

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

BEFORE THE  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - x  
IN THE MATTER OF: : Project Number  
BROADWATER ENERGY LNG PROJECT : PF05-4-000  
- - - - - x

Branford High School Auditorium  
185 East Main Street  
Branford, CT

Wednesday, September 21, 2005

The above-entitled matter came on for scoping  
meeting, pursuant to notice at 7:10 p.m.

MODERATOR: JIM MARTIN, FERC

## 1 APPEARANCES:

2 Peter Boynton,

3 Coast Guard Captain, Port for Long Island Sound

4

5 Richard Blumenthal,

6 Attorney General of the State of Connecticut

7

8 Bill Staeger

9 Represents environmental contractor ENTRIX

10

11 James Paton

12 Speaking for Congressman Christopher Shays

13

14 Ryan Drajewicz

15 Speaking for U.S. Senator Christopher Dodd

16

17 State Senator Len Fasano

18

19 State Senator Ed Meyer

20

21 State Representative Pat Widlitz

22

23 Allison Dodge

24 Speaking on behalf of Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro

25

-- continued --

## 1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2 Representative Tom Drew

3

4 Senator G. L. Gunther

5

6 Larry Miller

7

8 Selectman John Opie

9

10 RTM Jonathan Waters

11

12 RTM Kyle Nelson

13

14 RTM John Smith

15

16 John Lee Norris McDonald

17

18 Erin Reilley

19

20 Adriane Espisito

21

22 Carrie Frohling

23

24 Barbu Panaitescu

25

-- continued --

## 1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2 Leah Lopez

3

4 Felice Cressman

5

6 Anna Gouznoba

7

8 Thomas Baptist

9

10 Pat Dugan

11

12 Bruce Weihart

13

14 Richard Weisberg

15

16 Michael Ball

17

18 John Andrews

19

20 Cheryl Dunson

21

22 Henry Farcus

23

24 Tom Callinan

25

-- continued --

1           APPEARANCES CONTINUED:  
2                   Clark Broadbent  
3  
4                   Adrian Little  
5  
6                   Lee Weiner  
7  
8                   Wendy Hansen  
9  
10                  Jim Clifford  
11  
12                  Michael Lutz  
13  
14                  Peter Brown  
15  
16                  Todd Berman  
17  
18                  David Silber Kleit  
19  
20                  Henry Platt, Jr.  
21  
22                  Annie Valentino Upson  
23  
24                  Phil Dunlop  
25                                   -- continued --

## 1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

2 Mr. Pottenger

3

4 John Frank

5 Retired police captain

6

7 Rwanda Nelson

8

9 Gina Russell Tracy

10

11 Wayne Kicklighter

12

13 Amy Parsons

14

15 Jeff Wakefield

16

17 Norris McDonald

18

19 Bruce Whichard

20

21 John Case

22

23

24

25

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

(7:10 a.m.)

1  
2  
3 MR. MARTIN: Good evening. We're ready to get  
4 started now. So far we're only 10 minutes behind schedule.  
5 Thank you all for coming tonight. My name is Jim Martin,  
6 and I'm the environmental project manager for the Federal  
7 Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC. Seated with me here  
8 tonight is the U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port for Long  
9 Island Sound, Capt. Peter Boynton. He's joined here tonight  
10 by Lt. Cmdr. Allen Blume, and Lt. Andrea Logman. Also,  
11 present from FERC is my deputy project manager, Joanne  
12 Wachholder.

13 Environmental contractor ENTRIX is represented by  
14 Bill Staeger, seated next to me. Wayne Kicklighter and Amy  
15 Parsons and Jeff Wakefield are assisting Joanne at the back  
16 table. We're here tonight to provide some information and  
17 to hear your comments on the Broadwater LNG project. I'd  
18 like to start just by saying that, if you would like to  
19 speak tonight, please sign up at the table in the back, we  
20 have a speakers' list that we're going to be reading from.  
21 I'll just describe that a little bit more in detail, but if  
22 you'd like to speak and you haven't signed up yet, please  
23 take this opportunity to do so.

24 I'd like to take just a brief moment to describe  
25 the project. Broadwater is proposing to build and operate a

1 Liquefied Natural Gas, LNG, terminal near the center of Long  
2 Island Sound. LNG is natural gas, methane that has been  
3 cooled to an extremely cold temperature at -260 degrees  
4 Fahrenheit. The gas is not stored under pressure, and is  
5 not explosive in its liquid state. The terminal would be  
6 probably more --approximately nine miles offshore from Long  
7 Island and 10 miles offshore from Connecticut.

8 The terminal would consist of a Floating Storage  
9 and Re-gasification Unit or FSRU. That would be  
10 approximately 1200 feet in length, 200 feet wide and rise  
11 approximately 8 feet above the sea level. The FSRU would be  
12 designed to accommodate a net storage capacity of  
13 approximately 350,000 cubic meters of LNG or the equivalent  
14 of eight billion cubic feet of natural gas. The LNG would  
15 be delivered to the FSRU and LNG carriers at the frequency  
16 of two to three carriers per week. The FSRU would have a  
17 closed-loop vaporization system to vaporize or re-gasify the  
18 LNG at a typical rate of about one billion cubic feet per  
19 day.

20 The gas would be directed into a send-out  
21 pipeline that would extend about 22 miles to an offshore  
22 connection with the existing Iroquois Pipeline, which  
23 provides natural gas in New York and Connecticut markets.  
24 Tonight's meeting is a joint meeting between FERC and the  
25 U.S. Coast Guard.



1                   We have slightly different reviewing processes  
2                   that this meeting will support, but fundamentally the whole  
3                   purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide each of you an  
4                   opportunity to give us your comments, and to tell us what  
5                   the environmental, safety and security issues are that you  
6                   think we should address in our respective analyses in the  
7                   Broadwater project. I would briefly describe FERC process  
8                   and then Capt. Boynton will describe the Coast Guard  
9                   process.

10                   The FERC staffs and environmental and engineering  
11                   analysis will result in a generation of an Environmental  
12                   Impact Statement or EIS. FERC is the lead federal agency  
13                   tasked with preparing the EIS. We're fortunate to have  
14                   several cooperating agencies that will help us ensure that  
15                   all concerns are represented. The cooperating agencies  
16                   include, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Environmental  
17                   Protection Agency, the National Marine Fishery Service, U.S.  
18                   Department of Transportation, the New York State, Department  
19                   of State, and our partner agency; the Coast Guard.

20                   I'd like to take a few moments now to further  
21                   explain the purpose of tonight's public meeting. First, I'd  
22                   like to clarify that the Broadwater proposal was not  
23                   conceived by and was not promoted by either FERC or the  
24                   Coast Guard. FERC reviews applications for the import of  
25                   natural gas and Broadwater is in the process of preparing

1 applications to submit to FERC.

2           Once the application is submitted, our obligation  
3 is to review that application and prepare an analysis of the  
4 environmental impacts. Tonight's meeting is not a public  
5 hearing, we're not here to debate the proposal or to make  
6 any determinations on its fate. We're here to listen to  
7 your concerns, so that we can consider them in our analysis.  
8 Based on the letters we've received, we understand that many  
9 people are opposed to the concept of having an offshore  
10 natural gas import facility.

11           Others have raised concerns about the  
12 environmental impacts or safety considerations. That is,  
13 some objections are general in nature and some objections  
14 are based on potential environmental and safety impacts.  
15 Both categories are important to FERC, but they're addressed  
16 in different ways. General objections to the project would  
17 be considered during the Commission's public interest  
18 review, whereas environmental and safety impacts are  
19 addressed by the FERC staff in our Environmental Impact  
20 Statement.

21           And the EIS is an analysis of impacts to  
22 resources and does not analyze public opinion per se. With  
23 that said, we request that your comments tonight focus on  
24 potential effects of the project specifically. We're here  
25 to ask for your help in identifying potential impacts to

1 both the human, and the natural environment of Long Island  
2 Sound. In our Notice of Intent, issued on August 11, we  
3 requested your comments and assigned a deadline of October  
4 7.

5 We will take your comments throughout our review  
6 process, but for us to accurately direct your comments,  
7 analyze them, research the issues, we ask that you try to  
8 get those comments to us as soon as possible. The speakers'  
9 list is located at the back table, and we will use that list  
10 to identify individuals wishing to provide verbal comments  
11 on the Broadwater project. In addition to verbal comments  
12 provided tonight, we'll also accept your written comments.

13 Many people have already submitted their comments  
14 to FERC -- to the FERC docket. If you have comments, but  
15 don't wish to speak tonight, you may provide written  
16 comments on the comment forms also at the back of the table  
17 in the front there. You may drop those off with us tonight,  
18 or mail them at a later date, be sure to include the project  
19 docket number, which is PF05-4.

20 The Broadwater project is currently in our pre-  
21 filing process. That is an application has not yet been  
22 filed with FERC. We consider the pre-filing process to be,  
23 amongst other things, an extension of our scoping process.  
24 The scoping process is a learning process. It is where we  
25 educate ourselves about the project and the potential

1 issues. During the scoping process, we gather information  
2 and we are using a number of different sources for that.

3 The four general sources that we're using right  
4 now include, information provided by the applicant, input  
5 from other agencies, our own fieldwork and research of  
6 different issues, and information provided from the public.  
7 Once we gather information during the scoping process, we  
8 would analyze it, and we'll prepare a draft Environmental  
9 Impact Statement, or draft EIS, that will be distributed for  
10 comments.

11 There are two general ways that you can get a  
12 copy of the draft EIS, if you would like. First of all, the  
13 Notice of Intent to be sent out has an attachment on the  
14 back , and you can fill it in and return it to us to be  
15 included in the mailing list. If you don't have that or  
16 would like to get a copy of it, there's an additional form  
17 out on table for a mailing list, in which you just fill in  
18 your name and address, and you'll be added to the mailing  
19 list for this record.

20 If you don't do one of those two things, then we  
21 won't mail you a copy. After the draft EIS is issued,  
22 there's a 45-day comment period. During that period, we'll  
23 normally hold another public meeting, similar in format to  
24 this one. We'll probably come back here to the same  
25 facility, if it is available, and ask you to comment on the

1 information provided in the draft Environmental Impact  
2 Statement.

3 At the end of the 45-day comment period, we begin  
4 synthesizing all the information gathered today in preparing  
5 the final EIS. Once we have issued the final EIS, it is  
6 forwarded to our commissioners. Our commissioners at the  
7 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission would use that document  
8 as well as other information to make a determination on  
9 whether or not to grant an authorization for this project.  
10 At this time Capt. Boynton will describe the work being  
11 performed by the Coast Guard, following the Coast Guard  
12 presentation we'll begin listening to your comments.

13 MR. BOYNTON: Thank you, Jim. As Jim mentioned,  
14 I am Capt. Peter Boynton. I'm the Coast Guard Captain of  
15 the Port for Long Island Sound. I'm responsible for Coast  
16 Guard operations in Connecticut, on Long Island Sound, and  
17 on the north and south shores of Long Island. I'd like to  
18 give you a brief overview of the Coast Guard role with  
19 regard to the Broadwater proposal.

20 The Coast Guard is a cooperating agency with  
21 FERC, and my office is responsible for doing a safety and  
22 security assessment of this proposal. We provided the  
23 safety security assessment to FERC they included in the  
24 draft Environmental Impact Statement, and then the  
25 subsequent second round of public meetings.

1           The Coast Guard neither supports nor opposes this  
2 proposed project. The Coast Guard is however an advocate of  
3 safety and security and that will be our role throughout  
4 this process. I just want to pause for a minute here and  
5 add a comment that the Coast Guard receives many nice  
6 compliments from folks including some of the speakers  
7 outside, tonight, but I do want to be clear on the Coast  
8 Guard role. We neither support nor oppose the project. Our  
9 role will be to assess safety and security.

10           Our process in assessing safety and security is  
11 to examine and manage risk. I think it's important to say  
12 very clearly that the Coast Guard doesn't eliminate risk.  
13 In the case of Long Island Sound, we have a lot of mixed use  
14 on the Sound. We spend a lot of time managing risk. So  
15 that that mixed use is done safely and in fact we have a  
16 great safety record on Long Island Sound, but we do not  
17 eliminate risk. The way we manage and assess risk is to  
18 look at the pieces of risk. Rather than address risk as a  
19 general topic, we break risk down into three components.

20           The components we look at are, threat,  
21 vulnerability and consequence and when we assess both safety  
22 and security, we look at those elements, so for example,  
23 what are the potential threats, how might the facility be  
24 vulnerable to those threats, and if something were to  
25 happen, what would the consequences be. In cases where we

1 cannot control one of those elements, we look at the other  
2 elements that we might be able to control to lower the  
3 overall risk.

4 When the Coast Guard has completed the safety and  
5 security assessment, we'll provide that in a report to FERC,  
6 and FERC will include that in their Environmental Impact  
7 Statement. The Coast Guard has taken some steps to try to  
8 have as much public input into our process as is possible,  
9 and I'd like to give some examples of those. Prior to this  
10 series of four public meetings, this being the fourth, we  
11 had two on Long Island last week, one last night and then  
12 tonight is our fourth.

13 Prior to this, there's been a series of open  
14 houses, both here in Connecticut and on Long Island and  
15 either myself or members of my staff have made an effort to  
16 attend as many of those as possible, so that we can listen  
17 to concerns of the public. In addition, we decided to  
18 jointly hold these public meetings with FERC to have another  
19 opportunity to listen and we've been getting -- actually I  
20 have been getting quite a few letters from you, residents of  
21 Connecticut and residents of Long Island, up to as many as a  
22 160 letters per day.

23 I've read each one of those letters, I'll make an  
24 effort to reply to all of those letters, and we will enter  
25 all of those letters into the public docket as a record for

1 this process. I'd like to talk briefly now about our safety  
2 assessment to give you an idea of what we're doing to assess  
3 safety. We began our safety assessment with a structured  
4 two-day workshop last May, in Port Jefferson. The workshop  
5 is called a Ports and Waterways Safety Assessment; we refer  
6 to this by its acronym or PAWSA.

7 The Coast Guard has done about three dozen safety  
8 assessments around the country over the last five or six  
9 years. Many of these assessments have nothing to do with LNG  
10 proposals. They're designed to assess safety on a  
11 particular waterway, whether it's San Francisco Bay, New  
12 York Harbor or Long Island Sound. We were fortunate to be  
13 able to hold one of these for Long Island Sound this past  
14 May.

15 Now, a safety assessment of this type or PAWSA is  
16 not designed to look at the specifics of our proposal like  
17 the Broadwater proposal, what it's designed to do is to take  
18 a baseline look across the waterway, at various safety  
19 issues, like what. Well, visibility, weather, congestion,  
20 aids to navigation, things like that and we did that for  
21 Long Island Sound.

22 When we do these safety assessments, we want to  
23 involve as many waterway users as possible, and we did that  
24 in this case. We had representatives from environmental  
25 groups, from both Connecticut and Long Island -- we had



1       representatives from recreational boaters, commercial  
2       fishermen, commercial operators, tugboat operators, marine  
3       pilots, and government agencies from both Connecticut and  
4       Long Island.

5               And what did we find? Well, we found that there  
6       are some safety issues on the Sound. That's the purpose of  
7       the assessment, and we worked to try to come up with some  
8       mitigations for those safety issues, for example, we don't  
9       have a lot of marine firefighting capability on Long Island  
10      Sound, and we've known that for some time, but the PAWSA  
11      highlighted that.

12             We also knew and the PAWSA outlined that we have  
13      some congestion issues on the Sound, and I'd like to talk  
14      about that a little bit more. As the PAWSA outlined, Long  
15      Island Sound in a typical year receives about 700 foreign  
16      vessel arrivals from ports all around the world, Indonesia,  
17      Columbia, Algeria, and many other ports. These are 700  
18      commercial vessels per year that make ports of call here in  
19      the Sound and offload cargo.

20             In addition to those, we get about 1200 domestic  
21      commercial vessel arrivals per year. Many of these are tugs  
22      and barges bringing various types of petroleum into the  
23      Sound. Together they add up to 1900 or, for the sake of  
24      rounding off, about 2000 commercial vessel arrivals per  
25      year. In addition, the Sound carries somewhere between 2000

1 to 4000 commercial vessels per year transiting the Sound,  
2 they're passing through, they don't stop, but when you add  
3 those numbers together, it's a total of 4000 to 6000  
4 commercial vessels either stopping or passing through the  
5 Sound per year.

6 Now, if my math is right, and I'm not a math  
7 major, but I think that comes out to between 10 to 20  
8 commercial vessels transiting the Sound per day. So those  
9 are some of the things that we looked at in the PAWSA. We  
10 have posted this report on our website. And I think we have  
11 a handout at the door?

12 SPEAKER: Yes, sir.

13 MR. BOYNTON: That lists the URL for that  
14 website, we encourage you to take a look at that. I do want  
15 to caution you, at some of our meetings people have  
16 characterized the PAWSA as the Coast Guard safety  
17 assessment; it's not. We looked at some aspects of  
18 Broadwater, but the PAWSA is intended to take a broad look  
19 at safety. We're going to use that report as our starting  
20 point for our assessment.

21 We will gather together members of the Harbor  
22 Safety Committee for Long Island Sound. Again, these are  
23 people who are involved in using the water. We'll use the  
24 PAWSA as a starting point and then for example, we'll say,  
25 "Okay, we know we have some congestion issues, what would --

1       how would the congestion issues be affected if this  
2       proposal were to be approved, what safety issues with  
3       respect to congestion might arise, and what might be done to  
4       mitigate those issues."

5                Another example, if this proposal were approved,  
6       what would that do to the safety issue of marine  
7       firefighting and what might need to be done to mitigate  
8       that. We haven't yet gone through that part of our safety  
9       assessments, so the PAWSA is a baseline, I encourage you to  
10      look at it and that's how we'll proceed with our safety  
11      assessment.

12               I'd like to talk a little bit about our security  
13      assessment. There are some differences between the safety  
14      and security assessment. Whereas the safety assessment is  
15      as open a public process as we can make it. It's a little  
16      different with the security assessment and that's because  
17      some of that information is sensitive. Where it deals with  
18      specific security procedures we do not release that to the  
19      public. It's

20      -- typically treated as Sensitive Security Information or  
21      SSI, that's a classification that we give to information  
22      that deals with specifics of port security. So not all of  
23      that will be available to the public.

24               But I can, and I will describe the process we  
25      use, and we want to keep that as open and as transparent as

1 possible. And that process will be to use a body called the  
2 "Area Maritime Security Committee." What's a "Maritime  
3 Security Committee," well, there are about 40 Coast Guard  
4 Captains of the Port, like me, around the country, and under  
5 the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002, all of  
6 those Coast Guard Captains of the Port are required to form  
7 and chair a Maritime Security Committee, and the purpose of  
8 that committee is to assess and implement security measures  
9 to enhance port security all around the country.

10 The Maritime Security Committees including ours  
11 here in Long Island Sound are made up of a very diverse  
12 group of representatives. It includes local, state and  
13 federal agencies, it includes representatives from industry;  
14 people who work on the water. And that group works together  
15 to assess and implement security, what we have done is  
16 formed a subcommittee of that group to assist us with our  
17 security assessment and why have we done that.

18 I do not want to take an approach where we have a  
19 group of Coast Guard people in a room making these  
20 assessments in isolation. For both safety and security, I  
21 want to involve as broad a cross section of waterways users  
22 and security experts as is possible, and I think we're doing  
23 that. The first thing we did with this subcommittee was  
24 spend a day with the New York Police Department counter-  
25 terrorism branch.

1           To give this subcommittee an overview of the sort  
2 of things that they need to be aware of and looking at with  
3 our security review, we put them in a van, we drove to New  
4 York City and gave them a day overview. That committee  
5 continues to work to assess the security and we're doing  
6 with the same principles that we're using for safety. We're  
7 doing it with an objective of managing, because we cannot  
8 eliminate risk, and we're breaking risk down in its  
9 components.

10           What do we think the threats to security might  
11 be, how do we think this facility might be vulnerable to  
12 each one of those threats and if something were to go wrong,  
13 what would the consequences be for those security threats  
14 and vulnerabilities. Now, we haven't finished either the  
15 safety or the security assessment yet, and there's an  
16 important reason why we haven't finished.

17           At some of the public meetings, some of the  
18 comments we've received have been right on the mark that,  
19 "Gee, we don't seem to have a lot of information." And  
20 that's true and the reason for that is, we are still in the  
21 pre-filing phase. We don't yet have the full formal  
22 application from Broadwater. We don't expect that until  
23 what, November, December, until we have that full formal  
24 application, we don't have all of the information we need to  
25 thoroughly assess safety and security.

1           So we've begun the process. We have our base  
2 line, we're going to wait until we have all the information  
3 before we conclude our assessment. Another thing that I  
4 want to comment on and that comes up in a lot of the letters  
5 that I've read, and also has come up at a lot of the public  
6 meetings and the open houses, is the notion of a safety and  
7 security zone.

8           It is true that in the four land-based LNG  
9 terminals that are currently in operation in the U.S.,  
10 Boston, Cove point and the Chesapeake Bay, Louisiana and  
11 Georgia, that there are various forms of security and safety  
12 zones. There's two basic types of zones. One is fixed, it  
13 stays in place, and the other is a moving safety and  
14 security zone. And typically, for LNG tankers coming into  
15 those four ports, typically, there are moving safety and  
16 security zones that follow the tankers as they come into  
17 port.

18           And the purpose of those zones is to enhance  
19 safety, prevent accidents and enhance security, prevent  
20 intentional incidents. The size of those zones varies  
21 depending on the geography of the port and the assessment of  
22 risk. In any port, what's the threat, what's the  
23 vulnerability, what's the consequence. Now, I've read and  
24 heard many statements about how big a security and safety  
25 zone might be if this proposal were approved.

1           I'm the one who's going to have to make that  
2           assessment, I haven't, I can't, I won't, until I have all  
3           the information. So I wish I could give you that number,  
4           but we just don't have it yet, and I think it's best to wait  
5           until we have all the information. But I will give you an  
6           example. For the tanker in Boston, the security zone is  
7           roughly two miles in front, a mile astern, and about a half  
8           a mile on each side. So, what does that mean?

9           A tanker moving at a typical speed of 12 knots  
10          would take a security zone of that size 15 minutes to pass.  
11          That doesn't mean that would be the size of a safety and  
12          security zone if this proposal were approved, but I give  
13          that to you as an example of an existing moving security and  
14          safety zone in another port. If the proposal were approved,  
15          it is likely that it would also be a fixed safety and  
16          security zone around the anchored barge. I can't tell you  
17          how big that will be, and I just won't be able to until we  
18          complete our assessment and we have all of the information.

19          I also wanted to comment that one of the inputs  
20          we're going to use when we assess the size of the zone using  
21          the elements of risk and in particular that consequence  
22          element is a report that was released last January by the  
23          Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratory, it's  
24          referred to as the "Sandia Report." Now, over the years,  
25          there have been many studies on LNG, the consequences, the

1 risks and most of those studies have widely varying results  
2 and conclusions and part of the reason is because many of  
3 those studies use different entering assumptions.

4 The Sandia Report attempts to pull together all  
5 of those studies using a consistent set of assumptions and  
6 it does some important things for us. It considers risk and  
7 consequence and it looks at risk and consequence twice. The  
8 first time, it looks at risk and consequence as a result of  
9 an accidental event such as a collision. The second time it  
10 looks at risk and consequence as a result of an intentional  
11 event; an attack.

12 And it gives us guidelines, consequences that we  
13 could expect for both an accidental and an intentional  
14 event. And it comes up with three rings of consequences.  
15 The inner ring, where there's the greatest hazard to public  
16 security is an -- and hell, tell me if I screw up my  
17 numbers. The inner ring is out to 500 meters, I think  
18 that's about one-third of a mile. The greatest public  
19 hazard -- this is in the event of an intentional act that  
20 causes a fire, which would be a very intense fire.

21 The second ring, which is moderate impact to  
22 public health, extends from 500 meters to 1600 meters.  
23 That's about the third of a mile till one mile; those are  
24 radiuses not diameters. And then the third ring is out  
25 beyond 1600 meters or out beyond one mile, which according



1 to this report assesses low level of public risk. Now,  
2 there's a lot more details in that report and I just  
3 summarized. The Sandia Report is also available on the web.  
4 I think we have included the URL on our handout at the door,  
5 and I encourage you to look at that.

6 Jim's giving me the eye here, 'cause I'm taking a  
7 little longer than I normally do, but I'm just about done.  
8 Again, our next step will be to complete the safety and  
9 security assessment. Once we have the full application and  
10 all the information, we'll provide those assessments to  
11 FERC. FERC will include them in their draft EIS, and then  
12 we're going to have another chance for public input, where  
13 we will have the benefit of all that information in the EIS  
14 and another opportunity to comment in here; public comment  
15 based on that information. Thank you very much.

16 MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Captain. I do have a --  
17 an urgent message from the police. If your car is parked in  
18 the fire lane, it will be towed if you don't move it  
19 immediately, so just -- if you can, go ahead and take care  
20 of that right now. Also, if you have a cell phone -- I'm  
21 sorry. Since half the room is leaving, maybe we'll take a  
22 little break.

23 (Recess)

24 MR. MARTIN: Okay. Looks like everyone's back  
25 now. At this point, we'll begin taking your comments. As

1 your name is read, I would like you to come up to the podium  
2 and state your name for the record. A court reporter is  
3 here to keep a file of the public record for this meeting.  
4 It is important that when you speak, you state your name and  
5 affiliation, if any, so that your comments will be correctly  
6 attributed to you.

7 If you have an unusual last name, please spell it  
8 for the record to eliminate incorrect spelling of your name.  
9 That doesn't mean that we won't mispronounce it. All of the  
10 -- all of your comments will be transcribed and put into our  
11 public record. Public record is available on our website at  
12 [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov). There's a link there called eLibrary and in  
13 eLibrary is everything that we issue; letters, documents,  
14 anything that we issue is in eLibrary. Anything that  
15 Broadwater sends to FERC is in eLibrary.

16 There are summaries of meetings, notes and things  
17 that we have from other agencies and with Broadwater and all  
18 of the comment letters we've received, which now is, I  
19 guess, something over 3000 that we received that are all in  
20 eLibrary under our docket number, which is PF05-4. In your  
21 comments tonight, I ask that you try to be as specific as  
22 possible with your environmental or safety and security  
23 concerns.

24 As stated in our notice, the meeting is scheduled  
25 to conclude at 10:00 p.m. We have a little less than three

1 hours, and right now, approximately, 40 plus speakers who've  
2 signed up. In the interest of allowing as many speakers as  
3 possible, I'd like you to keep your statements as brief as  
4 possible, preferably around three minutes. If you have  
5 written comments, you may submit those directly rather than  
6 read them off, if you would like to.

7 If your comments and concerns have previously  
8 been stated by another speaker, and they also provide  
9 additional time for other speakers by simply stating that  
10 you endorse the comments provided by the earlier speaker.  
11 If we have additional time in the meeting, I'll just call  
12 from the crowd for anyone that would like to speak. Thank  
13 you very much for your consideration.

14 MR. STAEGER: When Jim said, we'd mispronounce,  
15 he meant me. I'll be calling your name and if you'd come up  
16 to the stand quickly we'll move along. I'll probably  
17 mention the next person, so that they -- we can keep things  
18 moving and try to get everyone in. At the end of two  
19 minutes, I will raise this sign, which, I assure you, no  
20 taxpayers' money has been spent on.

21 And after that, if you get too much past three  
22 minutes, then I'd -- I'm going to have to just ask you to  
23 wind it up. So I apologize if it seems rude, but we really  
24 want to get as many speakers up here as we can. And one  
25 final point before we start. This is an equal opportunity

1 speaking moment, so we'd really appreciate it if you would  
2 treat everyone with the respect; the same respect that you  
3 would like if you were speaking, even though their views are  
4 different. So without further ado, we're going to start  
5 with the elected officials as we usually do. First one  
6 tonight is Lonnie Reed, the RTM for Branford.

7 MS. REED: Good evening gentlemen. I've also got  
8 written remarks, but I'll -- and I'll keep it brief, my name  
9 is Lonnie Reed, I'm a member of the Town of Branford's RTM,  
10 which is kind of like our town council and I'm also a  
11 founder of Hands Across Our Pond. I just want to say at the  
12 beginning that I grew with lots of family in the energy  
13 industry, so I have a high tolerance for energy  
14 infrastructure, including plants and tankers and much of the  
15 other necessary energy facilities, and I'm not a knee-jerk  
16 energy industry demonizer.

17 In fact, I have enormous respect for the  
18 hardworking hands-on people who deliver these vital services  
19 to all of us. But the very idea of test-driving this  
20 floating LNG concept in as mercurial a body of water as Long  
21 Island Sound and placing our already overburdened Coast  
22 Guard in charge of all the safety and navigational  
23 ramifications, seems very wrong headed to me in the extreme.

24 A few facts; a floating LNG plant is not a new  
25 idea, it's been kicking around for more than 30 years and

1 safety and navigational concerns have prevented even one of  
2 these LNG barges from ever being built. In 1978, the  
3 California Coastal Commission issued an Environmental Impact  
4 statement, when there was a move to locate a floating LNG  
5 plant off Point Conception. Keep in mind that due to  
6 earthquakes, California was really hoping that the floating  
7 plant would be far safer than their onshore facilities.

8 The EIS report raised several concerns, and I'm  
9 told they're still relevant today. Here are just some of  
10 them. The hazard of a collision during docking and the  
11 potential spread of a spill or a fire between ship and  
12 floating terminal. Two, high-speed ramming by a cargo ship.  
13 This was pre 9/11. So they're talking accident.

14 Three, leaks and spills of diesel fuel as it is  
15 loaded aboard the floating terminal to operate various  
16 onboard systems. And this is my personal favorite. Number  
17 four, a fear of what is described as, "Catastrophic mooring  
18 failure due to collision or storm damage and the difficulty  
19 of controlling such a large structure, should it ever break  
20 away.

21 I'm told by several energy experts that these  
22 same concerns are indeed still relevant today even with  
23 design upgrades and improvements. Broadwater engineers tell  
24 us that they have all kinds of safeguards and backup systems  
25 to protect us from disaster. I remember hearing several --

1 similar words of comfort several years ago, when I was a  
2 young journalist covering the nuclear power industry and  
3 then one day I found myself on a plane heading to a story  
4 called Three Mile Island.

5 My beloved dad was a nuclear engineer; he got  
6 very excited over innovative technologies and shiny ideas,  
7 but he was also a big fan of common sense. One day when we  
8 were mourning the explosion of the Challenger spacecraft due  
9 to an O-ring malfunction, my dad said, "You can be smart and  
10 dedicated and have the best of intentions, and then  
11 catastrophes still happen and sometimes they happen in ways  
12 that the best minds never even anticipate it." Right now,  
13 this floating LNG idea lives in computer models and in  
14 engineer's minds, giving it a real world test-drive in Long  
15 Island Sound can in now way be considered an acceptable  
16 risk. To quote my dad again -- actually paraphrasing,  
17 "Stuff happens," thank you, gentlemen.

18 (Applause)

19 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker will be Attorney  
20 General Richard Blumenthal. And can we ask you to push the  
21 mike down. Apparently, somebody had lifted it earlier.

22 SPEAKER: Yeah.

23 MR. BLUMENTHAL: Push the mike down?

24 MR. STAEGER: The one in -- the one on your  
25 right.

1 MR. BLUMENTHAL: Yes.

2 SPEAKER: The one in the left.

3 SPEAKER: Yeah, that's -- the PA system.

4 MR. STAEGER: Thank you.

5 MR. BLUMENTHAL: Thank you. Thank you for  
6 hearing me again, I was with you last night in East Lyme and  
7 I want to thank you, Mr. Martin and Capt. Boynton, for  
8 hearing so many citizens who will speak much more cogently  
9 than I can as to their reasons for being here tonight, and I  
10 hope for their reasons that they have reservations as I do  
11 and strong opposition to this project in its present form.  
12 We have an obligation to provide resources; energy resources  
13 to both sides of the Sound, and to this region, but there  
14 are better, safer ways to do it.

15 These risks are intolerable, these risks cannot  
16 be managed effectively and safely. These risks, not just of  
17 spills, collisions, leaks -- all of the expectable risks  
18 have to be taken into account with the security risks that  
19 are unknowable and unpredictable. Terrorists risks,  
20 hurricane risks, other disaster risks that could make the  
21 Sound look like the Gulf and I'm haunted by the hooks of  
22 platforms and structures adrift and on the shores that were  
23 thought to be impregnable and invulnerable.

24 We have hurricanes, we've had them in 1938, 1944,  
25 that posed the same risk. Last night, one of the members of

1 the panel compared the Sound, I think quite appropriately to  
2 I-95. We don't want a vulnerable and sitting accident  
3 waiting to happen in the middle of Long Island Sound in the  
4 kind of traffic that's comparable to I-95. I would just  
5 leave you with two words, "fragile" and "stressed."

6 Those words are from the Coast Guard's own report  
7 released July 15, 2005. "Fragile" and "stressed," are the  
8 words that the Coast Guard used in its port and waterway  
9 assessment report to describe the current state of Long  
10 Island Sound, because of the traffic and congestion that  
11 exists right now. And "fragile" and "stressed" are an  
12 understatement compared to what it will be with the tanker  
13 traffic and the zones, maybe unknowable right now, in their  
14 extent, but certainly, larger than anything we can imagine  
15 right now.

16 And I would like to just close by saying that  
17 that report emphasized about Long Island Sound now that we  
18 already are at risk in, I believe 18 of the 24 categories  
19 thought to be relevant. Eighteen of the 24 categories are  
20 already above medium risk and the remainder are at high  
21 risk. We would be adding unacceptable risk, and I would  
22 suggest very simply that even at this pre-file state, even  
23 at this early state, we ought to keep in mind what the  
24 doctors have as their professional motto. First, "do no  
25 harm." This project threatens a lot of harm, thank you.



1 MR. STAEGER: Thank you for your comments.

2 (Applause)

3 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker will be James  
4 Paton, speaking for Congressman Christopher Shays. James  
5 Paton. I'll say it again, this is James Paton, speaking for  
6 Congressman Christopher Shays.

7 MR. PATON: Thank you, I appreciate the  
8 opportunity to read this few words that Congressman Shays  
9 wrote. He represents the 4th Congressional District with --  
10 which I live in. Before I start, I want to take this  
11 opportunity to thank both of you organizations for allowing  
12 us to be part of this, but most of all I want to pay some  
13 tribute to the Coast Guard for the marvelous job that your  
14 organization did in saving lives in the Gulf of Mexico. I -  
15 -

16 (Applause)

17 MR. PATON: I can't say it too strongly, Captain  
18 and Commander, I think your colleagues did a -- an  
19 outstanding job and I think they did the best job of anybody  
20 down there, but -- and anyway, another story for another  
21 day. All right, this is a quote as prepared by Congressman  
22 Shays' office and I'd like to read it as best I can.

23 "While I believe, liquefied natural gas is a  
24 viable alternative energy source, I am opposed to the Shell  
25 US Gas & Power and TransCanada proposal to place an LNG

1 facility in the middle of Long Island Sound. Protecting our  
2 environment and promoting energy independence are two of the  
3 most important jobs I have as a Member of Congress. Long  
4 Island Sound, which contributes more than five billion  
5 dollars annually to the regional economy is one of the most  
6 populated and visited areas of our country."

7 "In fact, approximately 10 percent of the  
8 American population lives within Long Island Sound's  
9 watershed. It is a source of livelihood, nourishment, and  
10 recreation for many in Connecticut and elsewhere and it is  
11 critical that we treat it well. Long Island Sound is our  
12 own Yellowstone. I think that's well said. It would be  
13 unthinkable to cite an industry facility in the middle of  
14 Long Island Sound. There is very little information on  
15 impacts of floating re-gasification facilities, since there  
16 are so few currently in existence. To the best of my  
17 knowledge, there's only one in the world."

18 "However, I have four primary concerns. First,  
19 the trenching to connect the barge to existing gas pipelines  
20 would cause significant damage to the seabed. Second, at  
21 the intake and discharge of the giant facility would degrade  
22 the water quality. Third, potential explosions from  
23 platforms, operations, other technical malfunctions and  
24 tankers bringing shipments of LNG into the facility will  
25 threaten human and ecological safety."

1                   "Finally, Broadwater should set a -- finally,  
2           Broadwater would set a precedent that could be unwise in the  
3           industrialization of Long Island Sound. There are risks  
4           associated with the siting and expansion of LNG terminals  
5           in populated areas and is essentially -- states would be  
6           able to protect sensitive coastal areas. If an LNG facility  
7           were built in Long Island Sound for example, it could have  
8           extreme detrimental impacts on Connecticut-New York coastal  
9           habitat, undermining all environmental efforts made in the  
10          Long Island Sound stewardship incentives for the past  
11          century."

12                   Now, that is what Congressman Shays said, but now  
13          I have a few comments of my own, while I got a couple of  
14          minutes left. I am a -- an environmentalist, I'm also an  
15          engineer, and I'd like to just pass onto you folks that the  
16          Iroquois gas transmission line that was put in some 20 years  
17          ago, I don't know whether you were the Captain of the Port  
18          then -- but there was significant damage done to the bottom  
19          of Long Island Sound, and that damage by and large has never  
20          been repaired. There's never been any mitigation that can -  
21          - that has taken place, all right.

22                   The other thing I'd like to pass on is that this  
23          organization that is bankrolling this thing, TransCanada,  
24          also controls 50 percent of the Iroquois gas transmission  
25          line. So I'm opposed to look from a safety standpoint, and

1 I'm opposed to look from the standpoint of the fact that  
2 they're going to destroy the bottom of Long Island Sound  
3 like they did the last time.

4 Now, in summary, I just have a few brief comments  
5 that I got from an engineering journal and I as an engineer,  
6 much like this lady said that her father said, what's going  
7 to happen will happen and one of the most important  
8 statements that I could say, if I'm going to build something  
9 I have to look at the risk of that facility being destroyed  
10 by nature.

11 We can't control nature, we can design and we can  
12 spend all kinds of money, proof in putting the Army Corps of  
13 Engineers down in the Gulf of Mexico. All the theories in  
14 the world cannot control nature. You can do the best  
15 engineering in the world, but nature might still throw a  
16 curveball at you and that's what I'm concerned about here,  
17 and I thank you for your time.

18 SPEAKER: Thank you.

19 MR. PATON: I'd like to give you this document  
20 that Congressman Shays presented. Who should I give it to?  
21 Thank you very much, thank you, gentlemen.

22 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be Ryan Drajewicz  
23 speaking for U.S. Senator Christopher Dodd.

24 MR. DRAJEWICZ: Thank you. As he said, my name  
25 is Ryan Drajewicz, I'll definitely spell that for you. It

1 is D-R-A-J-E-W-I-C-Z. And I'm representing U.S. Senator  
2 Christopher Dodd. And I'll read exactly as he had written  
3 it.

4 "I am pleased that the Federal Energy Regulatory  
5 Commission, FERC and the Coast Guard are conducting this  
6 scoping meeting on the proposed Broadwater liquefied natural  
7 gas, LNG project. It gives the citizens of Connecticut the  
8 opportunity to voice their opinions and concerns.

9 "While I sincerely recognize the need to increase  
10 our supply of natural gas, I have serious concerns about  
11 placing such a facility so close to a large metropolitan  
12 area. It poses a potential risk to the lives of millions of  
13 citizens of Connecticut, New York and surrounding areas. As  
14 you may know, more than eight million people live, work and  
15 recreate on or around Long Island Sound."

16 "Long Island Sound is an estuary of national  
17 significance. And federal, state and local authorities have  
18 spent significant time and expense to restore its health and  
19 that of the surrounding ecosystem. I am deeply concerned  
20 that this LNG project will hinder continued restoration  
21 activities. Construction and operation of such a massive  
22 facility, not to mention the increased tanker activity,  
23 would cause severe hardship to individuals and businesses  
24 that rely on Long Island Sound for their livelihood."

25 "Current transportation routes that commercial

1 and recreational operators depend on would be upended if an  
2 anticipated large safety exclusion zone were implemented.  
3 Long Island Sound provides an economic benefit of more than  
4 five billion dollars to the regional economy. All of these  
5 scenarios are troubling."

6 "In addition, the federal government has been  
7 given new authority in the LNG siting process. I am  
8 concerned that any state concerns and objections will be  
9 overruled. I implore FERC and those associated with the  
10 Broadwater project to listen carefully to our concerns.  
11 This LNG facility does not belong in Long Island Sound,  
12 thank you."

13 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. The next speaker will  
14 be State Senator Len Fasano.

15 MR. FASANO: Thank you very much. I have  
16 submitted my written testimony today, and there are a lot of  
17 people here and I'm going to have my opportunity to ask  
18 questions and to comment. So I'm just going to briefly go  
19 through, if I may so ,in my testimony. My name is Len  
20 Fasano, State Senator representing the Town of Wallingford,  
21 East Haven and North Haven.

22 Last week, I was appointed chairman of the --  
23 Governor Rell's taskforce created by executive order number  
24 9 to examine the LNG project known as "Broadwater." This  
25 taskforce will examine this project from all sorts of

1 avenues including safety, environmental, as well as energy.  
2 One of the issues I want to talk about and raise is the  
3 issue of security, which is a major issue, at least in my  
4 mind.

5           The coordination of various agencies require --  
6 is required in order to ensure the safety of Connecticut  
7 residents as well as New York; this is a huge task. From  
8 9/11 to the natural disaster in Katrina, what we have seen  
9 this glaring error where there is a lack of organization,  
10 support, action, exchange of information among and between  
11 the various federal, state and local agencies. I believe  
12 this is going to be a major issue in this matter. I've  
13 heard the Coast Guard talk about it today. I don't think  
14 he's underplaying the magnitude of this plan that he has to  
15 develop. But certainly, this is going to be a cornerstone  
16 to this project on whether it's going to succeed or fail.

17           I also recognize the significant debate about the  
18 degree of an LNG explosion. And I recognize, as I  
19 understand it, the various scenarios that go in to the  
20 probability risks that the Coast Guard talked about. But  
21 the models that they have today cannot take into account  
22 variations from weather, from wave action, and even from  
23 other boats. Therefore, I believe it is important that when  
24 we do this analysis on a risk factor, that we err strongly  
25 on the side of caution.

1           In particular, I'm concerned about three local  
2 airports that are very close to the LNG barge. This would  
3 be Tweed-New Haven airport, which is probably about 12 miles  
4 away. Macarthur airport, Long Island, once again,  
5 approximately 11-12 miles away. And Islip, which is  
6 approximately 15 to 17 miles away. At all three of these  
7 low-key airports, the problem is going to be security, and  
8 who is going to pay for that security.

9           Recently, a year ago, a plane was taken by an  
10 individual and flown from Connecticut to New York without  
11 much notice. This can happen and when you're that close to  
12 this barge, it will be seconds before that plane takes off,  
13 it'll be able to make its way to the barge, the mooring.

14           It's my understanding that there's going to be a  
15 Yoke Mooring with respect to this project. The failures of  
16 a Yoke Mooring, I cannot tell you about 'cause I don't know.  
17 What I can tell you is, I know, in the Gulf of Mexico, Yoke  
18 Moorings were used frequently for the barges in Mexico; in  
19 the Gulf of Mexico. I don't know how they fared with  
20 hurricane Katrina, and part of the taskforce would be  
21 looking at that issue.

22           The other issue is we need to quantify the safety  
23 issue, and I mean that respectfully. You see the  
24 safety/security plan will be sole responsibility plan --  
25 will be the sole responsibility of the Coast Guard in



1 developing it with a combination of state, local, and  
2 federal.

3 The whole system of surveillance patrolling and  
4 escorting will be a costly endeavor, which costs ultimately  
5 must be borne by taxpayers. As such they will not be  
6 deemed energy costs. Therefore, when the project is labeled  
7 as a way to reduce energy costs which may or may not be a  
8 debatable issue, clearly, taxpayers' costs to ensure the  
9 security and protect our residents will not be allocated in  
10 that computation. The complex issue and the price tag that  
11 it will probably carry needs to be known, so an adequate  
12 evaluation of this project can be made.

13 In conclusion, since we've just recently --  
14 established the taskforce, we'd only scratch the surface.  
15 This -- Governor Rell is concerned for the State of  
16 Connecticut and the safety of its residents. This taskforce  
17 will go forward -- looks forward to the input of the  
18 residents that are here today and have participated in  
19 various public hearings. We wish to get their information  
20 and their concerns and work with you in a tightly knit  
21 group, so we can get the answers to these questions. I  
22 thank you for your time now.

23 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker will be State  
24 Senator Ed Meyer.

25 SPEAKER: Excuse me, sir, I would like to just

1 make one comment about the senator's comment. The safety  
2 and security assessments are designed and I failed to  
3 mention this to also estimate resource gaps. So for  
4 example, on the safety side, the baseline study showed us  
5 that we don't have much capacity with major marine  
6 firefighting on the Sound, so our final assessment should  
7 identify what would it take to fill that gap. And that  
8 means firefighting boats, how many, how much?

9 On the security side, the resource gaps that we  
10 should identify include what sort of security presence would  
11 be required to mitigate the elements of risk, where would  
12 they come from; Coast Guard, other federal, state, local;  
13 those are unanswered questions and how much resources would  
14 be required, how expensive, where would that come from, that  
15 should be part of our assessment. I apologize for not  
16 mentioning that.

17 SPEAKER: Thank you.

18 MR. MEYER: Good evening, gentlemen, my name is  
19 Edward Meyer, I'm the State Senator for the 12th District,  
20 and I speak tonight on behalf of the 100,000 people of my  
21 district, including the shoreline towns of Branford,  
22 Guilford, and Madison.

23 In -- earlier this year, Congress passed the 2005  
24 Energy Bill, which gives to the federal government, in  
25 effect, to FERC, the full authority to determine the

1 location of liquefied natural gas terminals. I express to  
2 you tonight my concern about your ability to protect us. As  
3 Senator Fasano said, we went through an attack on the World  
4 Trade Center in New York City on 9/11, we went through a  
5 horrible hurricane just a few weeks ago, and the federal  
6 government did not show its mettle in being able to protect  
7 us beforehand against those disasters.

8 I think that the importance of the Coast Guard to  
9 what we're doing tonight and what we'll be doing in the next  
10 months cannot be discounted in any way. The Coast Guard can  
11 protect our interests here. But Captain, I want to just say  
12 that I was concerned about a couple of things you said. You  
13 said in your remarks that you're a cooperating agency with  
14 FERC. FERC's responsibility is to determine the location of  
15 liquid natural gas terminals, and I ask you not to be  
16 necessarily a cooperating agency with FERC; but indeed a  
17 separate agency taking a separate look. You said that --

18 (Applause)

19 MR. MEYER: Capt. Boynton, you said that the  
20 Coast Guard's role and I'm quoting you, "Is to manage risk."  
21 I ask you to make your responsibility in these hearings, the  
22 avoidance of risk and not the management of risk. I want to  
23 share with you -- I want to share briefly with you two  
24 statements.

25 Earlier this year, I was introduced to a

1 university of Connecticut marine biologist, and I hope  
2 you'll be consulting with marine biologists, because that  
3 marine biologist told me, based on a bunch of scientific  
4 information, that frankly, as a layman, I didn't totally  
5 understand. But he said that if there was an explosion or  
6 implosion at this terminal below the surface of the water,  
7 the ecology of Long Island Sound would be ruined, not for a  
8 day, not for a year, but for a generation. And I ask you to  
9 please consult with marine biologists. I'm going to try to  
10 get him to agree to give me his name and make him available  
11 to you.

12 And then finally, I heard a statement tonight  
13 that was totally alarming. The senior vice president of  
14 Broadwater is here, and in an interview on Channel 8, about  
15 an hour ago, he was asked by the Channel 8 reporter why this  
16 terminal was being located in the middle of Long Island  
17 Sound and not on land, and he replied that Broadwater wanted  
18 to keep it away from population centers, and I ask you to  
19 take into account the implicit suggestion of that that  
20 Broadwater itself knows the threat of this terminal to the  
21 people in our area. And --

22 (Applause)

23 MR. MEYER: And finally, I just would refer you  
24 to testimony a few minutes ago by one of the representatives  
25 of the U.S. senators, who very appropriately thanked the

1 Coast Guard for having saved lives in the Gulf after  
2 Katrina. I think many of us here tonight are asking you not  
3 to save lives after the fact, but to prevent it from ever  
4 happening.

5 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. The next speaker will  
6 be State Representative Pat Widlitz.

7 MS. WIDLITZ: Good evening, that's a tough act to  
8 follow. I would like to -- I'm State Representative  
9 Patricia Widlitz of the 98th District representing parts of  
10 Branford and Guilford.

11 It was my understanding that basically tonight we  
12 were to address security issues, and that's what I'd like to  
13 focus on. In thinking about the location of this facility,  
14 which could be a volatile facility for us, looking at the  
15 surrounding areas, I thought about Plum Island where there is  
16 very sensitive research going on, and about how the Coast  
17 Guard might be called into action as a first defender if  
18 there were a problem there, intentional or unintentional.

19 Our sub-base, which thank God, we will have the  
20 ability to keep and defend for years to come, the Coast  
21 Guard, if there is a problem, if there is an attack or an  
22 accident at our nuclear sub base, the Coast Guard also would  
23 be called in to intervene.

24 Then I thought back to an experience I had on the  
25 Sound several years ago, among a group of four people out on

1 a 32-foot vessel on the Sound, when we became disabled. To  
2 be honest, we ran out of gas. And it was a beautiful  
3 afternoon, so it was, you know, "Okay, we'll call the Coast  
4 Guard." Within half an hour, a squall blew up on Long  
5 Island Sound that I could not have imagined, and we called  
6 for help. And we were told that if we were not in immediate  
7 danger, and even though we thought we were dying of  
8 seasickness, we had our life preservers and we were okay.  
9 So they said, "If you're all right, we have people in the  
10 water. We need to go there first."

11 So, it was a good two, two and a half hours  
12 before we were rescued and towed in. And I thought about,  
13 that was several years ago, the Sound wasn't as busy as it  
14 is now. And now that there are 200,000 registered vessels  
15 between the State of Connecticut and the State of New York  
16 using Long Island Sound, what would happen today if we had  
17 that problem and my question is has the Coast Guard been  
18 adequately funded to build up to the proportion of growth in  
19 the area and use of the Sound. I don't think so.

20 (Applause)

21 MS. WIDLITZ: As has been previously mentioned,  
22 there are 700 foreign flag vessels that come into the Sound.  
23 The Coast Guard has the responsibility of inspection. Only  
24 a fraction of those vessels can reasonably be inspected.  
25 This would be adding more tankers coming in from countries

1 around the world that adds to that burden. Again, is the  
2 funding keeping up with that responsibility?

3 There will be 12,000 barge and tug trips through  
4 the Sound in a given year. And I understand that the  
5 average age of our Coast Guard vessels is 28 years, if I'm  
6 correct? I'm a little concerned about that. If we address  
7 an issue of The Race, where we enter the Sound, where all of  
8 these commercial vessels enter the Sound at The Race, that's  
9 the narrowest part of the Sound. I believe it's about a  
10 two-mile area where people -- where the vessels would come  
11 through.

12 Think about a problem. If there were a problem  
13 with one of these tankers, an explosion or any kind of  
14 accident in that area that is already congested; fishermen  
15 like to go there, the boaters have to access the Sound  
16 through there; if there were a problem that had to be  
17 addressed, and that area had to be closed to traffic for any  
18 period of time, we would be shut off effectively from fuel  
19 oil deliveries, home heating fuel oil. We could only hold  
20 up for about a week with our supplies in Long Island Sound.  
21 We've all experienced, unfortunately, this side of the  
22 hurricane in New Orleans and the facilities that are  
23 bouncing around down there, it could happen here.

24 In addressing the environmental issues, we have  
25 that experience. We know what happens from pipelines that

1 are laid in Long Island Sound. We have the experience of  
2 the Iroquois Pipeline that goes right from the local town of  
3 Milford. Fifteen years ago, when that was installed, we  
4 were told that the shellfish beds that were damaged would  
5 restore themselves. Well, guess what? They haven't, and  
6 they're probably not going to. It's been 15 years.

7 So, we know what to expect from this pipeline.  
8 We already have a stressed fishing industry in Long Island  
9 Sound. It's a multi-billion dollar industry that is  
10 stressed. We don't need this additional threat and  
11 inconvenience and avoidance area for our fishermen. And I'm  
12 told by some of the lobster fishermen --

13 (Applause)

14 MS. WIDLITZ: I'm told by some of the lobster  
15 fishermen that the area in which this platform would be  
16 anchored is one of the areas that they would look to for  
17 restoration of the lobster industry. They will be  
18 prohibited from going anywhere near it.

19 So, in summary, I just think this is a foolhardy  
20 idea. I think it's a disaster waiting to happen  
21 economically, environmentally and security-wise. I really  
22 appreciate all of the efforts of the Coast Guard, but I  
23 think that this is just piling it on too high, and I'm  
24 really concerned that this will be overwhelming and we will  
25 not be able to guarantee the people of our two states the



1 security they deserve. Thank you very much.

2 (Applause)

3 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be Allison Dodge,  
4 speaking on behalf of Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro.

5 MS. DODGE: Good evening, my name is Allison  
6 Dodge. I am here on behalf of Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro,  
7 who represents the 3rd District of Connecticut in the U.S.  
8 House of Representatives. She asked me to submit the  
9 following statement.

10 I thank the Coast Guard and FERC staff who have  
11 come to Branford this evening, and appreciate this  
12 opportunity to bring to your attention my serious concerns  
13 regarding the proposed Broadwater Liquefied Natural Gas  
14 Facility. After reviewing the proposal and listening to the  
15 hundreds of constituents who have contacted my office, it is  
16 clear to me that the Broadwater project is not the best  
17 answer to address the energy concerns of Connecticut or Long  
18 Island.

19 In this time of emphasis on homeland security, we  
20 must be aware of what the placement of such a facility in  
21 the Sound would mean to our regional and national security.  
22 Our security resources are already taxed with the  
23 international shipping traffic, which traverses the Sound,  
24 the Groton submarine base, and Plum Island. We are already  
25 asking the U.S. Coast Guard and our local first responders

1 to do more with less.

2 Before the Broadwater proposal moves forward, we  
3 need to know what additional security responsibilities come  
4 with it. This is not simply a matter of the security of  
5 this region alone. With our close proximity to both New  
6 York and Boston harbors, any potential security problems in  
7 Long Island Sound would have serious impacts on national  
8 security as well.

9 We all understand the need for additional energy  
10 resources and infrastructure. We know that natural gas is a  
11 clearer burning fuel. It is true that Connecticut is home  
12 to several oil-burning power plants, and let me assure you  
13 that Connecticut residents would like to see that change.  
14 However, there is no indication, either from the company  
15 proposing this facility or the industry here in Connecticut,  
16 that the construction of this facility will either encourage  
17 or compel those power plants to replace their existing  
18 systems. All we have heard is the possibility that  
19 Connecticut may have access to additional supply.

20 Without an example of any such facility elsewhere  
21 in the country, it is difficult to determine just what the  
22 environmental impacts of such a project would be. But we  
23 all know the devastating scarring which was the result of  
24 the installation of the Iroquois Pipeline, damage to the  
25 Sound that has still not completely healed over a decade

1 later.

2 This proposal calls for the installation of  
3 another 25-mile pipeline. There will certainly be  
4 environmental consequences with such a project.

5 It is also my understanding that the proposed  
6 location of this facility would be very close to, if not  
7 right at, one of the areas of Long Island Sound which is a  
8 prime ground for both lobstering and fishing. Not only  
9 would the construction of this facility create environmental  
10 havoc in that area, it would also be placing these  
11 industries at further risk. Without the guarantee of the  
12 complete recovery of the ecosystem, which is impossible,  
13 there is no way to ensure that the populations of lobsters  
14 and fish will recover.

15 Additionally, as I understand it, those grounds  
16 would be off-limits to the lobster and fishermen, further  
17 devastating an industry, which has faced significant  
18 challenges over the last several years. We are finally  
19 seeing some signs of positive recovery in the lobstering  
20 industry, and the construction of this facility will make  
21 all of that work meaningless.

22 Over the last several years, with proposals like  
23 the Cross Sound Cable, the Islander East Pipeline, and now  
24 the Broadwater Liquefied Natural Gas facility, we have  
25 witnessed what amounts to the industrialization of the Long

1       Island Sound, without consideration of the cumulative impact  
2       of such projects on the commercial industries, the  
3       recreational value, or the delicate ecosystem of the Long  
4       Island Sound.

5               FERC thus far has not denied one application. I  
6       have no doubt that the onslaught of proposals will continue.  
7       Make no mistake. The Broadwater facility will be permanent,  
8       creating a private industrial quarter, which impedes on a  
9       public trust. I cannot believe that the only means to  
10      satisfy growing energy demands is to sacrifice the Sound.

11             The Long Island Sound is more than simply a body  
12      of water. It is at the very heart of our region's history.  
13      Fishermen have worked these waters for generations and  
14      thousands of residents and visitors spend their free time  
15      enjoying the quiet beauty of its waters and landscape. In  
16      fact, the Long Island Sound is an estuary of national  
17      significance, an official designation I am proud to have  
18      helped secure.

19             As stewards of this regional and national  
20      treasure, we have a responsibility to ensure its protection  
21      and preservation. Thank you.

22             (Applause)

23             MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be Representative  
24      Tom Drew, and we'd appreciate it if you'd set your cell  
25      phones on vibrator and turn them off, please.

1                   MR. DREW: Yes, good evening. I'm Tom Drew from  
2 Fairfield, Connecticut. As you probably know, it's a shore  
3 community a bit closer to New York City, and I want to thank  
4 you very, very much for your careful consideration. The  
5 thrust of my comments are that this proposal is extreme. It  
6 has inherently unpredictable consequences. I don't think  
7 there is any way to get around that conclusion.

8                   And the second point is the location is really  
9 extreme in and of itself. This is in the New York City  
10 metropolitan area, in some respects the capital of the  
11 world. And the other big piece that kind of penetrates is  
12 that this is going to be permanent. It's going to be  
13 permanent, presumably, and all the risks that are motioned  
14 here will exist permanently again in New York City area.  
15 This idea, the location idea in and of itself, I think, is  
16 extreme.

17                   I also want to especially emphasize, we should  
18 not be proposing extreme ideas like this when our federal  
19 government has not made any realistic effort, any realistic  
20 effort to end our dependence on foreign sources of oil and  
21 other energy sources.

22                   (Applause)

23                   MR. DREW: And I truly don't mean that in a  
24 political statement at all. We've had many administrations,  
25 different parties over the decades, and this situation

1 continues today. Our very way of life in the United States  
2 is dependent on the stability of unstable nations, and this  
3 creates a risk of extreme international conflict. It was  
4 just about, I think, about ten days ago, I was reading an  
5 article about Japan and China that are literally threatening  
6 each other with war over access to oil and gas.

7 And over the coming years and decades, we in the  
8 United States might -- may find ourselves at risk of being  
9 in direct conflict with many of our allies internationally,  
10 and others who are not necessarily our allies, Japan, China,  
11 India, South America, and someday, maybe even Europe.

12 And I also want to directly link our terrorism  
13 with our increasing dependence on foreign energy sources. I  
14 think we all know that terrorists manipulate any hostility  
15 that situation generates. All these existing conflicts and  
16 potential conflicts exacerbate all the other known and  
17 unknowable risks and security risks we'll learn about as we  
18 study this proposal. And the Energy Plan passed several  
19 weeks ago in Washington, D.C. is not in any way a realistic  
20 -- does not realistically address these risks to our nation.

21 When I first heard about this proposal, I  
22 questioned, "Why not place this in the Atlantic Ocean, south  
23 of Long Island?" And the apparent answer is that the risk  
24 of turbulent water is really unknowable. So, the choice  
25 then is to place this and propose this in Long Island Sound?

1 I think that risk is also unknowable. And it really is  
2 unacceptable, especially again linking this to the location  
3 being in the New York City metropolitan area. If it can't  
4 be placed in the Atlantic Ocean, then it shouldn't be placed  
5 in Long Island Sound either.

6 Also, I asked, when I first heard about this, is  
7 "Where else in the world does this barge exist?" And I was  
8 informed by a representative of Broadwater, when I went to  
9 the event in New Haven which I think was last winter, that  
10 something like this has never been attempted, specifically  
11 like this has never been attempted anywhere else in the  
12 world. And further, as far as I know, this project is  
13 intended to be permanent. To place this in the New York  
14 metropolitan area is really about the last place on the  
15 planet to be conducting something that -- I don't think it's  
16 sarcastic to say --

17 (Applause)

18 MR. DREW: I don't think it's sarcastic to call  
19 this an experiment. So, I mean that literally. In closing,  
20 I'd like to say this plan is extreme. And there are many  
21 trueable, literally unknowable and unpredictable  
22 consequences, and this should not even be considered at all  
23 unless all other alternatives to dependence on foreign  
24 energy and fossil fuels have been exhausted. And we as a  
25 nation have not even begun to seriously explore those

1 alternatives. So, I think safety first. Thank you very,  
2 very much.

3 (Applause)

4 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be Senator G. L.  
5 Gunther.

6 MR. GUNTHER: Actually, you want my credentials?  
7 I'm "Doc" Gunther from the 21st Senatorial District in  
8 Stratford, Shelton, Monroe and Seymour. I'm also been --  
9 that's 40 years in the State Senate. I've been 35 years on  
10 the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. I'm on the  
11 Connecticut Maritime Commission, that's a new one with -- I  
12 sit with our Coast Guard officer here who is a great asset  
13 to that by the way. I'm also on the bi-state Long Island  
14 Sound Committee, have been for years. And that just as --  
15 in fact, some people think I was here when Adrian Block  
16 sailed down, and I said hello to him, and he was very  
17 biased. I wish we were back when Adrian Block was here;  
18 must have been wonderful.

19 I would like to take and concur with practically  
20 everybody that spoke here. There's a little variation here  
21 and there. I don't want to be repetitious. But one thing  
22 that bothers me a bit, let me start at the discussion of --  
23 he was a Coast Guard and had said about how this is a pre-  
24 filing. You know, I'd feel a lot better if they didn't pre-  
25 file and they didn't bring this thing into the Long Island



1 Sound at all. But pre-filing -- and looking at the pre-  
2 filing, that's what I have to react to. And reacting to  
3 what I find in the pre-filing, which is very superficial in  
4 my book, is some of us, we've been up here for about five  
5 years fighting the Cross Sound Cable, fighting the Islander  
6 East. We've got -- well, there was, at that time, that I  
7 think there's 11 projects potentially that would go through  
8 Long Island Sound.

9 I have a map on all of these. There's about five  
10 or six have been there already, and if we ever complete all  
11 of -- and then this would make about the 12th structure that  
12 would be put in Long Island Sound, and if you'd look at the  
13 map, it looks almost like a bowl of spaghetti, with  
14 everything being put, brought into the Sound, into the base  
15 of the Sound. And when I hear about people talking about  
16 the Sound and what could happen to it, you know, this is one  
17 of the things that really bothers me, because the Iroquois  
18 line, when it went from Milford, and this was 15 years ago,  
19 Milford to Northport, that destroyed the bottom.

20 Now, this is a bottom, it took them a million  
21 years to build up the bottom of Long Island Sound. And when  
22 you talk about getting it back to where it is, never coming  
23 back. Now if you want some of the references, I'll give you  
24 some from NOAA who has made these remarks in some of the  
25 reports, and that type of thing. Once you destroy that

1 bottom, it's gone, and it doesn't come back again.

2 Now, incidentally when Representative Widlitz  
3 spoke about the loss of the shellfishery, we lost the fin  
4 fishery in that area too, because the fishermen down there  
5 say there is nothing left in that area, that they completely  
6 denuded it as far as destroying the bottom itself, nothing  
7 has come back. Incidentally, get down there, you've  
8 displaced the bottom of Long Island Sound by a 24-inch pipe,  
9 which is a nice hump down there.

10 And what they did is they took an I-beam and  
11 pulled it over the top to try it level it out, that off.  
12 Now, when I see, the only thing I've got by is this 48-page  
13 report that came from Broadwater. And I'm going to tell  
14 you, the things that immediately come up in my mind, after  
15 being involved in all these years in these different  
16 projects, is here we go again. You know, they talk about  
17 the yoke that's going to hold that vessel. They have a yoke  
18 forward and aft, I can see in this book. Now, if there is  
19 only one forward and aft, man, that's got to be quite a  
20 stabilizer for that mass that's going to be in Long Island  
21 Sound.

22 They talk about the footprint in the bottom.  
23 They don't describe it. They say it's going to be the size  
24 of a basketball court. Now, how big is a basketball court?  
25 Is that going to be pilings that's put in there? Or that's

1 going to be the caissons? What is it going to be in that  
2 footprint, that's in it? Now, they talk about how they are  
3 going to bury that pipe. That's a 30-inch pipe that has a  
4 cement coating on the outside, I believe, that they are  
5 going to put in the bottom. Now, how deep in the bottom  
6 you're going to put that 30-inch pipe?

7 Now, if you're going to bury it down three feet  
8 below the level of -- which we've heard that, three, and  
9 four, and five feet, and cables, and type of thing; and I'd  
10 like to see the dimensions of the plow that they are going  
11 to put in, and I like to know whether that plow is also  
12 going to be supplemented by either air or water pressure in  
13 order to try to bury a 30-inch pipe in Long Island Sound.  
14 To put an 8-inch cable, the trough you had to cut with that  
15 -- with a plow, I believe, was somewhere around 10 foot wide  
16 and maybe about 10 to 12 foot deep, that they plow in, and  
17 then with a jet action of either air or water, that would  
18 take in and let the pipe settle down into that thing.

19 Now, they admit, even in this pre-filing, there's  
20 areas that they will not be able to bury it, and they're  
21 willing to take and put either cement or something over the  
22 top as a protective medium. Now, I also say, I heard  
23 conversations that they are going to take and put anchoring  
24 material somehow to keep that pipe from raising. Now what  
25 is that? Is there going to be a mass of cement or what have

1       you? No description in this thing as to what they're going  
2       to do.

3                       Now, they're taking a 30-inch pipe and they're  
4       going to hook it into the 24-inch pipe that goes from  
5       Milford to Northport. Now, that -- at the point, you got a  
6       24-inch pipe and you got Port Chester East which is a 24-  
7       inch pipe, goes right down to New York. Now, in the FERC, I  
8       have corresponded with you people and incidentally, don't  
9       get a hell of a lot of answers back. I certainly wouldn't  
10      like to pick --

11                      (Applause)

12                      MR. GUNTHER: They inform me I was misinformed.  
13      I thought that pipe going from Northport to New York was  
14      going to be a supplementary for the Long Island Sound. No,  
15      it is a directional gas that will take from the Long Island,  
16      even now, and put it into New York City. These are just  
17      from this 48-page, and incidentally, we had a presentation  
18      at the Maritime Commission that was a four-page. They had a  
19      very sweet young gal come in there and make a presentation.  
20      I was a little upset because I had already gone through the  
21      48 pages, and, you know, I thought that was rather  
22      preliminary to a bunch of people who are authoritative and  
23      have a good background, to like put that type of a  
24      presentation in.

25                      The risk, I think, you've heard about a lot of

1 the risk. Incidentally, just don't go by the local  
2 airports, and don't forget we are in the major area of  
3 Kennedy and all the airports, plus even Bradley, and I've  
4 flown -- I've just come back from Tennessee the other day,  
5 and I have to laugh because I flew right over this area,  
6 when we were making the approach just to Bradley. So, if  
7 you're looking at that air quarter, I know you're talking  
8 about anywhere from 1,500 to a 5,000 feet zone, and a  
9 perimeter around this area, you better look up in the air,  
10 and find out that we are not going to have them coming in  
11 from there.

12 I tell you, I'd like to see the Atlantic States  
13 Marine Fisheries Commission, as one of your groups that are  
14 in consultation with all this preliminary. I know you have  
15 got NOAA. I know you've got the National Fisheries and all  
16 that type of thing, but having served on that Board for  
17 about 35 years, we're a little bit closer into the migration  
18 and the controls of the migrating species, and Long Island  
19 Sound has about 98 species of fin, shellfish, and benthic  
20 animals in the bottom.

21 All I can tell you is this is one of three  
22 national -- well, it's been mentioned as a national  
23 treasure. Well, you've got Puget Sound, Chesapeake Bay and  
24 Long Island Sound are the three national, significant  
25 estuary systems. And I tell you, I don't want to wake up

1 and find out that my generation's coming, that I've had  
2 helped them take and bring in here, that they are not going  
3 to have Long Island Sound, and the assets, and all the  
4 things that are out there are not going to be there when I'm  
5 not around.

6 So, I hope that we -- well, I'd like to see us  
7 appeal to them. Let's not have a secondary filing, let's  
8 drop it with a preliminary. I think there's enough in it  
9 now to say we don't need it and we don't want it.

10 (Applause)

11 MR. MARTIN: As for the comment on the lack of  
12 information, I did want to remind people that our ferc.gov  
13 page, the e-library link for the project has draft resource  
14 reports, they're parts of the application. There's a lot  
15 more detail there, so you might want to check that. It's  
16 the e-library link on the FERC page under the docket PF05-4.

17 MR. STAEGER: And information on how to do that  
18 is available on some of the forms at the table there. Next  
19 speaker will be Larry Miller, and I'm sorry I can't see the  
20 affiliation.

21 MR. MILLER: Good evening, I'm always a little  
22 worried when I see the FERC people in Connecticut, because  
23 of the transmission line we're going to have to put in  
24 through Bayfield (?) County at a cost of I don't know how  
25 many billions of dollars, the Cross Sound cable. And

1        incidentally, that thing is still lying on the ground in the  
2        shipping lanes at New Haven harbor. And we've got winter  
3        coming up, a lot of ships coming in with fuel oil to heat  
4        the homes of the people behind me.

5                But, most of all, I think it's incumbent upon  
6        FERC to protect the citizens of Connecticut from such a  
7        thing as Broadwater, but also to make sure we have a  
8        diversity of fuel that we will not be dependent on any  
9        foreign country for, for instance, for oil. And if we go at  
10       the rate we're going with gas, we're going to be dependent  
11       on foreign gas imports from the Middle East, and this is the  
12       area that people are sending terrorists to this country to  
13       do away with Americans. And I think this project,  
14       Broadwater, we just -- I mean, we just kill it right now if  
15       that's possible.

16               But again, the diversity of fuel, the protection  
17       of the citizens of the State of Connecticut, we have hydro,  
18       we have gas, we have coal, oil, biomass burning, and some  
19       other facilities that provide us with a well broad section  
20       of energy for our state, and I think we got to keep it that  
21       way. So to continue to rely on gas for everything in the  
22       Northeast here is wrong, because we'll then be dependent on  
23       foreign companies that serve us gas. And that could be  
24       devastating to the economy of the State of Connecticut as  
25       well as protection of the people of the state. I thank you

1 very much.

2 (Applause)

3 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be Selectman John  
4 Opie.

5 MR. OPIE: Thank you, and good evening. I'm John  
6 Opie, First Selectman of the town of Branford, and on behalf  
7 of the town, I'd like to welcome both the U.S. Coast Guard  
8 and FERC to our community. I want to thank you for this  
9 opportunity to comment on this proposed project. Input from  
10 municipal, regional and state as well other impacted  
11 parties, is crucial to the development of any valuable plan,  
12 no matter what its purpose.

13 I'd like to share with you a few thoughts I had  
14 at the other day's press conference down in Milford. For  
15 the record, I want to state unequivocally that Branford,  
16 like the other towns on both sides of Long Island Sound,  
17 opposes Broadwater and the transforming of Long Island Sound  
18 into an industrial zone. I'm sure you will hear this  
19 evening how critical this magnificent body of water is to  
20 our quality of life at every level, environmental,  
21 economically, culturally, as well as in terms of security.

22 Our view is that we are under attack. They're at  
23 the gate with a Trojan horse of a plan and they intend to  
24 take no prisoners. Who are they? They are Broadwater, they  
25 are Islander East, they are Duke Energy and Royal Dutch,



1 they're KeySpan, TransCanada. They're any company, office,  
2 agency or even government official who has no interest in  
3 these waters other than to advance their own agenda at any  
4 cost. And that cost, which we know, will be very, very  
5 high, will not be borne by them, but by us and our children.

6 Let us add to that list our own government and  
7 the agencies that are allowing it to be open season on the  
8 Sound. Our federal government with the complicity of  
9 Congress has arranged to eliminate any meaningful state or  
10 local input from the federal regulatory process, and put it  
11 in the hands of those who don't work here, don't live here,  
12 and don't pay taxes here, but come here with that offering  
13 of a Trojan horse of a plan, a plan that will surely lay  
14 waste to Long Island Sound just as Troy was done.

15 We are told that we need more energy and that  
16 this plan will make us independent of foreign oil, that it's  
17 clean, it's abundant, it's affordable, it's reliable, and  
18 that it will be safer. We don't believe it for a second.  
19 What we know is that this proposal jeopardizes our  
20 environment, especially the water-dependent environment to a  
21 degree unheard of before.

22 All you have to do is -- to do, is look at  
23 Milford. Twelve years ago -- twelve years after that  
24 pipeline was put in, nothing seems to live along the trench.  
25 This is in spite of repeated promises and assurances that it

1 will come back. And if this platform is allowed to go in  
2 with an additional 25 miles of pipe, that swath along the  
3 Sound will also be lost forever.

4 In terms of safety and security, it's nothing  
5 short of madness. The dangers that this operation will  
6 cause at the mouth of the New Haven harbor and throughout  
7 the Sound have not been assessed. Should anything happen,  
8 the burden will fall to our local first responders and the  
9 Coast Guard, who without a doubt, will find it too much to  
10 handle in the event of an emergency.

11 We in Branford have seen industry's idea of  
12 support from other proposals. It comes in the form of  
13 videotape training in a motel room somewhere within a 100-  
14 mile radius every two or three years. They will take no  
15 action when the emergency sirens call, but they will provide  
16 coffee and doughnuts with the videos. The complete chaos  
17 that a natural or man-made disaster would cause are the  
18 makings of a nightmare. Imagine a scene at The Race in  
19 which an LNG barge, petroleum tankers, naval vessels or  
20 others are embroiled in a mishap -- that would effectively  
21 close the traffic up and down the Sound, halting deliveries  
22 to New Haven harbor which supplies petroleum products to  
23 most of New England.

24 And what's the plan if something happens at the  
25 same time, another disaster competes for our resources,

1       which will surely be the case whether it's a hurricane or an  
2       attack. You might note that today is the 67th anniversary  
3       of the 1938 hurricane. That storm effectively leveled the  
4       Northeast, including our shoreline. There are lots of folks  
5       around here who witnessed that tragedy and would tell you  
6       just how awful it was.

7               Now imagine the '38 hurricane hitting us with  
8       this platform and the tankers in the middle of it all. By  
9       the way, that storm had the same force as Katrina had when  
10      it slammed into New Orleans a few weeks ago. As we've seen  
11      from Katrina, we were not ready to handle such a  
12      catastrophic event even after nearly seven decades after  
13      Hurricane Gloria, and after 9/11.

14             We have seen that even at -- with time and  
15      notice, FEMA and Homeland Security failed miserably. I do  
16      not know how you at FERC or at the Coast Guard feel about  
17      it, but that scene scares the heck out of us. We must not  
18      be placed in that position so the mega energy companies can  
19      improve their bottom line.

20             So, what should be done at this point? You  
21      should be sure that everyone knows and understand everything  
22      about this project. You need to be sure that there is a  
23      true need for this facility as well as for any perceived  
24      increase in energy supply. And I don't mean some quick and  
25      dirty study that's -- that a profit driven company pays for

1 to justify its latest scheme. Those schemes are designed to  
2 do little more than line -- than pick our pockets while  
3 endangering our environment and threatening our security.

4 You need to have a plan that addresses the  
5 legitimate and verifiable needs of our communities, our  
6 state and our region, and not simply the claims of slick  
7 marketing. Broadwater will only increase our dependency on  
8 foreign energy, especially from parts of the world that are  
9 not stable or friendly. Where is the planning in that kind  
10 of a proposal?

11 Considering all this, it is inconceivable that we  
12 are here having a public meeting tonight. There is no  
13 application on file yet. This exercise is a pre-application  
14 event. Even at our local level, a project is reviewed and  
15 analyzed after a plan is submitted and after it meets  
16 established standards and thresholds. If local and state  
17 standards can't even be considered, how can anyone seriously  
18 entertain, yet approve something on this scale?

19 Evidently, with the new Energy Act, that's how  
20 the system works now. It claims to be streamlining the  
21 process. In reality, it allows the energy giants to  
22 steamroll their scheme through, no matter -- with no  
23 meaningful regional or state input. You must be sure that  
24 our state offices, agencies, and elected officials are part  
25 of the decision making process with real input, not just lip

1 service. If not, these remarkably abundant and uniquely  
2 beautiful waters, and all they have provided us for so long,  
3 will be left in ruins just as Troy was. And just as at  
4 Troy, there will be dire consequences of epic proportions  
5 felt for generations. Thank you very much.

6 (Applause)

7 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker will be RTM  
8 Jonathan Waters.

9 MR. WATERS: I'm Jonathan Waters, RTM, 2nd  
10 District, Stony Creek. I'm also -- I've been a commercial  
11 fisherman for the last 20 years. I've got a number of  
12 concerns and a lot of them have been addressed tonight, and  
13 will be addressed.

14 SPEAKER: Louder please? Can't hear.

15 MR. WATERS: I have a lot of concerns and they'll  
16 be --

17 SPEAKER: Use the mike on your left.

18 MR. WATERS: This one? Sorry. I have a lot of  
19 concerns and many have been addressed tonight. Many will  
20 continue to be addressed, I'm sure, coming up. But, one of  
21 the ones that really bothers me is the exclusion zones, and  
22 the privatization of a public resource. I'm afraid that  
23 we're going to set a precedent here, prohibiting traditional  
24 fisheries and recreational boating in the area of the  
25 facility and the path of the tankers that service it.

1                   This also -- I'm also concerned about the  
2                   environmental impacts, heat, thermal, waste, spills, the  
3                   actual trenching of the pipeline, what this is going to do  
4                   to lobster migrations, traditional fishers; obviously,  
5                   Hurricane Katrina and Rita now, is on everybody's mind.  
6                   And, you know, it has to be looked into, if this thing were  
7                   to get loose, and what the ramifications of that would be.

8                   The evacuation rates in potential areas, would  
9                   you be able to get people out? Terrorism, accidents; on any  
10                  summer weekend or during the week, cigarette boats are a  
11                  part of our life in Long Island Sound. Would you be able to  
12                  stop a errant cigarette boat or two of them, traveling at 80  
13                  or 90 miles an hour in time? And what would be the effect?

14                  I will put the rest of my concerns in writing.  
15                  Thank you.

16                  (Applause)

17                  MR. STAEGER: Next will be Selectman Carl  
18                  Balestracci.

19                  MR. BALESTRACCI: Members of the United States  
20                  Coast Guard and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, ladies  
21                  and gentlemen, last Monday, the Guilford Board of Selectmen,  
22                  and Guilford is the neighboring community to your east, I  
23                  know the Coast Guard knows this, I'm not sure about FERC,  
24                  passed this resolution unanimously at our regular  
25                  selectmen's meeting. Our history books are replete with

1 narratives of the early explorations of Long Island Sound by  
2 European sailors and navigators. Verrazano in 1524, Adrian  
3 Block in 1614 are two of the earliest who explored, mapped  
4 and noted the qualities and significance of this magnificent  
5 body of water.

6           These early visitors took back to Europe  
7 descriptions of the harbors, bays, inlets, islands and tidal  
8 marshes. They wrote up of the abundance of sea life and  
9 water from all of the freshwater rivers that empty into the  
10 Sound, the great forests that lined its shores, the many  
11 species of wildlife, and the natives who inhabited this area  
12 and who were sustained by its abundance. It was not long  
13 before Europeans came to these shores to settle and  
14 establish permanent homes and communities such as my  
15 hometown of Guilford in 1639, and Branford in 1644.

16           In the past three and a half centuries, we have  
17 taken much from Long Island Sound. This vital, significant  
18 and magnificent body of water has sustained us. It  
19 contributes every day to the quality of our lives,  
20 meteorologically, economically, recreationally and  
21 emotionally. Although we depend upon its good qualities, we  
22 have a dismal record of stewardship.

23           With some notable exceptions such as Governor  
24 Abraham Ribicoff's initiatives in the 1950s, we have given  
25 little back to the Sound that sustains us. We do little to

1 protect its integrity. We have abused it. We show  
2 negligible concern for this asset that is so vital to us  
3 all. We have been steadily inundated in more recent times  
4 with private for-profit companies and consortiums proposing  
5 gas lines, electric lines and petrochemical terminals, each  
6 of which diminishes the qualities of Long Island Sound  
7 significantly.

8 We have before us now the Broadwater Energy  
9 proposal. The enormity of this structure, the space it will  
10 consume, the potential threat to our citizens, our shores  
11 and our Sound is unthinkable. We, the leaders and citizens  
12 of Guilford ask you, the representatives of the United  
13 States Coast Guard and the Federal Energy Regulatory  
14 Commission to join us in opposing the Broadwater proposal  
15 until the following can be accomplished by our federal  
16 government.

17 One, a true needs assessment can be completed for  
18 Long Island and our region of all energy sources.

19 Two, the least number of energy lines, terminals  
20 and facilities to meet those needs is determined.

21 And three, the routes and sites of the least  
22 environmental impact and the most public safety can be  
23 established.

24 Ladies and gentlemen, it is both poignant and  
25 ironic that the name of Captain Adrian Block's ship during



1 the 1614 exploration of Long Island Sound was the (*italics*)  
2 Unrest. There is a great deal of unrest among the leaders  
3 and citizens of Connecticut and Long Island about this  
4 proposal. We stand against the Broadwater proposal and we  
5 ask you to stand with us.

6 That is the end of our formal proposal. This was  
7 signed unanimously by all five members of the Board of  
8 Selectmen of the town of Guilford.

9 I would like to just point out that in  
10 conversations with our Guilford chief of the fire service,  
11 he reminded me that the hurricane of '38 was a Category 3.  
12 If we had a facility of this enormity off the north shore of  
13 Long Island, approximately 12 miles from our shore, ten  
14 stories high, the length of four football fields long and  
15 almost 200 feet wide, is there any anchor in the world that  
16 would hold this facility secure in a Category 3 hurricane,  
17 let alone a Category 4 or 5?

18 I watched the news tonight, and I see how the  
19 coast of Texas is scrambling with all of their offshore  
20 facilities to try and protect the citizens there. Let us  
21 not have a similar situation in Long Island Sound, because  
22 this is an inland waterways of significance, and there is no  
23 place for a facility like this to go except to come at us.  
24 Please protect us and our shores and our waters.

25 (Applause)

1                   MR. STAEGER: The next speaker will be RTM Kyle  
2 Nelson.

3                   MR. NELSON: Thank you very much, my name is Kyle  
4 Nelson. I'm here today as a lifelong resident of Branford,  
5 current member of the Representative Town Committee here in  
6 -- our town meeting in Branford, former Chairman of the  
7 Branford Shellfish Commission, former member of the Branford  
8 Blue Ribbon Commission on the Islander East proposal, and a  
9 husband and a father of two children. I am here tonight to  
10 express my firm opposition to the Broadwater LNG project as  
11 a representative of all of the above.

12                   This introduction may sound familiar, because it  
13 was only two years ago, May 8th, 2002, on a, I believe,  
14 Tuesday night, that I was explaining to this very body,  
15 FERC, why the Islander East Pipeline project made absolutely  
16 no sense. It was filled with false assumptions, and would  
17 be detrimental to everything in its path. And here I am  
18 again tonight to say the same thing about the Broadwater  
19 project.

20                   The negative impacts of Broadwater project on  
21 wildlife, fish, shellfish, and the real security and safety  
22 issues, and the overall industrialization of this Sound  
23 caused by this project, all for one company to make a buck,  
24 is an absolute mistake. I challenge this committee to  
25 determine once and for all the actual market demand for

1 natural gas in Long Island Sound and whether or not it's  
2 real. And I say this because there has been no third party  
3 review of that demand to date.

4 Two years ago, Islander East came before this  
5 group and told us there was a demand. Today, Broadwater is  
6 saying there still is a demand. Yet, if this was true, then  
7 why are both companies spending thousands upon thousands of  
8 dollars advertising to promote their natural gas offering on  
9 Long Island Sound? These ads are so bodacious to promote  
10 natural gas to heat swimming pools, and make sure that snow  
11 would melt on driveways in the winter.

12 (Applause)

13 MR. NELSON: If this market demand was so real,  
14 then why aren't there hundreds of citizens from both  
15 Connecticut and Long Island here today, demanding FERC to  
16 approve these projects so that they can survive?

17 The fact is, and if I could take a -- just a  
18 quick show of hands, how many people are here that actually  
19 support the project, please raise your hands? Broadwater  
20 representatives and employees, please, are excluded.

21 (Laughter)

22 MR. NELSON: The fact is, there is no one here  
23 who is here to support this plan. Why don't we see  
24 thousands of letters when you say you're getting hundreds a  
25 day to elected officials, news outlets, to FERC, to the

1 Coast Guard, to say, approve these plans because we can't  
2 survive without them. They are just not happening.

3 Two years have passed since Islander East came  
4 before us. Two winters have gone, two summers have gone by,  
5 and life on Long Island Sound still survives without these  
6 projects. There are many people here tonight who will cover  
7 the details in much better detail than I, and I'm thankful  
8 for that. I ask you consider these deliberations as you  
9 place a keen eye on the market demand statistics that  
10 Broadwater uses to justify the need for this plant at all.

11 Letting Broadwater or Islander East to find  
12 market demand for natural gas on Long Island Sound is simply  
13 letting the fox tell the farmer how many chickens he should  
14 put in the henhouse.

15 (Applause)

16 MR. NELSON: And certainly, it would be a slap in  
17 the face of future generations to allow the destruction of  
18 this wonderful, natural resource, so that we -- that we've  
19 all grown up loving and enjoying, so that swimming pools  
20 could be a little warmer and snow can melt on heated  
21 driveways. Thank you.

22 (Applause)

23 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker will be RTM John  
24 Smith.

25 SPEAKER: John is not here.

1                   MR. STAEGER: That for now, is our last elected  
2 official, and as you may --

3                   (Laughter)

4                   MR. STAEGER: -- as you may have noticed, we let  
5 them go over since they represent so many people. We're  
6 going to have to return to -- oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Smith is  
7 here, but after this, we are going to have to return to our  
8 concept of three minutes, so that we can get everybody  
9 involved, because we still have about 40 people left.

10                  MR. ROY: I'm the first one on the secondary  
11 list. I'm State Representative Richard Roy of Milford, the  
12 home of the pipeline that killed everything in its path. I  
13 stand here unequivocally and vehemently opposed to the  
14 Broadwater project. Since the officials who have gone before  
15 me have usurped all my comments, I'm going to ask you to put  
16 "ditto" with my initials next to each of their names.

17                  (Applause)

18                  MR. ROY: This is the second time I've addressed  
19 this issue this week publicly and there are many in this  
20 room who are trying to speak for the first time. Members of  
21 public, gentlemen, I ask you to please listen to them  
22 carefully. You will hear the heart and soul of Connecticut.  
23 Thank you.

24                  (Applause)

25                  MR. STAEGER: The next speaker will be John Case,

1 followed by John Lee Norris McDonald.

2 MR. CASE: Good evening. My name is John Case.  
3 I am a U.S. Coast Guard licensed chief engineer and have  
4 worked on LNG vessels for well over 20 years. I began my  
5 career on LNG ships as a cargo engineer and worked my way up  
6 to chief engineer, the highest engineer rating in the  
7 merchant marine. I've sailed on maiden voyages of brand new  
8 LNG ships as they came out of the shipyard, and as all new  
9 ships, they required extra care and being cared for. But,  
10 with qualified people, you know, we delivered this gas  
11 safely.

12 Of my 20 plus year history of transporting LNG, I  
13 worked within a fleet of eight ships, and we had an  
14 outstanding safety record, and it was 20 plus some odd  
15 years, and oh, by the way, the operating company of that --  
16 those eight ships is a Connecticut company that is located  
17 on Long Island Sound.

18 I have reviewed the information about the  
19 Broadwater project early. This floating storage and re-  
20 gasification unit would be approximately 1,200 feet long,  
21 180 feet wide. It would be -- have identical machinery and  
22 equipment to just a regular old LNG ship. This is nothing  
23 new. In fact, the document from the American Bureau of  
24 Shipping says that Broadwater -- on the Broadwater's  
25 website, states as much, basically it is a vessel that does

1 not navigate. The purpose of Broadwater's FSRU would be --  
2 would be constructed at a shipyard, towed to a site in the  
3 Sound and attached to a yoke mooring system, which would be  
4 supported by a tower structure.

5 The mooring system based on a seabed would only  
6 cover 700 square feet, as someone mentioned, a basketball  
7 court. The yoke will be designed to hold both the FSRU and  
8 the LNG carrier. The yoke -- by the way, this yoke, that is  
9 well proven technology and designed to hold both quite  
10 safely.

11 In conclusion, I just want to say that we  
12 transport gas from Japan -- from Indonesia to Japan, and  
13 Japan is very strict on safety, and they would not allow us  
14 to do this. They -- in their LNG facilities in Japan, they  
15 have homes within one mile of the facility, and there has  
16 been no problem anytime in Japan with LNG. I strongly  
17 support Broadwater's plan. It's a sound plan, it's a proven  
18 plan. Thank you.

19 MR. STAEGER: Norris McDonald, followed by Erin  
20 Rielley or Riley, I guess.

21 MR. MCDONALD: My name is Norris McDonald. I'm a  
22 founder and president of the African American  
23 Environmentalist Association. We are a national  
24 environmental group with a local office in New York in the  
25 Bronx. We support the Broadwater project. The floating

1 storage and re-gasification unit, we believe, is needed  
2 along with the pipeline.

3 Let me first thank FERC and the Coast Guard for  
4 holding this hearing early. As you're well aware, in the  
5 NEPA process, it is important to get out to the public  
6 early, as early as possible in the scoping process to get  
7 feedback from the public. So, thank you for doing that, and  
8 I'm sure you'll follow up very well.

9 I'm going to address three issues, health,  
10 safety, and security. Health is very near and dear to my  
11 heart. I've been intubated twice due to respiratory  
12 failure. For four days, I was under twice, due to that. My  
13 son also has asthma. I take health issues very seriously,  
14 and if I thought the Broadwater project was going to  
15 threaten this community, the Sound, we would be the first  
16 out opposing it. Well, when we look at health threats,  
17 we're very serious about it. Our air standards are higher  
18 than EPA's. They go by parts per million and parts per  
19 billion. Our standard is if you can see the air, it's not  
20 healthy to breathe.

21 Also with health effects, we look at places like,  
22 you know, Newark, New Jersey, if you want to see threats.  
23 Up 95, the refineries, the power plant, the airport, and  
24 airports aren't regulated under the Clean Air Act. I mean,  
25 those, in my opinion, are health threats. So, when I look



1 at the FSRU, I just don't get it. I don't see it, I have  
2 heard doctors testify, I just don't get the health threat.  
3 It's nine miles away from the shore, and maybe it's my  
4 perspective. I have had a little Boston Whaler, a little  
5 22-footer with two 75 horsepower motors. It takes me  
6 forever to get nine miles. So, any sort of vapor cloud that  
7 might form, I mean, I just don't -- and my little Whaler, it  
8 gets pretty good speed, I think, but it seems like it will  
9 be forever. I don't see how a vapor cloud could threaten  
10 the health of people on the shores. So, I have problems  
11 about that.

12 When it comes to safety, same sort of problem,  
13 you know, it's in the middle of a 120 mile per hour Sound.  
14 So, basically when people talk about safety, you know, you  
15 look at airplanes for instance. Airplanes crash, people get  
16 right back on. Now, there have been some, I think, deaths  
17 in the history of LNG. There have been deaths in the  
18 history of LNG, but you know, you have got -- you have more  
19 deaths in one airplane crash than you have in the entire  
20 history of the LNG industry. So, people get right back on  
21 those airplanes.

22 In concluding, talk about security. Security --  
23 people tonight will probably talk about airplanes, the  
24 threat of airplanes, flying into a tanker or into the FSRU.  
25 Well, whenever they bring up that issue, you're really

1 talking about the airline itself and also the airport. Now,  
2 in the draft Environmental Impact Statement, I hope you  
3 seriously look at that issue, seriously look at the fact  
4 that the Broadwater project and the principals of that  
5 project shouldn't be held liable for another company's  
6 product, that is an airplane.

7 So, the airlines and the airline industry should  
8 be able to protect their project, and I have confidence in  
9 the U.S. military, I have confidence in America, and I have  
10 confidence in the citizens that we can prevent that sort of  
11 thing, but the project shouldn't be held because of another  
12 company's product, thank you.

13 SPEAKER: Thank you.

14 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker is Erin Reilley, R-E-  
15 I-L --L-E-Y, followed by Adrienne Espisito.

16 MS. REILLEY: As we all know and as has been  
17 stated many times before, the Sound is an estuary of  
18 national significance. The Race is home to the largest mass  
19 migration of life anywhere on the planet once a year. It's  
20 also one of the country's biggest fly-fishing seasons. The  
21 Sound is also a habitat for about 60 percent of the world's  
22 endangered -- endangered species stop by here once a year or  
23 they spend their entire lives here. I'm sure there is a  
24 certain large, non-human constituency that FERC is now  
25 responsible for protecting and evaluating in this approval

1 process.

2           And as I understand that this facility and its  
3 barges will probably use something called biocides to flush  
4 out their pipes as a part of their routine maintenance, and  
5 then flush the treated biocide filled water out into the  
6 waters of the Sound. I want to know what 100 percent  
7 guarantee we have, that not through human error, not through  
8 technological malfunction ever, not once, any bit of  
9 untreated biocide filled water will ever enter into the  
10 Sound, ever, and impact those non-human constituencies,  
11 those endangered species, those lobsters, the benthic  
12 organisms, everything that we depend on in our daily lives  
13 and that they depend on.

14           And I challenge you, FERC, to apply the full  
15 spirit of the Endangered Species Act, which protects not  
16 only those species but their habitat as well from any  
17 compromise or industrial use, not the Endangered Species Act  
18 that we -- that we know today, compromised by policy  
19 directives, through legal challenges, and unfair decisions.  
20 I want you to apply the full spirit of the Endangered  
21 Species Act in evaluating every bit of this facility, the  
22 dredging, the pipelines, the light that it will block from  
23 the seafloor, the mooring, the new facilities that will have  
24 to be built, and the impact to air quality to process this  
25 gas, these tankers coming in, everything, the biocide filled

1 water.

2 I want to make sure that you're using every bit  
3 of your quantitative capabilities to protect everything that  
4 lives in the Sound, not just the people that are concerned  
5 about our energy policies and our safety, but also  
6 everything else that lives there. There is a reason it's an  
7 estuary of national significance and we want to keep it that  
8 way. Thank you.

9 (Applause)

10 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker is Adriane Espisito  
11 followed by Carrie Frohling.

12 MS. ESPISITO: Good evening, gentlemen. The good  
13 news is you're almost done, three down, one to go. The bad  
14 news is we've only just started the public portion of this  
15 process here tonight.

16 Three quick points for you, one is that I think  
17 you have heard loud and clear that preserving what's special  
18 about Connecticut and Long Island, communities and  
19 landscapes needs to be integrated into any planning process.  
20 Long Island Sound is a natural, historical, and economic  
21 resource that needs and is supposed to be safeguarded. As a  
22 matter of fact, studies show that communities that preserve  
23 their natural character outperform the economies of  
24 communities that do not.

25 (Applause)

1 MS. ESPISITO: Intensive growth pressures have  
2 already severely impacted our lives. We can't go anywhere  
3 without sitting in traffic and feeling a flicker of road  
4 rage, we can't any longer afford to buy the very homes that  
5 seems like we bought only yesterday, and we watch our  
6 children pack up and leave to begin lives they can more  
7 easily afford down south.

8 These are dramatic changes. But, we know that  
9 change is inevitable. But it does not and should not have  
10 to come at that expense of what citizens and communities  
11 value. And what we value is the Long Island Sound. We can  
12 be victims of change or we can plan for it. And right now,  
13 we see no reason to change the middle of Long Island Sound  
14 into Detroit, Michigan. So what we want and what we're  
15 asking for is we want part of the FERC process, the EIS  
16 process to have some element in it which talks about the  
17 change that this would bring to the character and the  
18 identity of Long Island Sound, and that's not quantifiable  
19 in data or in numbers, but it certainly is quantifiable to  
20 community and community values.

21 The second point is about security. In a  
22 recently released report of May of this year, it was a  
23 security risk management analysis for the Attorney General  
24 in Rhode Island, Patrick Lynch. It clearly identifies that  
25 one of the top four priorities for terrorists is to attack

1 the infrastructure for energy, both natural gas and oil.  
2 And no one knows about terrorist activities, I think, better  
3 than New York and Connecticut residents.

4 We now live in a world of "what if"s. We send  
5 family and friends and relatives off to work in New York  
6 City and for a second, we think, "what if?" We ride the  
7 Metro, we ride the subway, we ride the Long Island Rail  
8 Road, and we think, "what if?" We take the ferry, all over  
9 from Branford to Long Island, to Port Jeff, what used to be  
10 a wonderful and joyful experience, now during times of high  
11 security, like we had just in July, we passed guards with  
12 very large guns. We look down and we see this -- a Coast  
13 Guard escort, and we think to ourselves, "what if?"

14 Now, you're asking us that when we get in our  
15 boat, and we go out on the Long Island Sound, a place, one  
16 of the last places in Long Island, New York City and  
17 Connecticut that we can go to and find peace, solace, joy  
18 and yes, even a spiritual connection to our natural world,  
19 you want us to once again ask ourselves, "what if?" It's  
20 too much. It's too much to ask us to do. So, as part of  
21 your EIS, we also need to quantify what that fear factor  
22 does to the community, and to take away the last special  
23 place that we have, the last place that we have, it's our  
24 Yellowstone Park, it's -- Park, whatever you want to call  
25 it, we call it the Long Island Sound. And how will you

1 value that and how will you quantify that in an EIS?

2 And the very last thing, because I'm getting the  
3 high sign, is we also want to present to FERC as part of the  
4 formal record what we feel is an unprecedented public  
5 response to this particular proposal. We have, for your  
6 record, 50,000 names on signature sheets.

7 (Applause)

8 MS. ESPISITO: And we know you'll like taking  
9 those on to the airport there, Mr. Martin. But the point  
10 about this is that we are not an industry funded  
11 environmental group, we are the real deal. We are a  
12 grassroots activist organization, 80,000 members in New York  
13 and Connecticut, and we know the public sentiment on this.  
14 We can demonstrate it with petitions and we are here to  
15 communicate it to you. You've seen it in letters, and the  
16 public feels the same way that we've -- you've been hearing  
17 today, at all your hearings, it's enough, enough is enough,  
18 let's get a good energy plan, let's reject the wrong energy  
19 plan, and let's move on with the quality of life that we  
20 deserve. Thank you.

21 (Applause)

22 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. The next speaker will  
23 be Carrie Frohling followed by Barbu Panaitescu.

24 MS. FROHLING: Hi, I attended the meeting last  
25 week in Long Island. I am also here tonight. I want to

1 address to you concerns which I really didn't hear  
2 mentioned. One of them is the fact that this facility  
3 undeniably will aid to global warming, is going to release  
4 emissions that aid to global warming. These tankers that  
5 will be coming in and out have the possibility of bringing  
6 an invasive species to the Sound. These invasive species  
7 will not only be detrimental to our native and rich  
8 biodiversity, but they could take over entire populations.  
9 I also feel that this project will impede upon our  
10 progression towards more renewable energy sources. This is  
11 a roadblock in a road that has taken long enough to pave. I  
12 am also afraid that my -- or rather that our best interests,  
13 concerns, and sentiments will be ignored for the benefit of  
14 a foreign oil corporation. This is not the answer to our  
15 energy needs. Thank you.

16 (Applause)

17 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker whose name I've  
18 probably ruined is Barbu Panaitescu and the next speaker  
19 after that will be Leah Lopez.

20 MR. PANAITESCU: Thank you very much. Did a  
21 great job on the name. It's P-A-N-A-I-T-E-S-C-U. I'm a  
22 resident of Greenwich, Connecticut. I spent my entire life  
23 on the Sound. I was swimming in the Sound this morning  
24 thinking about all this. One image I couldn't get out of my  
25 head, that's one of -- we have all seen a Katrina, of the



1 oil rig that had broken loose and smashed onto the bridge.  
2 Our administration is very fond of using baseball as a  
3 metaphor for just about everything, so I am going to do the  
4 same. This is not a baseball game; we only get one chance.  
5 If anything happens, we are talking about 10 percent of the  
6 American population. I would like you to add my name and  
7 just say, "ditto," to every point that's been made. I was  
8 going to bring a couple of other ones but in the interest of  
9 keeping time, I am just going to reiterate all points that  
10 have been made, they are all very important. Thank you.

11 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. Next is Leah Lopez  
12 followed by Felice Cressman.

13 MS. SCHMALZ: Can I add one more name to that?  
14 And the last name is Schmalz, S-C-H-M-A-L-Z. Good evening,  
15 my name is Leah Schmalz and I am the Director of Legislative  
16 and Legal Affairs for Save the Sound, a program of  
17 Connecticut Fund for the Environment. We would like to  
18 thank the Coast Guard for their continued effort of engaging  
19 the public and a frank discussion about this joint venture  
20 posed by Shell and TransCanada. We would also like to thank  
21 FERC for allowing this meeting to extend beyond the issues  
22 of safety and security. We will be submitting full written  
23 comments by the close of the deadline but tonight we wanted  
24 to highlight a few overarching issues. One, let me be  
25 clear, Save the Sound is not opposed to LNG, we are opposing

1 Broadwater. Liquefied Natural Gas could be a good thing  
2 under certain circumstances. Using LNG as a way to move  
3 North American gas supplies around the U.S. could be a good  
4 thing if it is part of a comprehensive plan and if receiving  
5 complexes are cited in appropriate locations.

6 Projects promoting LNG may not be such a good  
7 thing if they are used as quick fixes, if they reinforce our  
8 addiction to foreign sources of fossil fuels, and if they  
9 are cited in inappropriate locations. The absence of  
10 regional energy plan and the existence of a wide range of  
11 alternatives as the New England Governor's report and the  
12 preliminary findings from the report commissioned on  
13 Broadwater alternative show combined with the fact that this  
14 particular project is posed for the middle of the regional  
15 treasure lead to one conclusion about the Shell and  
16 TransCanada, current Broadwater proposal. It is a bad idea.  
17 Two, big energy is pitting state against state in hopes that  
18 they will devour each other. With 40 to 50 LNG proposals  
19 throughout North America and no end in sight, we need a  
20 national strategy that takes a comprehensive look at all LNG  
21 facilities. Feeling that we at least need a regional energy  
22 plan, we should be assessing the actual need of the region  
23 and creating a roadmap of how to get there not citing energy  
24 infrastructure willy-nilly because proponents see big bucks  
25 on our shores.

1           Three, Broadwater has made much about Stony Brook  
2 scientists who commented on their project. I respect and  
3 admire the work of the scientists from Marine Scientists  
4 Center but (a) at the time there were only 3-1/2 pages of  
5 Broadwater's proposal that focused on potential  
6 environmental impacts; (b) their testimony was compelled by  
7 our requests from the State of New York, and (c) it had a  
8 caveat, and I quote "In the absence of a detailed  
9 environmental impact statement, my comment should be  
10 regarded as a preliminary appraisal."

11           While there may not be enough information to say  
12 Broadwater will not fund the environment, there's plenty of  
13 information pointing out the possibility of tremendous  
14 impact to Long Island's own habitat. One need look no  
15 further than the history of energy infrastructure in the  
16 Sound. None has been an environmental success story and  
17 some have resulted in substantial and often irreversible  
18 environmental complications. Four, Broadwater will tell you  
19 there are always environmental safeguards available. The  
20 question we need to ask is, are those safeguards enough to  
21 protect this congressionally declared estuary of national  
22 significance. For example, shortening the pipeline to 15  
23 miles instead of 25 miles with lessened environmental  
24 impact, but is that enough? Placing a bond on any permits  
25 received that mandate they be responsible for restoring any

1       damaged resource would help mitigate any damage but is that  
2       enough?  Compensating the public for removing public waters  
3       that belonged to them for recreating and fishing can be  
4       done, but is that enough?

5                 We have not had one successful large-scale energy  
6       project in Long Island Sound.  Each has left its own pack of  
7       destruction.  We wonder why this project will be any  
8       different, why should the citizens of New York and  
9       Connecticut hand over their treasure to a Canada and Texas  
10      based company?  Even if we put aside for the moment, the  
11      environmental impacts, the safety considerations, the energy  
12      policy implications and the states rights issues, the  
13      determination on a case-by-case basis that the Sound is for  
14      sale should enrage anyone who sees the Sound as a public  
15      resource.  If we say to this company that it's okay to come  
16      into Long Island Sound and build a gas facility, how do we  
17      say no to anyone else wanting to develop the Sound for  
18      profit?  So I think environmentally devastating projects has  
19      proven time and time again to be a bad idea.  Yeah, we keep  
20      doing it and we keep doing it in the absence of a  
21      development plan that helps the region decide what is and is  
22      not appropriate.  If we as a region ignore the fact that  
23      once we invite this type of development in industry as  
24      permanent residents of our midwaters, it becomes virtually  
25      impossible to get off the slippery slope; then what can we

1 expect next? Another LNG facility, maybe 5 of them, a  
2 couple of bridges, a man-made island for hotels, or as the  
3 song goes, we can always pave paradise and put up a parking  
4 lot. I would actually like to thank Broadwater for they,  
5 more than any others could have been -- have been able to do  
6 what some thought impossible, unite New York and  
7 Connecticut.

8 (Applause)

9 MS. SCHMALZ: The message is clear. Both the  
10 states know that a project of this magnitude is not right  
11 for our fragile Sound. You may be able to find mariners  
12 from San Francisco, Florida, Pennsylvania or even Texas and  
13 Canada to say otherwise, and I can understand that. When  
14 Long Island Sound is not part of your heritage when you will  
15 be cozy at home, a few states away from this -- when this  
16 monstrosity is built and when you are not voting along the  
17 waters of the Sound worried for your safety, it may be easy  
18 to fly in and support Broadwater, even easier if they  
19 provide you a limo. In conclusion, I'm heartened by our  
20 regional unity but saddened by this campaign. The best  
21 result fighting Broadwater provides is maintenance of the  
22 status quo. Trust me, I would rather our region use all of  
23 this energy and effort to move beyond status quo and  
24 actually improve the health of the Sound. Instead of  
25 continuing to fight bit by bit to maintain, we should focus

1 our efforts on meeting the region's energy needs in an  
2 environmentally sensitive way. Broadwater would do us the  
3 best service if they would pack up and go home. Let us get  
4 back to proactive protection. We need to be mindful that  
5 just because Broadwater has offered up a solution does not  
6 mean that it is the best solution for our region.

7 If they are truly concerned about meeting the  
8 region's needs in a responsible way, why not join us in  
9 advocating for our comprehensive regional assessment and  
10 energy plan, a plan that is thoughtful, considerate, and  
11 long term because in the end, this first come first serve  
12 haphazard development is never the basis of a solid  
13 solution. As a reminder of what we stand to lose, here are  
14 two copies for the record of Tom Anderson's "This Fine Piece  
15 of Water" an environmental history of Long Island Sound. He  
16 has written our history, but it is you here today who will  
17 write our future and make no mistake. If you retreat on the  
18 progress already done, we will hold you accountable.

19 (Applause)

20 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker will be Felice  
21 Cressman followed by Anna Gouznoba.

22 MS. CRESSMAN: Felice Cressman and I'm from Hands  
23 Across Our Pond and a resident of Branford. I want to thank  
24 you, gentlemen, for coming out again for another evening of  
25 presentations. Last night was rather lengthy. I will be

1       brief in my discussion of two issues. One issue has not  
2       been brought up yet, and that will be my second point. Has  
3       the 100-year storm that we've all been waiting for finally  
4       arrived and are more on their way? Around the world, gas  
5       and oil platforms are generally built to withstand a 100-  
6       year storm, a hurricane so powerful that it occurs only once  
7       every 100 years.

8                A recent study published this week in the Journal  
9       of Science cites that global warming has increased the  
10      number of storms in categories 4 and 5 since the 1970s.  
11      There was no increase in the number of storms just in their  
12      intensity, and that's in bold print, intensity. Keep that  
13      in mind as you envision Broadwater's proposal, it calls for  
14      a yoke mooring system designed for shallow water like Long  
15      Island Sound with a tower, 75 to 100 feet above the water  
16      and a base the size of a basketball court. Broadwater  
17      claims it has a track record of 25 years, but 25 years ago  
18      that would be about 1980. Was it designed for the 100-year  
19      storms that could now become annual events? I am skeptical.  
20      If the oil industry since Katrina wonders if the 100-year  
21      criteria for their platforms are good enough, shouldn't we  
22      be worried about Broadwater's FSRU? Can we sacrifice Long  
23      Island Sound if we have our own Katrina? If this structure  
24      breaks loose or topples over in a hurricane, where will it  
25      land, on Plum Island? Who gets to rescue it then? You

1 can't even get on Plum Island, it's so secure or will it be  
2 up against Waterford's nuclear power plant? But most  
3 importantly, what kind of damage will this basketball size  
4 base cause if it's dragging across the bottom of the Sound.

5 My second point focuses on the 25-foot boats that  
6 the U.S. Coast Guard will use in safety zones. It's my  
7 understanding that the Coast Guard has started to purchase  
8 these boats that are manufactured by Safe Boats  
9 International at a cost of \$180,000 a piece to the tax  
10 payers. If an incident arises in which the weather is calm  
11 and guns need to be fired, the Coasties, it could probably  
12 hit something but the Sound is fickle. We all know the  
13 weather can change quickly and for example, if we are  
14 suddenly in a squall and a bad situation arises during this  
15 rough weather, will the Coast Guard be able to maneuver one  
16 of these boats and at the same time actually hit anything  
17 with the guns? How effective will the safety zones be when  
18 it's rough and stormy on the Sound? Thank you.

19 (Applause)

20 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be Anna Gouznoba  
21 followed by Thomas Baptist.

22 MS. GOUZNOBA: Okay and the last name is G-O-U-Z-  
23 N-O-B-A and the difficulty in predicting the environmental  
24 impact is overwhelming. To refer to comments stated  
25 earlier, Broadwater is concerned with imposing this facility



1 in a populous area but is the Sound not populous, steaming  
2 with biodiversity? With all honesty, we are not pleading to  
3 preserve the last three of a colorful species, we are  
4 fighting to preserve the web that feeds us, in turn the  
5 lobster beds, the shellfish harvesters, suppliers, and  
6 distributors. And finally on behalf of all those who are  
7 unable to resist the pristine magnetism of the Sound please  
8 do not force us to live and visit in fear. Thank you.

9 (Applause)

10 MR. STAEGER: Next is Thomas Baptist followed by  
11 Pat Dugan.

12 MR. BAPTIST: I'm Tom Baptist. I'm a Vice  
13 President of National Audubon Society. Our mission is to  
14 conserve and restore natural habitats focusing on birds,  
15 other wildlife and their habitats for the benefit of  
16 humanity and the earth's biological diversity. Thanks for  
17 the opportunity to address you this evening on behalf of the  
18 Connecticut and the New York offices of National Audubon  
19 Society. I have submitted 21 pages of written testimony,  
20 and I'd like to just amplify just a few points. Long Island  
21 Sound was designated by the United States Congress in 1987,  
22 as an estuary of national significance and is a critical  
23 resource for birds and other wildlife in the Connecticut,  
24 New York region as well as for people.

25 Thirty-five species of birds use the offshore

1 aquatic habitats of Long Island Sound including six species  
2 listed by the States of New York and Connecticut and the  
3 Federal Government as either threatened, endangered, or a  
4 species of special concern. The Sound is a crucial foraging  
5 area in the nesting season and also serves as a central  
6 wintering, or migratory stopover habitat for birds. Audubon  
7 believes that critical environmental questions must be  
8 answered before any decision can be made about citing the  
9 Broadwater facility in Long Island Sound. For example,  
10 foraging areas and key areas important for prey-based  
11 species for the federally endangered Roseate Tern, which  
12 nests on nearby Faulkner's Island are not known and need to  
13 be identified. Key feeding areas and other resources used  
14 by water birds and their prey also need to be identified as  
15 do the areas of Long Island Sound that are important for the  
16 prey species that water birds and other animals that use  
17 Long Island Sound depend upon. Little is known about the  
18 bottomlands of Long Island Sound. A comprehensive mapping  
19 of the benthic communities of the Sound is needed to  
20 identify habitat locations, the relative abundance of those  
21 habitats and the importance of each type of bottomland  
22 habitat for wildlife.

23 Without the larger picture of the benthic  
24 communities of the Sound's bottomlands, it is difficult to  
25 know which habitat types are rare, which are key resources

1 for the wildlife and if any rare key resources are being  
2 impacted by the construction of the natural gas platform or  
3 its associated pipelines. Importantly, there are  
4 alternatives to the current proposal, which are described in  
5 my testimony including importantly energy conservation and I  
6 ask this question, would this facility even be necessary if  
7 our nation had a cogent energy conservation policy.

8 (Applause)

9 MR. BAPTIST: That alternative and the other  
10 alternatives listed in my testimony require full exploration  
11 and need to be carefully considered as part of the  
12 environmental review and approval process for this project.  
13 In conclusion, as we've learnt from past flood control and  
14 water management projects in the Florida Everglades and the  
15 Mississippi river system and most recently in the aftermath  
16 of hurricane Katrina, development decisions often carry  
17 devastating and unintended consequences. Long Island Sound  
18 is an ecosystem that is equally as important for wildlife  
19 and for the people as is the Everglades and Mississippi  
20 river. We have the opportunity now to learn from past  
21 mistakes as we consider whether to cite energy facilities in  
22 Long Island Sound. Answering these questions is essential  
23 if we are to ensure that proposed Broadwater facility is  
24 consistent with preserving the long-term ecological health  
25 and well being of Long Island Sound and all of its species

1 including humans that depend upon it. Thank you very much.

2 (Applause)

3 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be Pat Dugan  
4 followed by Bruce Weihart.

5 MR. DUGAN: Gentlemen, putting that floating of  
6 the natural gasses on Long Island Sound. Economically  
7 speaking, it would hurt all commercial fishermen, our  
8 marinas, and our local boating industry. Security wise, it  
9 would be like taking one of us over here, covering us with a  
10 giant bull's eye and asking us to take our chances, welcome  
11 back and forth in a shooting range. Environmentally  
12 speaking, any disturbance to the floor bed, any biocides,  
13 any kind of chemical release in there would be a severe  
14 detriment to the Sound and one that would be long lasting.  
15 I ask you, LNG facility, our Sound, our estuary, the two  
16 just don't go together; please don't do it. Thank you.

17 (Applause)

18 MR. STAEGER: Thank you, next speaker will be  
19 Bruce Weihart followed by Richard Weisberg.

20 MR. WHICHARD: Good evening. My name is Bruce  
21 Whichard, W-H-I-C-H-A-R-D. Thank you for allowing the  
22 public to voice opinions about the Broadwater project. I  
23 was born, raised, and currently reside in the New York  
24 metropolitan area. I have made and continued to make my  
25 living on the sea. I am United States Coast Guard licensed

1 marine engineer and I have worked on Liquefied Natural Gas  
2 carriers for over 11 years. The transportation of LNG has  
3 an excellent safety and environmental record. LNG can be  
4 handled, stored, and transported in a safe and secure  
5 manner. During my 11 years on LNG carriers, I worked for  
6 the New York based energy transportation corporation. I  
7 also worked for the Stamford based Pronav ship management  
8 company, which operates fleets of LNG carriers throughout  
9 the world. The LNG carriers I worked on loaded Liquefied  
10 Natural Gas from liquefaction plants in Indonesia and  
11 discharged liquefied natural gas to re-gasification plants  
12 in Japan. In Japan, the ships pulled in to shore side  
13 terminals and discharge the LNG into the re-gasification  
14 plants. These 125,000 cubic meter ships and the re-  
15 gasification facilities are within 1 mile, residential Japan  
16 communities and have been for decades. I have reviewed many  
17 of the documents on Broadwater's website. It is my  
18 understanding that the terminal would consist of a ship like  
19 vessel moored in the deep waters of Long Island Sound. This  
20 receiving terminal would be staffed by workers round the  
21 clock just like our ships are.

22 I consider Broadwater's re-gasification plant to  
23 be basically a stationary ship. This floating storage and  
24 re-gasification unit would be very similar to the re-  
25 gasification facilities that my LNG ships pulled into while

1 we were discharging in Japan. The main difference is that  
2 the Japan facility was on land and that was located within 1  
3 mile, like I said, of residential communities. Broadwater's  
4 re-gasification plant on the other hand will be 9-1/2 miles  
5 from the closest residential area. Natural gas is safe to  
6 transport and store provided that there are qualified people  
7 handling and transporting it. Do I consider the  
8 transportation of LNG safe? Yes, when my father entered into  
9 retirement some years back, he wanted to see what I actually  
10 did for a living. So I took my father on board my LNG ship  
11 for a trip. He stayed for 2 trips and sailed for over a  
12 month with us. If I did not think it was safe, would I ever  
13 let my father or any of my family members ever step one foot  
14 on an LNG vessel? I hope FERC will consider my comments on  
15 the safety and security of LNG transportation operation as  
16 it considers the Broadwater application. Thank you.

17 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker would be Richard  
18 Weisberg followed by John.

19 MR. WEISBERG: My name is Dick Weisberg. I am  
20 the State Legislative Director for the recreational fishing  
21 lines. I have a few brief comments but first I'd like to  
22 bring to FERC's attention the economic impact to the  
23 recreational fishery in Connecticut because it's of  
24 relevance to my subsequent comments. As a general  
25 proposition, recreational fisheries can provide norms and

1 economic benefits to coastal communities and the  
2 contribution by marine recreational fishermen to the economy  
3 of Connecticut is extremely significant. The marine  
4 recreational fishery in Connecticut supports a huge,  
5 diverse, economic infrastructure including party and charter  
6 boats, guide services, bait and tackle shops, hoarding goods  
7 stores, boat sales and repairs, marine supply houses, gas  
8 stocks, marinas, retail food stores, restaurants, hotels, as  
9 well as local manufacturers, fishing boats tacking gear.  
10 According to the Connecticut BEP in 1997, there were 300,000  
11 marine recreational fishes and Connecticut spent a total of  
12 \$158 million on marine recreational fishing. This  
13 expenditure had an overall economic impact, they have the  
14 multiplier effects where \$320 million generated 4000 jobs in  
15 correlative state income and sales taxes. The point is that  
16 these marine recreational fishing expenditures are a  
17 function of marine recreational fishing opportunities.

18 If these opportunities are diminished, economic  
19 damage ensues. In one way, to diminish marine recreational  
20 fishing opportunities is to diminish the access of marine  
21 recreational fishes to their traditional fishing ground.  
22 Therein lie some of our concerns. As Captain Martin  
23 explained, we are going to have 2 to 3 tankers accessing the  
24 Sound through the Race at least 2 to 3 for opens, I assume.  
25 Each of these vessels will be surrounded by a rolling

1 exclusionary zone of approximately 3 to 6 square miles and  
2 we have no idea how this is going to work or how it's going  
3 to be enforced. The point is that the Race and the Eastern  
4 Long Island Sound is one of the premier fishing grounds on  
5 the East Coast. On any of the given day, you are going to  
6 have hundreds of recreational fishing boats in that area,  
7 many private owned but also others, small water dependent  
8 fishing businesses in the nature of charter and party boats  
9 and this process or proposal is going to hit -- inhibit  
10 fishing because it's going to create, at the very least  
11 uncertainty, people are not going to be willing to pump down  
12 the amount of money, they go fishing in the Race or Eastern  
13 Long Island Sound, if they can't, they have some assurance  
14 that their fishing days are going to be disrupted by being  
15 routed from their favorite fishing hole.

16 So this could -- this proposal has -- carries a  
17 little bit, the potential for the destruction, it's  
18 potentially destructive to all quality of life, potentially  
19 destructive to many water dependent small businesses and has  
20 the potential for reducing marine recreational fishing  
21 expenditures with attendant economic damage particularly in  
22 the coastal communities in Eastern Connecticut. Now, how  
23 are you going to address yet the exclusionary zone and  
24 that's going to be brought about by the facility itself,  
25 which I imagine is going to be huge, I mean, Captain Martin,



1 I don't expect you are going to be able to deter a  
2 waterborne attack on the facility if you only have a half  
3 mile or a mile and they are not going to be using Boston  
4 Whalers with 70 horsepower engine, but I can't address that  
5 but we imagine that that exclusionary zone is going to be  
6 huge and it's going to carry with it the impacts or extend  
7 the adverse impacts that I've already addressed. Thank you  
8 very much.

9 (Applause)

10 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be Ken Warner  
11 followed by Michael Ball. Ken Warner? We'll go to Michael  
12 Ball next please followed by John Andrews. Well, we'll go  
13 with John Andrews.

14 MR. ANDREWS: Good evening gentlemen. My name is  
15 John Andrews, I am a U.S. Coast Guard license chief engineer  
16 and former commander O5 in the United States Naval Reserve.  
17 I have worked on LNG ships for well over 20 years. I  
18 started my career on LNG tankers with the El Paso Natural  
19 Gas Company out of Texas. El Paso ran membrane-type LNG  
20 vessels, which protect the LNG cargo tanks by a series of 2  
21 still hauls, also with insulation about a meter thick and 2  
22 stainless steel membranes. For approximately 15 years  
23 afterwards, I worked on the LNG tankers for the New York  
24 based energy transportation corporation and Pronav ship  
25 management out of Greenwich and then Stamford, Connecticut.

1 Over my 20 years as a shipboard engineer on LNG carriers, I  
2 have been responsible for all aspects of safe and secure  
3 handling of LNG. The transportation of LNG has an excellent  
4 safety and environmental record. I believe that LNG  
5 carriers are the safest type of tank vessels provided that  
6 qualified people operated this. I have been through every  
7 nook and cranny of LNG carriers whether at sea, during the  
8 construction and building phases of LNG vessels and the  
9 shipyards and during schedule maintenance overhauls in ports  
10 all over the world. Broadwater's re-gasification plant  
11 would be considered the stationery ship. Indeed the ABS or  
12 American Bureau of Shipping has been involved with the plans  
13 and specs for the FSRU.

14 The proposed Broadwater FSRU would be constructed  
15 at shipyard, towed to a site in the Sound and attached to a  
16 Yoke mooring system, which would be supported by a tower  
17 structure. The yoke will be designed to hold both the FSRU  
18 and the LNG carrier. The yoke is well proven technology and  
19 will be designed to hold the FSRU even during the most  
20 severe conditions that would be experienced in the Sound.  
21 As I have stated, natural gas is safe to transport and store  
22 provided that they are qualified and well-trained people  
23 handling and transporting it. Throughout my career, the  
24 corporate officials who own the LNG carriers had no problem  
25 ever sailing aboard the vessels along with passengers,

1 dignitaries, and family members of the crew. That tells me  
2 the corporates and the insurance underwriters believe that  
3 the ships were being operated safely and that the carriage  
4 of LNG can indeed be handled and transported safely. I hope  
5 the FERC will consider my comments on the safety and  
6 security of LNG transportation operations as it considers  
7 the Broadwater application. Thank you.

8 MR. STAEGER: Next will be Denise and I apologize  
9 Sabageau followed by Cheryl Danson.

10 MS. SABAGEAU: Good evening, this is Denise  
11 Sabageau, S-A-B-A-G-E-A-U. I am a conservation director for  
12 the town of Greenwich, and I am here on behalf of the  
13 conservation commission for the town, which is voted to  
14 strongly oppose the industrialization of Long Island Sound,  
15 a nationally recognized estuary. I think it is fitting and  
16 perhaps a little bit ironic that we are here this evening  
17 this week as we get ready to celebrate National Estuary Day,  
18 September 24, 2005.

19 As maybe before we have said, estuaries are  
20 significant resources in terms of biodiversity, they rival  
21 rainforest in terms of productivity. Well, because of their  
22 location where freshwater meets saltwater, their course or  
23 affiliation, they are into threat and particularly in areas  
24 like this where there's so many humans living in such close  
25 proximity. One of the things that I've been working on in

1 my professional life with water-ship management and non-  
2 point source pollution, we are working very high to clean up  
3 Long Island Sound and have a lot of programs in place to do  
4 this. There's a lot of money that's been put into these  
5 programs but what's the point of looking at land use  
6 regulations, which we are required by the environmental  
7 protection agency to file. Regulating land use if we can't  
8 regulate the use on our waters, if we can't zone our waters.

9 (Applause)

10 MS. SABAGEAU: It seems that's in direct conflict  
11 the mandates under the Clean Water Act. There's a lot of  
12 comments that have been made tonight and I don't want to  
13 repeat them. I'm going to go to one of the areas that I  
14 know the best and what I'm concerned about. My training as  
15 an environmental economist is going to be an environmental  
16 impact statement and I'm extremely concerned because a lot  
17 of the environmental impact statements I've read are very  
18 light on the cost benefit analysis. We don't have a  
19 regional energy plant, how do you define the benefit that  
20 will be accrued to us from putting in an LNG facility in  
21 Long Island Sound if we don't know what place in a regional  
22 plant.

23 When you do a cost-benefit analysis it's not just  
24 about the cost of construction versus the sale of gas,  
25 there's a lot of information we need here. One of the key

1 components of the cost-benefit analysis -- some of those  
2 intangible things or some of those things always the hardest  
3 and that has to do with the security issues. What's the  
4 cost of security, what are the risks, and who benefits --  
5 who, I should say, who shoulders the burden of those risks?  
6 We have heard a lot about the 100-year storm event. One of  
7 the things that needs to be considered, if you are involved  
8 with FEMA, everyone knows the standard 100-year storm does  
9 not mean that it happened once in a 100 years. The  
10 definition under FEMA for a 100-year storm is that there's a  
11 1 percent chance every year of a storm happening and a lot  
12 of people don't understand that distinction because I work  
13 with the federal government on float control on the  
14 Connecticut River, it's a very big distinction and people  
15 need to be aware of that, and I think when you look at a  
16 cost-benefit analysis, it needs to be taken into  
17 consideration.

18 In our region, you need to understand how  
19 important things are for us and some of the safety issues we  
20 deal with, we look at Katrina and what happened and some of  
21 those really hit home to an area where our highways are  
22 always congested. Evacuation is not even a consideration  
23 even though as a plan just like they had in New Orleans and  
24 I'm just going to show you briefly this anecdote I had from  
25 someone who worked in the mental health field and is in

1 charge of a group home. When he saw it happen at Katrina he  
2 basically looked at it and said, you know, we have a plan  
3 for evacuation and we have no idea how to implement this.  
4 Our first responders in this region are constantly dealing  
5 with updating their plans, going through all kinds of  
6 maneuvers and practices but the reality of the situation is,  
7 on Long Island Sound we have a catastrophe.

8 You have 8 million people and no way to get them  
9 out. And so when you laid the environmental costs or the  
10 environmental risks, we have to say who shoulders the risks  
11 and again it's going to be that vulnerable part of our  
12 society, and so the challenge in an environmental impact  
13 statement is to weigh the benefit of a natural gas facility  
14 and as part of a regional energy plant, and how that fits in  
15 and the costs associated with a vulnerable population, and  
16 as you said the consequences of what would happen if we had  
17 that large storm event. Thank you.

18 (Applause)

19 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be Cheryl Dunson.

20 MR. DUNSON: Good evening, I am Cheryl Dunson, D-  
21 U-N-S-O-N, Vice President of Public Issues of the The League  
22 of Women Voters of Connecticut. The League of Women Voters  
23 is a non-partisan public policy organization committed to  
24 effective public policy through education and action. Since  
25 the 1970s, the League has believed that governmental

1 policies and programs must promote resource conservation,  
2 stewardship, reduction of energy growth rates, and renewable  
3 energy sources. The League of Women Voters of Connecticut  
4 urges that this application be denied when it is filed and I  
5 will shorten my comments based on other speakers' previous  
6 remarks. First we opposed this project because we believe  
7 that the benefit of Broadwater does not outweigh the risk  
8 and the League thoroughly reviewed PAWSA and the 24 risk  
9 factors to waterway safety in Long Island Sound as well as  
10 the mitigation measures currently in place to redress those  
11 risks.

12 The League believes the results clearly support  
13 the rejection of this proposal. Only 6 or 25 percent of the  
14 risk factors reviewed is adequately addressed by existing  
15 strategies. For the remaining 18 or 75 percent of the  
16 identified risks, the strategy is reviewed either  
17 unanimously as ineffective or there is a lack of consensus  
18 on the effectiveness of the strategies. Among the  
19 recommendations offered to reduce existing risks were  
20 increased staffing, increased funding, improved enforcement  
21 and the need for coordinated emergency preparedness and  
22 public evacuation plans. How and when or even whether these  
23 recommendations would be implemented is unknown. All those  
24 citizens can count on the Coast Guard in times of emergency.  
25 We believe that avoiding such emergencies in the first place

1 should be the priority. As has been already identified,  
2 Broadwater would jeopardize an estuary of national  
3 significance as well as the estimated \$5 billion per year to  
4 the regional economy. As Attorney General Bloomenthal also  
5 noted based on the PAWSA report, Long Island Sound is a  
6 fragile ecosystem.

7           The potential of contamination from a natural  
8 disaster such as a hurricane or a manmade disaster either  
9 through omission or commission would be devastating. The  
10 best protection is to not to improve the project in the  
11 first place. Finally, energy conservation, not consumption,  
12 these are our comments referred to in particular. It must  
13 be the cornerstone of a strategic energy plan and policy.  
14 League of Women Voters adopted a position supporting energy  
15 conservation as a national policy in 1975. We believe it's  
16 long overdue for the Department of Energy and the Federal  
17 Energy Regulatory Commission to do the same. For example,  
18 just 2 weeks ago, New York and Connecticut along with 12  
19 other states in the city have filed a lawsuit against the  
20 Department of Energy for failing to enact tougher energy  
21 requirements mandated by Congress for 22 common appliances.  
22 In the suit, it spotlights Department of Energy estimates  
23 that stricter standards would result in annual energy  
24 savings meeting the needs of 3 to 12 million households and  
25 electricity savings would equal the input of over 13 large



1 power plants. The League urges also that FERC expand its  
2 vision as stated on its website. Reliable, affordable  
3 energy to reliance on competition and effective regulation  
4 is insufficient. The vision needs to recognize the critical  
5 role of conservation and producing reliable and affordable  
6 energy that protects the safety and economy and economic  
7 interests of the American public.

8 In conclusion, the League of Women voters  
9 believes that our resources must be conserved and protected  
10 to assure their future availability, this holds for Long  
11 Island Sound as well as our sources of energy and we believe  
12 that Broadwater is not a Sound project and should be denied.

13 (Applause)

14 MR. STAEGER: It looks like we are now about half  
15 way through the speakers' list, so would anyone have an  
16 interest in taking just a quick break?

17 SPEAKER: No. I think we'll go home.

18 MR. STAEGER: All right. We'll keep going.  
19 Let's back up and see if either Ken Warner or Michael Ball  
20 is in the room. There is Larry Smith followed by David  
21 Carmody.

22 SPEAKER: Could you tell us how many more  
23 speakers are there?

24 MR. STAEGER: About 34, 35.

25 SPEAKER: How many we have had so far?

1                   SPEAKER: Number 36 and I have by myself that  
2 count.

3                   MR. STAEGER: Well, we had the elected officials  
4 earlier and that was they went first with about 17 or 18  
5 there. We've got still 40 roughly. Larry Smith?

6                   MR. SMITH: I thought the day would never come.  
7 Hi, my name is Larry Smith, I'm a voter against Broadwater  
8 and I'm representing the New Haven Yacht Club, which is  
9 chuck full of voters against Broadwater, and boy, what to  
10 say about this. I think -- I rather -- they're just -- I  
11 think that I really have to voice the concern that I think a  
12 lot of people have but maybe are too polite to say, or feel  
13 it's not the right thing to say. But my concern is that I'm  
14 a little worried that this process is rigged. You know, and  
15 rigged against the people, in particular, in this area.

16                   (Applause)

17                   MR. SMITH: I -- my concern is that it's being  
18 presented as -- well, it is this technical aspect, it's the  
19 safety aspect and then there's the environmental aspect and  
20 we have different people, different -- we have the Coast  
21 Guard considering the safety, we have -- we have our own  
22 environmental impact study, and we're evaluating this on  
23 purely technical grounds.

24                   But basically, the real question here is, are the  
25 people in the -- in this area who are supposedly the

1 beneficiaries of this project, in other words, to get this  
2 oil, to get -- I'm sorry, to get this natural gas,  
3 increasing our natural gas supply, are we really being given  
4 the opportunity to say, "Well, wait a minute. Do we want to  
5 take the risks that are being posed here?"

6 And certainly, I -- what more can we say about  
7 the risk, I mean, every way you look there are -- there are  
8 all these risks. Do we really want to take these risks for  
9 the sake of having an increased supply of natural gas for  
10 maybe 20 more years, or 30 years, who knows. But or will,  
11 would we rather really protect our Sound and have a -- and  
12 really engage in a public debate on -- as people have been  
13 saying here, on an energy plan that makes sense for this  
14 region.

15 In other words we -- sooner or later we have to  
16 get off of -- of this dependence on foreign oil. Are we  
17 going to spring this out for another 20 years and destroy  
18 our Sound in the process? It just doesn't make sense to a  
19 lot of us here. And I really hope that you -- you can take  
20 that in and recognize it that if you, as a member of FERC --  
21 have been given this authority, which seems to me  
22 completely against our whole democratic tradition of being  
23 able to ultimately decide whether this -- this goes forward  
24 or not, regardless of what the people in this room or the  
25 people in Connecticut, the people in -- on Long Island, the

1 people in New York, regardless of what we all feel.

2 I really hope you'll take -- you'll recognize,  
3 you have a very delicate responsibility here and you have to  
4 consider more than just technical aspects of this. This is  
5 really a big question.

6 (Applause)

7 MR. STAEGER: Next will be David Carmody,  
8 followed by Mary Margaret Visnic.

9 MR. CARMODY: Good evening, I'm David Carmody.  
10 I'm a U.S. Coast Guard Licensed Chief Engineer and I have  
11 worked in the liquefied natural gas -- for over 20 years. I  
12 have sailed in every officer rating in the engine room, up  
13 until reaching and sailing as Chief Engineer on the LNG  
14 ships operated by Energy Transportation Corporation of New  
15 York and Pronav Ship Management of Stamford, Connecticut.

16 Over my 20 years as a Ship Board Chief Engineer  
17 on LNG Vessels, I have been responsible for all aspects of  
18 safety and secure handling of the LNG. LNG can be safely  
19 transported and handled in a safe manner, provided qualified  
20 personnel are in charge of the operations. I have sailed  
21 new ships of the shipyard in Quincy. We went through all  
22 the re-gasification and all that, as Broadwater will have to  
23 go and do when they build their ship. And that can be done  
24 safely.

25 The proposed Broadwater FSRU would be constructed

1 in a shipyard, towed to the site. It will be -- will have  
2 the same equipment that a ship will have except it won't  
3 have a propeller. It would be moored safely by the yoke  
4 system, with a tower structure. When sailing aboard the LNG  
5 vessels, the work is live and work on the vessel for months  
6 at a time.

7 And in the Broadwater re-gasification plant, the  
8 same condition will be, the periods will be diminished a  
9 little bit, because of proximity to shore, but the workers  
10 will be there, living and working right on the vessel.  
11 Currently, I work as a contractor to Portland-Montreal  
12 Pipeline Corporation as a Pollution and Safety Advisor.  
13 What I do in the capacity is inspect and review the  
14 documents of inspection, all cargo handling equipment,  
15 mooring equipment, pump room conditions, engine room  
16 conditions to make sure that these ships come in and do what  
17 they're supposed to do, not endanger the environment.

18 I am one of the series of safety and security  
19 personnel that inspects cargo-operating procedures prior to  
20 the cargo transfers. I remain on-board the vessel  
21 throughout the entire transfer of Cargo. At the conclusion  
22 of the transfer, I make a performance evaluation for the  
23 terminal as well as the ship.

24 So that any problems that I see, they can correct  
25 and not till they happen in the future. The transfer of

1 fossil fuel, such as LNG should have the most effective  
2 safety and security procedures in place. I have also had --  
3 when I sailed on an LNG ship, my wife made several voyages  
4 with me, and same as a friend of mine, why would I have my  
5 wife come into a dangerous atmosphere, I wouldn't.

6 As I have stated natural gas is as safe to  
7 transport and store provided that there are qualified people  
8 handling and transporting it. I hope that FERC will  
9 consider my comments on the safety and security of LNG  
10 transportation operations, as it considers the Broadwater  
11 application, thank you very much.

12 MR. STAEGER: Next is Mary Margaret Visnic,  
13 followed by Gil Kelman.

14 MS. VISNIC: Hi, thank you. First, I want to say  
15 Kiki Kennedy is not here tonight and she wanted me to  
16 mention that. She attended the hearing last night and  
17 submitted her comments and strongly opposes the LNG  
18 facility. I'm not going to read what I've typed up here,  
19 I'm going to hand it in, I'm going to submit it, because  
20 it's already been repeated and some research that I had --  
21 had found out was about the -- in Algeria last year the LNG  
22 pipe -- plant explosion, which immediately killed 27 people.

23 But again, I'm going to hand this in. I did want  
24 to say, when I was driving here tonight I dropped my four  
25 children off at the soccer field, my husband and the other

1 coaches, and I was explaining to them where I was going  
2 tonight. And you know, why I have been on the computer and  
3 doing this research about LNG. And after the children left  
4 the car, I wondered would all of this matter, time the  
5 people have taken tonight, the years of these public  
6 hearings, the research, will it all matter? Will it be  
7 enough or is this energy company the winner and Long Island  
8 Sound the loser. I will not stop this by -- we will not  
9 stop. But for our children to fight and protect Long Island  
10 Sound, we must show them that we have a voice and it would  
11 be and will be considered, thank you.

12 (Applause)

13 MR. STAEGER: Next is Gil Kelman, followed by  
14 Doug VanLeuven.

15 MR. KELMAN: The only organization that I belong  
16 to is, I've been a citizen of the United States for 84  
17 years. I was number 23 at 7:20 -- 20 minutes to 7:00, I was  
18 23 on that list that you have before you. I believe that  
19 those people who have been working for the LNG industry are  
20 honest people. And I believe all the environmentalists are  
21 very honest people, and I would like to record the fact that  
22 I agree with everything the environmentalists have said.

23 (Applause)

24 MR. KELMAN: We are living in a very energy  
25 deprived nation. We are also living in a nation that has

1 changed its complexion since 9/11. And since 9/11, the  
2 present administration has brought us into conflict and has  
3 stimulated the fact that we are subject to terrorism. I  
4 heard people -- I heard a speaker here talked about the  
5 airfields that -- that are close to this big large  
6 commercial ones.

7 But I would like to remind you of just one thing.  
8 This little airport up here at -- called the -- near --,  
9 called the Griswold Airport. A couple of small airplanes  
10 piloted by a couple of crazy terrorists could make that 11-  
11 mile run, to that installation that's being proposed and  
12 wreak havoc to the populations of Long Island and  
13 Connecticut. It has happened, it happened in 9/11, it is  
14 easily possible to be done in a future date if this  
15 installation is installed.

16 I think that it's about time that we really  
17 looked at good energy planning and we're talking about Long  
18 Island Sound, a place where twice in a 24-hour period the  
19 tide rises and falls, 8 minutes -- 8 feet, excuse me.  
20 Nothing is being done to harness that great energy of Long  
21 Island Sound. And I think we'd be wiser spending a lot more  
22 money to harness new energy such as that than consider  
23 having a huge bomb in the 11-miles off the coast of  
24 Branford, thank you very much.

25 (Applause)



1                   MR. STAEGER: Next is Doug VanLeuven, and on Doug  
2                   (?) will be Marcia Wilkins.

3                   MR. VANLEUVEN: My name is Doug VanLeuven. Chief  
4                   --

5                   SPEAKER: Please spell your name for the record?

6                   MR. VANLEUVEN: My name is Doug VanLeuven. U.S.  
7                   Coast Guard certified Chief Engineer and cargo engineer for  
8                   LNG operations. I support the use of liquefied natural gas  
9                   because I believe it to be safer than nuclear power plants  
10                  and environmentally better than coal burning facilities.  
11                  Unlike oil, there is no residue. LNG just vaporizes and  
12                  becomes lighter than air. Natural gas is a more efficient  
13                  energy source as well. Each LNG vessel carries sufficient  
14                  natural gas to power the needs of a city of 75,000 for a  
15                  year.

16                  I began my career in late 1980 on LNG ships. I  
17                  have over 18 years of experience transporting LNG, from  
18                  liquefaction terminals to re-gasification terminals  
19                  worldwide. For 15 years, I transported LNG from Indonesia  
20                  to Japan. I spent another four years transporting LNG to  
21                  the United States, Europe, and Asia. The last five years  
22                  I've contracted with Pronav Ship Management of Greenwich and  
23                  then Stamford, Connecticut, for automation and controls  
24                  maintenance during the LNG ship dry docks.

25                  Broadwater's re-gasification and storage facility

1 is in essence just like an LNG ship, and instead of the  
2 facility being a ship moving from port to port, it's a  
3 stationary waterborne structure like a ship at anchor. Like  
4 a ship, Broadwater re-gasification plant would have housing  
5 on-board. The plant should be manned by professional  
6 workers on a watch-type rotation, day-in and day-out, just  
7 like on a ship. The equipment and machinery on-board the  
8 re-gasification facility would either be the same or nearly  
9 identical to the type of marine equipment and machinery on-  
10 board a ship.

11 LNG transportation has been proven to be safe, so  
12 long as the people handling and transporting the natural gas  
13 have the requisite training and qualifications. I was  
14 aboard when we delivered the 8000th row (?) from Indonesia  
15 to Japan. The Broadwater re-gasification and storage  
16 facility as well as transportation of LNG can be achieved in  
17 a safe manner providing that qualified personnel operate the  
18 facility.

19 What better way exists to guarantee the safety  
20 and security of these vessels than to crew them with  
21 Americans, certified by the U.S. Coast Guard, now part of  
22 homeland defense. There are hundreds of active officers in  
23 the American Merchant Marine, who like me, have decades of  
24 experience in the safe and reliable transportation of LNG.

25 I believe I can speak not only for myself but for

1 my shipmates in LNG transportation, who would welcome the  
2 opportunity to serve the citizens of Connecticut and New  
3 York by working to guarantee safe delivery and storage of  
4 LNG to the Broadwater terminal port project. I hope the  
5 FERC will consider my comments on the safety and the  
6 security of LNG transportation operations as it concerns  
7 Broadwater application, thank you.

8 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker is Marcia Wilkins  
9 followed by Henry Farcus, is Marcia here? We'll go to Henry  
10 Farcus.

11 MR. FARCUS: Thank you, my name is Henry Farcus,  
12 I'm a home owner, I'm a business owner, and I live three  
13 houses in from the Long Island Sound. I'm sure you can  
14 appreciate how much I'm concerned about Long Island Sound.  
15 I'm actually not anti-business, and I heat my home with  
16 natural gas. So I listen with interest to the proposal as  
17 much of it as I did here tonight.

18 And I found some of it interesting, but a point  
19 that may not have been considered is the money to build this  
20 facility would not be loaned to Broadwater by any banker,  
21 unless they had assurances that their assets would be  
22 returned to them in the event of the unexpected or even the  
23 unthinkable happening. And they get those assurances in the  
24 form of hard collateral that would be turned over to them in  
25 the event that plans did not work out as expected.

1           I think the same is only fair for the residents  
2 of the area surrounding Long Island Sound. I think everyone  
3 in this room will agree, no matter how they feel about the  
4 terminal, that the value of the Sound is inestimably greater  
5 than the value of the facility they're considering putting  
6 in front of it. And --

7           (Applause)

8           MR. FARCUS: And therefore, I'm proposing that  
9 before we even consider putting this platform in, that a  
10 trilateral commission be formed of industrialists, qualified  
11 environmentalists and scientists, including economists who  
12 by their training, their education and their discipline and  
13 experience are qualified to set a figure at the restoration  
14 of the Sound, in the event of a catastrophic happening, and  
15 I further propose that before we allow this thing to be  
16 built that Broadwater put up two-thirds of that value in  
17 assets and the remaining third be put into a fund for the  
18 restoration and reclamation of the Sound by a surcharge on  
19 the users of that product.

20           This is a heavy burden, but when the  
21 representatives of Broadwater go home from this meeting,  
22 undoubtedly they'll be going to their homes. The Sound is  
23 our home. It is not unfair to expect assurances as great as  
24 a banker would supply for just money, not only their home,  
25 thank you.

1 (Applause)

2 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. Next speaker will be  
3 Tom Callinan. Tom, I apologize, I sort of missed on that  
4 last person going by here to ask for a little extra time.

5 MR. CALLINAN: Good evening, every one. Thanks  
6 for hearing me. Tom Callinan, C-A-L-L-I-N-A-N, Clinton,  
7 Connecticut; life-long resident of Long Island Sound. I'm  
8 also the president of the Clinton Council of Associations,  
9 representing over 500 coastal residents. I'm the member of  
10 the Clinton Beach Association Board, a past president;  
11 former member of the Clinton Zoning Board of Appeals. I was  
12 the first Official State Troubadour here in Connecticut by a  
13 legislative action of the general assembly.

14 In the past 25 years, I've written over a dozen  
15 songs about -- about Long Island Sound and this is one that  
16 I just wrote recently called "Our water, not Broadwater."

17 (Applause)

18 MR. CALLINAN: Thank you. I'm also the co-owner  
19 of Crackerbarrel Entertainments with my wife, and everybody  
20 that I mentioned is all opposed to the Broadwater facility.  
21 Not necessarily to liquid natural gas but this thing is  
22 madness.

23 (SONG BEING SUNG BY SPEAKER.)

24 (Applause)

25 MR. CALLINAN: Thank you.

1                   MR. STAEGER: Thank you. Next will be Cheryl  
2 Morris, followed by Clark Broadbent.

3                   MS. MORRIS: Well, I don't know how you follow  
4 that. My name is Cheryl Morris, and I'm a lifelong Branford  
5 resident, and I'd like to publicly state that I am totally  
6 opposed to the LNG facility in Long Island and off the near  
7 coast of Branford. You don't need to be in the shipping  
8 business, or even a recreational boater to know that the  
9 Coast Guard's already overburdened with patrolling the Sound  
10 and rescuing boaters.

11                   Not only is the Coast Guard overburdened, it is  
12 my opinion it's under-funded. More money and resources will  
13 be needed to keep the Sound safe if this facility is allowed  
14 to be constructed. And who's going to pay for this extra  
15 security, taxpayers. What a deal for LNG, they make money,  
16 while the taxpayers foot the bill for securing their  
17 facility.

18                   As a former manager of people in commercial  
19 business, the personal safety of people always came first.  
20 Apparently, the safety of our citizens isn't a top priority  
21 for federal government. Unfortunately, we now live with the  
22 threat of terrorist attacks everyday. And we expect the  
23 federal government to do everything possible to protect us.

24                   Is this their idea of making us feel safe,  
25 putting a natural gas facility, the size of the Queen

1 Elizabeth, in our Sound? What an easy target for  
2 terrorists, and it wouldn't take much imagination to blow up  
3 this facility. I expect our federal government to protect  
4 its people and put them first, not private industry.

5 I hope everyone tonight speaks out loudly on  
6 their opposition to this facility, and obviously they did.  
7 In case our federal government officials have forgotten,  
8 government is supposed to be for the people, by the people.  
9 Our government needs to start listening to its citizens.  
10 I'd like to thank the U.S. Coast Guard for everything they  
11 do to ensure our safety, along the shores of our great  
12 nation, thank you.

13 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be Clark  
14 Broadbent followed by Harry Mishkin.

15 MR. BROADBENT: I'm Clark Broadbent, B-R-O-A-D-B-  
16 E-N-T. I'm with New Haven Yacht Club, but that's just a  
17 small part of what this is all about. I want to first talk  
18 for the Merchant Marine folks who've spoken, I have the  
19 highest regard for anyone who makes their living in, on, or  
20 around the water; partly, because I do that myself, not in  
21 that same capacity.

22 But I also have the same respect for the crews of  
23 the three aircraft that flew into buildings. Good  
24 intention, highly skilled, highly capable people in a  
25 horrible what if scenario. Well, thinking about coming down

1 to here today, I was online and I ran into couple of bits of  
2 correspondence; one of them from a gentleman named John  
3 Hritcko, who's Broadwater regional project director in  
4 response to some questions written by Senator Chuck Schumer.

5 The first had to do with experience and so on and  
6 to cut it down apparently, Broadwater folks, all the people  
7 are very experienced, very knowledgeable, very capable. The  
8 technology currently used in LNG industry today has been  
9 tried and tested for more than 40 years as safe operation.  
10 There is no unproven technology proposed for the Broadwater  
11 project.

12 The next question that Senator Schumer brought  
13 up, and this by the way was April 14th of this year, had to  
14 do with similar instances and/or other any similar parallel  
15 kinds of operations in a fragile ecosystem. Well, they came  
16 up with one in Brunei that runs on land; one in Gabon,  
17 that's on land; one in the U.K. which is on land; one in the  
18 Philippines, which is on land; one in the Netherlands, which  
19 is on land, and they've brought out Cove Point, which is an  
20 area 70 miles south of Washington, D.C., that is also on  
21 land.

22 Next question that was brought up was, are there  
23 any bad things that have happened? One of them was at Cope  
24 Point. A question that was also brought up, and I'm going  
25 to skip, thank you for your reminder, sir, to question 12,



1 "Are there anything flammable on these boats, such as  
2 polystyrene or polyurethane?" Well, there is, they're  
3 double hulled boats. IMO and the IGC have great regulations  
4 and the Coast Guard is doing everything it can do.

5 But a question that was raised by Senator --  
6 Congressman Markey, in the worst what if scenario, and I've  
7 got it right down to the quick here. "The Coast Guard in  
8 the light of 9/11, is there any plan by the department or --  
9 and this is response from a young lady, a Pamela J. Turner,  
10 assistant secretary for legislative affairs in the  
11 Department of Homeland Security.

12 The question was, "In the light of the 9/11  
13 threat, is there any plan by the Department of the Coast  
14 Guard to review safety standards of applicable LNG carriers,  
15 having to do with installation of polyurethane and  
16 polystyrene?" Again, it came down there is no applicable  
17 standard.

18 There is no way for them to know what they're  
19 doing particularly, what it comes down ultimately,  
20 gentlemen, the question, "Is the department studying whether  
21 design changes might be needed to better protect LNG tankers  
22 from threats of terrorism or sabotage or to mitigate the  
23 consequences of such attacks?" The answer, "I assure you  
24 that the department and the Coast Guard take LNG vessel  
25 safety and security with the utmost seriousness. The

1 Department recognizes that the LNG -- the role that the LNG  
2 plays in our national energy picture." They go on to say,  
3 "A significant LNG vessel casualty or a terrorist incident  
4 is simply unacceptable, simply unacceptable. I appreciate  
5 your interest, thank you very much."

6 (Applause)

7 MR. STAEGER: Next will be Harry Mishkin. Harry  
8 Mishkin followed by Adrian Little. Harry Mishkin's still  
9 here? Let's go with Adrian Little, followed by Lee Weiner.

10 MR. LITTLE: Now, I know what the after-lunch  
11 speaker feels like it is two-day conference. Adrian Little,  
12 I am here as a citizen of the State of Connecticut. I am  
13 also representing a thousand citizens of the town of  
14 Westport as the Vice Commodore of the Minuteman Yacht Club,  
15 and I'm also the spokesperson for the Save the Sound's  
16 Boaters Against Broadwater Initiative.

17 Speaking hopefully on behalf of all 112,000  
18 voters in the state of Connecticut, and those are boaters  
19 and voters by the way, gentlemen. Much of what I was going  
20 to say, actually was preempted by Capt. Boynton, very early  
21 this evening, in his comments about exclusion zones as they  
22 impact us as recreational boaters. So I will not rehash  
23 that, other than to say for the record that in the initial  
24 documentation provided by Broadwater, there is identified an  
25 area referred to as the tanker maneuvering zone, which as

1 best I could identify is about 5 miles in diameter.

2 But I will respect the fact the exclusion zones  
3 have not been completely identified but I think it behooves  
4 the public to know that they are going to be there and they  
5 are going to be significant. An exclusion zone of 5 miles  
6 in this particular area approximates to one-third of the  
7 distance across the Sound, which I would hope that -- the  
8 budding communities would certainly find an egregious  
9 incursion on our freedom to move around the Sound.

10 But I'm not naive enough to think that the  
11 opinions necessarily of boaters is going to sway the  
12 decision of anybody, but what I think every citizen should  
13 be outraged about is the fact that any part of the Long  
14 Island Sound should be taken away from its public trust and  
15 public use and given over to private enterprise. I mean,  
16 this is our water, not Broadwater.

17 (Applause)

18 MR. LITTLE: And that exclusion zone, as a  
19 gentleman spoke earlier, will extend all the way up to the  
20 rise and in fact out to Monto (phonetic) point and Judith  
21 Point, which is where the pilot station is, where these  
22 boats will be -- the tankers will be made.

23 I would like to close by just quoting from a  
24 paper presented to the Connecticut Maritime Association of  
25 which I am a member, titled "LNG terminal safety restricting

1 community perceptions," and this is written by the head of  
2 risk assessment services for Lloyd's Register and I quote.

3 "To date, the scientific arguments put forth by  
4 the LNG industry have been poorly made with an over-reliance  
5 on cold numbers and facts. Even if numbers demonstrate that  
6 an accident is unlikely, or the consequence is negligible,  
7 if the link between LNG and a major accident can be  
8 imagined, then often this belief can carry a lot more weight  
9 than the scientific facts. For the general public,  
10 plausibility usually beats absence of scientific evidence.

11 "This is even more relevant when those providing  
12 the facts are generally not trusted even to the extent that  
13 if too good an argument is made, then there is a suspicion  
14 that this is being done to cover up the truth. Much of the  
15 problem lies in that the local communities exposed to  
16 changes in voluntary, the benefits of the new terminal are  
17 perceived as being mainly to the good of the LNG industry  
18 and that the community, should anything go wrong with  
19 safety, the environment or an increasingly industrialized  
20 neighborhood, then the local community has little ability to  
21 escape or change things for the better.

22 Gentlemen, I join with every other speaker who's  
23 preceded me in asking you to oppose this project, thank you.

24 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. Next speaker is Lee  
25 Weiner, followed by Robert Bjornsson, (Phonetic).

1           MR. WEINER: Thank you. It's Lee W-E-I-N-E-R,  
2 and I was going to -- I was originally going to read the e-  
3 mail that I received from Senator Dodd, but it was more  
4 eloquently done by his representative earlier. So I have a  
5 couple of notes, if I may run through them. One is, and I  
6 must thank the Coast Guard for being as patient as those  
7 guys have monitored Channel 16, 24 hours a day and have to  
8 listen to those "I'm stuck" things.

9           I would like, first -- in your comments to strike  
10 offshore in referring to the mooring of this proposed barge,  
11 Long Island Sound is not offshore. Any waste disposal  
12 comments, whatever else, any charts you read, Long Island is  
13 not offshore, the oceans is offshore. This is our -- the  
14 second is, when you weigh risk, you weigh risk against some  
15 sort of benefit. That benefit or that opportunity can be  
16 very arbitrary and very qualitative.

17           And if an authority says, "We need this," and we  
18 don't know that we need this gas necessarily, because  
19 shortages come and go. You're going to weigh a risk against  
20 10 lives, a 1000 lives, a 100,000 lives, who knows, but  
21 somebody up there will say, "This is the problem, okay,  
22 that's the cost, so be it."

23           Excuse me. The Energy Bill was recently passed  
24 by the way. The purpose of the importation of LNG and a  
25 government mandate to put plants where it wants is not

1 because there is a desperate shortage of natural gas  
2 necessarily, but to drive down the price of domestic natural  
3 gas, I've heard it and that's a fact.

4 I say we may find out in a year or two years or  
5 five years. So we've got lots of natural gas here. We dug  
6 a few more holes, and life is fine and we've got this thing  
7 floating on Long Island Sound. And by the way if anybody  
8 wants an example -- thank you. Anybody wants an example of  
9 what it's like having a large ship floating in Long Island  
10 Sound, there is a coal ship that is -- or coal ships that  
11 are virtually, perpetually anchored off Bridgeport.

12 Because apparently, it's cheaper to get coal from  
13 China and anchor ships off that are too large to get in  
14 Bridgeport harbor than it is to get domestic coal. I don't  
15 know what that deal is, but there's always a ship there.  
16 Any boater who is curious what this thing might look like  
17 can go sailing off to Bridgeport at any time and there is --  
18 especially at night, and find out what a real hazard to  
19 navigation is, thank you.

20 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker would be Robert  
21 Bjornsson, and on deck is number 36, and, I guess, Wendy  
22 Hansen is up.

23 MS. HANSEN: Well, I have many concerns, a lot  
24 have been talked about. Number one, is safety. I was born  
25 in Long Island and moved to Old Saybrook, Connecticut, where

1 I grew up until I was 18, and then I moved to Florida and  
2 lived on the water there, and now, I'm back in Branford, and  
3 lived here almost 20 years. I don't live on the water, I  
4 wish I could afford to, but I do use it. I have children,  
5 grand children.

6 I have biked it, I have swam it, I have fished  
7 it, I have crabbed it, I have water-skied it, I have sailed  
8 it. I have body boarded it, I have windsurfed it, I have,  
9 you know, kayaked it, I've done everything on this Long  
10 Island Sound, and I just cannot, for the life of me,  
11 understand why anybody would be wanting to do this and if  
12 they do do it, I think they ought to pay us, the taxpayers,  
13 of all of the surrounding Long Island Sound to have this  
14 thing put in the middle of our Long Island Sound, and how  
15 dare they think they can restrict it whether it's one mile,  
16 five miles; it's unconceivable to me.

17 You know, Port Jeff is going right through that  
18 I'm sure, you know. I mean, how is that not going to, you  
19 know, that ferry from Bridgeport to Port Jeff, I mean, I  
20 just -- I -- it's just so inconceivable that this can even  
21 be happening and to think that the Coast Guard -- if you  
22 guys ever went to our Coast Guard base in New Haven -- in  
23 the New Haven Harbor, it is the smallest little Coast Guard  
24 base I've ever seen in my life, how in the world are they  
25 ever, ever going to take care of a big huge monstrosity like

1 this that they're proposing. I mean, wake up.

2 I just don't know what, you know, how am I going  
3 to bring my kids to be able to play in the sand, you know.  
4 If this goes through, I just cannot fathom anybody going  
5 through with okaying this and being supportive of it, and I  
6 do have to give these guys that work on these LNG boats  
7 their due, where I'm sure they -- they're on it all the  
8 time, and they do what they do and they do very good at what  
9 they do, but I just am too fearful of the "what if," you  
10 know, with the terrorists out here and just anybody for that  
11 matter.

12 I mean, you just -- it's so easy for something to  
13 go wrong and for lives to be taken and, you know, the  
14 environmental issues -- all the people that make a living on  
15 the shore, you know, in this Long Island Sound, it just -- I  
16 just can't understand how you could let this go through and  
17 I hope that you are listening to us, thank you.

18 MR. STAEGER: I believe, the next speaker is Jim  
19 Clifford.

20 MR. CLIFFORD: Good evening, my name is Jim  
21 Clifford, I'm a resident of Milford, I also am a summer  
22 resident at Mansfield grove in East Haven. I'm a teacher,  
23 I'm a husband, I'm a father of two children who love  
24 swimming in Long Island Sound, and I'm also an attorney.

25 I came here with a very open mind, because I



1 realized that there is a need for natural gas, but I don't  
2 know the full extent of it, and I'm looking to you, the  
3 members of FERC to persuade us that there really is an  
4 overwhelming persuasive demand that would justify the  
5 catastrophic risks we're facing.

6 I looked at this document -- I downloaded the  
7 document from the Broadwater website, which appears to be  
8 the Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact  
9 Statement dated, August 11, 2005, and looking through this,  
10 I put on my lawyer's eye glasses and I'd like to ask FERC a  
11 couple of questions. I don't understand why only New York  
12 State is included as an invited participant in this and not  
13 the State of Connecticut. I see that there's a line that it  
14 shows it in New York waters.

15 If you're going to guarantee me that the tankers  
16 that will access the LNG FSRU facility will only travel in  
17 New York waters, I can perhaps live with that, but I suspect  
18 that those tankers with their floating security zones are  
19 also going through Connecticut waters and Capt. Boynton, and  
20 the rest of the Coast Guard, I urge you to go through the  
21 chain of command and I would like to see the State of  
22 Connecticut as a full participant in this process; that's my  
23 first request.

24 My second request is, I'm looking at the cost  
25 benefit analysis, and I see on page 6 of the Environmental

1       Impact Statement, or actually this is an intent to file an  
2       Environmental Impact Statement. I see a list of -- a very  
3       long list of items, which I guess, FERC has identified as  
4       potential impacts. Now, as the gentleman said briefly, an  
5       impact or a risk is only half the equation.

6                If you're going to do your job as a public  
7       servant, if you're going to prove to me and to my children  
8       and to everyone else here that this facility is justified, I  
9       would like a hard dollar figure on each of those items and  
10      then I'm going to take that figure and I'm going go to the  
11      elected officials who are here tonight and I want to ask  
12      them to go to Congress and push through a bill as quickly as  
13      this Energy Bill went through and I want to see a bond  
14      posted by the Broadwater coalition that will pay for all the  
15      damage that maybe done in the event of a natural disaster or  
16      an act of terrorism or some other cause.

17               As the gentleman said before, bankers demand  
18      that. I think the public has the right to that as well.  
19      The third point I'd like to make goes to the risk analysis.  
20      I heard the gentlemen speak from the merchant marines and I  
21      understand what they're saying, but with all due respect,  
22      that applies to the pre 9/11 world. Post 9/11, it's not the  
23      issue of having qualified personnel handling the docking  
24      station, it's much more than that. We are opening ourselves  
25      up as a tremendous target and Capt. Boynton, if I heard you

1       correctly, you assessed the risk, you assessed the  
2       vulnerability, you assessed the threat; the vulnerability  
3       and the consequences of the impact.

4               All three of those to me seem exceptionally high  
5       and off the charts with over several thousand commercial  
6       vessels traveling through Long Island Sound. And I heard up  
7       to 200,000 other ships traveling through Long Island Sound  
8       on a daily basis. I don't see anyway that a Coast Guard  
9       even with 10 times your resources could adequately safeguard  
10      this facility and the people who live along the shores.

11              And I will be following this, and I'll be  
12      following this and I mention I'm also a teacher, and I have  
13      120 students who will be following this as in active civics.  
14      We want our students to learn about participation. You'll  
15      be hearing from them and from me. And one last comment.  
16      I'd like to quote our President George Bush, because I want  
17      you to understand how your commander-in-chief sees the risk  
18      here. And to paraphrase George Bush, "You have to be right  
19      a 100 percent of the time, but terrorists only have to be  
20      right one percent." That's a hell of a burden. And I have  
21      tremendous faith in the coast guard, but I'm also a realist  
22      and I know that even if you have a 100 times the resources,  
23      I don't see how you could ever be right a 100 percent of the  
24      time as President Bush has stated. And lastly, because it's  
25      such a heavy topic and it's late and I'm tired and everyone

1 else is too, I'd like to offer another option here for  
2 Broadwater and also for the Commissioner of FERC.

3 I would like them to demonstrate since we heard  
4 how safe the facility is, and Long Island Sound is a  
5 beautiful place for recreation, I'd like to see them to  
6 amend their program to provide for the Broadwater Timeshare  
7 Program, and I would like the CEOs of the Broadwater  
8 facilities, RD Shell, USA LNG, and the third entity, which  
9 is TransCanada Pipelines Limited, I would like their CEOs to  
10 spend time on the Broadwater platform Timeshare, and they  
11 can host the Commissioner of FERC, so that you'll understand  
12 what it's like to be living in close proximity to the  
13 facility as we are. Thank you.

14 (Applause)

15 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker will be Michael  
16 Lutz followed by Mike Blakeslee. Michael Lutz, Mike  
17 Blakeslee, Morgan Zimmerman (phonetic), Larry Smith, Dave  
18 Stieneman, Mark De Fellese (phonetic), Gina Tracy --

19 SPEAKER: --

20 MR. STAEGER: Bingo.

21 SPEAKER: Bingo.

22 MS. TRACY: These are not my glasses, so -- my  
23 name is Gina Russell Tracy, and I live in Gilford with my  
24 husband, who is an emergency responder and my young son,  
25 whose future I am here to protect. I have a number of

1 questions for the Coast Guard regarding this or any such  
2 proposal for Long Island Sound. I don't want you to answer  
3 any of these questions publicly here tonight. I just hope  
4 to god that you have the answers for me.

5 As I understand that the issues presented to you  
6 by the executives at Broadwater are issues of capacity and  
7 size, since they propose the largest facility of its kind on  
8 the eastern seaport. First of all, regarding capacity, if  
9 the expansion ratio of liquefied natural gas is 600:1, how  
10 big do you estimate the cloud would be from a catastrophic  
11 release of 60,000 gallons? How many people are put at risk  
12 in the event of such a release? How about with the worst  
13 possible atmospheric conditions of wind and temperature and  
14 humidity? Forget the airplanes in 2001, or the truck-bombs  
15 in Oklahoma City and New York City in '90s, what would  
16 happen if a category 5 hurricane like our famous Katrina hit  
17 this facility? What about category 3 back in '38? What  
18 about a simple Northeastern like the ones that have flooded  
19 this shoreline in the last 10 or 20 years? Does our Coast  
20 Guard have the resources in Long Island Sound to keep this  
21 thing from running ashore if a storm -- when a storm tears  
22 it loose?

23 Moving on from capacity to size. Have you  
24 considered why the terrorists chose the Murray Building or  
25 the Pentagon or the World Trade Center? Does the FBI in New

1 Haven have the resources to handle a terrorist attack on  
2 this enormous target? Does the National Guard in  
3 Connecticut have the resources? Does the Coast Guard who is  
4 charged with protecting our coastline have the resources?

5 All it took in Oklahoma was a couple of guys with  
6 a Ryder truck and some stuff from Agway. What if the  
7 terrorists managed to get aboard this monstrosity, or ram it  
8 with a boat, any boat, or hit it with a missile, or fly a  
9 small plane right into it. What if a hurricane or tornado  
10 or earthquake struck it? Can you guarantee that the U.S.  
11 Coast Guard who protects our waters in Long Island Sound can  
12 protect us from any of these? As a matter of fact, what are  
13 the risks to all of us from a leak of this particular  
14 liquid? What about a catastrophic release of gas? What  
15 about an explosive release? And how do you stop the next  
16 project and the next project and the next project?

17 Can the United States Coast Guard handle all of  
18 the implications of Broadwater? Reject this proposal due to  
19 threats, vulnerability, and consequences. The Coast Guard's  
20 own criteria, the Coast Guard is charged to protect us. As  
21 a part of that 10 percent of our nation's population, stop  
22 this before we need you. On a personal note, my husband  
23 considered joining the Coast Guard in Santa Barbara,  
24 California in 1982. At the time I thought his job would be  
25 too dangerous. So instead, he became a hazardous materials

1 technician. Captain Martin referred for the needs for  
2 fireboats, hundreds? Are you going to fight these fires?  
3 Who is? Who is? The terrorists are hoping to god that you  
4 don't have the resources. We don't have the resources.  
5 They're right. We don't. Captain Martin, as an American  
6 citizen, I am asking you tonight to do the right thing.  
7 Thank you.

8 (Applause)

9 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. Next speaker will be  
10 Peter Brown. That will be followed by Todd Berman.

11 MR. BROWN: Thank you, I'm Peter Brown. I live  
12 at -- on Pot Rock Island in the Thimble islands, and I maybe  
13 one of the closest residents to where this is planned on  
14 being moored. And I've got a couple of concerns regarding  
15 Broadwater.

16 First is, and I'd mention the industrialization  
17 of Long Island Sound, and, you know, this is not a -- not-  
18 in-my-backyard story for me, it's a not-in-my-front-yard  
19 story. And it's more than just the industrialization of  
20 Long Island Sound, it's the uglification of Long Island  
21 Sound, and that is a big concern. Talk about recreational  
22 fishing, not just will they catch fish, but what that  
23 experience will be for folks out on the water once this is  
24 moored and this industrial looking, nasty, huge facility.  
25 With respect to safety, the folks -- I'm not a Coast Guard

1 engineer, but you guys are, and I ask you, what did you do  
2 with L & G tankers on 9/11? What did you do those with  
3 tankers that were headed into Boston harbor? Did you allow  
4 them to go into Boston Harbor if they're so safe as these  
5 gentlemen that are onboard those ships think? Why were they  
6 not allowed to go into Boston harbor on 9/11 if they're so  
7 safe?

8 And I think we need to get an answer to that  
9 question. And I think we need to remember a couple of other  
10 incidents before 9/11. A naval ship was attacked, and  
11 before 9/11 -- all these went into a harbor in Alaska, and  
12 all these things were supposed to have been safe. So we're  
13 going to destroy the appearance of our Sound, we're going to  
14 make it ugly, we're going to make it industrial and we're at  
15 risk. And you should deny this project. Thank you.

16 (Applause)

17 MR. STAEGGER: Todd Berman, please, followed by  
18 David Silber Kleit.

19 MR. BERMAN: My name is Todd Berman, I'm a  
20 resident of Killingworth. I'm a fourth generation fisherman  
21 in New Haven. My grandfather was a fisherman in New Haven,  
22 my father was, I'm not a commercial fisherman, but  
23 recreational fisherman as is my son. So for four  
24 generations we've been flying the Sound. I'm also a  
25 licensed Coast Guard master captain. A couple of things



1 first as you think about the scope on the Coast Guard side  
2 of the equation. One is, if it's going to be three ships a  
3 week, we're talking about six transits of the race as I  
4 understand it.

5 Question one is, is there going to be any kind of  
6 visibility standard, you know, darkness, rain, fog, I mean,  
7 will there be some standard when, and I think about this  
8 from the perspective of both the operating vessel and the  
9 dozens of vessels that you're going to have to somehow clear  
10 out of the race. So is there going to be a visibility  
11 standard?

12 Number two, what provisions are going to be made?  
13 Inevitably they are going to, you know, one ship is not --  
14 the scheduling of loading and offloading of ships as we all  
15 know is not a perfect science. There's -- one thing gets  
16 delayed. What provisions, where will the ships that are in  
17 the queue so to speak queue up? Are they going to linger  
18 offshore, or are they going to come into the Sound? What  
19 provisions for the queuing of incoming vessels are going to  
20 be made?

21 Next point, in -- as you're modeling potential  
22 terrorist scenarios, do your models presently include any  
23 kind of underwater intrusion to the facility? Given that we  
24 could go on the Sharper Image catalogue and buy ourselves a  
25 submarine, it would seem that that's not as outrageous a

1 scenario as you might see -- so underwater intrusion in  
2 terms of scoping your terrorists risk models. That sort of  
3 concludes the Coast Guard piece of it.

4 From the FERC perspective, I would like to see  
5 the EIS, the demand side of the equation be covered in your  
6 scope. The -- in terms of the environmental issues, if this  
7 facility is going to be lit at night, environmentalist FERC  
8 -- okay, if this facility is going to be lit all night,  
9 clearly it's going to dramatically change the distribution  
10 of squid in Long Island Sound as they were clearly -- as  
11 they do are attracted to light, you know, that's going to be  
12 a big change.

13 So in terms of scoping the EIS, I think that's  
14 all. I guess my last comment would be for Broadwater, if  
15 they're going to read this transcript, which is that, given  
16 the overwhelming public disdain for the project, you know, I  
17 think they should just cut their losses now and save  
18 themselves the resources they're investing in this process  
19 that will probably linger on for years, and certainly save  
20 us the taxpayers the burden of this multi-year process. So  
21 if there's anybody from Broadwater here, why don't we just  
22 stop this now instead of, you know, dragging it out another  
23 three years. Thank you.

24 (Applause)

25 MR. STAEGER: David Silber Kleit followed by

1 Henry Platt.

2 MR. SILBER KLEIT: Hi, I'm David Silber Kleit. I  
3 live in Branford, and I'm a commercial pilot. I thought I  
4 would share a little bit of my perspective of why this  
5 project is so shocking to me, because as a pilot I am -- I  
6 just can see too many scenarios that would bring about a  
7 catastrophic result in Long Island Sound, which I happen to  
8 love very much. The first thing, you know, and again, this  
9 -- I realize that we have the Coast Guard here today. This  
10 is not really your area of responsibility, but the  
11 consequences of course are. And the aviation risk seemed so  
12 much greater than the nautical risk that I think it's worth  
13 discussing.

14 Number one, I hope that you guys have looked at  
15 the number of high altitude departures that fly directly  
16 over the center of Long Island Sound. I know as a resident  
17 of Branford, every night I watch the aircraft heading  
18 eastbound usually for Europe from JFK in New York. They fly  
19 directly over that corridor, and unfortunately we do have  
20 some precedence even before 9/11 of commercial flight crews  
21 that have intentionally downed large jet aircraft.

22 But perhaps more at risk to me is the number of  
23 low altitude over flights of the center of Long Island  
24 Sound. If you look at and I hope that you will review the  
25 instrument approach procedures for New Haven airport, you'll

1 find that to line up for the instrument landing system  
2 approach for runway 2 at New Haven, you do fly directly over  
3 the area, which I think is exactly over this facility. And  
4 we're -- Broadwater to propose putting this thing at the  
5 base of a runway, no one would ever allow it. What they are  
6 proposing is putting it at the base or the entryway of an  
7 instrument approach procedure, which means that a large  
8 quantity of aircraft, and you can review the data on the  
9 number of instrument arrivals into New Haven would be flying  
10 directly over this structure at low altitude. And  
11 unfortunately, at 180 knots even if it's not directly over  
12 the facility, it takes about three -- you cover about three  
13 miles in a minute. And the risk in zero visibility or a  
14 200-foot ceiling less than a mile visibility is  
15 unfortunately something I just cannot believe that anyone  
16 would consider allowing in our region.

17 I also really encourage you to review the number  
18 of incursions that have happened in the last six months in  
19 the Washington, D.C. prohibited airspace. You'll find that  
20 there have been a number of aircraft that have straightened  
21 that airspace as recently as a few weeks ago. What the FAA  
22 will likely do if heaven forbid Broadwater is approved, is  
23 set up a prohibited airspace around this docking station.

24 Unfortunately, that is just not a sufficient  
25 protection for the possible catastrophe that would occur. I

1 dare -- I just can't imagine that there would be a fighter  
2 jet station in New Haven, and Black Hawk helicopter station  
3 in New Haven armed with missiles to shoot down aircraft in  
4 Long Island Sound. The area is far too dense. I just --  
5 what happens if you miss with a missile, where does it land?

6 So I don't see anyway around this. There's no  
7 way to reroute the air traffic, and it strikes me that this  
8 is just such a huge public safety risk I'm somewhat shocked  
9 that it's even being considered. Thank you.

10 (Applause)

11 MR. STAEGER: Henry Platt followed by Annie  
12 Upson.

13 MR. PLATT: Good evening. My name is Henry Platt  
14 Jr., and I live in Hampton, Connecticut. I want to thank  
15 you for being so patient and waiting for me to speak. Next,  
16 I want to stipulate that liquefied natural gas is a safe  
17 commodity handled properly. However, the fact is that New  
18 York State wants this thing located in Long Island Sound, so  
19 that Connecticut ratepayers and taxpayers can foot some of  
20 the bill. It is my opinion that a barge is not a safe way  
21 to do things. Obviously, throughout the world they have put  
22 them on land. I think that the best place to do -- way to  
23 do this is to build an island for the facility to dock, and  
24 then have a short tunnel that would take the natural gas  
25 from the island into the south coast of Long Island, outside

1 the Sound.

2 Some place where you would not have to have a  
3 vessel go through the race. You could sail in from the open  
4 sea to this place off the south coast of Long Island. As it  
5 is, this is not going to provide additional needed gas for  
6 Connecticut, because putting a line across to Connecticut  
7 only compensates for the gas we are already shipping to New  
8 York, 24 inches of pipe under the Sound from Milford to Long  
9 Island. If Connecticut needs a little gas, well, fine, take  
10 some off that pipeline. Supplement it with the gas, which  
11 goes to Long Island from the south coast of Long Island.

12 I guess that about covers it, but mainly as far  
13 as I'm concerned this is a proposition, a conspiracy by the  
14 State of New York to have Connecticut pay for some of the  
15 costs, which are strictly to benefit New York State. Thank  
16 you.

17 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. Next is Annie Upson  
18 followed by Tim Cleveland, or perhaps Tom.

19 MS. UPSON: Good evening. I'm Annie Valentino  
20 Upson. And I would just like to thank you, Mr. Martin and  
21 Captain Boynton for coming here and giving me the  
22 opportunity to express my concerns and relay how grateful I  
23 am to live in this fine State of Connecticut and in our  
24 country, where my rights and concerns can be expressed and  
25 represented especially as a woman.

1           I have many concerns regarding the installation  
2 of the Broadwater L & G project, some of which you have  
3 already heard from others. However, no one has mentioned  
4 the fact that the Sound School, the first school in the U.S.  
5 to offer programs in Aquaculture, is only 10 miles from the  
6 project.

7           Students from this school have classes both in  
8 the classroom and out on Long Island Sound. They have a  
9 boat, which travels several miles out into the Sound to  
10 perform laboratory experiments in Marine Biology and  
11 Chemistry, Aquaponics, Plant Science and Environmental  
12 Science. I am concerned that this project would endanger  
13 the future of this school and the safety of the children  
14 especially if they come within the five-mile shoot-to-kill  
15 radius. I have copies of the school programs, and I would  
16 like this to be kept on file, and we'll hand that to you  
17 after I speak.

18           Secondly, I am concerned about the safety issues  
19 involved not only in the development of such a project, but  
20 the maintenance and repair of pipes and supporting  
21 structures. As we all know, plumbing leaks happen in new  
22 structures as well as old. Who is going to be responsible  
23 for the devastating effects of the Broadwater L & G project  
24 that it is going to have not only on the environment, but  
25 the safety and security of the eight million people who live

1 in the surrounding area in the event of an explosion or  
2 implosion.

3 Thirdly, I am concerned about terrorist  
4 accessibility especially since the two Turkish crewmen that  
5 jumped ship last year to my knowledge have still not been  
6 found. Lastly, hurricanes of a category 3 have hit the  
7 Connecticut shoreline, not often, but once every 100 years  
8 and we are doomed. There would be no way to contain the  
9 elements of the Broadwater L & G project if such a storm  
10 would take place. And I am also concerned about a  
11 conspiracy happening with New York State.

12 In closing I ask that we take time not only to  
13 think about the devastating effects that the Broadwater L &  
14 G project would have on our environment, but also on the  
15 preservation of ourselves. Alternative routes need to be  
16 examined and implemented, and thank you very much.

17 MR. STAEGER: Next will be Tom perhaps Cleveland.

18 MR. CLEVELAND: Thank you.

19 MR. STAEGER: Tom Cleveland? Phil Dunlop, and  
20 after Mr. Dunlop is J.L. Pottenger.

21 MR. DUNLOP: My name is Phil Dunlop. I've worked  
22 on a few commercial lobster vessels out of Branford and  
23 Gilford. What I have to say has nothing to do with impact  
24 Broadwater might have on lobster, shell and fish populations  
25 in the Sound, rather I raise a specter of a catastrophe



1 similar to the one inflicted by the Union Carbide  
2 Corporation on the resident population of Bhopal, India.  
3 Several gentlemen from the L & G industry have earlier  
4 attested to the safety and ease of transport of liquefied  
5 natural gas. I'm sure it is in relatively ideal conditions.  
6 But as we've seen over the past month in New Orleans,  
7 sometimes nature refers you to her.

8           Since 1995, the frequency and intensity of  
9 Atlantic hurricanes has shortly increased. Hurricanes  
10 derive their energy from the heat, technically the stored  
11 specific heat capacity of surface waters. As mean marine  
12 surface water temperature increases so too inevitably will  
13 the frequency and intensity of hurricanes.

14           Mean surface water temperatures in the Atlantic  
15 are slowly and exorbitantly rising every year. Global  
16 warming is here to stay. If this facility is built someday,  
17 not today, not tomorrow, but someday, there will come a  
18 hurricane of sufficient force and bearing to shear this  
19 thing right off its mooring. As surely as the sun will rise  
20 tomorrow this will happen. What then? Where will it go?  
21 It will be what, several storeys high and several football  
22 fields wide. It'll be like a giant sail. Can you throw a  
23 cable on it and stabilize it with a tugboat, highly unlikely  
24 in 30-foot seas and 150-mile power of winds.

25           Depending on the wind direction it's likely

1 overdrift towards the north shore of Long Island or the  
2 Connecticut shoreline, or it will run aground. And then  
3 with the steel membranes holding the stored liquefied  
4 natural gas hold or will they rupture before nature's fury?  
5 Even steel will shatter and rupture if enough kinetic energy  
6 is applied to it. If -- were the platform to run aground  
7 and the steel walls were to rupture, this is what will  
8 happen. Natural gas is mostly methane, which as the  
9 gentleman in the liquefied natural gas industry stated  
10 earlier is lighter than air and would likely disperse.

11 Liquefied natural gas is only in the liquid  
12 state, because it's kept either under sufficient pressure  
13 and cooled to a sufficient degree to be in a liquid state.  
14 But once liberated from its sealed cage, it immediately  
15 gasifies or it becomes gaseous. However, a significant  
16 portion of natural gas is composed of heavier than air  
17 factions of ethane, hexane, pentane and so on.

18 For these natural gas components to be released  
19 in a catastrophic ship to ground incident, they would form a  
20 lethal smothering cloud, which would instantaneously  
21 suffocate whomever was unfortunate enough to be caught  
22 within the vicinity of the wreck. And if a spark would be  
23 lit, well the gas cloud would go up like Hiroshima or  
24 Dresden.

25 In Bhopal, India the agent of destruction was

1 hydrogen sulphide gas, and the corporation responsible was  
2 Union Carbide. But to see the shipwreck in slow motion,  
3 possibly decades before it is to happen, it is brutally  
4 apparent that the agent of destruction will be LNG and the  
5 corporation responsible will be Shell and the TransCanada  
6 Corporation whomever they are.

7 And FERC like FEMA will have sat on our hands,  
8 because it's in your court now. The courts can't stop this  
9 from going through, the legislature can't stop this, the  
10 populace can't stop this. This is an executive decision  
11 through some previous law in our system of governance.

12 I feel like all of us in this room are like  
13 Cassandra, chained to a cliff by an ill-intentioned parent,  
14 waiting to be devoured by a monster from the sea, her cries  
15 of providence lost in the deafening wail of wind and sea and  
16 foam. Thank you.

17 (Applause)

18 MR. STAEGER: And I think you'll be happy to know  
19 we're down to two. Mr. Pottenger followed by John Frank.

20 MR. POTTENGER: I -- I'm sure I won't be as  
21 poetic as my predecessor. I'm a lawyer and a law professor,  
22 so there's no chance of that.

23 Like others tonight, I want to thank you for your  
24 patience and for your attention. It's important I think  
25 it's actually pretty crucial for public trust and acceptance

1 of the decisions that you're going to render from the Coast  
2 Guard and from the FERC that you're hearing and listening to  
3 before. I'm not going to repeat what's been said and said  
4 again about safety and security and science, instead I'm  
5 going to make a process comment, and it's a process comment  
6 that I think may have substantive implications. And it goes  
7 like this. The proposed facility is going to involve a  
8 taking of what is now a public trust.

9 It's a special public resource, Long Island  
10 Sound. But it's an odd kind of a taking because it's a  
11 reverse taking, it's taking from what's now public and  
12 giving it to a private for-profit company or consortium. So  
13 it's a -- kind of a flip or reverse of what happened up in  
14 New London and, which as you know, caused a lot of  
15 controversy all across the State of Connecticut and all  
16 across the country, in response to the Supreme Court's  
17 decision in KELO against the city of New London about the  
18 use of eminent domain and the power of the public to take  
19 private property from one person or one party and give it to  
20 another one.

21 What's at stake here, is taking a public trust, a  
22 public property that belongs to the people primarily of  
23 Connecticut and of New York and giving that to some private  
24 companies. What's odd, and what I think is a special  
25 concern is that what is going on here is in some ways more

1 undemocratic than what was going on in New London, because  
2 the decision in New London in the end, was made by public  
3 officials, elected public officials at the local level who  
4 were accountable at election to the people in whose benefit  
5 they said they were acting, the constituents in New London.

6           What's happening here, or what may happen here is  
7 this public trust is -- the decision about it is going to be  
8 made by you, unelected federal, not local officials, who  
9 aren't accountable to the electorates of New York or  
10 Connecticut. So my process point is simply this, I urge you  
11 to listen carefully as you obviously have been doing tonight  
12 and then to think about what you heard, when you go about to  
13 make your decisions. Because it's the public of New York and  
14 Connecticut in whose interests you're going to be acting and  
15 it's the public trust of New York and Connecticut that is at  
16 risk of being taken and given for private profit. Thank  
17 you.

18                           (Applause)

19           MR. STAEGER: Thank you. Last name on the list  
20 is John Frank.

21           MR. FRANK: My name is John Frank, I'm a retired  
22 police captain, so I know a little bit about risk management  
23 and of my experiences prior to 9/11 of course, and I can't  
24 imagine being in your position, Captain, if they allow this  
25 thing. We are talking about eight billion cubic feet of gas

1 on a boat. Maritime law limits reliability of that boat-  
2 owner to revalue the vessel, if there is any, after an  
3 explosion. Broadwater believes they will make lots of money  
4 and have extremely limited liability if something goes  
5 wrong.

6 My question is why should Broadwater get a free  
7 site for their plan and the enormous area around it that  
8 will be a no-boating and no-flyover zone. And how can a  
9 private company expect us to pay for the Coast Guard to  
10 provide round-the-clock security. No other agency has the  
11 authority to provide security for this thing, as it is  
12 proposed.

13 If the gas is needed and they can make lots of  
14 money, why can't Broadwater buy a site for a terminal on  
15 land, pay taxes on it, like everybody else and pay for  
16 private security?

17 (Applause)

18 MR. FRANK: On land they could add tons of  
19 reinforced concrete to their eight billion cubic feet gas  
20 tanks to make them safe from almost anything. If we let  
21 this happen, what do we say to the next private developer  
22 who asks, "Isn't all of Long Island Sound public property  
23 for all of us to use with nobody getting exclusive use of  
24 any part?" Thank you.

25 (Applause)

1                   MR. STAEGER: Okay, it's 11:25 p.m., I can take a  
2 couple, two, three maybe, more speakers if anyone in the  
3 audience would like to provide -- yes, ma'am. Please come  
4 up to the podium and state your name.

5                   MS. NELSON: Thank you for listening to us  
6 tonight and thank you all for today. My name is Rwanda  
7 Nelson, I'm from Fairfield County Commodore Association, I'm  
8 a boater in Norwalk. This is pretty ad lib. I didn't have  
9 anything prepared tonight, but I did hear a few gaps were  
10 discussed. One thing is that this is one application for an  
11 LNG facility. There's at least 34 to 40 others going on  
12 right now. At least three have already been approved in  
13 this area. The other -- the only other floating pipeline is  
14 in the Gulf. They refer to this as the test site, the only  
15 other one is not a re-gasification unit and it's a 100 miles  
16 offshore in the Gulf. Why did they choose to put it that  
17 far out?

18                   The other comment I wanted to make was regarding  
19 the shipboard engineers that were here tonight. I notice  
20 that they're still not here at this point, but I wanted to  
21 extend my respect for them making every effort to make LNG  
22 safe. I did notice however in their scripts that -- very  
23 slightly, that there was one common phrase between all five,  
24 and that was that they had an excellent safety record with a  
25 caveat amongst all five of them being, "provided qualified

1 personnel are in charge." Every single one of them had that  
2 quote.

3 And the other comment is regarding -- I just  
4 started reading the wildlife report that came out yesterday,  
5 it's 180 pages long, but it did mention something about a  
6 100 million gallons of water, being recirculated through  
7 this facility everyday. What would that do to the water  
8 temperature, what would it do to the air temperature --

9 (Whereupon, the proceedings of the meeting was  
10 adjourned)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25