1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

3

4 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

5 In the Matter of:

6 BAYOU CASOTTE ENERGY LLC Docket No. PF05-9-000

7 GULF LNG ENERGY LLC Docket No. PF05-5-000

8 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

9 Pascagoula, Mississippi High School

10 1716 Tucker Avenue

11 Pascagoula, Mississippi

12

13 Wednesday, April 20, 2005

14

15 NOTICE OF INTENT TO PREPARE AN

16 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

17 FOR THE PROPOSED CASOTTE LANDING LNG PROJECT, AND

18 REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES,

19 NOTICE OF PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING, AND SITE VISIT FOR

20 BOTH CASOTTE LANDING LNG PROJECT AND LNG

21 CLEAN ENERGY PROJECT

22

23 The above-entitled matter came on for

24 hearing, pursuant to notice, at 7:10 p.m.

25

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2

3 JOHN WISNIEWSKI

4 VAN T. BUTTON

5 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

6 888 First Street, NE

7 Washington, DC 20426

8 202-502-8613

9

10 JOHN McCUTCHEN, Chief Operating Officer

11 Gulf LNG's Clean Energy Project

12

13

14 RICHARD LAMMONS, Vice President

15 Bayou Casotte Energy LLC

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 I N D E X

2 SPEAKERS:

3 Mr. Wisniewski - page 4

4 Mr. McCutchen - page 9

5 Mr. Button - page 13

6 Mr. Lammons - page 13

7

8

9 AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

10 DARRYL MALEK-WILEY - page 19

11 Associate representative of the New Orleans

12 Sierra Club

13 OSCAR B. ECKHOFF - page 24

14 BECKY GILLETTE - page 25

15 Cochair of the Mississippi Sierra Club

16 ROB FORD - page 31

17 RONALD EMMONS - page 32

18 Executive director of the Mississippi Coastal

19 Conservation Association

20 TOM SINGLEY - page 33

21 PAULA VASSEY - page 35

22 J.M. FORD - page 43

23 TOM ESELIN - page 47

24

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

2 (7:10 p.m.)

3 MR. WISNIEWSKI: Good evening, ladies and
4 gentlemen. My name is John Wisniewski and this is Van
5 Button to my right. We work for the Federal Energy
6 Regulatory Commission, also known as the FERC, or
7 F-E-R-C. I am the project manager for the Gulf LNG
8 Energy LLC's Clean Energy Project. The docket number
9 is PF05-5-000.

10 Van Button is the environmental project
11 manager for the Bayou Casotte Energy, Casotte Landing
12 Project, docket number PF05-9-000.

13 Mr. John Peconom, a FERC biologist, is with
14 us today. And he's helping people get some
15 information and sign in at the table to my left. We
16 also have here tonight Ms. Jennifer Lee and Ms. Pat
17 Terhaar who work for National Resources Group, Inc.,
18 called NRG. They are our environmental contractor who
19 will be working on the Gulf LNG Clean Energy Project.

20 Our other environmental contractor is for the
21 Casotte Landing project, and that is Entrix, Inc.,
22 represented by Mr. Trevor Loveday and Eric Diltz.

23 We also have a court reporter here this
24 evening who will be making an official record of this
25 meeting.

1 I'd like to thank you all for taking the time
2 to be here this evening. I would like to also thank
3 Pascagoula High School for making their facilities
4 available for this public meeting.
5 This is a public scoping meeting for both the
6 Clean Energy Project and the Bayou Casotte Project.
7 This is your first of several opportunities to
8 formally comment on these projects. We will be
9 preparing separate draft and final Environmental
10 Impact Statements for each project. We sent out a
11 notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact
12 Statement, called an NOI, on the Gulf LNG Energy's
13 project on March 3rd, 2005. And on April 6, 2005, we
14 sent out a notice on the Casotte Landing Project. The
15 EISes will be used by the Commission to determine
16 whether certificates of public convenience and
17 necessity should be issued for the proposed pipelines
18 and whether authorization should be granted under
19 section 3(a) of the Natural Gas Act for the LNG
20 terminals.
21 Although no formal application has been
22 filed, the FERC staff has already initiated its
23 National Environmental Policy Act review under our
24 prefiling process for both projects. The purpose of
25 the prefiling process is to encourage the early

1 involvement of interested stakeholders and to identify
2 and resolve issues before an application is filed with
3 the FERC. Docket numbers PF05-5-000 and PF05-9-000
4 have been assigned for the Gulf LNG Clean Energy
5 Project and the Casotte Landing projects
6 respectively. Once a formal application is filed with
7 FERC, new docket numbers will be established.
8 We may not have all the answers to your
9 questions right now. We want to get issues so the
10 applicants can address them in their applications.
11 We have interagency agreements with the U.S.
12 Coast Guard and Department of Transportation. The
13 Coast Guard will perform a Waterway Suitability
14 Assessment and Navigation and Vessel Information
15 Circular review. The Coast Guard has regulatory
16 authority over LNG facilities which can affect the
17 safety and security of port areas and navigable
18 waterways. The U.S. Coast Guard is responsible for
19 matters related to navigation safety, vessel
20 engineering and safety standards and all matters
21 pertaining to the safety of facilities or equipment
22 located in or adjacent to navigable waters up to the
23 last valve immediately before the receiving LNG
24 tanks. The Coast Guard also has authority for LNG
25 facility security plan review and the compliance

1 verification and siting as pertains to the management
2 of vessel traffic in and around the LNG facility. The
3 U.S. Department of Transportation Research and Special
4 Programs Administration has authority to enforce
5 safety regulations and standards for the
6 transportation and storage of LNG in or affecting
7 interstate or foreign commerce under the pipeline
8 safety laws and to evaluate siting, design,
9 construction and operation of LNG facilities.
10 We, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,
11 are the lead Federal agency responsible for siting and
12 construction of onshore LNG facilities under section 3
13 of the Natural Gas Act, and we authorize construction
14 and operation of interstate national gas pipelines
15 under section 7 of the Natural Gas Act. FERC will
16 ensure complete review of the entire project in our
17 draft Environmental Impact Statements and final
18 Environmental Impact Statements as required by the
19 NEPA for approval of the facilities.
20 In addition to the U.S. Coast Guard and
21 Department of Transportation, a number of other
22 federal and state agencies have permitting and review
23 requirements for these projects. Those agencies
24 include the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S.
25 Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine

1 Fisheries Service, the Environmental Protection
2 Agency, and Mississippi departments of environmental
3 quality, marine resources and Secretary of State's
4 office as well as the port of Pascagoula and the Gulf
5 States Marine Fisheries Commission. We are working in
6 close cooperation with these agencies.
7 Maps showing the location of each project
8 were furnished with the notice of this meeting. We
9 have some additional copies on the table as you walk
10 in the office if you need one. Each company has also
11 set up some maps and displays about their projects and
12 also has additional information about LNG facilities
13 when you walk in the door. After this meeting is over
14 I encourage you to check out those sources of
15 information.
16 Briefly, I just wanted to say the Gulf LNG
17 project would include an LNG terminal near the mouth
18 of the Bayou Casotte on the east bank. The terminal
19 will include a berth and unloading dock and jetty to
20 accommodate one LNG carrier. The berth and loading
21 dock would be designed to service LNG carriers ranging
22 in capacity from about 87,000 cubic meters to 138,000
23 cubic meters. The anticipated level of traffic at
24 full terminal capacity would be about 115 ships per
25 year.

1 Two 160,000-cubic-meter full containment LNG
2 storage tanks onshore, and about five miles of
3 36-inch-diameter send-out pipeline that would parallel
4 the right of way of the Destin pipeline and connect it
5 with the BP processing plant.
6 This evening I would like to introduce a
7 representative of the Clean Energy LNG Project to
8 provide a brief three- to five-minute presentation.
9 Mr. John McCutchen, will you come up to the microphone
10 and say a few words?
11 MR. McCUTCHEN: My name is John McCutchen,
12 chief operating officer for Gulf LNG's Clean Energy
13 Project. As John just mentioned, it is a receiving
14 terminal basically consisting of a facility to berth
15 an LNG ship, to receive gas, store it in two
16 186,000-cubic-meter LNG tanks, full containment, and
17 then to regasify it through the vaporization system
18 descending to the pipeline to the actual grid.
19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could you turn the sound
20 up?
21 MR. McCUTCHEN: As I mentioned, I'm John M.
22 McCutchen, chief operating officer for Gulf LNG's
23 Clean Energy Project. Our project is basically a
24 receiving terminal to receive natural gas from ships,
25 receive, store and regasify, and then introduce it

1 into the pipeline grid. The LNG berth, as John has
2 mentioned, will be a single berth able to dock ships
3 from 87,000 to 150,000 cubic meters presently. The
4 berthing facility will actually be designed to
5 accommodate up to the proposed 250,000-cubic-meter
6 ship as far as the structural integrity of the
7 facility.
8 Two storage tanks are 160,000-cubic-meter
9 ships -- I mean full containment concrete tanks. They
10 are no-bottom penetration, so it's all coming out the
11 top. The send-out rate of the design of the facility
12 is for 1.5 million cubic feet a day send-out maximum;
13 ship frequency will be approximately two per week.
14 The brief regasification process is enclosed,
15 submerged combustion vaporizers, which means that we
16 will not be taking in any seawater as far as the
17 process or discharging seawater or coastal water back
18 into the Gulf. Also a part of this process uses clean
19 natural gas as their fuel source to regasify the LNG.
20 We're looking at locating, on this particular
21 drawing here, right at this point. There's a 95-acre
22 tract there that's currently under option from the
23 Port of Pascagoula, so it's located on the
24 southernmost tip, this being north and that being
25 south, of the Bayou Casotte entrance to the harbor.

1 Why is this a good site? It meets all the
2 FERC requirements to maintain a deep water channel.
3 It's a remote location. The material basin serves as
4 a buffer, which this is the dredge material basin that
5 adjoins this tract. It's zoned industrial. It's in
6 very close proximity to the natural gas pipeline grid.
7 There's a processing plant nearby to be able to
8 process gas that LNG receives from any terminal around
9 the world. And there's also close underground storage
10 once it gets into the pipeline grid.
11 Who is Gulf LNG? Gulf LNG is a privately
12 held limited liability corporation. The same
13 personnel involved in this Gulf LNG are the ones that
14 signed an option initiating development of the
15 Freeport LNG terminal in Freeport, Texas. That
16 terminal is presently under construction.
17 How will this project impact Pascagoula,
18 Mississippi? During the construction period it should
19 produce approximately 100 million dollars in personal
20 income for Jackson County and, of course, associated
21 tax revenue in retail sales. After construction is
22 complete, the facility will contribute an annual
23 school tax revenue of over 3.5 million dollars. There
24 will be a negligible amount of additional student
25 loans for the school district. Rentals and fees to

1 the port will total approximately 4.5 million
2 annually. So this translates to a very significant
3 future tax relief to Jackson County property owners.
4 It will provide 50 new high paying jobs to 50 people
5 with a total annual payroll of approximately 4 million
6 dollars.
7 Ship expenditures for politics, tugs, ship
8 stores, crew spending and local transportation will
9 total 4 million dollars per year with another 20
10 million dollars to be spent on fuel for these ships to
11 return to their original destination to get another
12 load.
13 What's the timetable? Gulf LNG used the
14 prefiling process application that was filed with FERC
15 on November the 17th, 2004. FERC then assigned the
16 docket number that John has already mentioned. It's
17 PF-05-5-000. That was done on December the 16th,
18 2004. Public application will be filed with FERC
19 later this year. The FERC process usually takes 12 to
20 18 months to receive a certificate. Construction
21 initially will take another additional 30 to 36
22 months. Having said that, the project startup date is
23 planned for late 2009.
24 Again I want to thank you for this
25 opportunity and appreciate you coming out tonight.

1 MR. WISNIEWSKI: Thank you, John. Now I'm
2 going to hand the microphone over to Mr. Van Button
3 who's going to talk about the Bayou Casotte Project.
4 MR. BUTTON: The Bayou Casotte Land Project,
5 I'm the environmental project manager for that one.
6 The project would consist of an LNG terminal also on
7 the east side of Bayou Casotte at the old Corning
8 Glass factory site next to the Chevron refinery. The
9 LNG terminal would include a turning basin, berthing
10 slip and pier and unloading facilities for a single
11 LNG carrier and berthing slip and facilities for an
12 oil tanker. The terminal would receive approximately
13 166 LNG shipments per year.
14 The facility would also include three
15 onshore, approximately 160,000-meter-cube capacity LNG
16 storage tanks, vaporization facilities, and pipeline
17 facilities to transport natural gas from the terminal
18 to interconnect with one or more of four existing
19 pipelines located within five miles of the proposed
20 LNG terminal facility.
21 Mr. Richard Lammons of Chevron Texaco will
22 now briefly describe the Casotte Landing Project.
23 MR. LAMMONS: Good evening, ladies and
24 gentlemen. My name is Richard Lammons. I'm vice
25 president of Bayou Casotte Energy LLC, a wholly owned

1 subsidiary of Chevron Texaco and a key element to
2 Chevron Texaco's global gas business enterprise.
3 One, Chevron Texaco from a corporate
4 perspective is looking and committed to bringing a
5 reliable supply of natural gas to a much needed market
6 for the United States, looking at the future. Aligned
7 with that, we have entered into the prefile process
8 for Casotte Landing, an LNG regasification, storage
9 and delivery facility on Bayou Casotte.
10 We'd like to take an opportunity to thank
11 FERC in their effort of engaging state, federal and
12 local agencies as well as the community and also
13 giving us an opportunity to speak to you this evening.
14 Casotte Landing consists of four major
15 components. The mooring and berthing facility for LNG
16 carriers, we're looking at constructing a slip to
17 allow those vessels to be off the bayou for future
18 operations. We own a couple -- not just the LNG
19 offloading piece but also the offloading of crude oil
20 for our refinery here in Jackson County. We see this
21 energy captured with existing operations. Moving
22 ships off the bayou creates a safer alleyway through
23 that area.
24 The second component is LNG storage, looking
25 at 2 to 300 60,000-cubic-meter storage tanks located

again in that same region at an industrial site presently controlled by Chevron Texaco.

Regasification facilities sized to regasify approximately 1.3 billion cubic feet of gas on an annual average per day. We're looking at technologies that will capture waste heat from the refinery, circulate that waste heat between the refinery and the regasification facility, from a perspective of energy conservation and minimizing environmental impacts.

The fourth component is pipeline take-away, delivering regassed LNG into a much needed market. There are existing regulated pipeline systems that cross the Chevron Texaco property, and we're looking at capturing that capacity so there's no significant pipeline associated with this prefiling application.

Chevron Texaco has dedicated resources from a corporate perspective, from a local perspective to address technical issues, environmental issues, operational issues and safety. We also recognize that we're capturing the skills and expertise exhibited by the safety record and the proven track record of our personnel and related facilities at the Pascagoula refinery, which we consider a very strong piece of our plans forward.

There's a dedication to safety by Chevron

1 Texaco. We're dedicated for focusing on people,
2 focusing on the environment, and obviously focusing on
3 our aspects. We expect this facility like any others
4 that we investigate or take any opportunity to move
5 forward to adhere to those strict components of our
6 own strategy as well as applying those set by the
7 industry.
8 We look forward to moving through this
9 prefile process with FERC, also the engagement
10 opportunities within the community to allow us
11 together to identify and address the economic impacts,
12 the social impacts, as well as achieving an
13 environmental understanding. Bayou Casotte Energy and
14 Chevron Texaco Global Gas appreciates this opportunity
15 to speak this evening.
16 MR. BUTTON: Thank you, Mr. Lammons. We
17 need to proceed now to the public comment section of
18 this meeting. As we said before, this is the first of
19 several opportunities for you to comment for the
20 record on these projects. We asked people as they
21 came in to sign a sign-up sheet there at the door.
22 You can also get signed up for the environmental
23 mailing list there so you'll receive copies of the
24 project Environmental Impact Statements. If you
25 prefer to write out your comments, we have a form for

1 that, and we'll also put a written version of your
2 comments in the record. If you want us to address
3 your comments in a draft EIS, please get those
4 comments to us by May 6.
5 You will also have an opportunity to comment
6 on the draft and final EISes for each of these
7 projects. Please follow the instructions in our
8 notice of intent and reference the FERC project docket
9 numbers. Again the docket number for the Gulf LNG
10 Clean Energy Project is PF05-5; the Casotte Landing
11 LNG Project is PF05-9.
12 So I'll go ahead and call the names of the
13 people in the order in which they signed in. When I
14 call your name, please step up to the podium and speak
15 clearly into the microphone so that the court reporter
16 can make an accurate transcript of your comments.
17 Please state your name and your affiliation, local
18 resident, concerned citizen, yourself, of course, is
19 fine. Please state which project you are commenting
20 on or if you are commenting on both projects. We will
21 proceed in the order you signed up.
22 I would like to ask you to keep your comments
23 to about three minutes. If you decide as we go along
24 that you want to comment more, we don't have an awful
25 lot of people signed up, so I'm sure we'll have an

1 opportunity for people to speak at greater length if
2 they don't finish in three minutes. But I would like
3 to make sure that everybody does have a chance to
4 speak. And it's perfectly okay if you decide, after
5 listening to somebody else, that you wish to speak,
6 that's fine, too.
7 If you have general questions, we may be able
8 to answer them here. But if your questions are very
9 detailed, we would ask you to submit them in writing
10 so that we can address them formally in writing and
11 give them the respect they deserve in our
12 Environmental Impact Statement.
13 We'll now start our comment session. The
14 first speaker is J.M. Ford.
15 MR. J.M. FORD: Good afternoon. I'm J.M.
16 Ford, Box 1655, Pascagoula, Mississippi, speaking as a
17 concerned citizen/resident.
18 I am particularly struck by the dearth and
19 lack of information that was presented at this time.
20 If I may, I would like to withhold my comments pending
21 what else is developed during the course of this
22 hearing and I would like to give some comments later.
23 Thank you.
24 MR. BUTTON: The next speaker is Darryl
25 Malek-Wiley.

1 MR. DARRYL MALEK-WILEY: Good evening. My
2 name is Darryl Malek-Wiley. I'm an associate
3 representative of the Sierra Club based in New
4 Orleans. And these are my preliminary comments, and
5 there will be more detailed written comments within
6 the time allotted.
7 In looking at this information, I looked at
8 both of the notices sent out, and you sent these out
9 to people within a half-mile radius. I would like to
10 see that expanded to a one-mile radius because of the
11 Sandia report, talking about the possibility if there
12 was a liquid pool fire of blistering skin up to a mile
13 away. So I think anyone within a mile should be
14 notified. Also that would include everybody who works
15 at Chevron. This is going to be an increased level of
16 risk for people who already work in a very risky
17 situation.
18 I would like to include in my comments
19 comments from Dr. Jerry Poje who was on the Chemical
20 Safety Board who did the investigation of the accident
21 at U.S. Chemical -- First Chemical plant here in
22 Pascagoula that had an accident in 2003. And I want
23 you to in your Environmental Impact Statement look at
24 the possibilities of accidents at other facilities
25 impacting LNG ports, what radius are we looking at for

1 damage. In this case a 13,000-pound object went from
2 the facility over a quarter of a mile, but there were
3 other materials that went distances also. And vice
4 versa, how would an explosion, any kind of leak of
5 liquid natural gas or pool and then a fire, how would
6 that impact the refinery, Chevron refinery, and
7 associated equipment there.
8 In looking at your map and trying to figure
9 out the scale, it looks like these are not that far
10 apart. We're looking at -- just doing my fingers on
11 this scale here, we're looking at probably a mile
12 apart or something like that. So I want to know if we
13 have some kind of accident at one plant, how does that
14 impact the other plant.
15 And I just heard that we're talking about --
16 one facility was talking about 166 ships per year.
17 The other facility was talking about 115. That's 271
18 ships per year. That's almost one a day. What impact
19 will that have on traffic in Mississippi Sound? What
20 impact will that have on shrimpers? Fishermen?
21 Boaters? I know that the Coast Guard requires a
22 moving zone of protection around these LNG tankers as
23 they come into port. So how is that going to affect
24 anybody that wants to go fishing or shrimping or
25 sailing?

1 On that question also I note that the Coast
2 Guard is tasked to provide security for these ships
3 coming into port. And I wanted to make sure that this
4 is an expense that will be paid for by the
5 corporations building these facilities rather than at
6 taxpayer expense and would like to see some numbers on
7 estimated cost of Coast Guard security coming into --
8 and also looking at the map that you had in the public
9 notice, I noticed that this might be on one of the
10 flight paths or close to one of the flight paths to
11 the Jackson County Airport. So we would like to have
12 some kind of analysis of a terrorist flying a small
13 plane impacting either a tanker or the tanks at the
14 facility and sort of giving me some kind of analysis
15 of what would happen if that happened.
16 I noticed one of the companies is a limited
17 liability corporation. I would like to know how much
18 insurance there's going to be required from these
19 facilities. Since the one that was Chevron Texaco is
20 next to one of the facilities, what will the insurance
21 be? Will it be a self-insurement-type policy similar
22 to the BP refinery in Texas that just exploded or will
23 there be a written insurance policy with an insurance
24 provider?
25 The cumulative impact is a great concern to

1 us, not only at these two facilities but all the
2 facilities in the Gulf of Mexico. At current, looking
3 at your map put out today, there are 21 proposed or
4 constructed or permitted facilities in the Gulf of
5 Mexico. There has been no analysis of the cumulative
6 impact, cumulative risk. We have a proposal currently
7 in the application process with Compass Port, which is
8 11 miles off of Dauphin Island. And just looking at
9 the navigation maps, the ships coming into these two
10 facilities might be coming near to that Compass Port
11 facility so that we have -- cumulative impact needs to
12 be addressed with that facility. We also have
13 Freeport McMoran pass facility.
14 I know these facilities will be using the
15 closed loop, not the open loop that we're very
16 concerned about fishery impacts on. But we still want
17 to see kind of analysis of cumulative impact across
18 the Gulf of Mexico.
19 We're interested about some kind of analysis
20 of if there was an accident, what level of emergency
21 response teams would be needed in Jackson County.
22 Would there be any kind of special fee assessed on
23 these two facilities to provide Jackson County with
24 the additional needed emergency response teams.
25 In looking at one of the nice color

1 illustrations of this facility, they looked like they
2 were at grade, ground level. We do have hurricanes
3 down here. And if you were to build a house on that
4 property, you could not build it at ground level. So
5 I want some kind of analysis of impact of a class 3 to
6 5 hurricane on the facility, the possibility of
7 leaking LNG. I know you probably have a lot -- a lot
8 less chance of a fire because the vapor cloud most
9 likely would be dissipated rather rapidly in a wind of
10 over 100 miles an hour.
11 Those are my initial questions right now.
12 Like I said, we will have additional comments. But we
13 would like to go on the record as opposing both of
14 these facilities. They just -- it's not the place to
15 be. We feel it's another example of the current
16 administration's effort to put these facilities all
17 around the country without really looking at
18 alternatives for do we need this LNG.
19 And that's the other analysis. I was
20 looking, and I've read these Environmental Impact
21 Statements before. They usually are very limited on
22 their analysis of do we need this liquid natural gas?
23 Who is going to be the beneficiary of this liquid
24 natural gas? Will it mainly be the petrochemical
25 industry with a cheaper price for LNG or is it going

to be actually shipped to end users and residentials? I'd like some kind of analysis of where the proposed natural gas will be shipped. Thank you.

(APPLAUSE.)

MR. BUTTON: Oscar Eckhoff.

MR. OSCAR B. ECKHOFF: Thank y'all. I am a geologist, retired, a nuclear physicist. I belong to the World Future Society. I know something about anthropology. And that means that I take a long-term view of things, and nobody else seems to do that. I don't know why.

Everybody is a specialist and therefore they think they know everything about everything else. Don't ask me why, but that's human nature. I'm a mother of five children or I'm a nuclear physicist or whatever it is and I therefore know everything about everything there is. Well, at least that's what I act as if it's true. I object.

Growth is suicidal. Earth is natural. Earth used to be natural. It's all artificial now, as far as I'm concerned. But a lot of it is unnatural. Mother Nature got here first and then we came along. We're trying to destroy Mother Nature. I object to all this growth that we insist that we have. The only reason that we need, quote, "need," unquote, economic

1 growth is because the population keeps increasing and
2 because businessmen bribe politicians to develop it.
3 I don't like that. It's unethical.
4 Now, speaking of unethical, everything that
5 we are doing is designed to destroy life on earth.
6 Now, that sounds mighty unethical to me, but we insist
7 on doing it. All future generations are going to
8 suffer as a result of this liquefied natural gas
9 facility. Everything that we do is going decrease the
10 total amount of life on earth. I call that unethical.
11 I think that our population should be
12 reduced preferably by desirable means instead of
13 undesirable means and that our standard of living
14 should be reduced also. It will be reduced and our
15 population will be reduced because we refuse to do it
16 on purpose. In other words, wars are inevitable, acts
17 of terrorism that kill more people than 3,000 in one
18 swoop will occur.
19 Everything that we do seems to be designed as
20 if we've got to have economic growth right now. The
21 hell with the future generations. I don't like that.
22 Thank you.
23 MR. BUTTON: Becky Gillette.
24 MS. BECKY GILLETTE: My name is Becky
25 Gillette. I'm the cochair of the Mississippi chapter

1 of Sierra Club.
2 The first thing I'd like to say is this is
3 the first time I've ever been involved with an
4 Environmental Impact Statement where you're doing the
5 scoping meeting before the applicants have even
6 applied for their projects. I think that means that
7 you don't know what you're scoping yet. And it seems
8 again that it's a fast track to get these facilities
9 approved without -- instead what we need to be fast
10 tracking is energy conservation and alternative energy
11 and finding other ways to deal with our energy
12 shortages rather than simply trying to rely more on
13 foreign oil and gas.
14 I'd like to put into the record recent news
15 articles that have been in the Sun Herald and the
16 Mississippi Press. The Mississippi Press, April 19,
17 "Gulf Sturgeon Could Kill Port Project," regarding
18 issues surrounding endangered Gulf Sturgeon. And also
19 "All's Quiet on the Waterfront," a front-page story in
20 the Sun Herald, and on the page with another story by
21 that same writer that came around, I guess, a couple
22 of days ago. I would like those to be included
23 because the Gulf Sturgeon is a major issue affecting
24 big projects on the Gulf Coast and small projects, for
25 that matter.

1 One of the most important things I think that
2 needs to be considered on the environmental side is
3 the impact of the proposed Chevron slip. I can see
4 how that by going into the land there, they are going
5 to be more protected from weather, from terrorists or
6 whatever. But keyhole slips are not allowed under the
7 Mississippi Coastal Program and you would be required
8 to do a variance. And we need to look at the poor
9 water quality that could develop by having it. The
10 reason that DMR doesn't allow the keyhole slips is
11 poor water quality, lack of oxygen can cause fish
12 kills. We already had a big fish kill in this area in
13 the last week and we don't need to be setting up more
14 conditions for that.
15 I take exception to Gulf Energy LNG calling
16 this a remote area, it's not well populated. The
17 largest employer in the state is Northrup Grumman and
18 they have a shipyard right across from this facility.
19 There's 12,000 people that work there. There's 1,000
20 people that work at Chevron. I would not call this a
21 remote area. I would not call it unpopulated,
22 particularly -- well, at least 24-hour shifts, I'm
23 sure, for many of those. It's also close to the
24 Singing River Yacht Club, and a lot of people who have
25 small boats enjoy going out into this area. And

1 again, with the number of ships we were talking about,
2 almost as many ships as there are days in the year.
3 So it seems to me that this area could be put off
4 limits almost permanently.
5 We need to look at the cultural impacts to
6 commercial fishermen. They're already having a hard
7 time surviving. We see stories in the paper about
8 them all the time, high diesel prices, low imported
9 shrimp. And for them to have to move out of the way
10 every time an LNG tanker is coming and going could be
11 a death kill to not just their livelihood but the
12 culture of the commercial fishermen.
13 Impacts to aviation, will there be aerial
14 exclusion zones?
15 Cumulative impacts, if you would please look
16 at the Coastal EIS that the Corps of Engineers has
17 worked on for a couple of years. They've developed a
18 methodology to look at large scale projects and have
19 done a lot of the detail kind of work that would
20 normally go into an EIS like this.
21 Air quality is a big concern to me because
22 the American Lung Association has given us an F for
23 air quality on the Mississippi Gulf Coast. We were
24 out of attainment in the late '90s. In the more
25 recent years we are in defacto attainment. But we're

1 on the borderline and it's only because we've had some
2 cooler summers that we've been in attainment. Chevron
3 is currently applying for a permit to expand their
4 production by 23 percent. You need to take that into
5 consideration. We also have the big industry on the
6 other side of the coast, DuPont DeLisle, that's doing
7 the same thing.
8 As far as the impact of the tax base on this
9 county in case of an energy, I have a concern as
10 someone who plans to retire here that if an accident
11 -- if it impacted Pascagoula, that it could also
12 greatly impact the tax base of this whole county. And
13 we would not be able to pay off our bonds if there was
14 a major accident in that industrial corridor because
15 we rely on that for a lot of our tax revenues. I
16 think that these companies should be required to set
17 up the type of insurance so that they would take care
18 of lost tax revenues in case of an accident up there.
19 Impact on the national seashore, the number
20 one tourist attraction in Mississippi. How close to
21 the island will these huge vessels come? And I wanted
22 to tell you I took a picture of one of the small LNG
23 tankers in Boston Harbor. This is 125-cubic-meter
24 tank. They could bring up to 250 or merely ships
25 twice that large. (Indicating.)

1 So I think that this could be a visual
2 impact to the number one tourist attraction of
3 Mississippi, which is the Gulf Islands National
4 Seashore. The proximity to the Naval Station
5 Pascagoula is also a concern. We're looking at base
6 closure hearings. What impact could it have on base
7 closure if they found out that there was an attractive
8 terrorist target going to be put in or two of them
9 right next door?
10 And the other thing that I'd really like you
11 to look at is the proximity of flares that could
12 ignite any vapor clouds from other industrial
13 facilities in the area. And when we took the tour
14 earlier today, we saw that there were flares in very
15 close proximity.
16 And one other accident is that the shipyard
17 that was Friede Goldman, is it Signal now, the new
18 one? About a year and a half ago one of their jackup
19 rigs broke loose and went across the channel and
20 rammed into Chevron's dock and did quite a bit of
21 damage. So you also need to consider that in high
22 wind situations, accidents are going to occur. And
23 you need to evaluate the impacts of that. Thank you.
24 (APPLAUSE.)
25 MR. BUTTON: You can leave your papers with

1 the court reporter. Thank you.
2 Rob Ford?
3 MR. ROB FORD: Good evening. My name is Rob
4 Ford. I live at 1303 Lureco Drive, Pascagoula. I'm
5 representing myself.
6 One of my major concerns on this project --
7 both projects actually -- is the impact that it has on
8 the water recreation for our citizens and some few
9 tourists whereby how it will impact the fishing of
10 recreational fishermen there in the Bayou Casotte area
11 and also we have some people that go kayaking,
12 canoeing and sailing in that area.
13 And with the state of homeland security,
14 during these operations is Bayou Casotte going to be
15 off limits to recreational use for the bayou? I
16 personally do not fish, but I may take it up again in
17 the future if I have time.
18 Another concern certainly I have is the
19 impact on the county tax base. Whereas Gulf LNG has
20 volunteered that they are more than willing to pay
21 their fair share of taxes that the county will assess
22 on the new industry, whereas in comparison Chevron is
23 very evasive on their attempts to evade or not pay the
24 taxes by seeking a tax exemption from the county. And
25 this is an adverse impact on the citizens of the

county. We don't see a tax benefit for ourselves here. And these things are things that impact the general population of the county as far as our well-being and enjoyment of our environment here, not just addressing the potential hazards, which, of course, potentially are there but they are remote, in my viewpoint.

Thank you very much. Have a good evening.

(APPLAUSE.)

MR. BUTTON: Mr. Emmons.

RONALD EMMONS: My name is Ronald Emmons. I'm executive director of the Coastal Conservation Association of Mississippi. Address is 109 South 27th Avenue, Suite 219, Hattiesburg, Mississippi.

Our organization has some concerns with these systems. Although being in the closed loop, there exists the possibility of some interactions between the regasification process and the marine environment. How much? What will it be? How many acres of wetlands will be impacted? Dredging, filling, covering drains, if any? Will there be any mitigation? Will any new pipeline transfer through wetlands or marine habitat?

And I guess mainly what our organization is really concerned about, being a recreational saltwater

1 fishing group -- there's been great concern for
2 recreational boating and especially recreational
3 fishing regarding potential loss of access to
4 waterways and fishing areas. Do you foresee any
5 foreclosures of the areas surrounding the terminals?
6 And what is it going to be? Is it going to be
7 temporary or will it be permanent? We'd like y'all to
8 look at that on y'all's impact statements to see what
9 it does to recreational fishing. Thank you.
10 MR. BUTTON: Paula Vassey. Paula Vassey?
11 (NO RESPONSE.)
12 MR. BUTTON: Dr. Tom Singley.
13 DR. TOM SINGLEY: Ladies and gentlemen, my
14 name is Tom Singley. I'm representing myself as a
15 citizen in the local area.
16 A few things that I actually question for
17 which I haven't seen answers, first of all, there's
18 been mention of commercial insurance. Has there been
19 any investigation of what insurance rates might do to
20 the populous in south Pascagoula? We've already dealt
21 with rising deductibles for wind and hail due to
22 storms. Of course, they've already happened. But in
23 this kind of situation we wouldn't put it past the
24 insurance companies to look at the local area in the
25 mile and a half, two-mile area to be of concern in

1 terms of home insurance and the risk thereof. So
2 that's one question.
3 Secondly, I consider myself not really a true
4 environmentalist but a conservationist and not an
5 alarmist but rather a realist. But if any of you
6 watch the TV program 24 -- you ought to watch it.
7 It's on Monday nights. It shows you how potentially
8 likely something like a terrorist attack is in this
9 country. We've already had that happen. And your own
10 Sandia report states, if I quote it right: It's
11 impossible to predict, impossible to predict, when,
12 how and to what extent one of these things will
13 happen. And that's your own commission report making
14 that statement.
15 Therefore, has there been a scientific study
16 or test? We've heard time after time LNG in liquid
17 form does not explode. And I accept that. But have
18 we heard information about dropping -- on a scale,
19 appropriate scale, dropping an explosive into a closed
20 vessel of LNG, an explosion that would not require
21 oxygen to ignite, and the result of that explosion?
22 And certainly I recommend that you consider this in
23 terms of your study of possibilities.
24 All of this leads to my last question, and
25 that is: Why can't these companies put these

1 facilities offshore? I understand there's taxes to be
2 paid if they're local. I understand Chevron has some
3 energy recovery that might benefit them. But if what
4 I also read is correct, that it would take one-half to
5 one percent of the LNG product to run a regasification
6 system offshore, that certainly would not cut into
7 their profit to a great deal.
8 The other thing about closed loop/open loop
9 that we're seeing discussed in Louisiana and Texas is
10 another concern, and Mr. Emmons brought that up.
11 Certainly that one-half to one percent LNG usage for a
12 closed loop system would take care of all the concerns
13 about environmental water in the area. And putting it
14 offshore would take care of all our concerns about
15 proximity to the public. Thank you.
16 (APPLAUSE.)
17 MR. BUTTON: Paula Vassey?
18 MS. PAULA VASSEY: My name is Paula Vassey.
19 I live at 3125 Graveline Road in Gautier. Although I
20 did receive a notice, I don't consider myself a
21 resident near this area. I spoke with a couple of the
22 FERC gentlemen on the phone and in person.
23 My biggest concern here is that I received a
24 public notice. The newspaper said there were 80 of
25 these sent out to residents. I think if only 80

1 residents in Jackson County, Mississippi, were
2 notified, y'all are doing a piss-poor job of notifying
3 the public of potential side effects, after effects or
4 terrorist attacks or risks to their lives, their
5 health, the public safety and welfare. I think
6 Chevron needs to step up to the bat, I think Gulf LNG
7 needs to step up to the bat. It's not up to the local
8 government officials to notify the people that they're
9 coming in like this. They need to come up, put up
10 some money and notify the residents of this community
11 of what the potential impact from these type of
12 facilities could do as far as taking jobs away from
13 us. Lots of big companies that have good high-paying
14 jobs don't want to come into areas that have the risks
15 that are associated with facilities like this.
16 I'm going to leave a map that I'm going to
17 submit, because so far none of the documents that
18 we've been shown show the relationship between all of
19 the facilities and the pipeline and the two LNGs that
20 are going to be located in very close proximity to
21 this. When I actually took the boat tour today, I was
22 very concerned when I saw how close these facilities
23 actually were.
24 For years we've been told anecdotal
25 information about fires that occur at Chevron that are

1 put out by their onsite personnel. Some of these we
2 were told may come from fumes leaking from the gas
3 storage tanks that we saw today that have lids that go
4 up and down. I'm concerned that if LNG can leak and
5 form vapor clouds, they may not explode onsite but
6 they could float to other ignition sources that are in
7 the near vicinity.
8 I'm concerned about the amount of damage
9 caused to Chevron and Mississippi Chemical, First
10 Chemical DuPont, however you call those particular
11 facilities, during a hurricane. A couple of
12 hurricanes back they were devastated. Those people
13 were out of work for many months.
14 If we continue to bring in risks that put
15 all of the rest of what our county stands for at risk
16 just so a few shareholders can make some money, it
17 doesn't bode well for our community.
18 When you talk about in the notice we need
19 alternatives, there are many alternatives on this
20 particular project. These facilities could all be
21 located offshore. They don't have to come into
22 Mississippi. Mississippi has very little usage of
23 natural gas. Most of the gas that comes in here will
24 be put in the Destin pipeline or BP or other pipelines
25 that are already there. It would be distributed to

1 other areas that don't have LNG facilities in their
2 communities. I'm not sure that's fair, and I would
3 like FERC to very, very specifically consider where
4 the usage, where the demand for the LNG is. Maybe
5 those people should be willing to step up to the bat.
6 Like Louisiana, National Public Radio, three mornings
7 in a row there are people begging. They love LNG.
8 You can take them all back over there. We don't need
9 them or want them in Mississippi and we don't receive
10 many benefits.
11 When you talk about a facility that may
12 produce 50 jobs on a 90-acre site -- today it was
13 discussed maybe 80 acres, maybe 85. On the map I show
14 90 something acres. That's less than one job per
15 acre. You know, we have places like Chevron that has
16 1,000 employees. God knows I'm not proud of them
17 being there either. But let's weigh the risks, the
18 economics, the health, everything. LNG for 50
19 employees is not worth the risks associated with it.
20 Gulf LNG, they say they're going to pay
21 their fair share of taxes. We can find better
22 companies that provide more for our community than as
23 few as 50 jobs for the risks that are associated. We
24 have Chemical Alley, we have DuPont or Mississippi
25 Chemical that had a major problem in the last few

1 years. We have people that caught on fire and burned
2 out there. We have a dike that broke recently that
3 blew Bayou Casotte.
4 We have people that live in that area that
5 do subsistence fishing. If they don't fish, they
6 don't eat. These people have not been notified. I do
7 not think that's fair of FERC, Chevron or Gulf LNG,
8 and I think Chevron and Gulf LNG should be
9 particularly embarrassed that they have not made an
10 effort to contact residents whose properties -- once
11 FERC permits either of these two facilities, they have
12 the right of eminent domain, condemnation, needs and
13 necessities, needs and convenience. Whatever y'all
14 want to call it. These people in our community need
15 to be notified that they potentially stand the
16 potential of having pipelines that may explode by
17 their house or the taking of their property because
18 all of a sudden for the third time in five years
19 Chevron wants to do another expansion.
20 So when you assess cumulative impacts,
21 please include the fact that places like Chevron
22 continue to get permits, new permits for more
23 expansions to take up more of our resources and to
24 cause us more damage with pollution in our community.
25 Under the NEPA process on alternatives when

there are better solutions that are less environmentally damaging, they must be considered. We know there are lots of less damaging environmental ways than this particular project. Take it offshore, store it offshore, store it in another country. I don't care. But get it out of Jackson County. We don't deserve this.

Public participation, we don't have very much of a turnout here. If you ask for a show of hands, most of these are either regulatory people or Chevron employees. It shows that our community has not been notified. In this particular document of public notice you say that the information will be available on your website. I went on your website. I could not find your contact list. Today I was told the contact list of residents is not public information. If we don't know who you've contacted and we can't find who you've contacted, how do we contact the other people? We don't have the resources to go door to door. Chevron has a phone system. They could pick up that phone system and notify all of the people within a radius of an area that they need to know that there's an LNG that may affect them personally. We need some other alternative ways to make sure that the residents in my community within a one- to six-mile area know.

1 There is a particular thing that happened, I
2 think in the year 2002 or 2004, where the windows
3 shook and rocked up to six miles away. I was away
4 when Mississippi Chem or the DuPont facility or
5 whatever the people want to refer to it as, when it
6 exploded. I live almost five miles away. My windows
7 shook, my walls shook. I live in an old wooden
8 house. I live by the beach. I am very concerned
9 about the wall of safety that's connected with these
10 projects and I think it needs to be explored a lot
11 more fully. The testing they've done on these
12 particular blowups or spills I think included about
13 10,000 gallons. When you compare 10,000 gallons in a
14 firewall or explosion rate or a cloud vapor as opposed
15 to one ship that's 12 stories high and 1,000 feet
16 long, I don't think that the odds are the same, that
17 y'all have got a clue as to what could happen to my
18 community.
19 In January 2004 an LNG plant in Algeria blew
20 up due to a leaking LNG pipe. It killed or burned
21 over 100 persons. Only because of the remoteness of
22 the location were there not more people injured.
23 This is not a remote location. This is my
24 community. This is where I live. This is where I try
25 to protect our natural resources.

1 I do not think that Chevron or Gulf Energy
2 deserve the right to locate in my town because we have
3 no need of what they are offering. They are only
4 offering to come here because of the lack of people
5 who are aware of what is coming our way with an LNG
6 facility.
7 "LNG Imports: Neither Safe Nor Wise." I'm
8 quoting from an article by Tom Bender. LNG is
9 considered by transportation officials to be a
10 hazardous and noxious substance. The Port of Astoria
11 and the community has been told by their
12 representatives that the terminal would be safe and
13 that any LNG spills would just fizz and evaporate like
14 7-Up. But a just-released Sandia research lab study
15 joins the voices of long-term government-funded
16 research to strongly disagree. Although the
17 operational safety is good, it's not the operation
18 that counts. It's now the 9/11 and the terrorist
19 attacks.
20 These tankers are huge. They compare to not
21 one but to 60, to 80 Hiroshima bombs that may could
22 explode. And I keep hearing the terms they won't
23 explode. Most LNG that comes in is contaminated.
24 It's one big transport site and unload site. We've
25 heard from Mr. McCutchen from Gulf today that when he

1 dealt with the former facility he worked at, that most
2 of the LNG came from one facility. Unfortunately with
3 this new facility planned, that would not be true. He
4 will not own the ship. He will not own the fuel. He
5 will merely be a secondhand man for somebody that
6 needs a place to unload or to store.
7 Part of that may include having to be
8 filtered. The things that would contaminate the
9 liquid natural gas are also the things that may would
10 cause it to explode.
11 Every question I asked today I was given
12 noncommittal answers that they don't know. And the
13 reason they don't know is we're here at a meeting that
14 shouldn't even be happening. You can't scope a
15 project that doesn't exist. At this point these are
16 only make-believe dreams of George Bush and they need
17 to be put to bed. Thank you.
18 (APPLAUSE.)
19 MR. BUTTON: Those are all the speakers who
20 signed up. Is there anybody else who would like to
21 speak for the record?
22 MR. J.M. FORD: I am J.M. Ford. I was
23 called as the first speaker and I deferred, hoping
24 that there would be some information developed that
25 would be addressable. And I do see several points

1 that I wish to bring out and emphasize or clarify.
2 The first one is that you did make a
3 statement that the Coast Guard's charge of safety is
4 in exclusion zones. However, we do not have addressed
5 at this time what is defined as an exclusion zone or a
6 safety zone for the vessels. It has been bandied
7 about in many conversations that the safety exclusion
8 zone is about two miles. If that were so, then the
9 two-mile exclusion zone means no other vessel can
10 enter the area when a ship is sailing or arriving
11 within two miles of the vessel. Within this two-mile
12 radius is the Singing River Yacht Club. This would
13 completely forestall any attempts for them to have a
14 regatta or even have any recreational activities
15 whatsoever.
16 Totaling the number of vessels, you have 166
17 on the Casotte project and you have 115 for the Gulf
18 Clean Energy Project. That's a total of 281 vessels.
19 Arriving and departing, that is 562 sailings, or one
20 and a half sailings every day. Which means that
21 effectively if the Coast Guard does institute a safety
22 or exclusion zone as has been bandied about, then
23 effectively the Pascagoula Ship Channel will be barred
24 from any other commerce or any other use of commerce.
25 The Bayou Casotte Channel which they will be

1 using is concurrent with the Pascagoula Ship Channel
2 from what is called the Y of the forest through Horn
3 Island Pass. All vessels must traverse that area. It
4 would preclude or have a serious effect on any other
5 shipping commerce or recreational use, much less many
6 other effects. Effectively Bayou Casotte would be off
7 limits for any private individuals, even ones that
8 have -- that are residents that live on the upper
9 reaches of the west part of Bayou Casotte that do have
10 boats, recreational boats, and commercial fishermen.
11 If these exclusion zone safety requirements are in
12 place, then they will not be able to have access to
13 their resources.
14 Ms. Gillette touched upon the air quality in
15 Jackson County is in a very serious attainment
16 position as far as ozone levels. As I understand it,
17 this is cryogenic storage of the liquefied natural gas
18 until such time as it is gasified. It is stored at a
19 cryogenic level by venting under low pressure into the
20 atmosphere or flaring.
21 I would very much like to see EIS address
22 specifically -- this is methane gas, natural gas being
23 vented into the atmosphere at fairly substantial
24 volumes to be able to maintain cryogenic temperatures
25 in these large storage vessels. What are the impacts

1 on attainment? If the vented gas is flared, then
2 again what will be the effects on the attainment
3 levels for nitrous oxide into the atmosphere?
4 I was struck by Chevron -- in all of the
5 public announcements and in all of the statements that
6 I have seen by Chevron, they have specifically
7 addressed their intention -- or they will be using
8 heat recovery from the refinery; that is, surplus heat
9 from the refinery as their closed loop gasification
10 process. I was very struck by the gentleman who made
11 the presentation for Chevron this afternoon, Mr. Van
12 Button -- I'm sorry -- Mr. Richard Lammons who said
13 "we are looking at" as opposed to "we will be doing."
14 If they do not know what is their heat source for the
15 proposed project, I suggest anything that they're
16 doing is extremely premature.
17 I would like to see a serious investigation
18 possibly that would allow us a win/win situation and
19 to the possibility of offshore offloading facilities
20 of the liquefied natural gas, pipelining the liquid
21 ashore, and then doing the gasification process, as
22 it's usually waste heat from Chevron. Or in the case
23 of Gulf looking at possibly putting in some
24 cogeneration; that is, running a closed-loop
25 combustion system, use gas turbines driving electric

1 generators, the waste heat from the gas turbines being
2 used to do the gasification, the surplus electricity
3 generated being entered into the market instead of
4 there being a total loss. Thank you very much.
5 (APPLAUSE).
6 MR. TOM ESELIN: Good evening. My name is
7 Tom Eselin. I'm here representing myself tonight.
8 I'm one of a vanishing breed here. I'm actually a
9 native of Pascagoula. Most of my remarks -- most of
10 my concerns, rather, have already been addressed by
11 others, Dr. Singley and now Mr. Ford.
12 I do want to bring up this two-mile
13 exclusion zone that Mr. Ford has alluded to that's
14 been reported in the local papers. Certainly some
15 properties to the west of these proposed sites fall
16 within that two-mile range. And I would like to see
17 an analysis by the agency, the federal government, as
18 to what properties will be taken at the eminent domain
19 proceedings. I realize that has not been mentioned
20 today, but it's certainly a possibility. I'm thinking
21 in terms of maybe the Singing River Yacht Club,
22 perhaps even the Longfellow House which is an
23 historical site for us here locally. I think we need
24 an analysis on particularly those properties on the
25 west side of the bayou that might be affected by way

1 of eminent domain proceedings.
2 I would like to go further here and mention
3 several remarks by Dr. Singley regarding insurance
4 problems we've had here in recent years. I was in the
5 property and casualty business for some 27 years. I
6 happened to be in the business during Hurricane
7 Camille, a monstrous hurricane in 1969. And after
8 Hurricane Camille the insurance market literally dried
9 up for us here. Prior to Hurricane Camille there were
10 at least 30 or 40 companies freely writing property
11 insurance on the Gulf Coast. I would say by January
12 of 1970 there were perhaps no more than 12 companies
13 left.
14 Over the years those numbers have dwindled
15 to the extent that as we sit here and stand here
16 tonight, there are only six companies writing property
17 coverage in the City of Pascagoula, and this is based
18 on research that I've done with former colleagues and
19 competitors and whatever. Of those six companies that
20 continue to write property coverage, one of those
21 companies have already red lined from the standpoint
22 of Highway 90 and they will not write any new business
23 south of Highway 90. This could have a devastating
24 effect on the other companies if we had an accident or
25 incident occur on one of these properties. And in

1 fact, with the crisis standpoint right now, all we
2 would need would be a big blow from an LNG terminal.
3 That's the extent of my remarks. Thank you
4 very much.
5 (APPLAUSE.)
6 MR. BUTTON: Is there anyone else who wishes
7 to speak for the record?
8 (NO RESPONSE.)
9 MR. BUTTON: Well, at this juncture I'd like
10 to again encourage you to send any written comments or
11 if you wish to use our electronic filing procedure, to
12 send those comments to us by May the 6th so that we
13 can be sure to include them in the draft Environmental
14 Impact Statements for this project -- for each of
15 these projects.
16 I would also like to emphasize at this time
17 that this is indeed early in the process. This, we
18 hope has been clear, is a scoping session and that
19 there's a lot of work yet to do in terms of the
20 analysis that needs to be done. The Federal Energy
21 Regulatory Commission and the other cooperating
22 agencies take with extreme seriousness their
23 responsibility to analyze these projects thoroughly,
24 do a complete and public and capable job of analyzing
25 the safety issues and the environmental impacts of

1 this project.
2 I want to thank you very much for both the
3 questions that you've given us to work on and the
4 comments. We appreciate you all coming out here this
5 evening and spending your time on these not very
6 comfortable seats.
7 This concludes the public scoping session.
8 Thank you.
9 (THE HEARING WAS CONCLUDED AT 8:18 P.M.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24