18 I am on the alternative route, not the main
19 route, but I hear that the alternative route is going to be
20 the route because there's too many environmentally sensitive
21 areas where the main route is located.

22 And the map is just not clear enough. I tried to
23 get details on the map. My neighbor's written, hasn't got
24 an answer. And, since he's Amish, that's his only way to
25 communicate. They do not talk on the phone. This is the

1 oldest order of Amish in the country. They are very, very
2 strict. Some of their district bishops won't even allow them
3 to have gravel. And they won't talk on the phone, they won't
4 even hold a phone. Because of their fear that another Amish
5 person will come down the road and see them. They won't even
6 hold a telephone.

7 I am a go-between, to hospitals, doctors, when
8 they say they won't talk to anybody else but the Amish
9 person. Then they can see here the Amish person in the
10 background. "I am so and so, Rick Adamson has my permission
11 for you to give him answers and questions." They are the
12 most strictest clan and the oldest clan. That are here, the
13 community of Amish in the United States. As far as we know.
14 So I do their phone work. The only time they are allowed to
15 ride in a car is for emergencies, doctor's, dentist's,
16 things like that. They can not ride in a car to come to
17 these meetings.

18 That's just about all I have to comment on.

19 Mostly, the crops are definitely depleted for
20 years after the soil is disturbed at this depth.

21 Thank you for having us here.

22

23 MARK KOLESAR

24 MR. KOLESAR: I have been a county resident for
25 33 years and I have concerns about the pipeline coming

1 through our county. I attended one of the public meetings on
2 the compression station, but looking over the entire line,
3 and the impact on Medina County, I have issues with the
4 location of the pipeline closest to property owners'
5 structures and homes.

6 I am concerned, you hear of the numbers, some of
7 the pipeline being 100, 200 feet from a home. When you are
8 looking at a blast zone that's so much larger, it just
9 boggles my mind as to why we are allowing to put a 36 inch
10 high pressure line so close to someone's property, and to me
11 that is a safety concern.

12 The environmental impacts of the pipeline coming
13 through and where the proposed line is. One example is the
14 pipeline to run on the north side of Chippewa Lake, which is
15 the largest glacier-made natural lake in the State of Ohio.
16 And it's fed by what is called the Chippewa Inlet. But this
17 pipeline will be cutting across the north side of that
18 entire lake's source of water. So I have a concern that if
19 anything is to happen with that line, it is going to
20 contaminate that inlet, which is the only source to feed
21 that lake, and a treasure we have in Medina County is at
22 risk. So, to me that is concerning.

23 I went to the meeting that the Ohio EPA had
24 referenced to the compression station that's in Guilford
25 Township, and sat back and listened and looked at the

1 other's conversation in reference to a contained compression
2 station versus a compression station that emits omissions
3 into the local neighborhood, if you will. And I am trying to
4 understand why that NEXUS wouldn't consider or put in a
5 compression station that is self-contained and does not emit
6 any pollutants, or anything along that line to the area, and
7 that causes me concern as to the local property owners
8 around there.

9 We see other proposed lines that might be
10 introduced here in the state, like the Rover line. Why isn't
11 NEXUS or the state or the federal level, why aren't we
12 working to set up a larger corridor area where there are a
13 less amount of property owners impacted by these natural gas
14 lines? Instead of a corridor that runs from I believe
15 Carrollton County all the way up to Canada. Maybe something
16 more in a generalized area, I know they can't be next to
17 each other, but something more in a generalized area that
18 impacts a lesser amount of property owners.

19 What benefits is this line going to give to
20 Medina County residents? And I don't see too much, I see a
21 36 inch high pressure line that goes from Carrollton County
22 or Southeastern Ohio up to Canada. And there is really
23 nothing in this area that shows our benefit. So for me to
24 see the risk factor of having this line in for generations
25 and generations to come, it just concerns me.

1 And I am concerned about future maintenance of
2 this pipeline. Who is going to be in charge of that? Is
3 FERC and the other government entities putting things in
4 place to make sure NEXUS, or the future company that might
5 take over NEXUS's assets, are there proper steps going to be
6 put in place to make sure that there's enough money, enough
7 capital there to make any improvements that might go wrong?
8 That's concerning.

9 Back to the emissions, I am trying to get good
10 data, and this has been a learning process, the Ohio EPA is
11 showing and giving data on what emissions are actually going
12 to be released in that area.

13 And then you have attorneys from -- and then
14 again some of the people that are fighting the pipeline. The
15 actual numbers are skewed a little bit compared to, one says
16 it's actually going to be more than what the Ohio EPA says,
17 and as an innocent bystander, I just want the facts, and I
18 want to make sure that our county residents are protected.
19 This county I believe lives on a great quality of life, we
20 have higher standards around here, and to me having a
21 pipeline of this caliber is a risk factor for the future of
22 our county and it's livelihood.

23 I reach out to FERC, I reach out to all the
24 government entities in place, if everything is not on the up
25 and up we're not making sure that we have backup plans and

1 great plans in place to protect our residents and our
2 property owners, then we shouldn't have to come through with
3 that account, and if that can't be in place I would rather
4 see it rerouted.

5 And take the southern tier into other counties
6 that might be more welcoming to the pipeline to us. I think
7 it comes down to a quality of life and protecting that
8 quality of life for generations.

9 So I reach out to FERC to make sure that
10 everything is met and if there are any concerns that I
11 brought up that aren't, I think we need to slow the pace
12 down and make sure everything is taken care of in a proper
13 manner instead of trying to bolt it down into the county in
14 a rapid approach. And I appreciate all your time, and
15 letting me get here and speak.

16

17 JONATHAN STRONG, 2730 Seville Road, Guilford Township 44270

18 MR. STRONG: I am going to read the prepared
19 statement that I have, so I don't forget anything important
20 to me.

21 So, I struggled to hone in on what to say at
22 this hearing, as so many areas of this pipeline process are
23 upside down and against us from a landowner's perspective.
24 However, I realize my comments, if to be considered, need to
25 focus on what matters.

1 What matters at this hearing is Section 3.3.3,
2 pages 322 through 324 of the DEIS volume one. the City of
3 Green Alternate Route. Two years of dedication to learning
4 process after process and connecting with hundreds of
5 neighbors and families across Northeast Ohio to hear their
6 stories, led to the creation of the City of Green Alternate
7 Route. In the DEIS, page ES-16, the Commission has stated
8 that both the City of Green route and the proposed route
9 alternative are acceptable.

10 First of all, thank you for listening. On Page
11 3-23, the Commission states:

12 Therefore we find that either route is safe
13 regardless of population density. However, an
14 important consideration in routing a natural gas
15 transmission pipeline instead is the impact on
16 land use.

17 I respectfully disagree with this statement. The
18 Commission is making a potentially fatal assumption here.
19 The assumption is the pipeline will be constructed perfectly
20 and without any issue to the exact specifications of the
21 Department of Transportation, and is therefore "safe".

22 Since this is being constructed by humans in the
23 field, there is no way a 100 percent perfection will ever be
24 achieved. Ask the folks in Sam Bruno or Salem, Pennsylvania
25 about perfection. Talk to the mother of James Baker whose

1 son has been forever changed from the burns sustained from
2 the most recent Spectra Energy pipeline failure.

3 With the proposed route bobbing and weaving
4 through heavily populated neighborhoods and communities,
5 this assumption is frankly ludicrous. Add to this the fact
6 that the Department of transportation, through PIPA and
7 PHMSA, recommends communities not develop near these
8 transmission lines after they are in. And yet, the CFR
9 statutes allow them to be put in within feet of a home just
10 to save the least disjointed policy.

11 We have a choice in siting this pipeline now in a
12 way that is both environmentally better and more sensible
13 and considerate of human life.

14 The Commission talks about easement compensation
15 and process in the draft EIS page 324. Let me tell you a
16 little bit about this "fair compensation" in process. I, as
17 a landowner along with many others have had to sacrifice
18 thousands of hours to educate ourselves in a process geared
19 towards a private company with a self-serving agenda.
20 Harassed with phone calls and propaganda mailings full
21 misrepresentation and false statements in an attempt to
22 garner support.

23 This is not the America I want for my children
24 or my grandchildren. Spectra Energy/NEXUS may be used to
25 getting things their way all the time which has emboldened

1 them into the bullies they have become today. NEXUS and
2 their attorneys present misrepresentation to the community
3 they profess to care about, then level lawsuit after lawsuit
4 as if they are the victims. In filing a suit they weave a
5 story of being an innocent victim misrepresenting the FERC
6 process and requirements in an attempt to manipulate the
7 courts to play their game to meet a self-imposed timeline of
8 operation.

9 Now we see fictitious letters from residents
10 being flooded on the docket in support of NEXUS. These
11 letters are mailed, follow a template, have no signature --
12 many of which come from areas outside the affected proposed
13 route or alternative routes. We in Coring have reached out
14 to more than a dozen of these people, and in every instance
15 they are stating they did not write or send any such letter
16 into the FERC docket.

17 It's time the Commission helped little guys, the
18 families, and the small communities make a statement to the
19 industry that this is a new day. It is no longer acceptable
20 to bully a project through a community for personal gain.

21 It is no longer acceptable to lie and
22 misrepresent the truth in court to achieve a self-imposed,
23 self-serving timeline.

24 It is no longer acceptable to choose the least
25 capable of defending themselves and victimize them for

1 personal gain.

2 It is no longer acceptable to manipulate the
3 system with falsified letters of support from unknowing
4 families and make-believe customers.

5 It is no longer acceptable to harass law-abiding
6 citizens with threatening letters, phone calls, and paid for
7 gun-toting security personnel.

8 It is no longer acceptable for this Commission to
9 hide behind other departments and regulatory agencies, and
10 not stand for what is right and just for the American
11 people.

12 Now, it is time the Federal Energy Regulatory
13 Commission to send a message to the industry that people
14 matter, the process is not to be taken lightly or toyed
15 with, and that truthful facts do matter.

16 We can do better than the NEXUS proposed route,
17 you can make the call to enforce this route alternative and
18 you must. All this being said I am respectfully and with
19 every fiber of my being for myself, my family, my community,
20 my State, my country, asking the Commission to mandate the
21 current "City of Green Alternate Route" be implemented.

22 I would now like to close us with a prayer:
23 God, you are an awesome God and I am humble to
24 come before you with this petition. Lord Jesus
25 thank you for a country where we have the ability

1 to participate in government. I thank you for all
2 the men and women who serve this nation. God you
3 are the truth, the way, and the life we can know
4 this through the sacrificial gift you made on our
5 behalf of your son Jesus, who gave it all for us
6 on the cross. My request is that you would
7 continue to redeem this pipeline process for your
8 purposes. I pray you would grant wisdom,
9 discernment to the Commission with their decision
10 yet before them.

11 I pray for your protection to be upon each and
12 every member of the FERC team and the NEXUS team
13 through out this process. Lord God your word
14 tells us that you are sovereign over all things
15 and I pray you would give me the grace needed to
16 accept the things I can not change, courage to
17 stand on the truth and change the things which
18 should be changed and the wisdom to distinguish
19 the one from the other. Mostly God I pray that
20 each person within reach of this project either
21 through direct or indirect contact may hear of
22 your gospel message. The word "Gospel" means good
23 news which is the message of forgiveness for sin
24 through the atoning work of Jesus Christ. Your
25 word says in Romans 10 If you confess with your

1 mouth that Jesus is Lord and believe in your
2 heart that God raised him from the dead you will
3 be saved. For with the heart one believes and is
4 justified and with the mouth one confesses and is
5 saved. I thank you for this opportunity may you
6 be glorified and thy will be done. I ask all
7 these things in Jesus's name -Amen.

8 And I really do appreciate you guy's time and
9 offering this venue. I know some people are taken aback by
10 the format. I know there's trade-offs, but I am just
11 thankful to have the opportunity to speak, so thank you.

12

13 LAUREN HALFORD

14 MS. HALFORD: My first point is that in the EIS
15 the FERC staff concludes that:

16 The approval of projects would result in some
17 adverse environmental impacts however, most of
18 these impacts would be reduced to less than
19 significant levels with the implementation of
20 NEXUS and Texas Eastern's proposed mitigation
21 measures and the additional recommendations.

22 I want to know what "most" means and what
23 environmental impacts would not be reduced. And also what
24 does "less than significant" mean and who determines what is
25 less significant. And who will monitor the project ongoing

1 to determine that the mitigation measures are being used.

2 As far as NEXUS indicating that the need for the
3 project originates for an increase in demand for natural
4 gas, I am confused by it because everything that I read is
5 that the demand for natural gas in our country is low, and
6 that we actually have a surplus. So I don't see any need for
7 a pipeline in our country.

8 It also states that some long-term cumulative
9 benefits to the community would be realized from increased
10 tax revenues, jobs, wages, purchases of materials. I would
11 like to know more about what details they can give about
12 benefits. How much will NEXUS pay in taxes, how many jobs,
13 none of that was in the impact statement.

14 And then what analysis would be done to determine
15 that the tax revenue would be more beneficial than having
16 healthy people and healthy ecosystem.

17 And who will pay for people that get sick from
18 these chemicals being deposited in the air and the water?

19 And also I am concerned about who would cover
20 emergency costs if a pipeline exploded?

21 Also we have really small, rural, fire
22 departments. They are volunteer for the most part. And so I
23 am concerned about their ability to handle a disaster. I
24 didn't see anything in the EIS that addressed that issue.

25 I also had a lot of concern with it seems like

1 all the analysis done was done by NEXUS. That seems like a
2 conflict of interest to me. Will there be any additional
3 third-party studies? i guess, ongoing I want to know what
4 the government is going to do to measure impact after the
5 pipeline is in, after the compressor station is in.

6 All throughout the document I read a lot about
7 how it won't adversely impact the state and so it seems like
8 FERC is giving it the OK. I read that there were 91 species
9 of wild life, 5,000 acres of land, 4,000 major farmlanders,
10 4 organic farms, several speciality crops, 50 acres of
11 forest, 475 bodies of water, and there are 1,000's of
12 people, so I don't see how all of those adverse impactions
13 are okay for our state.

14 Thank You.

15

16 ROBERT L. MATHIS, 8925 Guilford Road, Seville Ohio 44273

17 MR. MATHIS: My house is one half mile south of
18 the proposed site of the compressor station.

19 I am extremely concerned about the pollution that
20 this thing is going to exhaust in the form of carcinogenics;
21 the noise, and what it's going to do to the land and the
22 water.

23 I am concerned about pipeline incidents, that
24 there is no safety, we live in what is called the incendiary
25 zone. If there is an accident my wife and I have seconds to

1 get out or we will be dead.

2 If there is an incident who is going to put the
3 fire out? We have a volunteer fire department in our area
4 and it takes minutes for them just to get to the station and
5 minutes for them to get to the fire.

6 The fact that NEXUS is going to be a self-
7 reporting agency is a concern. Are they going to lose their
8 data? who's going to check their data?

9 We have gone over this in three other meetings
10 and it's been water off a duck's back. So I have stood in
11 line close to two hours to say my little two minute speech.

12 It's going to affect all the property values in
13 the area. Our area is an agricultural based economy. There
14 are no studies being made of the pollution going into the
15 fuel crops or the animals that are raised.

16 I think we have been thrown to the dogs. That's
17 it.

18 MS. GRAY: R-o-b-i-n G-r-a-y. First off is
19 there someone here from FERC, and where are you from? Like
20 what state are you from?

21 FERC STAFF: Originally?

22 MS. GRAY: No.

23 FERC STAFF: I live in D.C.

24 MS. GRAY: Okay great. So thank you. First of
25 all I just wanted to relay that I am very disappointed at

1 FERC and our government for allowing this format. This is
2 reminiscent of what the Nazi's did -- where here we get this
3 number to come in here and we are not in an open forum where
4 there is light and it is transparent where we can all speak
5 together and we are stronger together in a group. All the
6 people where are homes are going to be affected by this
7 pipeline coming through -- the behavior and how these
8 tactics that Spectra and Nexus has put forth to get this
9 pipeline through for our community, our county, Medina
10 County -- I have lived here for 22 years.

11 I worked hard for my home. It wasn't given to
12 me. I had to sacrifice to earn that house and to pay that
13 mortgage off and now you are going to industrialize our
14 community with this Nazi pipeline coming through and the gas
15 that you are going to need to supply that pipeline with you
16 are going to frack our communities.

17 They just recently built four large hotels in our
18 community. There is no way the business community can
19 sustain those hotel rooms. You are going to bring these
20 people in from other states, Texas, Colorado and you are
21 going to frack our community. You are going to build these
22 pipelines -- they don't live here, they don't pay property
23 taxes here. They don't pay for the schools and the fire
24 department, the police department -- they are going to come
25 here and ruin our lovely community that we have worked so

1 hard to build and I am just completely against what is going
2 on here.

3 You are going to export this gas out of our great
4 nation. It is not going to be utilized for the men and
5 women of our state and then you are going to send it off to
6 the Far East where you can go ahead and these business
7 people can go ahead and take advantage of other countries
8 where they don't have laws to protect the people. And we
9 should have this -- this should have been in a public forum
10 just like the other one was that we just recently had and I
11 firmly believe that what you are trying to do is to break us
12 up so that we can't educate ourselves about how we feel and
13 what we are all going through from what is happening to our
14 community and the compressor station that you are putting in
15 a residential community where people spent their lives to
16 save up and get their homes and now the values are going to
17 be depleted.

18 And then you are going to go ahead and these
19 articles that we get in the newspaper saying that they are
20 going to provide 54 million dollars' worth of tax revenue
21 for the community. To me that's a transfer of wealth. What
22 you are doing is you are taking the wealth of the property
23 owners, of the people that are having this pipeline come
24 through and it is going to decrease the value of their homes
25 and you are giving hush money to the Commissioners and to

1 the political leaders to say, "Be quiet, don't give us any
2 pushback on this pipeline and we will reward you with tax
3 revenues later on in the future."

4 So you are taking the private -- our homes that
5 we have worked so hard for and you are taking our values and
6 you are transferring it to the county, the 54 million
7 dollars and that's wrong. That is not acceptable. And once
8 it gets out and the people realize that you are going to
9 have more and more people are going to stand up for what's
10 going on here.

11 Also the health consequences for our community,
12 the people that are allowing this do not live here. You
13 live in D.C. You don't have to have your children go
14 outside and suck in all the bad air that is generated from
15 the compressor stations. And they are allowed to go ahead
16 and bring in toxic waste and put it into injection wells in
17 one of our townships. They just got a permit to go ahead
18 and allow the new injection well in our community.

19 This is unacceptable. They don't allow fracking
20 in France. They don't allow it in Germany. They just
21 banned it in New York, they banned it in Vermont. Why is it
22 that the financial community in New York where they provide
23 the funding for the oil and gas industry, they banned it
24 where their kids are not going to be exposed to this --
25 their water is going to be clean, their air is going to be

1 clean.

2 But you are going to come here and you are going
3 to expose us to this Nazi science of fracking when it is not
4 sound science. It is not sound science and it should be
5 forbidden we should ban it in our country just like France
6 has and Germany has and now New York has just banned it.

7 And they just got a thing on the ballot in
8 Colorado where they are going to ban it in Colorado so I am
9 completely against what is happening here and for you to
10 export it out of our great nation is just outrageous. And
11 that's it -- that's all I wanted to say.

12 FERC STAFF: Well thank you very much.

13 MS. GOURLEY: Terry Gourley.

14 COURT REPORTER HAWKINS: Last name?

15 MS. GOURLEY: G-o-u-r-l-e-y, you're welcome, okay
16 so I'll just begin. I'm just going to go through your
17 Environmental Impact Statement -- that will help me keep my
18 thoughts organized and then would it be best if I referred
19 to like a page number or -- okay. So just in your
20 introduction you talked about the mitigation measures and my
21 first question is -- who is going to -- and are you the
22 organization -- and I want to know the answer, who checks
23 the mitigation measures?

24 Are you the ones that do the consistent follow-up
25 or have you hired third parties to do that? Some of the

1 things later in the document say that there will be hired
2 third parties especially when it talks about environmental
3 impact. But I want to know about the whole process because
4 there are a number of different things that are addressed in
5 this Environmental Impact -- noise, other natural resources,
6 I'm thinking about water sheds, waterways.

7 And then I live rurally so I don't have access to
8 the internet. I stop by the library -- is there any other
9 way to receive the docket information and all the comments
10 or Nexus's responses to these recommendations that were
11 supposed to be submitted before the end of the comment
12 period? So I don't know the answer to that other than go to
13 the library.

14 I also want to know how I become a person to file
15 a Motion to Intervene. They weren't able to answer that so
16 I don't know if somebody knows the answer to that. It was
17 who I asked that question to.

18 Okay first comment I am a little apprehensive
19 about the analysis was based on information provided by the
20 applicants. So you are taking their information when they
21 have economic and I think that's the main benefit -- so you
22 are going to take their information and use their
23 information submitted to you to make your decisions -- that
24 makes me concerned.

25 I think it should be the other way around. I

1 think that and I don't know that's probably a big process to
2 have you know, employees at FERC that take the application
3 information and then you guys gather -- I think that you try
4 to corroborate the information but I am not so sure that you
5 have the manpower to do that. I in my exposure to federal
6 agencies tell me that there is a lot of bureaucracy within
7 the federal agencies so I am not sure that there is complete
8 cohesion with the decision-making process.

9 The other thing it said was there are field
10 investigations done and I want to know is that field
11 investigation referring to FERC? You guys actually sending
12 out people to investigate? That's a question. A lot of my
13 questions have a lot to do with the how are you confirming
14 the information -- the geo-technical and the environmental
15 and the information submitted by them. How do you confirm
16 that?

17 Then we get into pages like ES-4 and ES-5 where
18 they talk about -- and this is with the ground water surface
19 water stuff, inadvertent release of drilling mud
20 inadvertently makes the fuel lubricants -- environmental
21 inspectors and so again who is this and how are they going
22 to report that to the community or the local authorities or
23 what is the process in that?

24 You know my interest is that I am immediately
25 adjacent to the compressor station that is proposed in

1 Wadsworth. And I am not so sure that someone is going to
2 voluntarily come over and tell me that they have an
3 inadvertent release of something and so I want to know do I
4 as a local concerned citizen have the right to be on site
5 when they are doing certain things or do I have the right to
6 have contact with the FERC person that is supervising or do
7 I have the right to just have an update periodically if I
8 call someone and say, "Hey it smells funny, looks kind of
9 funny over there, is it all normal? Is everything okay?"
10 Can I do that?

11 And how would I do that? Oh and I want to
12 formally say I am not a property owner that the pipeline is
13 going through but I am immediately adjacent to and it says
14 here ES-4 that you -- the applicants would offer to conduct
15 pre and post-construction testing water quality and yield in
16 all wells within 150 feet of the construction once it -- I
17 think I'm a little bit beyond the 150 feet but I would like
18 to be one of those that gets pre and post-well testing, and
19 how do I do that?

20 And if this is a way to request that I would like
21 to do that. Do you know the answer to that?

22 FERC STAFF: I can answer some of these process
23 questions also afterwards.

24 MS. GOURLEY: Okay got you -- alright there is
25 all these recommend, recommend, recommend, recommend -- what

1 has been explained by Doug is that the Commission takes your
2 proposal -- your Impact Statement, Draft Environmental
3 Impact Statement and then they make their recommendations
4 and they may or may not incorporate your recommends.

5 And I would like to know when they make their
6 final statement do they tell us why they chose not to
7 incorporate all of your recommends? Does that make sense?
8 Oh and then here the applicants requested the use of
9 additional temporary workspace in several areas where they
10 conclude that site-specific conditions do not allow for 50
11 foot setback, do they detail that somewhere in here because
12 I couldn't find it, it doesn't mean it's not in here but the
13 specific areas that they are saying they don't have -- they
14 can't work within this 50 foot setback. And why do you
15 allow that?

16 It says -- you said, "Nexus has provided adequate
17 justification," -- is that justification on the e-document
18 information? And when I'm saying and part of all my
19 questions is this seems so -- like it seems like such a
20 complex way to gather information and data I wonder if there
21 is a more coherent way to find answers to the questions.

22 And I called Nexus three times have not had any
23 answers from anybody there. I called and left messages with
24 just wanting general information questions answered because
25 they have sent me in the mail multiple little cards, just a

1 few of them I have brought and they started very early on in
2 the project. And they say get the facts, if you want to
3 know more go here but there is no contact information like
4 to call a person. And so I just happened to look on the
5 internet Nexus and up comes some names so I called those
6 people -- I don't know if they were the right contact people
7 if that's why they haven't called me back but nobody has
8 called me back.

9 So I am right adjacent to the compressor station
10 and I have got some questions. So don't you think that that
11 should be something that should be addressed? Also it says
12 in here that they have agreed to send out newsletters to
13 interested parties and I have never been contacted as an
14 interested party but the regular newsletter mailing for
15 affected land owners and other interested parties is in your
16 1-8 document -- I've never got one but I have gotten these
17 cards that tell me how many jobs they are going to provide
18 and if this is the newsletter then I guess it seems like not
19 much news.

20 Anyway and then whenever they -- I want to
21 address this one card that gets into another topic. Their
22 card that they sent me addresses I think the 13 t-taps that
23 aren't really counted it looks like in your assessment --
24 it's only the 6 actual contracts that you use as I don't
25 know the right word, the 6 actual contracts that they have

1 for planned purchasing the gas or what you counted as weight
2 for making your decision. But this is what they are using
3 to sell to the community and I just think how come they are
4 allowed to do that? It seems like it is falsifying
5 information because these aren't even -- they are saying
6 this is potential stuff that it is making sound like it's
7 actual.

8 So let's see -- if I go on there are a couple of
9 places where you say that there will be long-term or
10 permanent impact, particularly what I'm talking about
11 vegetative issues, wetlands, forests, potential long-term or
12 permanent and especially this 1-39.9 acres from forested or
13 scrubbed shrub wetlands to emergent or scrubbed shrub
14 wetland. That's a lot of acres, especially if most of the
15 pipeline and if I understand this correctly there is a lot
16 of the pipeline that is going to follow an established
17 route, an established right-of-way.

18 And if this 40 acres that is going to be
19 converted is the new area that is concerned to me especially
20 if it is in my community because my community in Medina
21 County is the newer area where they are not using a lot of
22 right-of-way already -- and because we already have huge
23 mortality issues on our highways from deer because of the
24 fragmentation of the habitats we get a lot of car/deer
25 accidents.

1 And as we are thinking about here you guys even
2 state that there is land displacement of wildlife and
3 potential individual mortality reduction of habitat and
4 forest fragmentation if that would increase in certain
5 locations. That makes me concerned because I already live
6 in a relatively rural area where there is a highway and an
7 airport you know and lots of developments so these long-term
8 and permanent impacts on vegetation and habitat I want to
9 know why you guys view that as going to happen but
10 apparently not significant enough to recommend against or
11 recommend for the no construction option.

12 Oh yes in this one area you said that I am not
13 familiar with this but this is news to me. Ohio Oak
14 Openings region in Henry and Fulton Counties, Ohio, roughly
15 99% of the eco-system has been altered or fragmented by
16 agricultural development primarily through tree clearing and
17 wetland draining. And so you go on to say that there's an
18 area going to be impacted by this pipeline that is only "5
19 miles in length" that will be crossed by that but because of
20 that you have already told us that there has to be a 10 foot
21 section that is permanently cleared and then there is going
22 to be a so-many foot section that is going to be maintained
23 as a right-of-way.

24 And I am saying already you have given me
25 statistics that seem overwhelmingly for -- like why not go

1 around this area -- already 99% has been altered and
2 fragmented? So we are saying it is already a mess let's
3 just add a little bit more to it. But it is not significant
4 enough. So I am not very sure where you guys get the
5 statistics from -- and this is not a criticism that someone
6 is not using correct statistics, but I am trying to
7 understand.

8 You make this statement that 99% has already been
9 disrupted and we are only going to disrupt another half
10 mile. Can I ask you if you need CPR? Don't put that on the
11 record -- no put it on the record it will make me sound
12 concerned.

13 Do you need some water though?

14 COURT REPORTER HAWKINS: Eventually I'll get
15 some.

16 MS. GOURLEY: Okay and then let's go on to talk
17 about this area as a pollinator habitat that is going to be
18 affected. This is an agricultural area and you are going to
19 affect 1,049.9 acres with pollinator habit are going to be
20 affected. And I know that more and more stuff is becoming
21 available and we are developing our knowledge and
22 understanding of the impact but this is significant impact
23 and when you say in your report that they will provide
24 pollinator habitat -- once we vegetated after the first or
25 second growing season.

1 Well pollinators don't wait first or second
2 growing seasons to reproduce. You guys know how this works,
3 you are smart people. They need to have their habitat then
4 and how do we know -- is someone taking a look at -- you
5 make this corridor and how do we know that this pollinator
6 will cross this corridor that has not been vegetated to be
7 able to go over there and pollinate? Are their habits such
8 that they will do that? Maybe they will but are they such
9 that they will -- well we are not crossing that, you know we
10 only go this many feet or we only fly this far.

11 And I have a concern because we have regularly
12 Monarch butterflies that are on our farm regularly and we
13 own an organic farm and for that reason we leave the milk
14 weed at the perimeter and we don't mow it because we know
15 that's their habitat. So I am concerned for a number of
16 reasons. Number one you know agriculturally that's an issue
17 and number two you know if we are not looking out for the
18 future and the eventualities of these creatures one day they
19 are not going to be there and we are going to wonder why.

20 The noxious or invasive species -- when you leave
21 naked ground and you throw seed down you know what's going
22 to grow there more likely -- the noxious stuff, mare's tail
23 and all the invasive weed species. So even though they
24 throw that stuff down it doesn't mean that's what's going to
25 grow there immediately so I have a concern about how that

1 process works.

2 And just a general comment you know I have been
3 informed by different people that there are pipelines
4 crossing all over the place and I haven't been aware of any
5 because I haven't lived adjacent to one and so my interest
6 now is really strongly piqued because I am going to live
7 adjacent to a pipeline, I am going to live adjacent to a
8 compressor station and the Lord is ultimately going to
9 decide whether it is going to go through but if we are not
10 looking out for our community and we are not keeping our
11 eyes open for potential things and we are not bringing up
12 these concerns I understand that you folks as regulators or
13 government employees are all doing a great job and are all
14 doing everything the way you are supposed to.

15 I don't have any questions about that. And I
16 understand that you have to operate within regulation but
17 you also have consciences and you also have common sense and
18 you know that a lot of these comments that folks are
19 bringing up are probably good but because there is not an
20 avenue for addressing those within regulation or within
21 process, nothing can be done about it.

22 So I really wonder if in the process can anything
23 be done to alter the way these companies apply or the way
24 they you know, propose something is accomplished? Because
25 later in your document you talk about public necessity and

1 need for the project and in Section 1-4 you talk about all
2 the other -- you looked at and understood all the additional
3 potential gas avenues that are going to be available in the
4 future from the Marcellus and Utica shale.

5 And there are so many different pipelines already
6 I am surprised that as creative people we haven't come up
7 with a way to use what is already there. And I wonder if in
8 the process just because they are saying we want to build
9 another one -- why can't one of the first steps in the
10 process be that they have already looked and said we -- one
11 of the things going forward with any application is saying,
12 "We have already looked at the other avenues for getting our
13 gas where it needs to go and here's why it won't work."

14 Is that part of the process at all? Because
15 that's what I think -- I mean recycle. We are all like
16 using the same stuff over and over we have to think that
17 way. Let's see -- here you talk about Nexus provide final
18 migratory bird conservation plans for the Borough of
19 Michigan and Ohio. And you talk about vegetative
20 maintenance in the permanent right-of-way would take place
21 no more than once every 3 years -- I want to know what time
22 period do you put specific constraints on them when they
23 mow? Is it they can't mow during the nesting season?

24 Because some of the ground nesting birds like
25 ducks, mallards, will have like several hatchings and I

1 wonder -- you put March 31st to August 1st is that just the
2 time range or does it depend on what animals live in that
3 habitat that is going to be mown?

4 Let's see -- oh I wonder have you done a formal
5 consultation with the Endangered -- the folks who are the
6 experts in the Endangered Species Act? Because it says here
7 that you did through the applicant's informal consultation
8 with those experts -- I would like to know what the formal
9 consultation is because later the Ohio EPA had made
10 recommendations that were different than what the Nexus
11 recommendations where and so I wondered if maybe the
12 Endangered Species Act experts would agree with the
13 conclusions that Nexus had.

14 When you allow them -- when you say they have
15 this mowing criteria not more often than once every 3 years
16 but a 10 foot wide strip centered over the pipeline is that
17 -- that can be anybody, it can be whoever they contract
18 with? And does the person that they contract with know and
19 understand what to report if they see something unusual?
20 That's what I would wonder.

21 Where can I see the Issue Resolution Plan? Can I
22 have that in writing? And then you say repairs and
23 restoration to all these systems, the drain pile would be
24 monitored for 3 years or until restoration is considered
25 successful -- is that something in writing? Do you send

1 something to the home owner and say yes sign off if you
2 agree everything has been restored successfully or who makes
3 that determination?

4 To maintain that 10 foot are they allowed to use
5 herbicides? Because we are an organic farm and I don't want
6 -- I wouldn't want herbicides sprayed within so many feet of
7 my property. Here's something I thought was significant too
8 -- the Nexus Gas Transmission Project would directly affect
9 numerous you say trails, conservation, recreation and sports
10 facilities, state parks and in northeast Ohio here or in
11 Medina County specifically, because it is new pipeline not
12 using current pipeline route -- those areas would seem
13 significant to me because I enjoy recreation in the area and
14 I'm not so sure that I would enjoy having herbicide or paths
15 cut across our recreation area, so I would object to that.

16 And I'm thinking overall is the weight of the
17 application, the economics of Nexus? They have 6 customers
18 or at least 6 perceived contracts and because they have that
19 they automatically get the right-of-way and they
20 automatically get to take a property owner's right of what
21 to do with that property away because they have 6 customers?
22 I'm not sure about how the equality of that works out?

23 I understand that you are just the agency that
24 makes the approval but that just doesn't make sense to me.
25 I'm concerned for the 112 sites listed as potential or known

1 sources of contamination and hazardous wastes within a
2 quarter mile of 112 sites. I'm not sure again I am going to
3 trust Nexus, not that they are inherently dishonest but are
4 we going to trust the stakeholders to tell us if they made a
5 mistake or they have come across something that is noxious
6 or hazardous?

7 Now here you talk about the visual effects of
8 constructed forested areas -- we live adjacent to the
9 proposed construction site adjoining properties not
10 separated by a roadway, of the proposed compressor station.
11 The property owner has chosen after they surveyed, after
12 they have done all their EPA evaluations to deforest the
13 land for the economic benefit. Nobody looked at the bats,
14 nobody looked at the wetlands, nobody looked at anything but
15 he has a private consumer could choose to do that and so now
16 they are basing all the data and the information on building
17 that compressor station on conditions that don't exist
18 anymore.

19 So you know when you talk about visual effects
20 and noise effects, I'm not sure they used trees as buffering
21 but there aren't -- the trees there, the buffer and they are
22 saying visual impacts would be mitigated because they are
23 going to install perimeter fences, directionally controlled
24 lighting and slighted fencing -- oh that's better to look at
25 then the trees.

1 So now what's going to happen with the wetland
2 that was in there now? There's more exposure to it because
3 -- I would like somebody to look at that. Because now all
4 the trees are gone is that still considered a wetland or is
5 it more susceptible to encroachment from whatever the
6 compressor station would emit?

7 So I don't know if somebody can formally do that
8 but I would like to request that. And I am not sure what
9 the status of who owns that or how that works you know, I
10 think there's a proposed arrangement there but Nexus would
11 know about that and not make a statement about that or allow
12 that because they have been there since so they know that
13 has happened.

14 Let's see this is the example I was using that
15 the Ohio SHPO has said that there's actually more sites that
16 are eligible as historically protected sites, or
17 architectural properties than what the applicants identified
18 -- so that's just one consideration within your own document
19 where you say that this agency had a discrepancy with what
20 the applicant said so that's why I wonder is everything
21 being checked?

22 And then the applicants -- we recommend that the
23 applicants not begin construction until any additional
24 required surveys are completed. And I wonder is that an
25 enforceable thing or is that dependent on the Commission

1 because I was thinking that there is something in the court
2 currently about surveys in Medina County.

3 So another huge thing is the fugitive dusting
4 during construction. It is already an agricultural area in
5 two times spring and fall we have dust and so are we going
6 to have dust from emissions, dust from construction, is
7 anybody going to tell us anything? I don't know either
8 about the schedule the blowdowns -- are they going to notify
9 us when that is going to be? I would seem to be under the
10 impression that that is an annual thing and that they would
11 notify us but I have again had no communication from them
12 other than these cards that say you know it's going to be a
13 great thing.

14 So I want to know are they going to tell us that
15 and then I also want to know about continued noise it is
16 supposed to be at 55 decibels. Am I the one that has to
17 have documented when it exceeds that or are they going to
18 report to you when it exceeds that? Is my actual home
19 considered a noise sensitive area?

20 Or is my whole property considered a noise
21 sensitive area since it is a private residence? I want to
22 know that.

23 Okay here's -- cumulative impacts, this is the
24 big thing that I thought -- long term cumulative impacts on
25 wetlands, forested vegetation, wildlife habitats and again I

1 think if we look at the future potential for a lot of the
2 gas development in the area and I'm not sure that there's a
3 reason to continue to go forward with this project if we
4 already have you say, we determined 6 existing and 3
5 proposed systems potentially that could be used in various
6 combinations to transport natural gas to and from the market
7 served by the project, however none of these have capacity
8 available.

9 I am just surprised that you can't ask them to be
10 creative. That's one of the solutions. Say we already have
11 this, I mean do we want to be a community crisscrossed by
12 pipelines and don't go here, you can't mow here, you can't
13 dig here, you can't live here, you can't -- I mean we have
14 all moved here for a certain quality of life -- to live in
15 an agricultural community where there is peace and quiet and
16 then when we as a community say, "No, we are not interested
17 in this and we are trying to follow the formal processes," I
18 just want to know if somebody is looking at are there formal
19 community representatives or private entity representatives
20 from the community that have direct access to the
21 decision-making and the impact statements and the drafting
22 or is it all employees, you know, FERC or --

23 And if that is not the case then I would
24 recommend that -- especially on these projects, especially
25 where it said that you had 2,000 comments and maybe you get

1 that all the time but that's a lot of comments and there is
2 a lot of people that have something to say.

3 You've recommended 47 projects specific
4 mitigation measures that the applicants should implement.
5 That doesn't mean that they will but if you recommended them
6 and you have good basis for recommending them because you
7 guys have studied it and you have looked at documents and
8 you have consulted with other agencies I would want to know
9 similar to what I have asked before is why would the
10 Commission tell you why they haven't made that
11 recommendation?

12 And again I am surprised, what's the minimum --
13 do you have a minimum number of new metering and regulating
14 stations or a minimum number of clients that they have or
15 could it be just one that you approve because you say they
16 have a customer, there's a consumer, that's enough or is it
17 a volume or is it a dollar amount? Because it sounds like
18 you didn't include the t-taps as weighting in your decision
19 or your recommendation.

20 It was a little confusing when I read your
21 document because it said at one point you wouldn't determine
22 the need and then later it said that you will determine the
23 need so I want to know what do you use in determining the
24 need?

25 The Commission bases its decision not only on

1 environmental impact but also technical competence
2 financing. I want to know what that is. Like do they have
3 the money? Rates, market, demand, gas supply, long-term
4 feasibility and other issues concerning the proposed project
5 -- are any of those things formally decided or is that an
6 informal decision by the Commission?

7 Do you have anything you want to say to me
8 because I am almost done? You had asked something about
9 engineering, there was a question. Yeah does he have to do
10 that separately? Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No just what maintenance
12 would be required on something like this because it was our
13 understanding this is new technology as opposed to comparing
14 it to something that is already existing and you have live
15 data. So if it is brand new people that are adjacent in the
16 area could be potential for maintenance snafus in the proper
17 maintenance.

18 MS. GOURLEY: Okay's let's see I think that was
19 it. Did I give the longest comment? Let's see did you
20 write that down -- (laughing). That's okay let's see I
21 think oh okay here's my last one -- you say that each
22 applicant shall develop and implement an environmental
23 complaint resolution procedure. Prior to construction the
24 applicants will mail to each land owner whose property would
25 be crossed by the projects -- my concern is what about

1 adjacent especially to a compressor station -- if it's not
2 on it I want to say formally we should be included in that.
3 Okay, I think that's it. Except I am going to pray.

4 Father God I just thank you for this time that we
5 get to make comment and we just trust the decisions be in
6 your will and we trust you Lord for this process being for
7 your glory and we submit this to you in Jesus's name I pray,
8 Amen. Okay is that it?

9 FERC STAFF: Okay, give us your name and then we
10 can hear your comments.

11 MS. JONES: It's Katherine, K-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-e
12 Jones J-o-n-e-s. My comments are we should have had a
13 public meeting. We were demanding a public meeting. We
14 feel this is a farce it is to divide the people so they
15 don't hear each other and as far as further comments there's
16 no need for this pipeline and compressor station. It is
17 going to contaminate our air, our water and the report, the
18 Draft EIS report says, "Perhaps this, perhaps that," well
19 what do we do when it is all contaminated? Who is going to
20 protect us?

21 And a lot of the FERC people here are from out of
22 town so they could care less. We live here, we have the
23 right to say what we want in our community and we have a
24 right to protect the children and the future generations.
25 When we are going to have compressor stations that are going

1 to have formaldehyde, benzene, radon and cancer clusters
2 here and blowing toxins above EPA limits every 32 hours and
3 then we are going to have to worry about ruptured pipelines
4 and pipelines going through people's property feet from
5 their doorway, this is not what we want.

6 We don't want this in Medina County and we are
7 going to continue to fight it. And we think FERC is wrong,
8 we think Nexus is wrong. And as far as FERC I heard this
9 week that there were over 100 bogus letters sent to FERC
10 from Nexus from property owners that were already dead.
11 They signed them for the people who were already dead or we
12 checked with neighbors and they said they never signed those
13 letters. So FERC better look into that too because
14 something is wrong when you are getting bogus letters from
15 people that don't even exist or didn't sign the letters and
16 that's all I have to say.

17 FERC STAFF: Thank you very much.

18 MS. HORST: I'm Leona Horst, L-e-o-n-a H-o-r-s-t.
19 Do you need my address?

20 FERC STAFF: If you want to provide it.

21 MS. HORST: It's 8605 Matti Road, West Salem.
22 Okay ready -- I got my letter July 22nd or 23rd of last
23 month. Before that I didn't realize there was anything
24 about Nexus Pipeline coming through so I haven't had a lot
25 of time to pull comments together. So I am just going to

1 address some of my concerns that I have that as I wrote them
2 down.

3 I was talking with some of my neighbors and we
4 were saying why can't they use the Rover Pipeline easement
5 area that's already been evaluated for environmental impacts
6 and isn't being used rather than taking more farm land out
7 of production? I have several concerns -- I know this is a
8 proposed alternate route and some of my neighbors have not
9 even received notification yet and if it goes to me it would
10 have to go to them because there is no way it could go up in
11 the air and come back down to my property.

12 My farm has been in the family for over 3
13 generations since the 1880's and my goal is to pass the
14 viable farm land onto the next generation. As a result I
15 have some concerns. Part of the farm contains an orchard
16 that was started by my grandfather in the 1880's and these
17 are heritage apple varieties. I have not to date found any
18 company that supplies that particular variety of apples so I
19 cannot replace them.

20 I have tried doing grafting had no success. I
21 want to try doing germ plasm as a scientist to see if I
22 could reproduce those varieties of trees. I have not
23 received any contact in regards of an Environmental Impact
24 Statement, either letter, phone or in person and my
25 understanding is that has to be submitted by the end of

1 August.

2 So I have several concerns that would be
3 addressed by the Environmental Impact Statement. Several
4 areas of my farm are wetlands in the spring and the fall and
5 these areas are used by migrant birds as breeding grounds
6 and also feeding. It is also used by amphibians and I
7 haven't checked this year but previous years it's also been
8 one species of salamander that uses those which they are
9 kind of both amphibians and salamanders are becoming
10 endangered.

11 It's also used by blue herons throughout the year
12 as a pool with all the little minnows that are floating in
13 there. There's also one wetland area which is a possible
14 Native American hunting area and I'm guessing that because
15 of the number and type of arrowheads that are found there
16 and the tradition that has come down through the family.

17 I have about 5 acres that are virgin woods.
18 There have been a few trees that we have cut as a family for
19 firewood or for building but it has not been cleared. I had
20 the state forester come in the 1970's and he was puzzled by
21 some of the species that are growing there. He could narrow
22 it down to like oak but he couldn't clarify what type of oak
23 tree it was. He hadn't seen it before so he was kind of
24 uncertain and we just kind of dropped it at that point.

25 Some of the hollow trees are actually used by

1 bats however I don't know which endangered bat species it is
2 because I see them at dusk and I can't really determine
3 whether it is a long eared one or not.

4 In the 1980's I planted windbreak along the one
5 side of my property and it has taken me about 25 years to
6 get that established due to wind literally blowing the tree
7 sideways and I re-stake them. I had to re-stake them about
8 the first 5 to 10 years in order to get them to grow
9 straight and some of them still are leaning.

10 The windbreak provides a slowing of the wind --
11 it's the only windbreak in roughly about 8 miles depending
12 upon which direction the wind comes from. And my area is
13 flat and so it tends to be windy and so it helps slow the
14 wind down and in the winter it helps hold the snow there
15 which then helps replenish the aquifer which is used by all
16 of the farmers in our area for livestock as well as personal
17 use.

18 I have also creative a native pollinator habitat
19 in the last 15 years. That was before it became the
20 buzzword by the U.S.D.A. for encouraging farmers to create
21 that. And I know I have spotted the threatened species
22 Mitchell Spire butterfly in that habitat as well as a number
23 of native bees as well as my domestic goose using that.

24 In the late '70's and early '80's I worked with a
25 Soil and Water Conservation Office along with my father to

1 put drainage waterways in that connect both the drainage
2 from my farm and the drainage from the farms surrounding me
3 and they are all inner-connected so if anything would go
4 through my property you would have to know how to preserve
5 that drainage which also ties into the farm tiles as well as
6 the farm septic systems on several of the farms, it all kind
7 of pools together into that waterway.

8 Part of the farm has the fruit orchard that my
9 grandfather started and my father and I have both expanded
10 and I know that a pipeline area cannot plant any fruit trees
11 or vineyards in that area so I have a little concern about
12 that. The aquifer that I use is also used by the local
13 grade school which is grade school through 12th and it is
14 the whole northwest corner of our county that uses that same
15 aquifer.

16 I have also had several avid birders come to my
17 property to bird watch in the woods and orchard area and
18 also just see native habitat that I have established for
19 pollinators. And they all comments about the variety of the
20 birds that are actually on my farm. It's kind of unusual.
21 They have spotted some that I didn't know I had. So they
22 like to come in the spring and fall during migrations to
23 look at the warblers that go through as well as some of the
24 other birds.

25 So I have some concerns about construction of the

1 pipeline the noise, would that affect the birds that would
2 be nesting and passing through in that area. Another
3 concern I have is construction equipment -- I don't -- the
4 point of my knowledge know whether they actually sanitize
5 the equipment before it moves from one farm to the next and
6 I do know as a plant pathologist which is my occupation
7 during the day, I'm a farmer at night -- that those machines
8 can transport soil from one farm to the next and that soil
9 can contain seeds which would be invasive plants as well as
10 seeds which are resistant to your herbicides that are being
11 used and they can also transport soybean and nematode which
12 would decrease the host that I would get from the soybeans
13 and they could also transmit on that soil Pythigm
14 Phytophthora, do you want me to spell those out?

15 COURT REPORTER HAWKINS: Sure.

16 MS. HORST: I can spell it P-h-t-h-i-g-m is
17 Pythigm. Phytophthora is P-h-y-t-o-p-h-t-h-o-r-a and both
18 of those can be very deadly to soybean. It gets into the
19 soil and there's no way to get rid of it so you would have a
20 decrease in crop yields from those as well. So my concern
21 is how would they treat the equipment coming from one farm
22 to the next to decrease disease and hook resistant seeds and
23 basic wood species coming into my farm?

24 My farm also has buried electric lines, telephone
25 lines and also a propane gas line and so that would be a

1 and the state of Ohio and locally, we zone areas of our
2 communities for industrial use. It's pretty simple right?
3 So Medina has an industrial park, I work in that park
4 actually, Wyke has an industrial park, Brickman has areas
5 that are zoned for industrial and my primary objection to
6 the location is that within a 3 mile radius there are at
7 least 2 potentially 3 different industrial parks where this
8 could be placed where as a society we have said hey that's
9 where you put industry -- that's where you put things that
10 potentially pollute. That's where you put industrial-type
11 facilities entering in the ways --

12 COURT REPORTER HAWKINS: Excuse me (coughing)

13 (OFF THE RECORD CONVERSATION)

14 MR. DROWN: Anyways so a couple of different
15 things. There are some things on the report that I thought
16 the report kind of brushed over which had to do with
17 environmental leases, impact on water, impact on wildlife
18 and even noise concerns right? All of those things can be
19 eliminated by just moving this 3 mile-ish to an industrial
20 park, I mean that's why we zone those kind of things right.

21 So the exact math would be that 1.7 miles
22 approximately to the west is and just south of 76 instead of
23 just north of 76 so they all have a fairly large
24 industrialized zoned area. Wadsworth has one 2.7 miles to
25 the east, Brickman -- I don't know the exact impact -- the

1 exact distance it is probably a little closer to about 4, 4
2 and miles because they are an industrial area it is kind
3 of scattered around. And those would all be viable
4 alternatives if the pipeline stays where it is.

5 Now I support the corn people maybe to move the
6 entire pipeline south but more immediately I just don't
7 understand why we are putting this in a rural/residential
8 area. There are 57 homes in the neighborhood that are
9 within -- the neighborhood starts with about half a mile of
10 the area and it is a fairly large neighborhood so it
11 probably goes more like a mile and a half away on the edges
12 approximately.

13 You know those things if they explode have a
14 fairly large blast radius. I don't know exactly but from
15 some of the evidence I can gather the impact will go up to a
16 half mile to a mile blast radius and once again we zone
17 things industrial for risks like that.

18 So that's really my major objection to this is
19 that there are within reach without additional costs to
20 Nexus or anybody else, industrial parks where they can
21 locate this and it takes a bunch of the concerns out of the
22 equation because we have already made those decisions in
23 those industrial areas and so I made you a little map, I
24 can't record the map in there but the map is pretty straight
25 forward and I know exactly where the industrial zones are

1 and -- as a matter of fact the pipe is supposed to go fairly
2 close to where I work.

3 And I don't know exactly how far Nexus could
4 afford to move the pumping station but the Medina industrial
5 area which is significantly larger than Wadsworth or Seville
6 would probably be about 6 or 7 miles from the current
7 location and already on the pipeline, at least the proposed
8 route.

9 So I think those are all better options and I
10 think that FERC even though I know that FERC's intent is to
11 somewhat look at the environmental impact there's options to
12 mitigate that right this second. Nobody has to re-zone
13 squat, just move it to one of those zones and away they go.

14 Now other people are objecting for other reasons
15 but my primary concern has to do with the pumping station.
16 Thank you, do you guys have any questions of me?

17 FERC STAFF: No, would you like to submit that
18 with the map?

19 MR. DROWN: Yes, this is just a bunch of chicken
20 scratch up here but it is relatively straight-forward I just
21 kind of start at the current position, the approximate
22 distance to the industrial area of Seville.

23 COURT REPORTER HAWKINS: Okay it's Kohler?

24 MR. CULLER: C-u-l-l-e-r.

25 COURT REPORTER HAWKINS: Okay go ahead.

1 MR. CULLER: Okay. I see absolutely no need for
2 this pipeline period. There is absolutely no reason for it.
3 What I have been told -- what this paper that they sent out
4 is telling me that the gas is going to be distributed
5 northwest Ohio and Michigan. What I have heard is that the
6 gas is going to Canada. If the gas is going to Canada I
7 don't need to see this threat of eminent domain.

8 It is illegal, unconstitutional -- everything
9 about it. It just should not exist. Now the amount of
10 money they are wasting as far as I am concerned on this
11 issue would be better spent doing alternative energy, solar,
12 wind, whatever else they can come up with. There is no
13 reason that we can't be fossil fuel independent almost
14 within the next 10 years.

15 And that's -- this kind of stuff needs to be
16 stopped period. What I've heard and I don't know if it is
17 true or not that they are even talking about storing gas
18 underground, not in tanks just pump it down in the ground
19 and pump it back out when they need it. Well this is
20 something that is environmentally dangerous, it works for a
21 time but what happens? Here in northern Ohio we do have
22 earthquakes now and then. What happens if they do pump a
23 bunch of this gas down in the ground and then you have an
24 earthquake? I'll guarantee you it isn't going to stay in
25 the ground.

1 Now, on top of that just like over in Spencer and
2 Chatham, around that area, back in the route 1900 to late
3 1800's the oil wells started drying up over there. Well
4 what did they do? They went out there and blasted all of
5 the oil wells in a big circle around this area and when they
6 did that it cracked the shale up into the water table and
7 that's why you can't drink the water that is out there in
8 Chatham and Spencer right now.

9 And that I don't care how safe they say it is,
10 there's always that possibility that something like that can
11 happen and I don't think we are in a position this day and
12 age here where we need to even tolerate something like that.
13 I'm completely upset about this business with the Regulatory
14 Commission even allowing these people to consider something
15 like this because it needs to be stopped and stopped now.
16 That's what I have to say about it.

17 FERC STAFF: Thank you very much for coming out
18 tonight.

19 COURT REPORTER HAWKINS: So give me your name.

20 MR. NAGEL: I'll do more than that, I'll give you
21 my name and I'll tell you why I am here. My name is Warren
22 Nagel, a retired Colonel, Lieutenant Colonel in the United
23 States military. Here's my ID military, here's my -- do you
24 need another ID?

25 FERC STAFF: No sir.

1 MR. NAGEL: You sure alright. And I want to give
2 you my last D-214 you can take this with you as a matter of
3 record and Senator Kent, medals I got, awards I have.

4 FERC STAFF: We don't want to take your --

5 MR. NAGEL: I am going to say things that have an
6 impact on that to verify my credibility.

7 FERC STAFF: Okay that's fine, I just didn't want
8 to take your only copy.

9 MR. NAGE: They are copies for you for records.
10 So I speak here with some credibility because I know I have
11 a minority viewpoint and my viewpoint is this -- as I stated
12 I am a veteran, a combat veteran, 6 deployments, 3 years in
13 combat zones and I have got some direct experience on our
14 national defense. I would have to consider myself
15 Lieutenant Colonel Senior Officer of Intelligence,
16 Information Operations, formerly as an officer in
17 Afghanistan, Iraq, the Middle East to be of some value to
18 our country as a retiree.

19 And I was also the first Chief Interrogation
20 Officer in Guantanamo Bay. Now my viewpoint is this -- this
21 is my minority viewpoint I am sure and this is why I
22 appreciate this format actually because I can speak without
23 the howls of the crowd here -- and that is we have to have
24 this at number one priority for our national independence of
25 energy -- we have to be energy independent, number one top

1 priority that's why I am here.

2 Alright so I appreciate the input, I appreciate
3 the format and this is what I come from my credibility and
4 this is my top point to make of two or three points.
5 National independence of energy and as long as we have
6 dependence on foreign blood oil we are going to send our
7 youth to war and they are going to get killed and I
8 guarantee it. I have seen in with my own eyes. So that's
9 my viewpoint right there, number one viewpoint, energy
10 independence, getting rid of blood oil money and we have got
11 to address this.

12 They are teaching hate in the schools and I saw
13 it first-hand, I saw it through these prisoners. They don't
14 want us there so we have to be independent of our own oil,
15 independent of energy sources. And natural gas frankly is
16 one of the most abundant, most reliable, most economical and
17 cleanest sources of energy so that's my viewpoint.

18 And when we talk about this I will bet you 95% of
19 veterans would agree with me on the need for national
20 independence of energy so that's where I come from on that.
21 Otherwise we are subjecting our children, our future
22 children to wars to fight for energy sources to keep our
23 factories, tractors, hospitals operating. So I know
24 first-hand that's my viewpoint on that.

25 So two other minor points but I do have an

1 economic background, MBA and I served 38 years active in the
2 Reserve, taught college as well too and wrote a couple of
3 books in the field on energy and economic independence. The
4 economic aspect is definitely an impact. It would be good
5 for our area, no question about it and those nay-sayers that
6 propose, propound that we should not have it in our back
7 yard that's hypocrisy so the economic impact is good, is
8 positive for any community unless you have the nay-sayers.

9 You have got the fault finders, the fear mongers
10 and I totally support the No Charter Amendment, No Charter
11 that adds bureaucracy and I agree 100% with a very dedicated
12 person that's Bethany Dentler, I've worked with her when I
13 retired from the military to set up my own business -- my
14 son and I are probably going to employ 40-50 people on a
15 manufacturing basis so anyone that has anything negative to
16 say about our present -- Bethany Dentler does that name ring
17 a bell to you? No -- she's our Economic Director so if
18 anyone argues against her then I have got an argument with
19 them.

20 So that's basically it, national independence of
21 our energy, energy independence, otherwise blood oil, we
22 have got to get away from that or we are destined to go to
23 war again and the economic impact right. And then if I have
24 time I have a couple of questions.

25 One -- I just have a couple of other things that

1 I would like to state and that is I'm not a pushover here
2 for Nexus at all. And I'll fight with them on the right of
3 perpetuity of ownership of property because I have a farm, a
4 fruit farm and I have raised horse boarding, I want to have
5 that once they are done -- at least have an option to buy
6 back my property rights.

7 And I have a problem with this in perpetuity and
8 I should be assured that I can regrow my crops again and my
9 fruit trees, my corn, soybeans and I want to be assured that
10 if there is any kind of damage to my property they
11 compensate us appropriately for it. So are you available
12 for some questions, I don't know, can you answer questions?

13 FERC STAFF: This is just a comment portion so if
14 you have questions you can talk to staff about that.

15 MR. NAGEL: Unless you have anything more for me
16 that's it I'm on record and stated my viewpoint, I
17 appreciate the format, I appreciate the opportunity.

18 FERC STAFF: Yes thank you for coming out and
19 thank you for your service.

20 MR. NAGEL: Well thank you very much young lady
21 for saying that.

22 COURT REPORTER HAWKINS: State your name.

23 MS. WALKER: Patricia A. Walker, W-a-l-k-e-r.

24 COURT REPORTER HAWKINS: Okay go ahead.

25 MS. WALKER: I'm here first of all to object to

1 the format of these proceedings only allowing people to
2 speak in front of the private court reporter is not a true
3 public hearing. I request that a true public hearing be
4 held on this issue. I also understand that people who are
5 in the 2 mile evacuation zone some of those have not been
6 contacted and also people in the 5 miles of the compressor
7 station have not been contacted and those people are
8 affected by this issue and should have the opportunity to
9 know that they have the right to give their opinion about
10 the Nexus Project.

11 In my view there is no need for pipelines at this
12 time like the Nexus Project. There's a glut of natural gas
13 so the pipeline is not necessary and what it means is that
14 it will be sold to other countries, will be depleting our
15 raw U.S. natural resources. Also the pipeline creates more
16 greenhouse gases which foster climate change. There's going
17 to be -- I live in the city of Medina and we are not
18 directly affected by it as far as the pipeline going through
19 our city or the compressor station being in Medina.

20 However, we probably will be affected by the
21 gases that are created by the pipeline and we also have a
22 concern about the pipeline in or near our public parks
23 because our Medina County parks are affected directly by the
24 gas line as it is currently situated. The creation of more
25 greenhouse gases will as I said foster more climate change

1 but it will also make it harder for the United States to
2 meet its recent treaty obligations to reduce greenhouse
3 gases.

4 We should be encouraging the development of
5 renewable energy such as solar, wind and geo-thermal.
6 Therefore in conclusion I oppose the Nexus Project no matter
7 which location it is placed, whether it is the current
8 location that Nexus has set forth, the location that was
9 suggested by a community group or any suggestions that were
10 in the FERC report and I appreciate the opportunity to be
11 heard tonight, thank you.

12 FERC STAFF: Thank you.

13 COURT REPORTER HAWKINS: Okay name please?

14 MS. VENEY: Rona, R-o-n-a Veney V (as in Victory)
15 - e-n-e-y. I am Rona Veney I am Ken Veney's wife. We live
16 on Mennonite Road. Ken grew up on that property that we
17 live in now. I mean we bought it back in 1980 and the
18 reason that we came back was Ken went to California in '59
19 and we met and we married and Ken had a business on Pacific
20 Coast Highway, Tire Muffler -- Goodyear Tire Muffler right
21 across from that big thing called King Harbor, a big sign
22 King Harbor right there Redondo Beach. They had these old
23 streets with little junky houses on it in the city of
24 Redondo Beach.

25 They said if we tear down that stuff and built

1 big high-risers we will get lots more tax money if we do
2 that so let's do that and so they did. When you get all of
3 those people you need more access so you need to widen the
4 road. So I said, "You're out of business." You can't do
5 that, no we can't do that to you but we are and you and sue
6 us and you will win but it will take you 15 years in the
7 meantime your business is out of here.

8 So we had a problem with eminent domain before
9 okay. So we moved back here and we were able to buy the
10 property Ken grew up on which is beautiful property, it is
11 on the hill, it looks over the valley, it is just gorgeous
12 okay. We owned -- it was a 50 acre farm and we were only
13 able to buy 15 acres because the property was split at the
14 time that we bought it okay.

15 There is 3 to 5 acres of woods on our property on
16 the lower half of it. And the Nexus people came by and
17 said, "We would like to survey your property," we said "No."
18 They said, "Oh" we said "No." "Why don't you want us to
19 survey your property?" "Because we don't want your pipeline
20 because you are going to lower our property values, we've
21 lived here, our family has lived here for 50-some years".
22 His mom and dad originally bought that land in '52 and so we
23 don't want you here and they said, "We don't care," -- we
24 said, "We don't want you here, you may not come on our
25 property."

1 A few days later we go and look and there they
2 have blue survey sticks, they were on our property. That
3 wasn't right. They lied to us. We told them no and they
4 went and did it anyway now that's not right, that is not
5 right. It's our property and you know Kenny doesn't want
6 someone on the property that we own and if they fell off
7 their tractor or whatever they fell off of and hurt
8 themselves they could sue us. And we don't need that so we
9 don't want them on our property, that's the second reason we
10 don't want them on our property.

11 You know we don't want to be responsible for it
12 but mainly we don't want them wrecking our beautiful
13 property. I mean you look over -- so what they did was they
14 moved the line over a little bit and now they are moving
15 through our neighbor's property. I mean God, crickets, he
16 doesn't realize he's putting the pipeline within 50 feet of
17 where his children are sleeping, that is kind of dumb.

18 So anyway I wanted to mention after that and I
19 wanted to say that if you -- if they would do that if the
20 City of Green Route, it's much better for everybody. It
21 doesn't affect nearly as many people even in the City of
22 Green it doesn't affect as many people. It's out of the
23 country, there's less invasion of people's properties I mean
24 you know it's only 9 miles, but these people that did this
25 survey I think they were from Texas and said, "Let's go

1 straight way," you know, didn't think about the people.

2 There was no consideration of the people and
3 that's not right. Now we understand there needs to be a
4 pipeline okay we understand that but why don't you consider
5 where you are putting it. Only if you moved it where the
6 City of Green has asked you to put it that corn route or
7 whatever they are, it would affect fewer people and it would
8 be nice and then the second thing is that compressor station
9 they are going to put out there, 27,000 horsepower people
10 don't understand how much noise.

11 My husband and I we race cars -- we raced cars
12 for a long time. Kevin was the world champion okay he made
13 10,000 horsepower with his race car I mean that's a lot of
14 noise, okay. Now we are pulling tractors and we have the
15 same basic type of engine piston-driven specially made
16 engines, they make 12,000 horsepower we know how much 12,000
17 horsepower sounds like. They are going to have 27,000
18 horsepower.

19 You can hear our engines 4 miles away, I'm sorry
20 -- (phone ringing). So I mean this compressor station
21 people do not realize the noise that it is going to make and
22 it is within just a few miles of Wadsworth. I mean
23 Wadsworth is going to hear that thing all the time they just
24 don't realize how loud it is going to be. I mean we
25 understand what 12,000 horsepower sounds like and that's

1 27,000 that's the noise factor.

2 But the emission's factor that it is going to
3 produce -- we went to that meeting at Clover Leaf High
4 School -- (phone ringing). We went to the EPA meeting and
5 at that EPA meeting someone was presenting what the
6 emission's level was going to be and it exceeded what the
7 EPA said that would be okay, would be fair. I mean not
8 fair, that's not the right word. Would be permissible -- it
9 exceeded that so why do you want to do this to all of these
10 people? You know, the residents of Wadsworth in the city
11 itself I think is over 15,000 in the township I think it is
12 25,000 I'm not sure about those numbers, I might be off a
13 few numbers.

14 But what I am saying is the impact of that
15 compressor station if you put it out in the country it is
16 not going to be nearly as invasive as it is right there. So
17 I wanted to tell you about that and I guess that's what I
18 wanted to tell you was please use the City of Green's route
19 it is a much better route, it is away from the most people,
20 it's a safer environment that they are going to be less
21 invasive and I told you about the survey that we asked them
22 -- we told them we couldn't come and they did anyway and
23 that's not right.

24 And I asked you about the compression station and
25 I told you about the eminent domain so that's my comments,

1 do you have anything that you want me to say or anything
2 else?

3 FERC STAFF: No, that's it.

4 MS. VENEY: That's okay?

5 FERC STAFF: Yes, thank you.

6 MS. VENEY: Thank you too, I appreciate you
7 taking the time to do this and to listen, thank you.

8 JAMES DAVID HARVEY

9 MR. HARVEY: My name is James D. Harvey, I'm a
10 resident of Montville Township, On July 29th, 2016, a NEXUS
11 representative showed up at our property and proposed doing
12 a survey on the 'Chippewa Lake route variation.' This was
13 the first we'd been exposed to the NEXUS pipeline coming
14 through our family property.

15 I currently live at 7395 Wooster Pike, adjacent
16 property to the property that is family-owned, a 99-acre
17 family farm. I'm the beneficiary of the trust that owns
18 that property; and the NEXUS alternative Chippewa route is
19 being considered to go through our family farm.

20 We are opposed to the alternative route that's
21 been proposed. It's going to limit our future opportunities
22 of what we can do with farming; have an immediate financial
23 and operational impact to the farm, our horse and cattle
24 business. And also, we have developments on both sides, on
25 the east and west side of our farm. So if we did decide to

1 routine of a line and ask for some adjustments in
2 restoration. Still waiting to hear back from that.

3 The concern that we have is that the line, as it
4 is proposed to come through the Village now runs through a
5 single family residential subdivision, right through the
6 center of the development. This is not a development that's
7 proposed because the pipeline's coming and that would
8 increase the value of my property; this is a development
9 that was approved a number of years ago by the Village. The
10 development is being constructed, the subdivision is being
11 constructed in six phases. Two of those phases are done and
12 complete. The utilities are in, the streets, the sidewalks,
13 and a dozen homes have been constructed.

14 In the remaining section, the underground
15 utilities have been put in; the water lines and the sanitary
16 sewer lines are in, but the streets are not paved and the
17 homes have not been constructed.

18 The present routing of the line goes through 17
19 lots, actually runs through 17 building lots. Obviously
20 makes those lots completely U.N.buildable; no one is going
21 to construct a home with a gas line through their lot.

22 In addition to those 17 lots, there was a
23 concern, because it runs parallel to one street taking all
24 the lots on one side; we're now going to have a street with
25 homes on one side and not on the other. That makes it very

1 difficult to complete the development.

2 So the concern the Village has -- and this is a
3 small community. Having this kind of damage done to the
4 subdivision is going to create some serious impacts on its
5 viability going forward.

6 In addition to going through the residential
7 subdivision, the route is presently proposed; also goes
8 through two commercial properties. It makes one of those
9 commercial properties essentially un-buildable because it
10 goes down the center of the property.

11 Those to the Village are significant impacts on a
12 relatively small community. We have suggested routes that
13 would miss those lots or minimize the number of lots. We
14 suggested one route that only went through one or two lots
15 as opposed to 17.

16 There are areas within the Village where you
17 could run the line or you would be under a farmland or open
18 areas, wooded areas where you wouldn't be creating these
19 impacts on facilities that have already had major
20 investments, and which the Village is -- is part of the
21 Village's overall plan.

22 And so, mitigating those impacts is one of our
23 significant concerns. The other concern we have has to do
24 with the operation within the Village itself. Having the
25 gas line within the Village is going to create special needs

1 in terms of either training for safety forces, any
2 specialized equipment. The concern with the Village is how
3 that training and that equipment gets paid for.

4 Finances within the Village are very tight; they
5 don't have the capability to do that; and so if in fact the
6 Village is going to have some additional responsibility as a
7 result of the gas line being there, we would like there to
8 be some way of compensating the Village for that additional
9 cost that they're going to incur in terms of providing for
10 that facility to be there.

11 Again, the Village isn't necessarily opposed to a
12 gas line; we're not necessarily opposed to it coming through
13 the Village, but if it's coming through the Village, the
14 Village wants to be in a position to handle it properly and
15 to make sure that we have the funds to be able to do that;
16 and we want a route that doesn't damage the community by
17 going through a residential neighborhood and through our
18 prime commercial sites.

19 Thanks.

20 MS. BORUVKA: My name is Lisa Boruvka. B (as in
21 Boy) - o-r-u-v-k-a.

22 COURT REPORTER HAWKINS: Go ahead.

23 MS. BORUVKA: Okay I live at 3630 Candace Court
24 not far from the compression station where it is planned to
25 be built and we have been following along with my husband

1 about this project for Nexus and we have just really been
2 doing anything we can to investigate and understand and know
3 what this really means for us.

4 And as we look through the FERC environmental
5 report that they came out with, a couple of things I wanted
6 to talk about that kind of hit home the most for me is the
7 idea I think it was page 4, the idea of the release of the
8 fuel lubricants and substances and how it would be minimized
9 and how it will be controlled and all of these things but
10 you look at the pipelines and even just the accident in PA
11 being a mom, knowing you have children and knowing it is
12 just going to be a third of a mile from our home, that just
13 doesn't seem that would be okay for us to do that.

14 A couple of the other things that I found on page
15 8 they talked about -- they conclude the construction and
16 operations of the projects would not have significant
17 adverse effect on wildlife however I have to believe that
18 the noise and the ground shaking that they explained does
19 occur even though it is supposed to be put to a minimum. We
20 have 5 acres and we have so much wildlife that we enjoy and
21 we feed and I have got to believe that will probably not be
22 true.

23 On page 9 the land retained as a new permanent
24 right-of-way would generally be allowed to revert to its
25 former use except for forest and woodland and tree crops

1 which I live in the forest, all 5 acres. We have a driveway
2 that is back where our house is and maybe a fourth of an
3 acre of grass. So that's a concern to me knowing that they
4 could do something different -- different routes -- it just
5 doesn't make sense why they wouldn't take that approach.

6 Let's see the only other major thing that I
7 really -- because my husband and I have split up our big
8 issues is on page 5 they talk about the surface of the water
9 and there would be results and they would put it all back
10 together you know as best as they could and it shouldn't
11 have any maintenance effects. However, we have wetlands
12 that we wanted to see are these registered wetlands or what
13 is this area in our woods and just for us to try to make a
14 pond and it's \$5,000 for us to try to remove that -- just to
15 get the okay, I thought to believe that just being up there
16 tomorrow is going to affect our wetlands and our land that
17 we have.

18 So these are just some of the concerns that we
19 have that just doesn't seem ethical to just come ripping
20 through that so close to a neighborhood out in the middle of
21 the country. Those are my biggest issues after reading over
22 that.

23 FERC STAFF: Thank you so much for your comments.

24 (Meeting was closed at 9:55 p.m.)

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding
4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the
5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding:

7 NEXUS GAS TRANSMISSION PROJECT

8 TEXAS EASTERN APPALACHIAN LEASE PROJECT

9

10

11

12 Docket No.: CP16-22-000

13 CP16-23-000

14 CP16-24-000

15 CP16-102-000

16 Place: Wadsworth, Ohio

17 Date: August 17, 2016

18 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original
19 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy
20 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription
21 of the proceedings.

22

23

24 Daniel Hawkins

25 Official Reporter

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

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
3 Office of Energy Projects

4 -----x

5 NEXUS Gas Transmission, LLC Docket No. CP16-22-000
6 Texas Eastern Transmission, LP Docket No. CP16-23-000
7 DTE Gas Company Docket No. CP16-24-000
8 Vector Pipeline L.P. Docket No. CP16-102-000

9 -----x

10 NEXUS GAS TRANSMISSION PROJECT and
11 TEXAS EASTERN APPALACHIAN LEASE PROJECT

12

13 Wadsworth High School
14 James A. McIlvaine
15 Performing Arts Center
16 625 Broad Street
17 Wadsworth, Ohio 44281

18

19 Wednesday, August 17, 2016

20

21 The DEIS oral comment collection meeting, pursuant to
22 notice, began at approximately 5:00 p.m., with FERC Staff
23 assisting.

24

25 Court Reporter B

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

2 STATEMENT OF JAMES V. STEWART

3 Again, my name is James V. Stewart. I am
4 from Meigs County, in southeastern Ohio, and I
5 am the President of Ohio Gas Association located
6 in Columbus, Ohio.

7 I just wanted to come in and say a few
8 words in relation to the proposed NEXUS
9 pipeline.

10 As a background, I live on the border of
11 Meigs and Athens County, just a few miles from a
12 couple of large diameter transmission pipelines,
13 namely, Tennessee Gas and Texas Eastern. I also
14 live just a few miles from Tennessee Gas, a
15 Tennessee Gas compressor station for their
16 pipeline. It is a compressor station for the
17 Tennessee Gas pipeline. I also live fairly
18 close to a Texas Eastern pipeline.

19 You know, I wanted to point out that the
20 NEXUS pipeline, in my opinion, will serve a
21 public interest in transporting large quantities
22 of natural gas from the areas where the natural
23 gas will be produced, namely, eastern Ohio,
24 western Pennsylvania and northern West Virginia,
25 and will safely and efficiently transport it to

1 growing natural gas markets in the midwest and
2 Canada.

3 I, as someone who lives near large diameter
4 transmission pipelines, I can attest to their
5 safety, their longevity, and also to the fact
6 that they are large contributors in property
7 taxes to local Government and especially local
8 school districts. That goes not only for the
9 pipelines, but also the compressor stations.

10 It is my opinion that the NEXUS
11 transmission line and associated compressor
12 stations will add a significant short-term
13 economic benefit, in terms of construction jobs,
14 purchase of materials and wages. Long-term will
15 provide significant tax revenues throughout the
16 pipeline and compressor station footprints
17 across the roughly 255 mile path through
18 northern Ohio.

19 Again, I believe that natural gas pipelines
20 are the safest and most energy efficient means
21 of transporting natural gas and feel strongly
22 that this project is in the best interest of the
23 public and will also finally lead to some
24 long-term economic development across this
25 region, because it will bring another source of

1 natural gas to this region of Ohio.

2 NEXUS has signed agreements with several
3 natural gas local distribution companies to
4 supply gas to them.

5 For example, Dominion East Ohio, the Ohio
6 Gas Company and Waterville Gas have all signed
7 agreements with NEXUS. So I am very much in
8 support of this project, I look forward to see
9 it moving forward, and the benefits that it will
10 generate for this region of our state,
11 particularly in the form of millions of
12 increased tax revenues for schools and local
13 governments.

14 And I would like to thank you for your time
15 and your attention to this matter.

16 STATEMENT OF LISA R. DI GIACOMO

17 I am asking FERC not approve the City of
18 Green Route Alternative reroute. I was born and
19 raised on a small farm that is potentially
20 impacted by the NEXUS City of Green Alternative
21 reroute. It has been my long-term goal to live
22 on this farm.

23 In just the past several months, I have
24 also become a co-owner of this farm. My
25 intention has always been that of my parents, to

1 maintain the farm so that we could help provide
2 food to our community and to maintain the wooded
3 area, so that wildlife could thrive.

4 My parents and I have spent a good deal of
5 time, money and effort preserving this farm and
6 woods for future use. We have seeded waterways
7 to prevent soil erosion. We have cut only
8 timber that has been damaged or destroyed by the
9 elements or when the timber was ready to be
10 harvested for use.

11 We have purposely avoided cutting down or
12 destroying trees known to be legacy trees or
13 trees that provide sanctuary to the many species
14 of wildlife that inhabit this land.

15 We have planted many new trees to serve as
16 wind barriers and to provide shade for other
17 flora. We have planted other flora to attract
18 butterflies; and we have added several bird
19 houses and other birding equipment in order to
20 provide food and sanctuary for a variety of
21 birds, many of whom are migratory, including,
22 Pileated Woodpeckers, Barn Swallows and
23 hummingbirds, just to name a few.

24 The proposed reroute will negatively impact
25 all of these efforts. This farm is one of a

1 number of farms in southwestern Wayne County
2 that support a thriving agricultural community.

3 In order to farm and frankly, feed our
4 citizens, we need to have fertile topsoil. This
5 pipeline will not only damage the topsoil, but
6 will certainly affect crop yield for the
7 foreseeable future. Given all the reduction in
8 crop yield in Central California and the known
9 drying up of the Ogallala Aquifer in Texas,
10 Oklahoma, Kansas and many other nearby states,
11 why would we even think about jeopardizing our
12 crop output. I have included a link to a recent
13 Natural Geographic article about the lack of
14 water for these crops.

15 Furthermore, because this pipeline will
16 surely destroy trees and other wooded areas, the
17 Indiana bat and other bird species who feed on
18 predatory insects will have to relocate. It is
19 doubtful that the insects will also relocate.

20 The ET Rover pipeline is also slated to go
21 through this farm. The damages mentioned above
22 are sure to happen when this pipeline goes
23 through. And you are considering damaging this
24 land further. I, frankly, do not understand
25 this logic.

1 As I understand it, some of the natural gas
2 this pipeline NEXUS supports will service the
3 Green area. The current natural gas pipelines
4 that service this area are already at capacity.
5 So in order to meet the needs of this community,
6 the NEXUS pipeline makes sense. But the
7 industries using the natural gas near Green are
8 not in Wayne County. We in Wayne County do not
9 have direct access to the natural gas, so we do
10 not get the direct benefits. So why are we
11 being asked to sacrifice our rich farming
12 environment and other assets for someone else's
13 benefit? The NEXUS pipeline, therefore, should
14 stay located as close to the public need as
15 possible.

16 Finally, we have had several years to
17 prepare for and negotiate with the ET Rover
18 pipeline. The citizens of Green have also had
19 several years to prepare for and negotiate with
20 NEXUS. And yet, we have been given roughly 40
21 days to find legal counsel and prepare for this
22 response. And I find this grossly unfair.

23 Accordingly, I ask that the FERC Commission
24 not accept the City of Green Alternative Route
25 and not route the NEXUS pipeline through

1 southwestern Wayne County. Respectfully
2 submitted. Thank you.

3 STATEMENT OF PATRICIA J. DI GIACOMO

4 The purpose of this document is to request
5 that FERC does not approve the City of Green
6 Route Alternative.

7 In 1912, my grandfather, Dominic Antonio
8 Raucci, purchased 115-plus acres, located in
9 Wooster Township in Wayne County. After the
10 Raucci family cleared the land, they began to
11 plant crops in 1915. I was born and raised on
12 that land and we still own that farm today.

13 In February of 1966, my husband and I
14 purchased our present home, 40 acres located in
15 Plain Township in Wayne County.

16 As you can see, our Wayne County
17 agricultural roots run deep. We have enjoyed
18 the benefits of farming for most of our lives.
19 In clear conscience, we cannot allow another
20 pipeline company to destroy our fertile Wayne
21 County farmland.

22 According to the 2015 Wayne County Farm
23 Bureau Tour Guide, Wayne County is ranked number
24 one producer in the State of Ohio in the
25 following areas: Hay, oats, cattle and milk.

1 We are also state ranked number three in
2 sheep and number nine in hogs.

3 Wayne County is a very active agricultural
4 area, rich in diverse commodities that produces
5 a significant amount of the food that nourishes
6 our entire nation. If we had to, we could live
7 without oil and gas products, but none of us can
8 live without food. Further invasion of our
9 farmland would only jeopardize the strong
10 agricultural environment.

11 We already have two 42-inch pipelines going
12 through our valuable farmland. We do not need
13 another. If this must happen, it is time for
14 someone else to help bear the burden of land
15 destruction and property devaluation.

16 As an individual property owner, we cannot
17 get gas from these companies; but according to
18 an article in the July 28th, 2016 issue of the
19 Daily Record, the cities of Wadsworth and Green
20 already have service agreements in place with
21 NEXUS. If they are to benefit from the gas,
22 then the NEXUS pipeline should go through their
23 land, not ours.

24 While working with the Rover pipeline, we
25 had several months to decide if we needed legal

1 representation, and many more months thereafter
2 for the attorneys to negotiate on our behalf.

3 In this case, the preparations time is
4 extremely short, and we have had little chance
5 to acquire legal representation; a month, which
6 is what we have been given, is not nearly enough
7 time to investigate and respond to the proposal.
8 This is grossly unfair.

9 We, therefore, strongly urge that FERC
10 rethink the City of Green Route Alternative and
11 not route the NEXUS pipeline through the
12 southeastern portion of Wayne County.

13 STATEMENT OF JENNIFER D. KLEIN

14 Good evening. My name is Jenn Klein, I
15 serve as the President of Ohio Chemistry
16 Technology Council. We appreciate the
17 opportunity to provide an overview of why we
18 strongly support the NEXUS project.

19 Since 1988 the Ohio Chemistry Technology
20 Council has been the leading advocate for our
21 state's significant chemical technology
22 industry, the second largest manufacturing
23 industry in Ohio and the sixth largest chemical
24 manufacturing state in the U.S.

25 Natural gas is essential to chemical

1 production. Having a reliable, affordable
2 source of natural gas will not only help our
3 member companies keep their energy costs low, it
4 will also cut the cost of a critical raw
5 material, as natural gas serves as an important
6 feedstock for the huge number of chemical
7 products.

8 The NEXUS project can provide the source of
9 energy and the company's draft environment
10 impact statement has demonstrated that it will
11 have a minimal impact on communities along the
12 pipeline route.

13 Of course, other manufacturing sectors in
14 Ohio also rely on natural gas for heating,
15 cooling and electricity. They too stand to gain
16 from lower energy prices. And natural gas is
17 also used in the production of a wide variety of
18 consumer goods from fertilizer and fabrics to
19 plastics and pharmaceuticals.

20 The NEXUS project will help Ohio
21 manufactured goods of all kinds be more
22 competitive in the global marketplace, helping
23 to create jobs and growth back home.

24 But those are the downstream jobs we can
25 expect from the NEXUS project. In the shorter

1 term, the project will generate 6800 jobs, more
2 than 650 million in wages and 830 million in
3 total economic activity.

4 In its first year in operation in Ohio,
5 NEXUS would generate an estimated 83 million in
6 tax revenue, of which approximately 57 million
7 would go directly to local Ohio school
8 districts.

9 These economic benefits will greatly help
10 our state economy as a whole, which means it
11 will also benefit our industry, workers and the
12 consumers who benefit from our products.

13 Given all the benefits to our state, region
14 and the nation, we are also concerned that FERC
15 or other Government bodies will impose
16 unnecessarily restrictive limitations on the
17 project's implementation, that could hinder its
18 positive impacts. Natural gas pipelines are the
19 safest and most efficient way to transport
20 natural gas from where it is produced to where
21 it is consumed.

22 According to a U.S. Congressional Committee
23 report, pipelines are safer than roads, rails
24 and barges for the transportation of natural
25 gas.

1 More than 300,000 miles of pipeline
2 nationwide reliably bring clean burning natural
3 gas to our homes, businesses and factories every
4 day.

5 Once the NEXUS pipeline and related
6 facilities are placed into service, NEXUS will
7 monitor the pipeline 24 hours a day, seven days
8 a week, 365 days a year.

9 FERC addressed a wide range of concerns in
10 the draft impact study, including market demand,
11 energy corridor, safety, security, health,
12 pipeline system alternatives, induced upstream
13 for oil and gas production, life cycle impact
14 analysis, climate change, Oak Openings, electric
15 compressor units, proximity to homes, setback
16 variances and a host of major and minor
17 alternatives.

18 We are grateful for the chance to lay out
19 our reasoning regarding why the NEXUS pipeline
20 is not only good for our state's chemical
21 manufacturing industry, but also for the State
22 of Ohio as a whole. We look forward to hearing
23 your decision in the near future.

24 STATEMENT OF LYNN E. KEMP

25 My name is Lynn Kemp. And I live in York

1 Township, Medina County. There is a threefold
2 effect on me, due to this proposed NEXUS
3 pipeline project. First NEXUS wants my family's
4 century farm in Litchfield township for their
5 dirty pipeline. My mother, Georgia Kimble, has
6 spent her entire lifetime on this farm. She has
7 worked on and loved this land as have her
8 parents, her grandparents, her
9 great-grandparents, her children, grandchildren
10 and great-grandchildren. They have all spent
11 their lifetime being good stewards of this land.

12 Two years ago, our nightmare began. My
13 mom, my brother, my sister-in-law and nephew
14 have continually been harassed by letters,
15 visits and most recently sued in court by NEXUS.
16 NEXUS, who used FERC to try to validate their
17 case against my 82 year old mother. Shame on
18 you all.

19 Across from my mom's farm lies 20 acres of
20 a farm that belonged to my brother Alan.
21 Tragically Alan died at the Medina County Fair
22 in 2001 in a steam engine explosion. All he had
23 to leave his family was this 20 acres. Guess
24 what? NEXUS wants that for their dirty pipeline
25 too.

1 Alan's dream was that his wife and three
2 children could use this land to build homes for
3 themselves. Guess what? If this pipeline is
4 approved, that is an impossibility.

5 There is no compensation for the kind of
6 life changes that are imposed upon us, because a
7 gas company wants more money in their pocket.
8 FERC itself and their draft EIS has stated that
9 the 13 T Taps place aren't necessary or
10 validated by NEXUS. In other words, this
11 company has no documented customers along this
12 route through Medina County.

13 I question the need for the Certificate of
14 Necessity and Convenience. I have read numerous
15 articles and FERC filings which show there is
16 evidence of overbuild in the gas infrastructure
17 and pipelines, and that the market demand for
18 this gas has not materialized.

19 FERC should not allow the building of a
20 pipeline that will sit idle in hopes the market
21 will improve. That is not what FERC should
22 consider.

23 The question is, is this project necessary
24 now? We shouldn't be forced to take on the
25 impacts to our property value and environment,

1 for a project that may never move product. It
2 is incumbent upon FERC to do the research on
3 these issues.

4 Second, I too live close to where the
5 pipeline would be built. The safety of my home
6 and family, as well as those of my neighbors, is
7 in jeopardy. I do not feel comforted by the
8 attempted reassurances from NEXUS that they will
9 monitor this pipeline 24 hours. They stated at
10 a meeting I attended that the monitoring would
11 take place from Texas and that they would be
12 asking landowners to watch and police for
13 problems. Really? How much will we be paid for
14 doing their jobs?

15 Third, my grandchildren live 4 miles from
16 the proposed Wadsworth compressor station. The
17 toxins that will be emitted daily are going to
18 cause health issues for many. Again, we are to
19 be comforted this time by the fact that the EPA
20 has to approve and regulate air quality.
21 Really? The EPA has stated themselves that they
22 will not be testing the air quality around the
23 compressor stations. The gas company will
24 monitor and report back to the EPA when and if
25 they have gone above standards. Talk about the

1 fox watching the henhouse.

2 I have personally spoken to several people
3 who live near compressor stations in Ohio. They
4 report numerous health problems, noise issues
5 and nonresponsive gas companies when alarms are
6 going off at these stations.

7 Additionally, in a recent filing to FERC on
8 this project by Paul Wohlfarth, it was brought
9 to FERC's attention that numerous filings on
10 this project are fraudulent. All of these
11 fraudulent letters were in favor of the pipeline
12 project. The research of Mr. Wohlfarth shows
13 that many were not written by those named on the
14 letters. In fact, one of the supposed authors
15 passed away in 1998, and couldn't have written a
16 letter.

17 FERC must take responsibility of ensuring
18 the comments on the dockets are legitimate, or
19 am I to assume that you really don't care who
20 files? If that is the case, then I question
21 whether or not you truly look at and research
22 the comments on this project.

23 Many have said FERC is just a rubber stamp
24 agency. Could this be true?

25 Finally, I feel, as do many others here

1 tonight, that your new format of private
2 testimony away from other concerned citizens is
3 nothing but an attempt to stifle our rights to
4 be heard, to quiet the opposition to the project
5 and to keep us from sharing information and
6 facts.

7 Thank you.

8 STATEMENT OF THOMAS A. WEST

9 Well, honestly, my wife and I are in our
10 70s and we have lived where we live now for 50
11 years, over 50 years. And during that time, we
12 have planted several trees in our pasture and
13 nurtured them, fertilized them, one dies, we put
14 another one in, and we put chain link fence
15 around them to keep our horses off of them. So
16 basically now, my pasture now is a park. All
17 the trees are huge, except for a few oaks, which
18 we have replaced trees that died.

19 Basically, I am at this age, and when they
20 take these trees down, they are going to break
21 my heart. This is something that -- they are
22 not coming back, they are going to clear them,
23 take them out. I don't know how wide they are
24 going to take them. Their line runs right where
25 all my big trees are, they are going to have to

1 take those out to put the pipeline in, which I
2 understand. This is my dream, it is a little
3 place with 5 acres, we bought it with no trees
4 on it, and started back in the '60s working on
5 it, but we never made a lot of money, but we put
6 every dime in this place, besides raising the
7 children. They are taking it, they are taking
8 those trees and as soon as they cut the fence, I
9 am going to have to board my horses somewhere
10 else too. Because they are going to be in there
11 for -- we happen to live where they are going to
12 drill under the road and they are going to put
13 all the dirt on me. So they are going to be
14 there a long time and they are going to make one
15 heck of a mess. And that is just the aesthetics
16 that are in place.

17 The real scary part of this whole NEXUS
18 pipeline is they are putting this 36 inch,
19 almost 1500 psi pipeline barely over a hundred
20 feet from my house, 3 foot deep. You know, this
21 is where my children ride the horses, this is
22 where we live. When I go to bed at night, I can
23 look out the window and there is going to be
24 where the pipeline is.

25 When this guy over in Pennsylvania, who

1 lives a lot further away than we do, when NEXUS
2 had their blast here a couple, three months ago,
3 I am thinking he was 273 feet away, and it
4 burned him up, burned 75 percent of his body, he
5 lost an arm and he lost a leg. I am looking,
6 that could be us. And it was corrosion in the
7 line is what happened to it.

8 NEXUS is lucky that they were out in the
9 boonies when this happened, it just happened to
10 be one house, local. Where they are putting
11 them with me, our next-door neighbor is also
12 going to be a hundred feet away. If that goes
13 where I am at, they are going to get us both,
14 plus the other neighbors. This is a rural
15 neighborhood, this isn't out in the middle of
16 nowhere.

17 Anyway, my understanding is you need to be
18 a quarter of a mile away from this thing if it
19 ruptures. NEXUS has nowhere even thought about
20 that. They tell us this pipeline is safe. This
21 thing over in Pennsylvania kind of proves that
22 it isn't. Of course, you guys know, we have got
23 all the pictures and other stuff, in the last 20
24 years, they have had 2000 problems, major
25 problems with pipelines. So to ask us to accept

1 these people in our neighborhood and in our
2 backyards is ridiculous.

3 Now, like I told you out there, I don't
4 argue that the pipeline is the safest way to
5 transport gas. I am not against putting this
6 pipeline in. I am just against putting it where
7 we all live. There has got to be -- and, of
8 course, you know there is a reroute proposal,
9 which takes it away from heavily populated areas
10 and takes it somewhere else.

11 But anyone from NEXUS who designed this
12 pipeline with total disregard for our safety, I
13 think should be fired or canned. I cannot
14 believe that FERC would accept something like
15 this, as close as it is. I realize there are no
16 setbacks in the rules, but they need to take
17 that into consideration.

18 Something that hasn't been addressed is
19 that we are going to put a compressor station
20 right out here, around Route 3. Now, that
21 compressor station is putting the same amount of
22 gas through it, the same size line as going by
23 my house.

24 However, if I was a terrorist, and I was
25 going to attack Medina County, I would attack

1 the water system, I would attack the power grid,
2 I would attack the communications. And guess
3 where the really softest target would be? That
4 compressor station. You place a bomb in that
5 compressor station, we have a holocaust. I
6 don't know how far out, how many people it would
7 be. But I don't think these people can turn it
8 off like that. And there are people living
9 right across the street from where that
10 compressor station is going to be.

11 I am thinking that as an American, as
12 living here and wanting security and the safety
13 and not to overtax our police, not overtax our
14 fire departments, they can't handle an emergency
15 like this. And we should not be bringing soft
16 targets that terrorists can use into our
17 community.

18 Well, I think that is all I have. But
19 anyhow, as you can see, those people putting
20 that large high pressure line in our
21 neighborhoods have created a real potential for
22 disaster, and we are a hundred percent against
23 it. Okay?

24 Thank you.

25 STATEMENT OF PAUL A. BIRO

1 So I just have, I guess, a specific comment
2 and more of a general comment. And I was
3 talking to the gentleman at the desk that have
4 the EIS books on there, about a specific issue.
5 And he said I could send it in confidentially.
6 It is regarding an old family burial site. The
7 property I live on was originally part of my
8 grandfather's farm. The owners prior to my
9 grandparents, now we are talking probably 1900,
10 give or take, timewise, we have a family burial
11 site on the farm. Now, I don't know that far
12 back, if there are any court records or any kind
13 of records of this burial site.

14 My grandparents have since passed, so my
15 mother and her sister and her brother are still
16 living and know close to whereabouts that is. I
17 don't know if it is marked. It has been a long,
18 long time since anybody was back in that area.

19 The property has, in the last five years,
20 been sold, subdivided into nine or ten different
21 plots and sold off.

22 So when it was my family property, we could
23 access it and go back there. Now it is sold to
24 different owners, so we can't get back in there.

25 Back two years ago, I guess, when the NEXUS

1 group had an open house, like the initial
2 meeting and that, so I went to that, and I was
3 talking to one of the representatives and told
4 them about this, "Oh, yeah, that is very
5 important, we will need to know about that." I
6 don't know where that went from there, if it
7 did.

8 If there is no court -- what is it I am
9 trying to say -- record of this family burial
10 site, then I don't know how anybody would know
11 about it, other than a person like me or a
12 family member that had knowledge of this.

13 And they have got a pretty good idea of
14 whereabouts, within probably a span of no more
15 than 50 foot wide, maybe a span of a couple of
16 hundred feet. It was on the fence row dividing
17 their property from the neighboring farm.

18 So what I am going to do is he suggested I
19 get, just go to Google Maps and zone in and send
20 it in. But he said that that type of issue was
21 typically confidential, private and to label it
22 as such. But I asked, that is not my property
23 now, is it okay for me to still do that, with
24 the knowledge of that, the current owners may
25 have no knowledge of this -- but it would affect

1 that issue with going through there and all of a
2 sudden digging takes place and things are
3 unearthed. So he said that would be fine.

4 So I am going to actually send it in with a
5 map, so I can narrow it down to the exact area
6 on that.

7 My other comment is just a general comment.
8 This pipeline proposed route will go probably
9 within 50 to a hundred feet of my home, actual
10 home building. And it is probably less than
11 that from my well. And the farm property I was
12 talking about with this other issue, and the
13 property, the farm on the opposite side of the
14 street, which was also part of my grandfather's
15 farm, over the years when they farmed this
16 property, they found a lot of Indian arrowheads.
17 So that is a big Indian -- I don't know that it
18 is a burial site, but Indian sites, and up the
19 street a half a mile, even much more was found
20 there.

21 We have got the high tension wires right
22 now that are 150 feet from my house. And they
23 were looking to get an easement or permission
24 from FirstEnergy to run along there, and I
25 understand -- I don't think they were

1 successful, so it is moving it outside of that,
2 which is moving it closer to my home.

3 So with the high tension wires there, now
4 this 1400 psi high pressure device that is
5 sitting 3 feet under the ground and the
6 potential of any kind of issues down the road,
7 explosions, I mean, if it did, being that close
8 to me, I wouldn't live to read about it anyway,
9 because it is going to take us out, my family.

10 So I am concerned about the proximity of
11 this pipeline. I am not opposed to the project,
12 but there has been an alternate route proposed,
13 that is in much less populated areas, that I
14 don't know if that is even having any intention
15 of being paid attention to by the NEXUS group.
16 Because I am a Defendant in a pending lawsuit
17 now that has been filed by NEXUS, which when we
18 talk to a lot of folks, the representatives, "We
19 want to work with you, we want to make this
20 easy," yada, yada, but when they don't get their
21 way, we will sue you then, "We are going to get
22 our way one way or another."

23 That has kind of really soured me, and this
24 lawsuit affects a lot of the bat surveys that
25 they were trying to rush through to get finished

1 by the 15th of August, that is what prompted the
2 lawsuit and that was denied by the courts.

3 So I don't know now if that -- well, we
4 have got 90 percent of them done, we don't have
5 a hundred percent done, but we are close, is
6 that okay? Is close good enough for the
7 environmental study, or is it, we have to have
8 them all, a hundred percent complete before we
9 will consider your request to FERC for this
10 proposed project. So I know that that didn't
11 happen, because that deadline has come and gone.

12 So I guess my general statement was just my
13 concern about the nearness of this to my home,
14 and some of the other issues we have discussed
15 here. As I said, I am not opposed to the
16 project. I know things like this are necessary,
17 but it seems like with a lot of the public
18 opposition to this, and just kind of cut through
19 everybody's backyard without regards to
20 anybody's concern, it seems like they are just,
21 you know, like a bull in a china shop, we are
22 going, we don't care what you say.

23 And that is the part that kind of really
24 bothers me as well, in addition to the
25 closeness.

1 So like I said, I will send this other
2 issue in, a map, to get that on record as well,
3 just to make sure it is on record. That was
4 pretty much the detailed issue, plus my general
5 feelings with the Indian areas, and the things
6 that have been found over the years, and the
7 properties, the high tension wires going 150
8 feet from the house, now we are putting this
9 underground, the word I want to say I won't say,
10 but potential issue with failure of the
11 pipeline, I will just say it that way, any
12 failures of the pipeline, it could be
13 catastrophic, really concerns me.

14 So that is pretty much it.

15 STATEMENT OF REVEREND DR. SHARON L. KIESEL

16 I am Reverend Dr. Sharon Kiesel, a retired
17 Disciples of Christ Pastor from Medina, Ohio.
18 In 2015, I suddenly left the ministry, because I
19 developed an environmental illness from exposure
20 to moldy buildings, including the churches I
21 served. With it came multiple chemical
22 sensitivity, and that is abbreviated MCS, to the
23 point of having to run for my life to avoid
24 everyday chemicals.

25 I want to show you what I carry around.

1 Masks, bronchodilators, Epipens, because I go
2 into anaphylaxis around certain things.

3 My life-threatening symptoms resulted from
4 exposures to pesticides, fertilizers,
5 fragrances, fresh paint, new carpets, many
6 building materials, solvents, fresh ink, smoke,
7 vehicle exhaust, fuels, industrial fumes, and
8 many cleaning products.

9 I learned that synthetic chemicals and
10 petrochemicals extracted from crude oil or coal
11 tar, most often trigger life-threatening
12 symptoms in those of us with MCS. In my journey
13 to understand my chronic illness, I learned from
14 a whole world of people victimized by the
15 uncontrolled and untested release of chemicals
16 into our environment

17 According to the disability rights activist
18 Darrell Lynn Jones, 16 percent of the U.S.
19 population -- now, that is 51 million people --
20 are unusually sensitive to chemicals. Six
21 percent of the population, 19 million, are
22 chronically ill and disabled by exposures, like
23 myself.

24 Being an MCS survivor and a pastor who has
25 ministered to victims, has helped me understand

1 all the loss, the grief and negative feelings
2 that surround environmental illnesses. My
3 conviction is to prevent others from being
4 sickened by their environments.

5 And now a local threat to peoples' health
6 and safety looms on our horizon. A natural gas
7 compressor station for the NEXUS pipeline is
8 planned for within 5 miles of my home.

9 Scientific research shows that tons of hazardous
10 air emissions, some of which are carcinogenic,
11 minute size particulates and volatile organic
12 compounds will be emitted annually in the normal
13 operation of said facility.

14 What is important to note is that
15 chemically sensitive people can be harmed by
16 exposures to even minute amounts, even levels
17 considered safe for the general public. The
18 full range of toxicity of most chemicals is not
19 known, nor are the accumulating effects of
20 chemical exposures, nor the effects of being
21 exposed to more than one chemical at a time.
22 The fracking industry adds to these
23 uncertainties.

24 For example, a study of the materials known
25 to be used in natural gas extraction resulted in

1 a list of 353 chemicals. And this was a study
2 by Colborn in 2011. And these materials are
3 capable of causing multi-systemic symptoms.
4 Despite the lack of research, workers in the
5 public are often falsely reassured about the
6 safety of their chemical exposures.

7 Additionally, polluted air can be carried
8 up to 200 miles from its source by prevailing
9 winds. The unborn and very young are especially
10 susceptible to chemicals used in the fracking
11 industry.

12 And I have a report that was just given to
13 me, a working paper called "Shale Gas
14 Development and Infant Health: Evidence from
15 Pennsylvania." By Elaine L. Hill.

16 Acute effects, such as breathing
17 difficulties and nausea that I have to carry
18 these things around for, are generally
19 reversible when the exposure ends. But chronic
20 effects tend to appear later and are not
21 reversible.

22 Many researchers believe there are related
23 environmental causes for the epidemic of asthma,
24 allergies, autism, attention deficit
25 hyperactivity disorder, diabetes, Parkinson's,

1 Alzheimer's and other chronic illnesses.

2 There is much evidence of the physical harm
3 done to people living near gas and oil
4 infrastructures. The Internet and YouTube are
5 full of gut-wrenching stories, including that of
6 James Baker, severely burned by a pipeline
7 explosion in Salem, Pennsylvania, on April 29th
8 of 2016.

9 My biggest concern about the fracking
10 industry is that the immediate and cumulative
11 health effects and the unsafe nature of the
12 infrastructure are being ignored in favor of
13 economic profit and meeting deadlines.

14 This is putting monetary gain over peoples'
15 health and safety. It is a huge moral issue,
16 because of the intentional harm and negligence
17 involved and the ignoring of the many victims'
18 cries.

19 Speaking as a clergy person and for the
20 millions who have already been permanently
21 sickened by the pollution of our environment,
22 with the untested and uncontrolled release of
23 toxic chemicals, I oppose the NEXUS pipeline, as
24 well as any new fracking development. The
25 fracking industry is currently unsafe. And as

1 such, will cause irreparable harm to present and
2 future generations.

3 This is unfair and unjust to hold the
4 hearings in this manner, because it squelches
5 the peoples' voices, and it is intimidating.

6 STATEMENT OF SHEILA C. KLIMAS

7 My home is going to be about 2 1/2, 3 miles
8 from the proposed compressor station. I am
9 concerned that there are no set measures to
10 deal -- to recover any of the toxins that are
11 emitted from that station. I am also concerned
12 as a mother and a grandmother that I don't even
13 know if I want to invite my grandchildren to my
14 home after all this happens.

15 I already have a daughter who has
16 life-threatening allergies, and I don't even
17 know if I want her to come to my home, knowing
18 that I am going to be that close to a compressor
19 station. I feel like my home is going to be
20 more like a toxic dump.

21 I don't feel that there are monitoring
22 processes in place. I know that the pipeline is
23 going through rural areas because they say the
24 population is not there. Medina County has huge
25 rural areas, where -- I mean, there are probably

1 30, 40 homes on my road, not just farms. It is
2 a lot of developments and things like that in
3 the area.

4 So I think there are better ideas, than
5 going through areas where so many people live.
6 But I don't know that what is in place is trying
7 to protect the people that pay taxes, that try
8 to do what is right for other people.

9 I have children that work in the health
10 profession, I am a registered dietitian. Okay.

11 STATEMENT OF JOSEPH R. GIACOMONI

12 I guess the first comment is, you know, we
13 are not really crazy about this format. This
14 one on one stuff. But I will just get right to
15 what I have to say.

16 I was part of a lawsuit about getting on my
17 property to survey. NEXUS had sued me. And
18 during that lawsuit, I heard from an expert
19 witness for NEXUS, about the endangered species,
20 the bat species, the long-eared bats, the
21 Indiana bat.

22 I think the landowners should be also in
23 that group. I think we are endangered, I think
24 people that can come on and take over your
25 property, basically, I feel like they can walk

1 into my house, take whatever they want, and then
2 say, "Oh, that is worth 25 bucks, here is 25
3 bucks, we will see you later." It does not seem
4 right that they can do that.

5 I understand that this will probably end up
6 in an eminent domain, and I don't know much
7 about the courts and all that stuff. But it
8 just doesn't seem right.

9 You know, on my property, I deer hunt, and
10 on my property, I also train bird dogs. I also
11 have kids out there, I have had kids come out
12 and I have taught them the shooting sports, the
13 hunting sports, I have done some good for the
14 community.

15 This could be jeopardized with a 36 inch
16 pipeline in my backyard. I am not going to like
17 it.

18 They also tell me, one of the NEXUS people
19 have told me that the entire tree line that is
20 at the back of my property will be obliterated
21 and they won't put any trees back up. That just
22 ain't right either. They will remove that
23 boundary that has been there for years, and they
24 have no expectations, they are not going to put
25 it back. They told me that much. They told me,

1 "Oh, don't think you are going to get rich over
2 this either. Because you are not." Fifteen,
3 \$20 a lineal foot. There is no amount of
4 money -- there is no amount of money that they
5 can give me to put that 36 inch pipeline in my
6 backyard.

7 This is my daughter, Ann, she will inherit
8 that property. I don't want her living next to
9 a 36 inch pipeline. That is just crazy.

10 The fact is that is not benefitting anyone,
11 this pipeline is only benefitting NEXUS and the
12 other companies, they are profiting. That is
13 the bottom line, profit. Nobody else is going
14 to gain from this pipeline. They are going to
15 get all the money, yeah, they will supply gas.
16 Why not put it in a tanker and employ a truck
17 driver to truck it wherever it needs to go,
18 instead of tearing up peoples' lives.

19 I have already spent way too much time on
20 this issue. You know, being sued three times.
21 I was sued, then I was unsued, then I was
22 re-sued. So, you know, just the amount of time
23 I have had to spend doing this is uncalled for.

24 The pipeline danger. The pipeline goes in.
25 Oh, they say it is safe, it is not a problem.

1 But don't put anything on top of it, because it
2 is not safe. Talk about out of both sides of
3 your mouth. You know. That is pretty crazy,
4 pretty crazy.

5 I guess lastly, there is a City of Green
6 reroute. I know everybody knows about it, and I
7 just don't understand why -- I am hoping FERC
8 will look at that reroute, it affects less
9 people, less of everything, environment, so on
10 and so forth. Those people don't mind that
11 reroute down there, from my understanding. Why
12 don't we look at that, why doesn't FERC -- I
13 understand FERC made them already take the
14 reroute around Chippewa Lake, I think they ought
15 to just push it on down, you know. I don't feel
16 good about that, because there might be somebody
17 else like me that doesn't want it either. So I
18 don't feel good about that. So darn it, if that
19 is the only alternative that we have, then I
20 will take that one. Because I don't want a 36
21 inch pipeline on my property, I really don't, I
22 really don't.

23 If it comes down to that, I am wondering
24 about this country. I am wondering about the
25 laws and the people and what rights we have.

1 There is stuff out there, there are signs out
2 there, sign up to, you know, support an
3 amendment to the constitution, this and that. I
4 am going to go sign it. Because this is nuts,
5 this is nuts.

6 One other thing, it was asked, you know,
7 they are going to put a 36 inch pipe in the
8 ground. Well, there is a lot of dirt that is
9 going to be displaced from that. Where are they
10 going to put it? And they said they are just
11 going to scatter it about. I don't know how
12 they are going to do that. That is a lot of --
13 that is a great volume of dirt that is going to
14 be moved and just scattered about. It is not
15 going to be hauled away, it is just going to be
16 scattered on the property.

17 They are going to be displacing, you know,
18 topsoil. I am betting money that they are not
19 going to move that topsoil to this pile and then
20 when they cover the pipe over with the clays and
21 stuff, and then it is time for the topsoil, I
22 doubt very much if they are going to bring that
23 topsoil back over and cover that pipe. I
24 just -- they are not going to do that. They are
25 just going to push whatever dirt, cover it up

1 and then whatever dirt is left over, they are
2 not going to go to those details. I just figure
3 that won't happen.

4 And I have talked to people from NEXUS
5 about that, and they just said they are going to
6 scatter the dirt and they don't know or care
7 what to do with the topsoil. That would greatly
8 impact what is going to grow over that pipeline,
9 if anything, if it is just clay. You know,
10 erosion, it is not good, not good.

11 Really, the thing is, I don't want it, I
12 don't want it. And there are a lot of people
13 that don't want it. And there are a lot of
14 people that are scared, they are afraid to come
15 in here, because when they hear one on one, they
16 are like, "I can't do that. I can't do that."

17 I am not a great public speaker either, but
18 to come in here and talk one and one and you are
19 just sitting there nodding your head, and I
20 understand your position, but, please, please,
21 take it back to FERC that if it has to come in,
22 how about the City of Green reroute, but not on
23 my property.

24 If we can stop it, period, or it goes
25 nowhere, perfect. That would be the best thing.

1 I guess that is all I have to say.

2 STATEMENT OF TERRY A. SCHMEL

3 The address in question is 15020 Mt. Eaton
4 Road in Rittman, Ohio, and in the County of
5 Wayne County, Ohio.

6 The first thing I would like to bring up is
7 the EIS, and the way it has been presented. I
8 have submitted three different times to FERC the
9 proper information, whether it be wells, septic
10 systems, waterways and as such, I have not found
11 that in the draft proposal that I have in front
12 of me right now. It doesn't identify the wells,
13 it doesn't identify the septic systems, and this
14 is a critical path, due to the fact that the
15 center of the pipeline sets 85 feet off of my
16 personal property, and 55 feet off of my
17 neighbor's property, so it runs right between
18 the two houses.

19 So in question, and I have spoken with the
20 NEXUS people, and they say everything is going
21 to be taken care of, "Your well will be checked,
22 the septic system will be checked," and if there
23 are any problems with it, they will take care of
24 it.

25 I find that hard to believe, just because

1 where it is located at, it is located in a
2 waterway that is deemed as a waterway on the EIS
3 draft. That is my first concern.

4 My second concern is if this pipeline truly
5 goes in the location that it goes in, I have
6 been told the whole area would be bored with a
7 boring machine, it would not be dug out with a
8 backhoe or a shovel.

9 I find that hard to believe, just because,
10 once again, it passes so near to the well, and
11 it actually crosses the neighbor's septic
12 system. And no one has brought that to anyone's
13 attention.

14 The other concerns I have, the property
15 that I own has three plots. The pipeline and
16 its main corridor pass on all three -- pass
17 through all three lots. The third lot being the
18 largest lot is a building lot, and because of
19 the easement, it basically cuts off the access
20 to the back lot, which is a building lot, that
21 closes off the right-of-way to that building
22 lot. This is a commercial building that is on
23 the property now.

24 I know it has been proposed the pipeline to
25 go through there. But if the pipeline does go

1 through there, my tenants have expressed a
2 concern that they would move out. They do not
3 want to live that close to the pipeline and risk
4 an explosion. They have been tenants there for
5 16 years, it would be a loss of revenue. Not
6 only would it be a loss of revenue, but the
7 devaluation of all three plots where this
8 pipeline crosses or incurs.

9 Over the past eight years -- because of the
10 devaluation of the property, over the past eight
11 years, the property taxes increased 4 percent a
12 year, and that can be looked up through the
13 county on these plots. It has increased 4
14 percent a year for the past eight years. The
15 devaluation of the property and the increase in
16 property taxes just doesn't make sense.

17 With the EIS, once again, as I have pointed
18 out, that they have failed to disclose a few
19 things, under their notes they state "For site
20 specific residential drawings, refer to drawing"
21 something, I can't even read it. And I don't
22 know if that is because the ink ran together or
23 what happened. But I can't refer to another
24 drawing if I can't read what they are requesting
25 us to refer to.

1 The other thing that I have a problem with
2 is if a pipeline does go through, and I get a
3 nominal amount of money for this, I end up
4 having to pay capital gains tax on that money,
5 which is considered income, and I get no return
6 on those dollars, just for the simple fact the
7 property has been devalued.

8 I have asked NEXUS to look at purchasing
9 the property. They flat out stated that they
10 would not purchase any property, they only want
11 an easement.

12 And then last, but not least, is what NEXUS
13 and FERC has demonstrated to show the wetlands
14 that are in this area. And due to the elevation
15 change, I have a real concern on their EIS,
16 showing that much wetland, that they are boring
17 through that, and that is actually going to stay
18 a wetland, and it is going to service my well
19 depth at 25 feet. The depth of the well on site
20 is 25 feet.

21 We have asked the, the neighbor and I,
22 Mr. Stoller, we have asked and have given them a
23 legitimate proposal to move out of what I would
24 deem as a critical path, so close to these two
25 houses, in a wetland, that has septic and well

1 located on it that is not identified, and they
2 just flat out said, "No, there is no reason for
3 us to move the pipe." And truly, it actually
4 shortens the pipe by almost 800 feet, and the
5 path is much more amenable, as opposed to the
6 path that they are taking.

7 They have actually rerouted this pipe and
8 lengthened the pipe to bring it through this
9 area and cross over this state route. I talked
10 about the elevation change. The elevation
11 change of the wetland is actually higher than
12 the state route, State Route 94, or what we know
13 as Mt. Eaton Road, is actually higher. And what
14 ends up happening, in heavy rains through the
15 farm fields, this will actually fill up and pass
16 over State Route 94.

17 My concern, and I have brought this up for
18 the past two years to NEXUS is the erosion
19 control and having that in place, because they
20 are undermining the property, and it doesn't
21 have a natural saturation in the ground now,
22 because the pipeline is passing through there,
23 whether it is bored or dug.

24 I am truly against the pipeline passing
25 through in this area. I am not necessarily

1 against the pipeline, having the pipeline. I am
2 just concerned about its critical path, my
3 tenant and my neighbors. And I think a better
4 path could have been found with some more due
5 diligence. And I think there -- my personal
6 opinion is, they are truly in contempt of due
7 diligence, once they look at this.

8 I have asked them, I have been proactive
9 with NEXUS, I have invited them on site, two
10 years ago to start this process. And nothing is
11 shown on this draft that I have given them. And
12 I have given them that draft and I have given
13 FERC that draft. I have given FERC that draft
14 twice and I have given NEXUS that draft twice.
15 And nothing has been shown on here that shows
16 the well or the septic, and how the septic is
17 going to impede my property, because this is a
18 swale, so everything, where they have the pipe
19 running, everything centers right down on top of
20 that pipe.

21 So I am very -- I know we all have jobs,
22 and everyone is very busy at what they do. But
23 just a little bit more of due diligence, if
24 someone is offering you information, it is worth
25 taking note of. And whether it is three or four

1 times that I have passed this, FERC has got it
2 twice and NEXUS I am positive has got it twice.
3 It is just not noted anywhere. I am truly
4 disappointed with the process. And I hope we
5 can reroute it and keep it out of the
6 neighborhoods and keep it away from the houses.

7 But if that is what the Government decides
8 they have to do, I think they will truly look
9 back and say, "You know, we had a better plan,
10 and we probably should have used it." But time
11 is always of essence, and time is money, and
12 that seems to be what it is about. The due
13 diligence has not been put into this pipeline
14 like I think it should have. And that is all I
15 have to say.

16 STATEMENT OF RANDY J. WATT

17 As I just stated, my name is Randy Watt.
18 My wife, Victoria Stefan Watt, and I reside at
19 6338 Grove Road in New Franklin, Ohio.

20 The proposed NEXUS pipeline doesn't cross
21 our property, but the proposed path line is just
22 west of our western property line. We have
23 numerous concerns about the proposed NEXUS
24 pipeline that we want to discuss today.

25 We recognize going into this that our

1 situation is most likely more typical than
2 atypical for residents, properties lying just
3 outside the proposed NEXUS pipeline path.

4 Concerning groundwater, surface water,
5 water use and wetlands as addressed in the EIS,
6 our property line is at approximately pipeline
7 milepost 46.2 or Survey Station 2439. It is
8 difficult for us to tell from the FERC EIS
9 documents whether or not our sole water source
10 has been identified as part of the EIS.

11 In Appendix H-1, page 2, there is a
12 domestic well identified at milepost 46.2 that
13 lists, and I quote, an "... approximate distance
14 from construction work area" of 25 feet. This
15 may or may not be our well.

16 In the EIS Executive Summary page 4, FERC
17 states that "Construction of the projects could
18 result in increased turbidity and alteration of
19 flow in shallow aquifers if encountered within
20 trench depth or during grading and excavation at
21 aboveground facilities." End quote

22 If this much is acceptable to FERC, as a
23 servant of the American public, then I have to
24 question FERC's authority, because this is in no
25 means acceptable to us, to allow the potential

1 polluting; albeit, even only turbidity in the
2 best case scenario, or even the potential
3 disruption or alteration of flow to our shallow
4 well, in the worst case. Loss of potable water
5 will render our property unsanitary and
6 uninhabitable.

7 We have several spring outlets on our
8 property as well, within 50 feet of the work
9 area. These have not been identified in the
10 EIS.

11 Also stated in the EIS on page ES-4, it is
12 noted that, quote, "To mitigate impacts on
13 wells, springs and wellhead protection areas,
14 the applicants would offer to conduct pre- and
15 post-construction testing of water quality and
16 yield in all wells within 150 feet of the
17 construction work space. The applicants would
18 also implement their SPCC plans to avoid,
19 minimize and mitigate any chemical spills and
20 would prohibit fueling within 200 feet of a
21 private well and within 400 feet of a public
22 well. In addition, the applicants would repair
23 or replace any wells that are adversely
24 affected, or would otherwise compensate the well
25 owner." End quote.

1 We have concerns about this statement.

2 Considering the amount of harassment that we
3 have received from Spectra Energy over the last
4 18 months, the fact that they have trespassed
5 illegally on our property and the fact that
6 Spectra has sued us, what amount of faith can we
7 place in the simple statement in your EIS that
8 any water source issues will be handled
9 effectively by Spectra? How many lawsuits will
10 I have to file to force action, as promised in
11 your ES above. How many lawyers will I need to
12 hire to force action?

13 In the case of reduced water quality or
14 disrupted flow of our well, how long will we be
15 required to live without water? There are not
16 enough details in your EIS to raise any sense of
17 reassurance that residential water sources will
18 be cared for as rosily as your brief statement
19 of recourse indicates.

20 Secondly, additional temporary work space,
21 ATWS-4236, is situated directly uphill from our
22 well. As indicated here. (Indicating.)

23 Any oil leakage, fuel spill or chemical
24 release in this area would directly affect our
25 well. Your EIS indicates that Spectra, quote,

1 "... would prohibit fueling within 200 feet of a
2 private well," end quote.

3 Should ATWS-4236 be intended for powered
4 equipment parking or storage, then we take
5 exception to this and demand that such use of
6 this workplace be barred from powered equipment
7 use or storage.

8 Thirdly, I have worked over 35 years in the
9 energy sector, and I have been directly involved
10 in the active and practical execution of SPCC
11 plans numerous times. The effective application
12 of the Spills Prevention and Control
13 Countermeasures Plan is only as good as the
14 people who are present to execute such detailed
15 and complex plans.

16 We have little to no faith that contractors
17 working under tight construction schedules will
18 care enough to devote sufficient time and
19 resources to protect our drinking water. Plans
20 look great on paper, much like your EIS.
21 However, in practice, we believe we cannot
22 expect a high level of environmental integrity
23 from a field construction crew.

24 In the same general vicinity of our well
25 are an area of wetland and a small dammed pond.

1 The wetland extends into the construction area
2 to the west of our property line. The pond lies
3 within 25 feet of the construction area and is
4 not identified on any of the route maps to date.
5 We demand that the wetland area and the
6 potential for pond damage be accounted for in
7 the EIS.

8 Within 50 feet of the construction area, we
9 have another dammed pond. We have concerns
10 about the potential for damage to this pond
11 resulting from the pipeline construction

12 Concerning state-listed species potentially
13 occurring, the following comments reference
14 Appendix J of the EIS. There is the potential
15 that many old-growth northern red oaks,
16 scientific name *Quercus rubra*, and shagbark
17 hickory trees, scientific name, *Carya ovata*,
18 which grow along our western property line, will
19 be felled to clear the right-of-way for the
20 NEXUS project. These trees provide excellent
21 nesting possibilities for Indiana and long-eared
22 bats. We have many unidentified resident bats
23 visible on our property during warmer months.
24 Our ponds and wetlands provide excellent
25 habitats also for spotted turtles.

1 Our property currently supports at least
2 five species of frogs, one specie of toad and at
3 least two species of salamanders. Our two
4 ponds, wetland and trees support a host of
5 insect and plant species, all of which attract
6 and maintain a large population of nesting birds
7 and possibly bats. Loss of any of these
8 features will permanently alter a
9 micro-ecological gem that we have strived to
10 expand and maintain.

11 Concerning buildings, in the EIS Appendix
12 K-2, also called "Buildings within 50 feet of
13 the NGT project," our wellhouse is not
14 identified. It lies within 25 feet of the
15 construction area, this is a discrepancy in the
16 EIS that must be addressed.

17 In closing, I have some miscellaneous
18 comments. FERC's EIS covers a lot of digital
19 paper referring to plants and animals, streams
20 and wetlands, dollars and cents. In comparison,
21 the discussion of "Safety and Reliability" in
22 the EIS Executive Summary is condensed into four
23 short paragraphs on page EIS-14. One of which
24 reads in part, "Based on NEXUS' and Texas
25 Eastern's compliance with Federal design and

1 safety standards as well as their implementation
2 of safety measures, we conclude the constructing
3 and operating of pipeline facilities would not
4 significantly impact public safety." I repeat,
5 "... would not significantly impact public
6 safety."

7 We will not repeat or rehash newsworthy
8 items referring to real-time pipeline failures,
9 we are sure you have heard these reports many
10 times over.

11 With recent pipeline explosions in mind,
12 however, we ask FERC pointedly to define the
13 meaning of "significantly," when referring to
14 the impact on public safety. State it however
15 you wish, FERC, but we know for a fact that our
16 risk of being caught up in a pipeline problem
17 will significantly increase if this pipeline is
18 permitted to pass through our neighborhood.

19 If you truly believe this pipeline is
20 "significantly" safe, significantly in quotes, I
21 encourage you to invite any and all members of
22 FERC, Spectra's Board of Directors, the court
23 reporter, to come and purchase our home and live
24 next to this pipeline, should it be installed.
25 If you think this pipeline is, quote,

1 "significantly," end quote, safe at 36 inches in
2 diameter and 1440 pounds per square inch, I ask
3 that you please come tell my family member --
4 excuse me -- who suffers from anxiety and panic
5 disorder and see if you can get that family
6 member to settle down.

7 I implore you to go tell the 26 year old
8 man from Salem Township, Pennsylvania, who was
9 severely burned running for his life from the
10 failed Spectra pipeline there in April of this
11 year. I strongly urge you to go tell the
12 families and friends of the dead and maimed who
13 were caught up in gas line explosions.

14 For my wife and I in the event of a
15 catastrophic pipeline failure, our bedroom is
16 scant 200 feet from the pipeline, we would see
17 only a flash of light, feel a sense of
18 increasing heat and in the wink of an eye we
19 would go on to eternity.

20 Even though the NGT project does not cross
21 our land directly, it will undoubtedly affect
22 the valuation of our property. People like my
23 wife and I don't want to live next to such a
24 massive energy source, and others don't want to
25 live here either. This fact means that in order

1 to sell, the offer price will need to be much
2 lower to attract potential buyers and the time
3 on market will also increase.

4 These items I mention in passing: The
5 extended period of noise, dirt, disturbance,
6 traffic upset and trespass during the
7 construction phase of the pipeline, the nonstop
8 loss of peace of mind knowing that such a
9 massive energy source is only yards away every
10 day, every night.

11 The approach of Spectra Energy and the
12 machinations of FERC itself leaves the common
13 property owner like us with a very real sense of
14 being disenfranchised, that our
15 constitutionally-promised property rights are
16 for naught under the guise that such a privately
17 owned profit centered project is given the right
18 of eminent domain, even though it produces
19 absolutely no public benefit along the length of
20 the project, with the spoils going only to the
21 producers in the shale plate and the recipients
22 of gas in Michigan and Canada. We face all
23 this, citizens of the United States and of the
24 great State of Ohio, without recourse, without
25 consideration and without recompense.

1 The simple fact that FERC is even
2 considering the illogical and irreverent
3 proposed path of the NGT through cities and
4 populous areas by churches, schools, parks,
5 places of employment, tells me more than I ever
6 wanted to know about FERC. It seems that FERC
7 is an industry-driven bureaucracy, blinded by
8 lobbyists and corporate associations, and ever
9 forgetful of the rights, privileges and concerns
10 of the citizens affected by the NGT.

11 I pray you prove me wrong in that last
12 statement. I pray that FERC will listen and
13 give ample and equal weight to the comments of
14 those affected by NGT and move in one of two
15 directions.

16 One, require Spectra to develop a safer,
17 saner route for this project, away from
18 populated areas, a reasonable alternative being
19 the City of Green reroute; or, two, deny
20 permitting for NGT altogether.

21 Thank you.

22 STATEMENT OF MARYAN E. MATHIS

23 So my concerns with the pipeline and the
24 Guilford Road compressor station, I have
25 concerns about both of them. The first one, and

1 I can give you this, is that there are the
2 chemicals that are going to be exhausted into
3 the air that will eventually filter down into
4 the water. We have well water, we do not have
5 access to city water in any way. We had gone to
6 the meeting with the EPA, and they said they are
7 not planning on testing our water prior to,
8 during or only unless NEXUS reports a problem.
9 So that is like the fox guarding the henhouse to
10 me. If NEXUS doesn't report a problem, no one
11 will ever know.

12 There is not going -- there are no plans
13 for any independent regulation per the EPA. I
14 am a nurse, I have already had one child die of
15 cancer, I am not interested in having the rest
16 of my family be affected by the carcinogens that
17 NEXUS says are going to be exhausted into the
18 air.

19 Also with the location of this compressor
20 station and the pipeline, it is going through
21 farm fields where our crops are being grown and
22 so on, like that. We have a berry farm, and I
23 am very concerned about the exhaust of the
24 carcinogens into the air and how that would
25 affect our fruit.

1 I am concerned about the reduced property
2 values. We live within a half mile of where
3 they are planning to construct the compressor
4 station on Guilford Road. I am concerned about
5 the truck traffic that is going to have to take
6 place to get something like this built.

7 Because we live within a half mile of the
8 proposed compressor station, it is considered an
9 incineration or blast zone. If an explosion
10 occurs like in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, the guy
11 couldn't even get out of the house. He was
12 within the same zone that we would be. He could
13 not get out of the house and was burned so
14 badly. We are very concerned about our safety.
15 And our volunteer -- we have a volunteer fire
16 department. So by the time they get their
17 people to the station and get their trucks to
18 us, we are going to be dead. That is a major
19 concern.

20 All along that pipeline is proposed to go
21 behind our property, not through our property;
22 but, still, we are considered in the
23 incineration zone.

24 I am concerned about sound pollution from
25 the compressor station. They are saying that it

1 is going to run 24 hours, seven days a week, and
2 would be the equivalent of about 75 diesel
3 engines running, a 400 horsepower diesel engine.
4 We moved to a rural area to have quiet, to have
5 peace and are not interested in listening to
6 diesel engines.

7 And why don't they put this compressor
8 station in a designated industrial park? There
9 is one -- in speaking with people, there is one
10 in Wadsworth, there is one in Seville. Why are
11 they picking a residential area? There are
12 brand new homes, expensive homes all along this
13 area where the pipeline is proposed and the
14 compressor station is proposed. It just doesn't
15 make sense to me, when they have designated
16 areas already.

17 That is my concern, one other thing. I
18 don't particularly care for this venue. Why are
19 we not allowed to hear what other people are
20 saying, and to be able to hear what the
21 community's concerns are? I think that this
22 is -- I understand for your convenience, but I
23 think it is wrong that we are not able to have
24 an open meeting where people can express their
25 views and be heard.

1 STATEMENT OF PATRICIA A. HALL AND HARLEY HALL

2 We live in Lafayette Township, and we are
3 both retired, and we are really scared about
4 this pipeline going right -- it is going 50 foot
5 away from our house, right behind our garage.
6 If something blows or there is a leak, we are
7 not going to be here. I realize we are not
8 going to be here that much longer, but it would
9 be nice to live the rest of our life happy.

10 It is kind of scary being right there.
11 That is about all I have got to say. I don't
12 want it. It is not right to be there that close
13 to our house.

14 They have given an alternative route going
15 down around the wetlands, but it is still
16 cutting across the road, directly the same place
17 it went, right behind our house.

18 MR. HALL: They should use the
19 alternate route that CORN proposed. Plus, it is
20 too close to my septic system, and it is within
21 a hundred feet of my well.

22 MRS. HALL: That is the only
23 place we get our water from. And there is
24 supposed to be the mainline that goes down
25 through, the aquifer, and it is going to hit

1 that when they go through it. That is it.

2 STATEMENT OF DAVID G. HOLLISH

3 My concerns are I have a pond in front of
4 my house, I get my drinking water, whole house
5 supply of water. I am due north of the
6 compressor station. What is going to happen to
7 my pond when it rains and all that pollution
8 goes into my pond? I do not have access to city
9 water, there is no tap in out front or anything.

10 Being only a couple of hundred feet from my
11 house, what are my concerns? Am I going to wake
12 up dead in the middle of the night, because this
13 pipeline blows up, as illustrated in
14 Pennsylvania?

15 Wetlands, they are going to demolish the
16 little bit of wetlands in the woods next to me,
17 where who knows what creatures, frogs and
18 everything else, live. Trees, why cut down all
19 the trees? We are having problems with insects
20 killing certain species of trees. At what point
21 in time do we not deforest this country to a
22 point.

23 Noise, is this pipeline going to make
24 noise, even if it is underground? Am I going to
25 have to listen to that, instead of crickets at

1 night? I mean, it needs to be rerouted at the
2 end of the day.

3 Is there a reason why we can't take this
4 pipeline up through like Ashtabula, out to the
5 Great Lakes? Because they are basically turning
6 it into liquid, from my understanding, and
7 shipping it to Europe or shipping it to other
8 places. The reason why they are doing this is
9 because of the tax structure in this country, it
10 would save them billions probably in taxes.

11 Can they move that compressor, if this
12 pipeline does go through, can they move that
13 compressor station instead of deforesting
14 80-some acres of basically wooded land and move
15 it within two or three miles of three or four
16 different industrial parks?

17 I am just against it altogether, in all
18 forms of it, exporting our stuff to a foreign
19 country. Our natural resources should stay
20 within this country. Is this what I am supposed
21 to be telling her?

22 I am against it and it is going to be on
23 the backs of working people. We are not made of
24 millions of dollars, but these people profit by
25 billions on this. That or make us equal

1 partners, give us a revenue stipend every year
2 that would make us millionaires as they will
3 reap the benefits over a number of years. Just
4 to come in and take my land is not right at all.

5 I guess that is going to be it with that.

6 There are other questions I have, that she
7 can't physically answer or you can't answer. So
8 I have to see the people outside.

9 STATEMENT OF CLAUDE W. DOERING

10 Fracking was sold to Ohio as energy
11 independence and national security. The
12 pipeline is not about energy independence, and
13 this pipeline is not about national security. I
14 am sorry. The pipeline is not a national
15 security issue either.

16 The gas is being exported out of the
17 country. The gas line infrastructure is in
18 place already for domestic distribution. The
19 only issue for NEXUS is profit due to extremely
20 low interest rates for borrowing, and the cheap
21 current price for gas. There is money to be
22 made for exporting gas.

23 This situation will change and the pipeline
24 will no longer be financially viable. The
25 pipeline will create a permanent arid

1 microclimate because of the high pressure from
2 the pipeline.

3 I am a farmer, and this will drastically
4 reduce the production of my farmland. I guess
5 that is all I have got to say.

6 STATEMENT OF CAROL A. SNYDER

7 I am a concerned citizen regarding the
8 proposed NEXUS pipeline which will probably come
9 within less than a half a mile of my residence,
10 not only to the east of my home, but also to the
11 north of my home, is the projected line, not
12 only crosses Wall Road, but it also -- but also
13 Mennonite Road in Wadsworth Township.

14 I am also within the 5 mile radius of the
15 toxic emissions of the proposed compressor
16 station.

17 As Spectra Energy already knows, such
18 operations are risky to the environment, public
19 health and safety, and I quote them, "There are
20 a variety of hazards and operation risks
21 inherent in natural gas gathering and
22 processing, transmission, storage and
23 distribution activities, and crude oil
24 transportation and storage such as leaks,
25 explosions, mechanical problems, activities of

1 third parties and damage to pipelines,
2 facilities and equipment caused by hurricanes,
3 tornadoes, floods, fires and other natural
4 disasters that could cause substantial financial
5 losses.

6 "In addition, these risks can result in
7 significant injury, loss of life, significant
8 damage to property, environmental pollution, and
9 impairment of operations, any of which could
10 result in substantial losses.

11 "For pipeline and storage assets located
12 near populated areas, including residential
13 areas, commercial business centers, industrial
14 sites and other public gathering areas, the
15 level of damage resulting for these risks could
16 be greater."

17 I am concerned about toxic exposure and the
18 potential health problems associated with these
19 chemicals. Here in Medina County, we are
20 mandated to get EPA checks on our cars because
21 the toxic levels are already high in this area.
22 So having additional exposure would put the area
23 over the prescribed level.

24 I am concerned about safety issues, like
25 explosions in a 36 inch, approximately 800 psi

1 pipeline itself, as in the recent one in PA.

2 In the United States, over the past 20
3 years, there have been over 12,000 incidents and
4 over 400 fatalities. I am concerned about the
5 so-called 24/7 monitoring of the line from Texas
6 and the preparedness of local fire and emergency
7 services to handle such a catastrophic event.

8 This proposed pipeline is not for local use
9 as promoted and permitting eminent domain for
10 the pipeline supports corporate gain, not public
11 use. With a multitude of concerns have the
12 companies considered working together to avoid
13 pipeline overbuild? Please consider the true
14 need before issuing approval.

15 The proposed pipeline goes through multiple
16 areas of higher population. Whereas, the new
17 reroute of NEXUS proposed would eliminate denser
18 populated areas. The City of Green alternative
19 route is an excellent example.

20 I am asking you to consider rejecting the
21 NEXUS pipeline proposal and if not, consider
22 relocating the pipeline via the City of Green
23 alternative reroute.

24

25 STATEMENT OF SHAWN H. STARLIN

1 I am here representing the Wayne Economic
2 Development Council. Our organization is not
3 for profit organization that is here to promote
4 and facilitate business retention and expansion
5 in Wayne County.

6 Wayne County is a top ten micropolitan
7 area. We have been a top ten micropolitan for
8 ten consecutive years, which no other community
9 in the United States can claim. We attribute
10 our success to a diverse mix of businesses,
11 including industry and agriculture.

12 We support the NEXUS originally planned
13 route and would oppose the reroute proposed by
14 the City of Green. We take this standpoint for
15 the following reasons: First of all, the impact
16 on agriculture. Agriculture is Wayne County's
17 top performing industry. Wayne County has the
18 third largest ag economy in Ohio.

19 The proposed reroute would traverse more
20 than 35 miles of productive farmland.
21 Installation will disturb the unique soils found
22 in Wayne County, foreseeably resulting in
23 reduced yields in lieu of the sound reclamation
24 efforts proposed by NEXUS.

25 Secondly, we oppose the proposed reroute,

1 due to a potential lost economic opportunity in
2 the City of Rittman.

3 The original route proposed by NEXUS has T
4 Taps in place to potentially service industry
5 parks in Rittman and in Wadsworth. The City of
6 Rittman has been working diligently to develop
7 an industrial park within the city limits.
8 Great strides have been made to bring this
9 brownfield site up to an acceptable standard,
10 one in which the site selection community would
11 find desirable; blessed with robust
12 infrastructure, including water, sewer, electric
13 and rail. The only potential shortcoming of the
14 development is natural gas capacity.

15 This has been made apparent with a very
16 significant business lead our organization has
17 been working on for more than a year. A lead
18 that would bring hundreds of millions of dollars
19 in new capital investment to the community, as
20 well as 100 high wage, high skilled jobs.

21 NEXUS represents the solution to this
22 problem; hence, our desire to move forward as
23 originally proposed.

24 If NEXUS is rerouted and the T Taps are
25 removed, we could lose an opportunity, due to

1 insufficient natural gas capacity for the City
2 of Rittman and the town, which is in need of a
3 significant economic boost.

4 If NEXUS is rerouted and the current T Taps
5 remain in place, miles of laterals will need to
6 be run, impacting additional property owners,
7 agricultural land, and communities, including
8 the City of Orrville, which lies due south of
9 Rittman.

10 In closing, we believe NEXUS can serve as a
11 tool to our organization to stimulate economic
12 activity in Rittman and in the surrounding area.
13 We feel that the original route was well
14 planned, meeting the required environmental
15 impact standards, and we urge FERC to move -- to
16 approve the NEXUS pipeline project as presented.

17 STATEMENT OF DIANA D. DOERNBERG

18 I am a partner in a family owned business
19 called Cross Agricultural Management Company.
20 It is a partnership of myself and my siblings,
21 three other siblings. We inherited the two
22 parcels in question from my mother and father.

23 My brothers and sisters, some of them are
24 retired at this point, but several are not. But
25 still we do depend on the income that we get

1 from cash renting the two parcels that are in
2 question. And they are large parcels of land.

3 And in modern day farming, one of the most
4 desirable things is to have large, flat pieces
5 of land.

6 So I am bringing a little bit of different
7 perspective here, maybe more income based
8 than -- although I am sure other farmers were
9 talking about this. But I think we are talking
10 here about two things. The desire of the oil
11 and gas company to make money, and the desire of
12 my siblings and myself to maximize the income
13 that comes from this property that we inherited
14 from our parents.

15 I think that we know a great deal about the
16 impact of these pipelines, because we already
17 have one on our property. The Sunoco pipeline
18 came through several years ago, and the Sunoco
19 pipeline was not one where we could say no or
20 had any way to stop it, because it was a
21 Government pipeline that Sunoco had purchased
22 the rights to. So it was just a question of
23 arbitrating the cost.

24 That was a 12-inch pipeline. I would like
25 to talk about what happened after this pipeline

1 was put in.

2 As I said, we cash rent our property and so
3 the ability to have a good production from that
4 piece of land is very important to us, because
5 we are going to get more in cash rent from that
6 property if it can be maximized.

7 By that I mean, equally good production of
8 the farmer who is farming, of his crop across
9 the whole property.

10 The farmer that farms our property has told
11 us that the area that had the pipeline is not
12 the same in production as the rest of the land.
13 I mean, they take the topsoil and they say they
14 set it aside, and they are going to just put it
15 back and everything is going to be hunky-dory.

16 That is not true. It reduces the
17 production. And we also have two rental
18 properties on these two pieces of land.

19 Now, what I understand from what they are
20 proposing, or I guess it was one of the
21 environmental gentlemen out there said that
22 somewhere in the literature, they like to group
23 pipelines. I can't imagine why that would be
24 true.

25 So the fact that we already have this

1 pipeline would be detrimental to our saying We
2 don't want another one. I find that really
3 difficult. Because this one is going to be
4 three times the size, it is going to take out a
5 great deal more of the available farmland. It
6 is also going to go through some wooded, forest
7 property, which ultimately could reduce the
8 value of this property were it ever to come to
9 the place where it could be sold off for
10 residential lots.

11 I question the desirability of any pumping
12 station or anything like that that they might
13 wish to put on this property, especially because
14 of the renters. Most of the renters who rent
15 our property there, they like being out in the
16 country, they like the idea that it is quiet out
17 there. They like the look of it. Anything that
18 disrupts that tranquility is going to reduce the
19 desirability of these rental properties.

20 As I said, I am speaking strictly from a
21 monetary perspective, but this is supporting for
22 families with the income that comes from this.

23 So that is basically the thing that I want
24 to talk about. And I am concerned also that
25 they are only going to put this pipeline down 3

1 feet deep. Even if a farmer -- unless he is
2 prohibited from going anywhere close to this
3 pipeline -- and maybe that is the way it is, I
4 haven't read all the literature on this, but
5 that doesn't seem like it is very deep, and on a
6 farm property, also farmers tend to want to
7 tile, to reduce the effects of water. Trying to
8 tile would be a problem there. So that is
9 another concern I have.

10 I think just the fact that they are even
11 considering rerouting this, I don't want to say
12 that my concerns are any more valuable than the
13 concerns of the people who had the original go
14 round on this, but I think we both have very
15 serious concerns. And I really question how
16 necessary this is.

17 I understand that the gentlemen and the
18 companies that want to put this pipeline in want
19 to make money. But is this a necessity, is this
20 really something we are needing? I don't know
21 of anybody in this area that doesn't have access
22 to gas lines.

23 So I am kind of thinking, are the farmers
24 being played off here against just a private
25 interest that wants to take their, you know,

1 their gas production out of the country.

2 So I guess basically that is my concern,
3 what I am representing, and I appreciate the
4 chance to come in and talk to you about it.

5 STATEMENT OF WILLIAM R. CROSS

6 Let it be stated I am strongly against the
7 Green alternative. This is not a case of
8 eminent domain. I should say this project is
9 not a case of eminent domain. In my opinion,
10 this is not a national security issue. This is
11 a private corporation doing business for profit,
12 and this is not a necessity. By exporting the
13 product proves my point. Gas is available to
14 Americans in the vicinity of this pipeline.

15 Farming is my livelihood, it is how I
16 support my family. We had an 8 inch waterline
17 installed on our property in the 1980s, we have
18 recently been involved with a 12 inch Sunoco
19 pipeline, and these projects have proven
20 property value decline. I have had appraisals
21 done, it has been a proven decline.

22 Also by the example of the line in the
23 1980s, we have proven decades in yield
24 reduction, proven wildlife reduction and these
25 greatly affect our family and community

1 directly.

2 And, again, as I stated in my opening
3 remarks, we are strongly against the Green
4 alternative.

5 STATEMENT OF EARL C. KERR

6 Just as an opening statement, I am not
7 opposed to any kind of pipelines. I understand
8 they are a necessity in this fossil fuel world
9 that we live in. So I have no problem with the
10 pipelines in general. And I don't have any
11 specific problems with NEXUS, except for the two
12 that I am about to bring up.

13 I have two concerns with the NEXUS
14 pipeline, and the concerns are entirely a matter
15 of pipeline siting, and entirely a matter of
16 where they go through Doylestown.

17 Where the pipeline is, according to the
18 draft Environmental Impact Statement, according
19 to that map, where the pipeline is currently
20 sited to go through Doylestown, there are two
21 problems that I want to make sure are on the
22 record, because the Village Council has met with
23 representatives of NEXUS, and I am not on
24 Village Council, I am just aware of these things
25 as a former mayor. I know that Village Council

1 met with NEXUS, and they made these comments to
2 them in meetings in Doylestown. But I want this
3 on the record, and so I am going to point out
4 there are two problems with the pipeline siting
5 going through Doylestown. I will take them in
6 order.

7 On the south side of State Route 585, where
8 the pipeline parallels 585 on the south side of
9 585, before it crosses 585, the NEXUS folks have
10 sited that pipeline, where it is going right
11 through a housing subdivision that is laid out,
12 but there are only a handful of houses there
13 yet. So when they were originally looking at
14 their satellite maps, they looked at a nice,
15 clear path and they thought that is the place to
16 put it. The problem was, it is a housing
17 development in process.

18 And if they put that pipeline where it is
19 currently sited, they will basically eliminate
20 19 lots of that subdivision. I mean, with the
21 size of the right-of-way and everything, it will
22 render 19 of those lots unbuildable. So that is
23 the first problem I have. That NEXUS had
24 indicated to the Doylestown Village Council that
25 they would re-site that to get it away from all

1 those lots. Even if they went to the edge of
2 the property, they might still obviate a few
3 lots.

4 But it wouldn't be the 19 lots that they
5 are taking by going right through the middle of
6 it right now. So that is my first issue with
7 the pipeline siting.

8 The second issue is after the pipeline
9 crosses State Route 585 on the north side of
10 585, it enters into a 68 acre parcel that is
11 owned by the Lockhart Development Company. And
12 I am well aware of that property, because it is
13 the largest parcel of commercial property in
14 Doylestown. And they sited their pipeline to go
15 smack through the middle of those 68 acres,
16 which does serious damage to the commercial
17 value of that property.

18 That is the future of Doylestown is in
19 those 68 acres, from a commercial standpoint.
20 And then they want to put that pipeline right
21 through the middle of it. Again, if they would
22 simply re-site that pipeline to the edge of the
23 property, instead of going smack through the
24 middle of it.

25 It is very similar to the housing

1 development. This is a commercial area that is
2 vacant, I understand, they have looked at it
3 from a satellite map, it looked vacant, it
4 looked like a perfectly good place to put a
5 pipeline. But Village Council has told them
6 about both of those problems. And I am just
7 concerned that this needs to be on the record.

8 Those are just some very minor adjustments
9 that could be made to that pipeline. And I
10 certainly would have no problem with the
11 pipeline, and the people that I know in village
12 Government, I don't think are going to have a
13 problem with that pipeline, if it were simply
14 re-sited to a very minor degree. That is all I
15 have got to say.

16 STATEMENT OF PAUL L. GIEROSKY

17 First of all, I want to thank you very much
18 for all the advice that you have given to us
19 over the last year and a half, starting with
20 when we met you back in February, remember here
21 in Wadsworth. I think it was down in the other
22 part of the building here.

23 When we got together and you met with our
24 board, you know, our loosely assembled Board of
25 Directors of our Coalition to Reroute NEXUS. So

1 it is an organization that started here in
2 Medina, Ohio, and its specific mission was to
3 convince NEXUS to move the pipeline to a more
4 southerly route that would avoid the densely
5 populated counties here in northeastern Ohio
6 that are already well served by natural gas
7 supplies and infrastructure.

8 So when we saw the proposed route, you
9 know, we were dismayed, I guess, at the least.
10 But when we met you, and we asked a few
11 questions, you told us, "If you have a better
12 route, you need to propose it." That is what
13 created the City of Green alternate route
14 proposal, your specific advice to us as to how
15 to use the process.

16 And now that we have seen this draft
17 Environmental Impact Statement, we understand.
18 We have understood it for a long time. But, you
19 know, FERC needs to evaluate alternatives. So I
20 thank you very much for giving us that very
21 clear, direct advice and I hope we have lived up
22 to your expectations by sticking to our mission.

23 And I want you to know that as the -- and
24 you are probably aware of this -- but because of
25 what is in this draft statement, you know, the

1 specific directions that you have given to the
2 company to make route modifications, okay, to, I
3 will say to make the City of Green route work,
4 we are working on it.

5 So the planners from Chrissy Lingenfelter,
6 so she and John Strong have been working very
7 closely to make the minor route adjustments that
8 you have requested, in order to improve all of
9 the statistics that you are looking at to
10 compare the two routes. I just want you to
11 know, again, your specific advice, both
12 initially and in the draft Environmental Impact
13 Statement is being taken to heart and we are
14 working on it. Again, thank you very much for
15 making it very clear to us what we needed to do.

16 Turning my attention to the specific
17 comment on the draft Environmental Impact
18 Statement, and I will leave this with you, but
19 the commission has looked at numerous
20 alternatives. You have looked at a no action
21 alternative, you have looked at systems
22 alternatives, you have looked at major and minor
23 reroutes.

24 And you have also looked at an alternative
25 that included the Rover, a Rover Route

1 Alternative. I guess that was pushing the NEXUS
2 pipeline into the Rover route.

3 But one alternative -- that was dismissed
4 because of various reasons. But one of the
5 alternatives I think that you have overlooked,
6 and it is an obvious one, that is combining the
7 NEXUS project with the Rover project, literally
8 making the NEXUS project go away, leaving the
9 Rover project the only one that exists.

10 The reason I say that is an obvious one, it
11 has come to light recently that the CEO of
12 Energy Transfer Partners in a recent quarterly
13 earnings conference call was questioned about
14 this, and he said, "NEXUS and Energy Transfer
15 Partners, sponsor of Rover, are talking, are
16 having discussions."

17 You know, it says, "Energy Transfer during
18 its second quarter earnings call revealed that
19 the company has had preliminary discussions with
20 NEXUS Gas Transmission about the possibility of
21 doing something together with the NEXUS and
22 Rover pipeline projects."

23 Okay. That was reported further by another
24 industry newsletter called RDN Energy. These
25 are industry newsletters, and they are quoted in

1 here. Okay. I mean, they say, in their
2 newsletter, they say, "There are two competing
3 Greenfield projects: Energy Transfer Partners'
4 Rover pipeline and Spectra Energy's NEXUS
5 project. And by competing, we refer to the fact
6 that these two pipelines would move gas from the
7 same general supply area to essentially the same
8 market area."

9 So, you know, I leave you with that
10 thought, that another alternative that ought to
11 be seriously considered is facilitating
12 discussions between these two companies,
13 because, as you well know, NEXUS is only 56
14 percent subscribed for at the present time, and
15 I think a combination of the NEXUS project and
16 the Rover project is a real win/win. I mean,
17 just think about it. All of these environmental
18 impacts that you have identified in this draft
19 would go away if NEXUS went away.

20 Yeah, the companies still get -- the
21 companies win, because they still have their
22 project. You know, the customers win, because
23 they will still be served. The property owners
24 along the NEXUS pipeline that are opposed to it
25 win. And most importantly, the environment

1 wins. So that is my statement. And I will
2 leave that with you as well as the references to
3 those articles that I mentioned. And would
4 appreciate you seriously considering it.

5 STATEMENT OF THERESA A. LEIBOLD

6 So we are here tonight to ask for the
7 rerouting of the NEXUS pipeline and the
8 relocation of the compression station, because
9 it is within 2000 feet of our home.

10 The growth in the last decade puts Medina
11 County in the top ten, it is number six out of
12 88 counties. So there are more homes, more
13 people, and it is just more danger for the
14 people to be so close to this transmission
15 station.

16 And I am concerned about accidents can
17 still happen, equipment can still fail, and our
18 health, safety and welfare is at risk. When we
19 bought our property, we bought where we are at,
20 because it was out in the country, it was quiet,
21 we had fresh air, and we have a lot of wildlife,
22 deer and everything. It is all going to be
23 impacted by the fences and the spotlights and
24 the pollution that the compression station is
25 going to make.

1 We understand that -- we have seen videos
2 of these compression stations, and we understand
3 that there is a constant buzzing, and a
4 vibration that we are going to be affected by in
5 our homes, because we are so close. We are in a
6 large development where there are 60-some houses
7 just within that vicinity.

8 Twelve years ago there was a gas explosion
9 in New Franklin that ruined the wells of the
10 homes there and all those homes are now
11 deserted, they are owned by a gas company, and I
12 don't want to see that happen where we live.

13 Our neighborhood, like I said, it is within
14 2000 feet of the projected station, the
15 compressor station, and it is going to affect
16 our air quality, the noise level. Right now, we
17 don't have that out there, it is nice and quiet,
18 we can hear everything; and our overall health.

19 The winds, it is real windy where we are
20 at, the winds come across the fields from the
21 west, and that will all blow into our house. I
22 know that they have those blow-downs that spew
23 out all kinds of emissions and everything, plus
24 it is really noisy. It also will blow it into
25 the City of Wadsworth. I feel, you know, we

1 have talked about the contaminants and that
2 before. It is going to pollute the water
3 eventually.

4 There are a lot of farms close by, there is
5 organic, heirloom farms that have plants and
6 vegetables that they raise. People grow berries
7 and everything, and there are a lot of certified
8 organic farms nearby and specialty crops, which
9 are going to be affected. They are going to get
10 polluted.

11 The parks that are close by, and our taxes
12 pay for those parks to be there and be
13 maintained, and the land was donated for
14 preservation, you know, and the people didn't
15 intend for it to be contaminated. They wanted
16 it to be appreciated.

17 So the effects of this project, it is not
18 temporary, it is seven days a week, 24 hours a
19 day, and we are asking that it be rerouted,
20 because we don't want to live by it. We have
21 all our money in our home, and we feel we should
22 be respected for that and it should be rerouted.

23 Hopefully, they can find a better location.
24 There must be a more suitable location than next
25 to a large housing development where families

1 are raising their young children.

2 So we just ask that they really consider
3 rerouting this to an area where it is not around
4 a lot of people.

5 Thank you.

6 STATEMENT OF REBECCA K. CLUTTER

7 You are from FERC, obviously, I take it.

8 Thank you for the science based draft EA, and
9 also I already said thank you for the format.

10 I believe that I read that FERC found that
11 the environmental impact would be pretty much
12 the same between the southern route and the
13 originally proposed northern route. And I would
14 like to say that because of the contracts that
15 are in place with the Wadsworth brickyard, that
16 actually, I believe the environmental impact
17 would be more with the southern route, because
18 there would be laterals that would have to be
19 put in the ground to reach those end users.

20 So in my layperson thought process, it
21 seems to me that the environmental impact would
22 be more in order to get product to the end users
23 with that southern route, and it also looked
24 like the route was just longer on the map,
25 taking the southern route, which I think would

1 be a bigger environmental footprint. So I am in
2 favor of leaving the line with the original
3 route.

4 I also think that just from a corporate
5 perspective, my dad had a business and we were
6 always looking for ways to take the most direct
7 route to a particular location in terms of cost,
8 that if you moved it south and then they had to
9 put those extra lines in to move it to their end
10 product, that that would be more costly.

11 And then I would imagine that the pipeline
12 company would probably push those additional
13 costs on to the end user, which would be people
14 in Medina County. So the people using the
15 product in our county would then have to pay
16 more as a result of moving that pipeline south.

17 I also live in Clover Leaf Local School
18 District, which is part of -- is in the path of
19 the pipeline. Clover Leaf Local Schools just
20 came out of fiscal emergency, and the ad valorem
21 tax, the tax on real property that they would
22 gain would be hugely beneficial.

23 The other thing is, we have something
24 called open enrollment. So if, say, another
25 school district was wealthier or had more money

1 coming in, you know, it is possible that
2 students could actually transfer out of the
3 Clover Leaf School District and it is my
4 understanding that Wayne County already has two
5 pipelines proposed to go through that county and
6 if it took the southern route, that would be
7 three, which would actually create, I think, a
8 financial disparity between the two school
9 districts. And I just wanted to make sure that
10 you guys were looking at that particular
11 imbalance.

12 And I think that is it. Thank you for your
13 time.

14 STATEMENT OF MICHAEL J. CAVEY

15 I am the owner of Medina Country Club in
16 Lafayette Township, and the work-around plan
17 goes through our property. Medina Country Club
18 is the largest employer and largest taxpayer in
19 Lafayette Township, we employ over a hundred
20 people.

21 We have a business plan that has been
22 approved, all through zoning, everything is
23 passed, we have started work, we have done over
24 \$600,000 worth of work to prepare for the
25 development. I just put in a new pump station

1 for our irrigation system that will be much
2 stronger, bigger pumps, so we can expand into
3 the property that we are developing.

4 We had a membership meeting in November
5 last year, where we basically announced that we
6 are going to be starting the process of bringing
7 the sewer and the water up now, and we will be
8 next year be able to sell the homes.

9 Now, in this business plan, we have 160
10 homes in the first phase. Every one of these
11 homeowners must be a member or a client of my
12 country club. Each social member, they are
13 required to have a social membership. A social
14 member is worth approximately \$5,000 a year,
15 between dues and what they spend. Every one of
16 these homes is going to have to be a social
17 member.

18 And when the NEXUS people came out to look
19 at the pipeline and they wanted to do surveying,
20 I said, "Well, first off, you are looking at a
21 map that doesn't show our plans or anything,
22 which have all been approved. We have already
23 started working on it."

24 I said, "You are going right through the
25 middle of my houses. You are going to have to

1 compensate me for customers or clients that have
2 to be a member in perpetuity, and now I can't
3 have this revenue source. This is very, very
4 damaging to our business."

5 If we have these homes around our golf
6 course, where I am more seasonal, as an
7 employer, I will no longer be seasonal, I will
8 be open with the restaurant operations all year,
9 because we will have all these people that live
10 around us.

11 I have done a work-around with the NEXUS
12 people that I will submit, this is hot off the
13 press as of yesterday, and I don't think you
14 folks know about this yet. But it takes the
15 pipeline, instead of coming up through where our
16 development is happening, through here and to
17 the north, to the east of the golf course, along
18 Ryan Road, which is the Bowers' property and
19 then across our land where the housing has
20 already been laid out and permitted, and what we
21 have done is gone through the southern part of
22 the property, where there is no housing intended
23 to be. We hook up to the county, it used to be
24 a railroad line, it is a county trail, park
25 trail, and Ohio Edison has some real high

1 powered lines, an easement right along that, and
2 they can hook up with that and get to
3 approximately the same place, without disturbing
4 any of our business plan, any of the
5 development.

6 The plan goes right through the middle of
7 this farm, which makes no sense to me why it
8 wouldn't be on one side or the other. It went
9 through the middle of our property. Again, it
10 makes no sense to me. One side or the other
11 makes more sense. We can't build anything
12 within 300 feet of either side of a pipeline.

13 Back here, like I told the fellows, I have
14 been to your meetings, I live 1.2 miles from the
15 pump station just off of Guilford, I have been
16 to the meetings. I am not against it at all. I
17 am assuming you guys are protecting me, I am not
18 going to develop cancer, the pipeline crosses
19 probably within 400 yards of my existing home
20 where I live, and I am going to develop over
21 here. I don't think there is a problem. I
22 mean, I am confident that we run it in here, it
23 is next to power. I think the power lines are
24 going to be more of a problem than something
25 underground.

1 I have -- I think the NEXUS people are
2 going to submit this to you folks at FERC, so
3 that you can see this. To me, it is a common
4 sense, simple work-around, and I have built golf
5 courses, I have seen the pictures of what they
6 have to rip up and go through, we talked about
7 this tree stays, this one goes. I think they
8 are good people. And I think they are very
9 happy with this. And this doesn't destroy any
10 of my business plan.

11 So I am totally against what they are
12 doing, and I will not permit people to come on
13 our property and we will fight it in court,
14 because it is too many dollars. I have two
15 phases. I have another phase, my second phase
16 is on the Bowers' property. We have another 150
17 homes going in over there. If this is
18 successful, we will go over here.

19 Now, I know, we know we are in the fastest
20 growth area, Medina County is the fastest growth
21 area. There are all kinds of projects at the
22 end of the street that are almost done. The
23 timing is perfect for us to do this now. My
24 developer had already approached the sanitation
25 engineer to assure that we have enough capacity

1 for the sewers and everything, so we can -- they
2 want to run these sewers this fall, where we
3 could be selling homes next year.

4 So I am dead set against the existing plan
5 that goes through our properties, and I am
6 tickled to do this. I have talked to landowners
7 for NEXUS already, saying, "Hey, I think this is
8 a win/win for everybody." Like I say, I am not
9 against it. I am against where you did it or
10 whoever did it, without talking and saying,
11 "Hey, look at what we are doing here." So I
12 want them to see this, the powers to be.

13 I have given you a picture of the
14 development too, so that you can put the two
15 together. The development is like this. This
16 is Lake Road down here, this is 162 and Ryan
17 Road is right here. But this is the golf
18 course. This acreage is this over here. The
19 pipeline comes through here and through here.
20 (Indicating.)

21 And that is this, this is what I have
22 gotten. This is like the highest level wetland
23 you can have. This is the bat habitat area,
24 this is their feeding ground. This is a
25 filtration, this is the last big filtration area

1 on the McCabe Creek, which runs into Chippewa
2 Lake. I just can't imagine running a giant
3 project like this through one of the highest
4 level of wetlands that you can have. To me it
5 should almost go over here and try and dodge
6 this bat area and up here, if it was to go
7 through this area. It makes no sense, going
8 right through the heart of a major wetland and
9 the bat habitat.

10 This is all bat habitat here, big woods,
11 ravines, and when their environmentalists looked
12 at the build around here, they said, "This is
13 much better." He said he doesn't have near the
14 problems they have in that acreage, not counting
15 my business plan, just counting what is there
16 with bat habitats and wetlands.

17 I know a lot about wetlands. I built two
18 golf course communities, I know all about it.
19 This was not difficult to work out with these
20 people, it didn't take very much time. Because
21 I understand wetlands.

22 I said, "You guys don't know what you are
23 doing over there, that is just going to rip that
24 all to heck."

25 All right. That is what I have to say. I

1 just wanted to let you people know. They
2 thought maybe I should come to let you know that
3 this is in the process, this work around is in
4 the process and you are probably going to see, I
5 have to vote no on this and I am not going to
6 cooperate at all, and I am going to fight it.
7 There are way too many dollars. My whole
8 business, I have been there for 30 years, is a
9 family business, no different than farmers, my
10 children are in the business, they are going to
11 be taking it over. And I just -- this will
12 destroy our business plan.

13 All right. That is all I have to say.

14 Thank you very much.

15 STATEMENT OF JOHN D. HARVEY

16 I am here to make my statement against the
17 NEXUS pipeline transmission. On July 22nd,
18 NEXUS dated a letter and sent it to me, July
19 22nd, 2016. On July 28th of that following
20 week, they already had a surveyor at my farm
21 asking me to sign paperwork to survey the farm.
22 As someone who hadn't gotten his mail in the
23 previous two days, I hadn't even received the
24 paperwork that they dated July 22nd, for me to
25 even review, let alone having someone knock on

1 my door and sign it before I was even able to
2 review the material.

3 The gentleman was pleasant, he asked us to
4 sign, and we actually run a family farm, between
5 my father and myself, we run over about 180
6 acres. We live in southern Montville Township
7 in Medina, where there are housing developments
8 on both sides, houses greater than \$600,000. We
9 are sitting on prime development land. He is
10 asking me to sign an easement to allow them to
11 survey to put basically a gas transmission
12 through our farm.

13 He basically told me that they don't
14 believe that it affects property value. I would
15 argue against that. Our property basically, our
16 farms behind us sold for \$1.4 million on a 120
17 acre farm. We are sitting in prime residential,
18 \$600,000 highest tax bracket in Medina County
19 and they are going to come and put a pipeline
20 through my farm without even giving me the
21 courtesy to even review the material.

22 Also I oppose this, we run a horse and
23 cattle farm. Where we have basically 40 to 50
24 acres of pasture where they were planning to
25 come through. It will largely affect that

1 pasture and grazing area. If they have the
2 right to have an easement, they can come through
3 that at any time.

4 As a farmer, I am liable for my animals if
5 they get off the farm. If somebody goes on that
6 property and opens gates or flies an aircraft
7 overhead to monitor for dead vegetation and
8 spooks the animals through the fence, who is
9 ultimately liable? I am ultimately liable.
10 Yet, they have the easement, they could possibly
11 cause irreparable harm to my farming operation,
12 and me to be liable for my animals, because of
13 some of their actions.

14 One other concern I have is they had
15 proposed one route to go through Chippewa Lake
16 area. FERC recommended a secondary route,
17 following basically some right-of-ways that are
18 already there. Then this third route is
19 basically their own new route they prefer to
20 follow.

21 My concern is, why aren't they required to
22 follow the FERC recommendation, if they are
23 allowed to put the route anywhere they choose,
24 what is the point of FERC then? I mean, FERC is
25 obviously doing their own evaluations and own

1 studies of where the pipeline should be best
2 located. There is already right-of-ways
3 obviously with power transmission lines, with
4 highways, with previous gas lines or railways
5 that the gas line could easily follow, there are
6 easements already there and there is no need to
7 affect the other future property values or
8 property owners.

9 So that is one of my biggest concerns, is
10 this pipeline is basically in some ways, the
11 lack of communication, the short notice, I mean,
12 this is obviously something that has been going
13 on for a long time. But to be given less than
14 six days' notice by NEXUS gas line, and they are
15 knocking on my door before I even read the thing
16 I got out of my mailbox, is an issue.

17 Other than that, I don't have a whole lot
18 to say. I am against it. Like I say, we are in
19 a residential area, we are the fastest growing
20 in Medina County. I don't understand how you
21 can put a 36-inch diameter pipe, 1500 psi with a
22 2 mile kill radius -- basically you are putting
23 in a 36-inch diameter gas pipe that is up to
24 1500 psi, it is going through residential areas
25 or new home developments that have been put in

1 in the last six to ten years. If this were to
2 have an issue and explode, it is a 2 mile kill
3 zone radius if the pipe were to burst.
4 Obviously coming through my farm, it puts me
5 directly in the kill zone, let alone all the
6 development that is around it. We are in one of
7 the fastest growing townships in Medina County
8 and one of the highest tax brackets.

9 So for them to say that it won't affect my
10 property value, I find hard to believe. Other
11 than that, it is short and sweet. I don't have
12 anything else to say. I am against it.

13 STATEMENT OF JAMES D. HARVEY and

14 LOUISE M. HARVEY

15 I have lived on this property for 56 years,
16 since 1960. I raise cattle, and purebred
17 Arabian horses. I think the pipeline, the way
18 it was proposed, would actually destroy our
19 entire farm. We have almost 80 head of horses
20 running on the pasture, as well as my son has a
21 herd of Angus cattle that is also on the
22 pasture.

23 But if you look at the proposed pipeline,
24 it not only comes through the center of our
25 farm, between two lakes and I believe it would

1 do irreparable damage to both the land
2 environment and the watershed. Basically that
3 is what I have to say.

4 MRS. HARVEY: I too am concerned
5 about what it will do to the water table and
6 what it will do to the quality and hence, the
7 quality of the water in our wells. We have four
8 family homes on 110 acres we own. The proposed
9 pipeline, which is the alternate, we understand
10 coming through, that we understand FERC has not
11 approved and did not initially approve; it runs
12 behind a housing development on this side, where
13 there are a number of very large, expensive new
14 homes, and on this side are our properties. We
15 have eight grandchildren living on our farm in
16 the various homes, it is a family, basically a
17 family compound.

18 We have great concern over what will
19 happen if it is approved for construction, with
20 80 horses, 40 head of cattle. The pastures are
21 divided, but they are at some time allowed into
22 all of the pastures. And this would cut across
23 them, so it would make it very difficult to
24 confine them in one area. So the NEXUS people
25 are going to have fun with a bunch of horses and

1 a bunch of cattle.

2 We are basically concerned about the
3 safety, even though they tell us that these are
4 safe, we know there have been instances in just
5 the last few years, where these pipelines have
6 exploded. We are way too close to it. If you
7 look at the map, it is from here to that wall to
8 our house. So we are adamantly opposed.

9 MR. HARVEY: That is it.

10 STATEMENT OF KURT M. GERSCHUTZ

11 You know, I heard that what we are supposed
12 to do is look at what they put out, and then I
13 was going to talk about some points that I saw.
14 Does that sound good?

15 Okay. One of them was, it said an
16 inadvertent release of fuel, lubricants and
17 other substances will be minimized and
18 mitigated. That is really subjective.

19 I mean, I want like, if they are releasing
20 fuel, how much, and I want objective numbers and
21 minimize is not a good word to use for that. I
22 feel like it should be specific, not subjective.
23 And accidents do happen, equipment does fail. I
24 just feel like that is why the compressor
25 station should be further from Medina County.

1 "To mitigate impacts on wells, springs and
2 wellhead protection areas, the applicants would
3 offer to conduct pre- and post-construction
4 testing of water quality and yield in all wells
5 within 150 feet of the construction work space."

6 And for this, I would like a neutral third
7 party to conduct the testing in and around the
8 compressor station, because it is really going
9 to affect my neighborhood, my house, and we have
10 well water. And I am afraid that it could
11 affect the well water and what we are drinking
12 every day. My family, we are big well water
13 drinkers, so that really concerns me.

14 And then another point was, "Operation of
15 the projects would result in air emissions from
16 stationary equipment; example, turbines,
17 et cetera, including emissions of nitrogen
18 oxides, particulate matter, sulfur dioxides,
19 volatile organic compounds and greenhouse gases
20 and hazardous air pollutants."

21 I just don't -- that is a bad combination
22 of pollutants in the environment, half a mile
23 from my house. I just feel like it should be in
24 a less populated county, other than Medina
25 County, which is one of the highest populated

1 counties in Ohio.

2 Another point, "We received several
3 comments about the safety of homes, schools,
4 hospitals, et cetera, within the potential
5 impact radius for the NGT project. The
6 potential impact radius for the NGT project
7 would be 1100 feet."

8 There was a fire and a pipeline explosion
9 in Pennsylvania, within the past six months, and
10 there was siding burned off of a house, it was
11 in a newspaper article I was reading. It said
12 there was siding burnt, melted on the house a
13 half a mile from the explosion. I just don't
14 feel like the 1100 feet is enough, when 2500
15 feet away, there was melting of siding.

16 Another point, "The City of Green submitted
17 an alternative route to south of the proposed
18 NEXUS pipeline route, that would minimize the
19 impacts of the pipeline on development in the
20 vicinity of the city. We conclude that both the
21 proposed route and City of Green Route
22 Alternative are acceptable and recommended that
23 NEXUS follow specific compressor station site
24 for the City of Green reroute."

25 My point is not only would it minimize the

1 impact of the City of Green, but it would reduce
2 the impact for the rest of Medina County, which
3 is, again, one of the highly populated counties
4 in Ohio.

5 The next point, "NEXUS proposes to
6 construct four new compressor stations." And I
7 will save you the rest of it. And they didn't
8 see an environmental advantage, and you are
9 right, there probably is not an environmental
10 advantage of having it in one location versus
11 another. But my point is, it would be better if
12 it was in a less populated area, as opposed to
13 Medina County, and right next to my
14 neighborhood.

15 And then the last one I want to talk about,
16 "We received comments suggesting that some of
17 the compressor stations should be relocated,
18 because of air and noise pollution." And they
19 didn't see a significant impact, which could be
20 true. But what about the impact of the water
21 quality, ground quality, they didn't talk about
22 that. And I feel like that can be more
23 dangerous and I think that is it.

24 STATEMENT OF CORIN T. BORUVKA

25 So I read through the draft Environmental

1 Impact Statement. My thoughts on it is it is
2 very thorough, very comprehensive, 1500 pages of
3 it. It was obviously a lot of thought was put
4 into it. But to me it seems like that thought
5 was put in from somebody who has a different
6 perspective, a different viewpoint than a local
7 property owner, somebody who lives far away and
8 isn't looking at it through the eyes of people
9 like me, who are local property owners, very
10 close to the proposed pipeline and compression
11 station route.

12 So I don't want to sound repetitive in
13 these points, but I probably will. It is only
14 because I feel so strongly about two different
15 issues here. Number one, the City of Green
16 southern reroute. So I am going to talk a
17 little bit about that, and how it makes a whole
18 lot more sense from an environmental, ecological
19 standpoint. And also the location of the
20 Guilford Township, Wadsworth compression
21 station, which is right next to our residential
22 neighborhood. It is less than 2000 feet away
23 from my residence, and a lot of other residences
24 right in our neighborhood as well. Certainly
25 there has to be a better spot for a compression

1 station than upwind from a residential
2 neighborhood.

3 So I also want to be clear that I am not
4 opposed to pipelines. I am not opposed to the
5 issues of natural gas nor progress. I think
6 they are a good thing, I think they serve a
7 purpose.

8 But I just think we need to be smart about
9 the placement of them. Instead of having kind
10 of a spider web looking field of pipelines in
11 the United States across various areas, I think
12 we need to be smart about going through more
13 rural areas, hence, the City of Green alternate
14 southern reroute.

15 So as I was looking through the draft
16 Environmental Impact Statement, a couple of
17 things caught my attention. And I really worked
18 primarily out of the Executive Summary, so I
19 will reference page numbers in the Executive
20 Summary.

21 On page number 4, it mentions that
22 inadvertent release of fuel, lubricants, other
23 substances, are mitigated by the impending
24 applicants, and then it gives countermeasures of
25 what they are doing to mitigate these potential

1 hazards and hazardous materials. It also says
2 that the remedial actions taken to address any
3 sort of spill.

4 I guess the point I want to make about this
5 is, no matter what steps are taken, no matter
6 what mitigation techniques are used, equipment
7 fails, accidents happen. It is bound to happen
8 at some point, somewhere during this pipeline
9 over the years, it is going to happen. That is
10 why the Wadsworth compression station is in a
11 terrible location, right next to a residential
12 neighborhood, less than 2000 feet from my
13 property, which is on a cul-de-sac in that
14 neighborhood, and we should use the City of
15 Green alternate southern reroute, move it away
16 from residences. With accidents that are going
17 to happen eventually, it is highly concerning.

18 So I know there are mitigation techniques,
19 I know there are hazardous programs in place.
20 But I am still highly concerned, being that
21 close and that distance, downwind from the
22 compression station. Not only me, but our
23 entire residential neighborhood. There has to
24 be a better spot for this compression station in
25 Guilford Township, somewhere else, hence the

1 City of Green alternate southern reroute.

2 Number two, on page number 5 of the
3 Executive Summary, it mentions that no long-term
4 effects on surface waters would result from the
5 construction of the compression station and
6 pipeline.

7 Again, I live less than 2000 feet from the
8 location of the compression station, I have a
9 wetland on my property. And I just don't feel
10 comfortable reading it in here, and making the
11 assumption that there won't be any negative
12 measures brought out to the wetland on my
13 property. How am I supposed to assume that? I
14 know surveying is being done, I know testing is
15 being done, but I don't -- I am not convinced.
16 That is why it is better to just route it
17 completely away from these populated counties,
18 like Medina and Summit, and go with the City of
19 Green's alternate southern reroute.

20 On page 7 of the Executive Summary, it says
21 the projects could have both a direct and an
22 indirect impact on wildlife species and their
23 habitats and it goes on to explain those. On
24 page 8 it continues. "We conclude that the
25 construction and operation of the projects would

1 have not a significant adverse effect on
2 wildlife."

3 So it is contradicting itself, it is saying
4 there will be an impact, it will be direct and
5 indirect and then it is saying it is not a
6 significant adverse effect. Which one is it?
7 There is a contradiction. Living close to this
8 pipeline proposed location, as well as the
9 compression station, I look out my backwoods and
10 I see tons of wildlife constantly. I see where
11 the compression station is being built, they are
12 already cutting down trees.

13 This is going to be a massive structure.
14 This will certainly have an impact on wildlife,
15 there is no other way around it. It certainly
16 will, it is not going to be insignificant. It
17 will have a significant impact, I see it every
18 day out my backyard. Wildlife is going to be
19 affected.

20 That is why if a more rural route is
21 chosen, where it goes through farmland instead
22 of areas closer to residential neighborhoods,
23 like Medina and Summit County, would be a better
24 spot, City of Green alternate southern reroute.

25 Page 9 of the Executive Summary, it says

1 "The land retained as new permanent right-of-way
2 would generally be allowed to revert to its
3 former use, except for forest, woodland and tree
4 crops."

5 I don't see any way the land on a
6 compression station right next to our
7 neighborhood is ever going to revert to its
8 current use. It is always going to be a
9 compression station. After construction, while
10 it is in process, while it is being used, it is
11 not going to revert back to its current use.

12 We have multiple houses for sale in our
13 neighborhood, largely because of this pipeline.
14 One that went up for sale, it is 3662 Mark Dale,
15 two different words, Mark Dale, and a couple of
16 months ago the house sold, they had a purchase
17 agreement on it, the buyer found out about the
18 proposed compression station and pipeline going
19 in several thousand feet from this property,
20 they backed out.

21 There is no reason this compression station
22 needs to go right next to a residential
23 neighborhood. There has to be a better spot for
24 it. And you can't revert back to the original
25 use of this land when you put a compression

1 station on it. It is a terrible location for
2 it.

3 Page 10 of the Executive Summary, it
4 mentioned 62 planned or ongoing residential and
5 commercial industrial development projects have
6 been identified within a quarter of a mile of
7 the NEXUS facilities.

8 And I guess I am asking, why are we so
9 focused on a quarter of a mile? The impact is
10 going to be much more drastic than a quarter of
11 a mile. You look at what happened in
12 Pennsylvania recently. People are supposed to
13 feel safe at more than a quarter mile from the
14 blast, the explosion from that Spectra Energy
15 pipeline? I mean, it created a giant crater
16 that was 1500 square feet in the land from this
17 explosion, just a few months ago. It scorched
18 40 acres. We are talking about a lot more than
19 a quarter mile here. My property is just over a
20 quarter mile. It is like .35.

21 So I don't think you can limit this to just
22 a quarter of a mile. I think they need to
23 expand that. When you do that, it puts even
24 more houses, more businesses, more industries in
25 harm's way. Another reason they need to go with

1 the alternate southern route proposed by the
2 City of Green.

3 Page 10 of the Executive Summary, it says
4 the NEXUS project would directly affect numerous
5 trails, conservation, recreation areas, sports
6 facilities, in other words, parks, recreation
7 areas.

8 So this includes the Medina County Park
9 District. And I guess my question is, aren't
10 parks supposed to be a place where you can feel
11 safe and not be concerned about pipeline
12 explosions? It should be a safety zone. So I
13 also think how would current or future land
14 donors donating their land to the park feel
15 about something they want to preserve, something
16 they want to protect, and a pipeline or
17 compression station goes right through.

18 The City of Green alternate southern
19 reroute goes through fewer parks, it is a fact.
20 These should be protected, they should be
21 preserved, another reason to go with that
22 southern reroute, not in Medina and Summit
23 counties.

24 Page 10 and 11, in the Executive Summary,
25 it says, in general, effects of the NEXUS

1 project, recreational and special interest areas
2 would be temporary and limited during the
3 construction period, which lasts several weeks.

4 Of course, in general, for pipeline areas,
5 but when you have a compression station, right
6 next to a residential neighborhood, that is not
7 going to be temporary, that is permanent. There
8 has to be a better spot for a compression
9 station, than right next to a residential
10 neighborhood. Another reason to go with the
11 City of Green alternate southern reroute.

12 Okay. Page 11, of the Executive Summary,
13 it mentions the impacts on visual resources
14 would be the greatest where pipeline routes
15 cross roads, right-of-ways, passing motorists
16 are nearby, residences are nearby. And so our
17 township of Guilford, and our community, our
18 residential neighborhood, Guilford Farms, this
19 compression station is going to be highly
20 visible, it is going to be visible from the
21 road, it is actually very close to the
22 interstate. It is going to be an eyesore in our
23 community.

24 This is a back road, but it is a somewhat
25 main road that people travel as they are going

1 through our community, our township. It is
2 going to be an eyesore and contrary to what it
3 says on page 11 of the Executive Summary, there
4 will be a strong visual context.

5 Pages 11 and 12 of the Executive Summary,
6 it mentions that NEXUS has designated
7 aboveground facilities to preserve existing tree
8 buffers within parcels. So in other words, they
9 would recommend installing perimeter fences or
10 directionally controlled lighting or slatted
11 fencing at compression station sites.

12 So if we wanted perimeter fences, if we
13 wanted directionally controlled lighting, if we
14 wanted slatted fencing, we would move into the
15 city. We moved out to Guilford Township because
16 it is somewhat suburban, but it is also somewhat
17 rural, into a residential neighborhood where we
18 don't want lighting and fencing and perimeter
19 fences.

20 Our neighborhood is less than 2000 feet
21 from the compression station, and any buffers
22 that are erected are going to have a direct
23 impact on the living situation in our community.
24 That is not a solution to the compression
25 station. It needs to be moved south.

1 Page 13 of the Executive Summary mentions
2 that operation of projects would result in air
3 emissions from turbines and emergency generators
4 and heaters, M&R stations; and these would
5 include emissions of nitrogen oxides,
6 particulate matter, sulfur dioxides, volatile
7 organic compounds, greenhouse gases, including
8 methane, hazardous air pollutants.

9 All this, all these toxins, and the
10 compression station is less than 2000 feet away
11 from a residential neighborhood. These toxins
12 would be better distributed if it were placed at
13 the alternate southern reroute, in the middle of
14 a more rural or agricultural area, not right
15 next to a residential neighborhood, directing
16 away from residents, away from citizens, instead
17 of our downwind neighborhood from the
18 compression station. Another reason to go with
19 the City of Green's alternate southern reroute.

20 Page 13 of the Executive Summary, noise
21 would be generated during construction of the
22 pipeline in the aboveground facilities. It
23 would be spread over the pipeline route, would
24 not be concentrated on any one location for an
25 extended period of time.

1 On the contrary, based on videos I have
2 seen, based on people I have spoken to who have
3 compression stations near their homes,
4 particularly during blow-downs, but also at
5 other times as well, the noise level is
6 significant for homes 2000 feet away from a
7 compression station.

8 There is a constant vibration, a constant
9 humming, and that is why they should use the
10 City of Green's alternate southern reroute to
11 get the compression station further away in a
12 more agricultural, rural areas.

13 Page 14, Executive Summary, it mentions we
14 received several comments about the safety of
15 homes, schools, hospitals within the pipeline
16 area, and the potential radius impact for the
17 NEXUS project would be 1100 feet and 943 feet
18 from the compression station.

19 Based on the widespread explosion from the
20 pipeline in Pennsylvania, which has reduced
21 pressure and it is a smaller diameter pipeline,
22 I would be highly concerned at more than 943
23 feet from the compression station, and 1100 feet
24 from the pipeline.

25 Our neighborhood is just beyond these

1 numbers, I mean, just barely. And it is highly
2 concerning. I don't feel comfortable being this
3 close to it, especially being downwind with all
4 those toxins they mentioned being released into
5 the air.

6 All right. Page 14 of the Executive
7 Summary, "We received comments regarding
8 potential for accidents during the pipeline --
9 related to pipeline leaks on your power lines.
10 Pipeline leaks occur at valve sites, fittings,
11 where the gas disperses into the atmosphere."

12 I want to emphasize again that equipment
13 will eventually fail; it is not if, it is when.
14 Nothing lasts forever. It will eventually fail.
15 Based on the recent pipeline explosion in
16 Pennsylvania, the distance here is highly
17 concerning. A pipeline of this magnitude should
18 not be built in this close proximity to the
19 neighborhood that I live in.

20 That is why they should move it away from
21 heavily populated areas, like Medina and Summit
22 County, into more rural counties and follow the
23 City of Green's alternate southern reroute.

24 It mentions on page 15 that "We evaluated
25 no action alternative, system alternatives,

1 major route alternative and minor route
2 variations and alternative compression station
3 locations. And while the no action alternative
4 would eliminate the short and long-term
5 environmental impacts, the objective of the
6 applicant would not be met."

7 So we are looking at the objectives of
8 NEXUS here. A proposal from a private
9 corporation that is moving natural gas from this
10 country into another country, they haven't
11 provided any evidence of any local customers
12 whatsoever. I don't think their proposed goals
13 and their agenda, what they are trying to
14 accomplish, should outweigh other
15 considerations, such as safety, environmental
16 concerns, ecological concerns and geological
17 concerns. It should not outweigh those.

18 Page 16 of the Executive Summary, the City
19 of Green submitted an alternate route that would
20 have a reduced impact. It says, "We conclude
21 that both the proposed route and the City of
22 Green alternate routes are acceptable and
23 recommended that NEXUS file a compression
24 station site for the City of Green alternate
25 southern reroute."

1 That is the best statement in this entire
2 document, that NEXUS should find another
3 location for the compression station, instead of
4 Guilford Township, they should find another
5 location for the City of Green's alternate
6 southern reroute. Somewhere where it is more
7 rural, away from residents, away from
8 industries. Not only would it minimize the
9 impact on the City of Green, but we are also
10 looking at a much reduced impact for Medina
11 County and Summit County; impacting a whole
12 different group of property owners, but these
13 are property owners who own farms, they are more
14 agricultural, they are more rural, so the
15 overall impact to the entire population is much
16 reduced.

17 Page 16 in the Executive Summary, it says,
18 "NEXUS proposes to construct four new
19 compression stations. We reviewed two or more
20 alternative sites for each of the new
21 compression stations and did not find a
22 substantial environmental advantage over the
23 proposed site in any of the cases. Therefore,
24 the alternate sites were eliminated from future
25 consideration."

1 Medina County is one of the fastest growing
2 counties in the state. It is a highly populated
3 county, compared to counties south of it along
4 the City of Green's alternate southern reroute.
5 There has to be a better location for the
6 compression station than in Medina County, right
7 next to a residential neighborhood.

8 My final comment is on page 16 of the
9 Executive Summary, where they state, "We
10 received comments suggesting that some of the
11 compressor locations should be relocated to less
12 populated areas, because of concerns about noise
13 and air pollution. However, our analysis
14 concluded that locating the compressor stations
15 at the proposed sites would not have a
16 significant impact on air quality or noise."

17 I have seen videos of similar compression
18 stations from a size standpoint, and they show
19 otherwise, from a noise and an air pollution
20 standpoint. They look like a steel factory,
21 with pollution shooting into the air.

22 This wouldn't be an issue, if they went
23 with the City of Green's alternate southern
24 reroute. This is a solution to so many of the
25 public's concerns and criticisms. Take the City

1 of Green's alternate southern reroute and move
2 the compression station in Guilford Township to
3 a more rural, agricultural based area and you
4 impact so many fewer people, and sensitive
5 ecological and environmental areas. That is it.

6 STATEMENT OF JOHN EUREKA

7 My primary interest is to make sure that
8 the gas line is safe, not only for the
9 environment, which I guess people are considered
10 part of the environment, so the burial depth is
11 not quite where I think it should be for a
12 substantial pressure of 1500 psi.

13 I believe that there is enough equipment
14 manufactured to bury the line a lot deeper, like
15 maybe 15 or 20 feet. That would probably be
16 more appropriate than 3 feet below grade.

17 My other concerns are the safety relief
18 valves for pressure, release of methane into the
19 atmosphere. I don't recall what the distance
20 between safety valve reliefs are, but it is
21 probably pretty substantial as well.

22 And I would suspect that these overpressure
23 conditions would release a fair amount of
24 methane into the atmosphere.

25 Under 1500 psi, according to the Boyle's

1 law, one cubic foot of gas at atmospheric
2 condition, would probably be like seven times
3 that or 700 times that amount, because of the
4 extreme pressure that the initial gas is under.

5 So when you have an emergency shutdown, the
6 line has to be evacuated and that gas is just
7 emitted to the atmosphere, it is not emitted
8 into a holding tank or it is not recovered in
9 any way, my understanding.

10 I would prefer that all those conditions,
11 there would be tankers or a tank farm or
12 something that would be able to handle these
13 blow-down conditions.

14 And, again, the environment consists of
15 human beings, and the location of this pipeline,
16 as I understand, can come as close to within 50
17 foot of a person's home or a dwelling.

18 I know that there is a day care and a
19 nursery, I guess, or preschool, within a half a
20 mile of this pipeline. And that is just one of
21 the instances where, yeah, there is going to be
22 a catastrophic condition. If someone walked
23 into a building with a bomb, which is nothing
24 more than this thing 3 feet below grade, people
25 would be all concerned, and, "No, we can't have

1 that," and next thing you know we would have
2 riots on our hands, because people are walking
3 around with bombs that are going to annihilate
4 human beings.

5 Well, that is exactly what this pipeline
6 is, or the potential could be there. Hopefully,
7 it is not that unsafe and our good friends at
8 the engineering offices of the Government will
9 see to it that everything is done in a safe and
10 controlled manner and that inspections are done
11 not self-imposed, but by a third party. That
12 would help ensure some of the safety aspects.

13 I think next is the relocation of the
14 pipeline to a less populated area. It seems to
15 me that NEXUS is not willing to look at the
16 alternatives. I think that they have gone ahead
17 and they have already spent a lot of money and
18 have done some due diligence to the
19 pre-engineering or pre-routing, and so they have
20 already got money spent, and those would become
21 sunk costs, which a company is not willing to
22 readily admit or accept.

23 So I think that the Federal Energy
24 Regulatory Commission should look at specific
25 reroutes and make sure that those reroutes are

1 best suited for the individuals who are going to
2 have to live next to these things.

3 That is it. Okay.

4 (Thereupon, the proceedings were
5 concluded at 10:00 o'clock p.m.)

6 - - -

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding
4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the
5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding:

7 NEXUS GAS TRANSMISSION PROJECT

8 TEXAS EASTERN APPALACHIAN LEASE PROJECT

9

10

11

12 Docket No.: CP16-22-000

13 CP16-23-000

14 CP16-24-000

15 CP16-102-000

16 Place: Wadsworth, Ohio

17 Date: August 17, 2016

18 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original
19 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy
20 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription
21 of the proceedings.

22

23

24 Binnie Purser Martino

25 Official Reporter