

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY,
U.S. COAST GUARD

JOINT PUBLIC MEETING
BROADWATER LNG PROJECT
DOCKET NO. PF05-4-000

Shoreham-Wading River
Middle School
100 Randall Road
Shoreham, New York

September 14, 2005

7:00 p.m.

JIM MARTIN, Presiding

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

2 MR. MARTIN: Good evening. Thank you all for
3 coming tonight. My name is Jim Martin and I am the
4 Environmental Project Manager with the Federal Energy
5 Regulatory Commission or FERC. Seated with me here tonight
6 is U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port for Long Island
7 Sound, Captain Peter Boynton.

8 He is joined here tonight by Lieutenant
9 Commander Alan Blume and Lieutenant Andrea Logman. Also
10 present from FERC is my Branch Chief, Mr. Lonnie Lister;
11 Deputy Project Manager, Joanne Wacholder, at the front
12 table.

13 Our environmental contractor, Entrix, is
14 represented by Mr. Bill Staeger, seated next to me; and
15 Wayne Kicklighter, and Amy Parsons, who are assisting
16 Joanne at the table.

17 Thank you for the applause. It is very nice.

18 We are here tonight to provide some information
19 and to hear your comments on the Broadwater Energy LNG
20 project. I would like to take a moment briefly to describe
21 the project.

22 Broadwater is proposing to build and operate a
23 liquified natural gas or LNG terminal near the center of
24 Long Island Sound. LNG is natural gas or methane that has
25 been cooled to an extremely cold temperature of negative

1 260 degrees Fahrenheit. The gas is not stored under
2 pressure and is not explosive in its liquid state. The
3 terminal will be permanently moored approximately nine
4 miles offshore from Long Island and ten miles offshore from
5 Connecticut. The terminal will consist of a floating
6 storage and regasification unit, FSRU, that will be
7 approximately 1,200 feet in length, 200 feet wide and rise
8 approximately 80 feet off the water line.

9 The FSRU would be designed to accommodate a net
10 surge capacity of approximately 350,000 cubic meters of LNG
11 or the equivalent of 8 billion cubic feet of natural gas.
12 The LNG would be delivered to the FSRU in LNG carriers at a
13 frequency of two to three carriers per week.

14 The FSRU would have a closed loop vaporization
15 system to vaporize or regasify the LNG at a typical rate of
16 about 1 billion cubic feet per day. Gas would be directed
17 into a send up pipeline that would extend approximately 22
18 miles to an offshore connection with existing the Iroquois
19 pipeline which provides natural gas to Connecticut and New
20 York markets.

21 Tonight's meeting is a joint meeting hosted by
22 FERC and U.S. Coast Guard. We have slightly different
23 review processes that this meeting will support, but
24 fundamentally the whole purpose of tonight's meeting is to
25 provide each of you with an opportunity to give us your

1 comments and tell us what the environmental, safety and
2 security issues are that you think we should address in our
3 respective analyses of this project.

4 I will briefly describe the FERC process and
5 then Captain Boynton will describe the Coast Guard process.

6 The FERC staff's environmental and engineering
7 analysis will result in generation of an environment impact
8 statement or EIS. FERC is the lead federal agency tasked
9 with preparing the EIS. We are fortunate to have several
10 cooperating agencies that will help us ensure that all
11 concerns are represented. Cooperating agencies include the
12 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Protection
13 Agency, National Marine Fishery Service, U.S. Department of
14 Transportation, New York State Department of State, and our
15 partner agency, the Coast Guard.

16 I would like to take a few moments now to
17 further explain the purpose of tonight's public meeting.
18 First I would like to clarify that the Broadwater proposal
19 was not conceived by and is not promoted by either FERC or
20 the Coast Guard. FERC reviews applications for the import
21 of natural gas, and Broadwater is in the process of
22 preparing an application to submit to FERC. Once the
23 application is submitted, our obligation is to review that
24 application and prepare an analysis of the environmental
25 impact.

1 Tonight's meeting is not a public hearing. We
2 are not here to debate the proposal or to make any
3 determination on its fate. We are here to listen to your
4 concerns so that we can consider them in our analysis.

5 Based on the letters we received, we understand
6 that many people are opposed to the concept of having an
7 offshore natural gas import facility. Others raise
8 concerns about the environmental impact or safety
9 considerations. Some objections are general in nature and
10 some are based on potential environmental and safety
11 impacts. Both categories are important to FERC but
12 addressed in different ways.

13 General objection to the project would be
14 considered during the Commission's public interest review,
15 whereas environmental and safety impacts are addressed by
16 FERC's staff in our EIS.

17 The EIS is an analysis of impacts resources and
18 does not specifically analyze public opinion. With that
19 said, we request that your comments tonight focus on the
20 potential effects of the project. Specifically, we are
21 here to ask you for your help in identifying potential
22 impacts to both the human and natural environment of the
23 Long Island Sound.

24 In our Notice of Intent issued on March 11th, we
25 requested your comments and assigned a deadline of October

1 7th. I wanted to tell you that your comments will be
2 received and considered throughout our process, but to
3 focus adequately on the issues and do research on them and
4 address those, we ask that you provide them to us as soon
5 as possible.

6 A speakers list is located at the back table and
7 we will use that list to identify individuals who want to
8 provide verbal comments on the Broadwater project. In
9 addition to verbal comments, we will also accept your
10 written comments. Many people have already submitted
11 written comments to the FERC. If you have comments and
12 don't wish to speak tonight, you may also provide written
13 comments on comment forms at the table in the back. You
14 may drop those off with us tonight or mail them to us at a
15 later date. Be sure to include the project docket number,
16 PF05-4.

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

24 During the scoping process we are gathering
25 information and we are using a number of different sources

1 for that information. Four general sources we are using
2 right now are information provided by the applicant, input
3 from other agencies, our own field work and research on
4 different issues and, of course, information from the
5 public.

6 Once we gather the information during the
7 scoping process, we will analyze it, prepare a draft EIS
8 that will be distributed for comments. There are two
9 general ways you can receive a copy of the draft EIS.
10 First of all, if you received a notice, there is a form on
11 the back you can attach and mail in to us requesting to be
12 maintained on the mailing list. Secondly, you can fill in
13 the mailing list form at the back table and we will add you
14 to the list.

15 If you don't do one of those two things, you
16 wouldn't be on our mailing list and won't receive a copy of
17 the draft.

18 After the draft EIS is issued, there is a 45-day
19 comment period. During that period we normally will hold
20 another public meeting similar in format to this one. We
21 will probably come back here to the same facility if it is
22 available and ask you to comment on the information
23 provided in the draft EIS. At the end of the 45-day
24 comment period, we begin synthesizing all the information
25 gathered to date and preparing the final EIS.

1 Once we issue the final EIS, it is forwarded to
2 our Commissioners. Our Commissioners at FERC will use that
3 document as well as other information to make the
4 determination on whether or not to grant an authorization
5 for the project.

6 At this time, Captain Boynton will describe the
7 work being performed by the Coast Guard. Following the
8 Coast Guard presentations, we will begin listening to your
9 comments.

10 CAPT. BOYNTON: Thank you, Jim.

11 As Jim said, my name is Captain Peter Boynton,
12 Coast Guard Captain of the Port for Long Island Sound and
13 responsible for Coast Guard operations in Connecticut, on
14 the Sound and the north and south shores of Long Island.

15 The Coast Guard role with the Broadwater LNG
16 proposal is neither to advocate for or against the project.
17 Our role is to do an assessment of both safety and
18 security.

19 When we do these assessments, we do them in a
20 manner which looks at the risk, the risk to safety and the
21 risk to security. We do not eliminate risk; We manage
22 risk. And we manage risk today on Long Island Sound with
23 the sort of commercial traffic and recreational and fishing
24 traffic that is already present on the Sound.

25 When we manage risk, we look at all three

1 components of risk. We define those three components as
2 threat, vulnerability and consequence. And when we do the
3 assessment of this proposal, we will assess risk in the
4 same manner, looking at threat, vulnerability and
5 consequence.

6 The Coast Guard has been seeking public input
7 for this proposal, along with FERC, in a number of
8 different venues. We have attended many of the open houses
9 that have been held this year both on Long Island and in
10 Connecticut. We are holding these public meetings jointly
11 with FERC and we have been receiving letters. I have
12 personally received, for three or four weeks, up to 160
13 letters per day. I have read all of those letters. I will
14 continue to read the letters I receive and at least up to
15 this point I have replied to all the letters and we will
16 attempt to continue to do that.

17 All of the letters that have been sent have also
18 been put into the public docket.

19 I would like to describe briefly the first of
20 the two assessments that the Coast Guard is responsible for
21 doing for this proposal, and that is the safety assessment.
22 The Coast Guard held what is called a Ports and Waterways
23 Safety Assessment Workshop in May of this year in Port
24 Jefferson. Over the last five years, the Coast Guard has
25 done about three dozen of these ports and waterways safety

1 assessments. Many of those have nothing to do with LNG
2 proposals. These assessments are done to look at a body of
3 water and assess many different aspects of safety issues on
4 that body of water.

5 The PAWSA, or ports and waterways safety
6 assessment, that we did in Long Island Sound in May was not
7 designed to look specifically at the Broadwater proposal.
8 It was designed to take a baseline look at safety issues
9 across the Sound. So, for example, issues like vessel
10 congestion; mixed use; use between commercial vessels;
11 fishing vessels, recreational vessels; lighting on the
12 Sound; weather; navigational aids.

13 As we did this assessment, we also took the
14 opportunity to ask the participants what effect might the
15 Broadwater proposal have on some of these safety issues.
16 One of the things the safety assessment looked at was the
17 current use of the Sound. We estimate that over the course
18 of a year there are typically 700 foreign commercial vessel
19 arrivals into the Sound from ports around the world,
20 bringing various types of cargo to ports here in the Sound.
21 We also estimate there is about 1,200 commercial vessels a
22 year that come from domestic ports to bring cargo to
23 various ports in the Sound.

24 So, together, about 1,900 commercial vessel
25 arrivals per year. Those commercial vessels are a mix of

1 tankers, cargo ships and tugs with barges.

2 In addition to the 1,900, we estimate somewhere
3 between 2,000 to 4,000 commercial vessels a year transit
4 the Sound not to make a port call here, but using the Sound
5 as a sort of I-95 of the waterway. They transit up and
6 down the Sound, typically coming to and from the port of
7 New York and New Jersey. Many of those are tugs and
8 barges. So when you add those two numbers together, the
9 PAWSA found that there is roughly 4,000 to 6,000 commercial
10 vessels entering the Sound every year, many of which are
11 tugs and tows, some of which are tankers and other types of
12 cargo ships.

13 When we held the PAWSA, the safety assessment,
14 in May of this year in Port Jefferson, we invited about 30
15 waterway users. We did that in part because it is a
16 standard practice whenever the Coast Guard does a PAWSA,
17 but we also did it because we did not want to do this
18 safety assessment based just on the perspective of the
19 Coast Guard. We wanted to involve as broad a spectrum of
20 waterway users as we could, which is typical practice
21 whenever we do a safety assessment.

22 In this case, the 30 members that we invited for
23 this two-day workshop included representatives of
24 environmental groups from both Long Island and Connecticut,
25 representatives of recreational boaters, representatives of

1 commercial fishermen, representatives of commercial vessel
2 operators, police, fire and other government agency
3 representative.

4 The report of this safety assessment has since
5 been completed and is posted on the Coast Guard website.
6 We have a handout at the door that lists the websites for
7 that and a number of other sources of information.

8 I do want to caution you -- and this came up at
9 the public meeting last night a number of times -- this
10 safety assessment is not the Coast Guard's report to FERC
11 on our assessment of the safety of the Broadwater proposal.
12 This safety assessment that we did in May we did as a
13 baseline to try to assess, take a fresh look at safety
14 across Long Island Sound. It is not even a draft version
15 of the Coast Guard's safety assessment of the Broadwater
16 proposal. It is a baseline input into the safety
17 assessment that we are working on.

18 The next steps for the safety assessment are to
19 work with our harbor safety group, which again includes a
20 broad cross-section of waterway users from both Connecticut
21 and Long Island, use the results of the PAWSA report and
22 consider all the aspects of safety as they apply to the
23 Broadwater proposal. We will do that looking at the
24 various components of risk as they apply to safety -- what
25 are the threats to safety? What are the vulnerabilities

1 for safety? What are the consequences for safety?

2 And when we look at those elements, we will look
3 for gaps in safety that, if this proposal were to be
4 approved, what gaps in safety might that create? Then we
5 will look at those potential gaps and try to identify
6 mitigating strategies. What might be done to address those
7 gaps in safety?

8 That is the process that we will use for our
9 safety assessment.

10 I would like to talk a little bit about the
11 second area that the Coast Guard is responsible for working
12 with FERC to assess this proposal, and that is security
13 assessment. The Coast Guard uses a different process to do
14 the security assessment, and in part that is because some
15 of the information that we deal with is sensitive because
16 it is dealing with security information. The meetings that
17 we hold to do the security assessment are held at what is
18 termed an SSI level, which is Sensitive Security
19 Information. That information is not releasable to the
20 public. However, what is releasable is the process we use
21 and I want to describe that process briefly.

22 Again, we will look at each of the three
23 elements of risk. What are the threats to security, what
24 are the vulnerabilities of the proposed facility, and what
25 are the potential consequences?

1 We will use a subcommittee of a group called the
2 Area Maritime Security Committee, which is a group that I
3 chair as Captain of the Port. There are about 40 Coast
4 Guard Captains of the Port around the country. They each
5 chair a Maritime Security Committee. Our Maritime Security
6 Committee here in Long Island Sound includes
7 representatives from federal agencies, state agencies, both
8 Connecticut and New York; local agencies, both Connecticut
9 and New York, and members of industry who use the
10 waterways.

11 We formed a subcommittee of this committee to
12 begin the process of doing our security assessment. That
13 group includes waterway users, members of federal agencies,
14 state agencies on both sides of the Sound, fire, police,
15 emergency response officials.

16 Our next steps are to complete the safety and
17 security assessments. We will not complete those until
18 after we have the full, formal application from Broadwater.
19 Right now we are operating off the prefiled information
20 that we received from Broadwater when they made their
21 profiling application in November. We can't finish our
22 assessments until we have the full description of their
23 proposal, which we won't have until their formal
24 application. So we will not complete our assessment until
25 we have received the formal application and had time to

1 consider all of that information.

2 In many of the letters that I have received and
3 the open houses that I have attended there has typically
4 been quite a bit of discussion about security and safety
5 zones both for the proposed facility that would be anchored
6 in the Sound and for any LNG tankers that would enter the
7 Sound if the proposal were approved, so I want to take just
8 a minute to talk briefly about safety and security zones.

9 Typically, those zones are used as a mitigation
10 for both safety risks and security risks. In the LNG
11 terminals that are currently in operation elsewhere in the
12 country, typically the tankers have moving security zones
13 around the tanker as they enter the port and depart the
14 port.

15 We have not yet completed our assessment, so I
16 cannot tell you tonight how large the security zones might
17 be for a moving tanker. I can tell you that in some other
18 ports they are as large as two miles ahead of the tanker, a
19 mile astern of the tanker, and a half mile or a mile on
20 either side. When those zones are used, they move with the
21 tanker. Just to give you an example -- but it does not
22 mean we would use this here because we haven't completed
23 the assessment, but to give you an example, a moving
24 security zone of that size around a tanker that is moving
25 at a typical speed of 12 knots would take about 15 minutes

1 to pass any given point. When we use these security zones,
2 no other vessels are allowed in that zone unless they have
3 express permission from the Captain of the Port.

4 If the proposal were to be approved, we would
5 also anticipate that there would be a safety security zone
6 around the FSRU where it is permanently moored in the
7 Sound. Again, we haven't completed the assessment and
8 can't give you the dimension of that zone, but it would be
9 based on our assessment of the risks, the threat, the
10 vulnerability, the consequence.

11 When we look at the size of potential security
12 zones for LNG tankers and facilities, we use the Sandia
13 National Lab report which was released in January of this
14 year. That report describes three rings of consequences to
15 an LNG incident. The report looks at both the risks and
16 the consequences over water from both an accidental and an
17 intentional LNG incident.

18 We have also included on our handout the website
19 where you can see that report. It has been posted on a
20 public website. We would use that report as one of the
21 inputs to help guide us to determine how large the zone
22 should be.

23 So at this point our next steps are to complete
24 those assessments once we receive the formal application.
25 We will then provide our two assessments to FERC and FERC

1 will include the results of those assessments in the draft
2 Environmental Impact Statement.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Captain Boynton. Now we
5 begin taking your comments. As your name is read, I would
6 like you to come up to the podium, being careful on the
7 steps, of course, and state your name for the record. All
8 of the comments will be transcribed and put into the public
9 record for the project. The public record is available on
10 our website at www.ferc.gov. On that page eLibrary and
11 input the docket number, PF05-4.

12 You can use the eLibrary to access everything
13 the Commission does with the project as well as all the
14 filings and information provided by Broadwater. We also
15 have all the comment letters submitted in that same area.

16 In your comments I ask that you try to be as
17 specific as possible with your environmental or safety or
18 security concerns. As stated in our notice, the meeting is
19 scheduled to conclude at 10 p.m. We have a little less
20 than three hours and approximately 50 speakers at this
21 time.

22 In the interest of allowing as many speakers as
23 possible, I would like you to keep your statements brief,
24 preferably to around three minutes. We have got a card
25 that we will hold up to just to alert you when you are

1 nearing sort of the end of your time.

2 MR. STAEGER: We spare no expense.

3 MR. MARTIN: A couple of other things you can
4 possibly do. If you have written comments and they are
5 extensive, in the interest of saving time, you might
6 paraphrase those and submit them directly to the court
7 reporter and they will be transcribed into the record so
8 they become an official part of the record.

9 If you have comments that have been already
10 stated by a previous speaker, you can also simply state
11 that you endorse the comments provided by the earlier
12 speaker and contribute that time basically to other
13 speakers that may follow you.

14 If we have additional time after we have gone
15 through this list, I will ask if anybody else wants to come
16 up and comment. That could be someone that already spoke
17 or could be someone that hasn't had an opportunity. So
18 depending on how much time it takes us to get through all
19 the comments, we might have some additional time at the end
20 for additional speakers.

21 I guess that is when I am going to stop talking.
22 Thank you all for your consideration. Bill will begin
23 reading off the names.

24 MR. STAEGER: I will hold up a sign when you
25 have about a minute to go. Although it may seem impolite,

1 I will say something that your time is over about the same
2 time the three-minute mark comes around. I apologize, but
3 that is the only way we will get through all the speakers
4 we have on the list tonight.

5 We will start with some elected representatives
6 of your community. Speaking first, Steve Levy.

7 MR. LEVY: Thank you, gentlemen and lady. You
8 threw me for a loop with the three minutes. I will do the
9 best I can here. I had some prepared text.

10 Let me just start by noting that it was just a
11 couple of weeks ago that I had the honor of joining many of
12 the elected officials in this room and many of the
13 community activists to meet with Senator Clinton at the
14 Long Island Sound waterfront. It was ironic because on one
15 side we were viewing the amazing landscape of the Long
16 Island Sound and on the other side was the white elephant
17 of the Shoreham nuclear power plant and it harkened back
18 the memories for me, about twenty years ago when I was out
19 there with droves of people, such as those behind me, who
20 were trying to get across to the federal government that
21 this was not something that was wanted in our very
22 environmentally sensitive area.

23 I just can't help think what would have
24 happened, how much money would have been saved, how much
25 aggravation could have been spared had the federal

1 government heard from these people and listened very early
2 on.

3 With the case of the Shoreham nuclear power
4 plant it was 1965 that there were first licensing
5 procedures taking place. It was in the late seventies that
6 the community started to become active in regard to that
7 particular facility and throughout the eighties we engaged
8 in court battles and eventually it was closed down.

9 We are at the early stages here. In this
10 particular case, we are looking to nip this in the bud
11 right now, so we don't have to go through...

12 We don't need to spend tens of millions of
13 dollars from our legal fees or from the perspective of the
14 federal government as well.

15 These crowds are not going away. They are going
16 to get bigger, they are going to get bigger, they are going
17 to get bigger. The bottom line is, this community does not
18 want this facility in the Long Island Sound.

19 I speak as their representative, someone who is
20 in charge of public health and safety in this area, but
21 also from an economic perspective. Not only does this
22 community not want it, we don't believe we need it. There
23 are plenty of other alternatives. We have a new pipeline
24 coming down that is going to provide us ample natural gas
25 and other facilities.

1 Finally, we have been spending on the state
2 level, the federal level, the local level, not millions of
3 dollars, not tens of millions of dollars. Hundreds of
4 millions of dollars to take care of Long Island Sound,
5 which is officially designated as an estuary, and to
6 replenish it, to bring it to its pristine state. In one
7 fell swoop with this particular structure, all of that hard
8 work, all of that money could go down the drain. It is not
9 worth it. It is not needed. It is not wanted.

10 Most of all, what I think the community doesn't
11 want is to be the test case, the guinea pig. This is an
12 untested type of situation of this magnitude. There was
13 nothing ever this large that has been placed in such an
14 environmentally sensitive area. We, in Suffolk, have put
15 our money where our mouths are when it comes to
16 environmental preservation. We spend millions of dollars
17 to preserve our open spaces. We fought the dumping of
18 dredge spoils into that Long Island Sound, successfully I
19 might add. And thanks to the federal government, who
20 listened to people like this, we were successful in
21 stopping that attempt to place dredge spoils into the
22 Sound.

23 Now we are asking you once again to please
24 listen. Let's not make the mistake we did with Shoreham.
25 We let millions and millions of dollars go down the rat

1 hole. We had lawsuit after lawsuit, and in the end it
2 didn't open anyway. Let's avoid that. Let's do what we
3 have to do with energy conservation, with other
4 alternatives to provide the needs to meet our energy
5 requirements. We will meet them. We are doing fine. We
6 don't need another white elephant this time in the Long
7 Island Sound.

8 I thank you very much and I will present my
9 comments.

10 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker will be Jennifer
11 Gund, representing Congressman Bishop's office.

12 MS. GUND: Good evening. Jennifer Gund,
13 Congressman Bishop's office.

14 Congressman Bishop has asked me to read the
15 following statement.

16 "I would like to thank the FERC, U.S. Department
17 of Homeland Security and the U.S. Coast Guard for holding
18 this meeting tonight. I regret I am unable to attend in
19 person as the House of Representatives is back in session.
20 While I appreciate this hearing, I oppose the process that
21 Congress and the administration have created where FERC has
22 the ability to dismiss state, county and local concerns. I
23 would urge FERC to remember a piece of school yard wisdom.
24 Just because you can doesn't mean you should.

25 "I would especially like to thank all the

1 citizens who have taken the time out of their busy
2 schedules to attend this public meeting. Throughout the
3 past several months, citizens have devoted so much of their
4 time and energy to standing up against the Broadwater
5 proposal. I urge the decision-makers on this panel and in
6 Washington to listen to these citizens. They are not
7 professional lobbyists, they are not hired guns brought in
8 from out of state. They are ordinary people who live in
9 this community. They did not come to this process with any
10 preconceptions and they do not stand to gain or lose money
11 from Broadwater. They are simply here to stand up for the
12 health and safety of the Long Island Sound.

13 "I am wholeheartedly against the Broadwater
14 proposal. I believe that Long Island needs more reliable
15 energy supply and I believe there are preferable
16 alternatives. However, I have judged this project not by
17 the need to bring more energy to our region, but by whether
18 we should view the Long Island Sound as an industrial park
19 to be exploited or a natural resource to be protected. I
20 do not support industrializing the Long Island Sound.

21 "Let me share some of my specific concerns. I
22 am concerned about safety. There are many unanswered
23 questions about a potential explosion on the platform in
24 terms of its effects on the surrounding communities. The
25 impacts of thermal radiation and what efforts would be made

1 to rescue personnel.

2 "There are also many questions about what kind
3 of exclusion zone would be needed around the platform and
4 whether the Coast Guard has the resources to protect the
5 facility and the tankers. As you know, the Coast Guard is
6 already stretched very thin with its existing Homeland
7 Security and rescue functions. I fear the Broadwater
8 platform and tankers would not be properly protected or
9 worse yet, that the redeployment would take away from
10 existing efforts elsewhere.

11 "I am troubled by the potential impact on the
12 environment. As you know, more than 20 million people live
13 within 50 miles of the Long Island Sound, making it one of
14 our nation's most impacted bodies of water. We have seen
15 the impacts of water pollution and the effect it has on
16 marine life, but thanks to a lot of hard work, we have been
17 turning the corner. We have been working to reduce
18 pollution that goes into the Sound and protecting vital
19 open spaces along our shores.

20 "What will the impact be of an industrial plant
21 being placed in the middle of the Sound with up to 8
22 billion cubic feet of natural gas on board? This raises
23 concerns about air pollution and water pollution.
24 Additionally, with tankers coming and going at all hours,
25 many shoreline residents are concerned about light and

1 noise pollution.

2 "I am also concerned that a private company will
3 essentially own a piece of the Long Island Sound and create
4 a wide exclusion zone that is off limits to boaters and
5 fishermen. In my opinion, the Long Island Sound belongs to
6 all of us and I don't think any company should have that
7 right.

8 "Finally, perhaps the biggest question we must
9 ask is if this would be a turning point for the Long Island
10 Sound. Once we build this one industrial platform and have
11 a Coast Guard presence, what happens inevitably when
12 another company smells an opportunity for private profits
13 from our public waterways? Will the taxpayers of Long
14 Island be required to foot the bill for increased Coast
15 Guard security?

16 "I understand FERC and the Coast Guard have a
17 number of issues to examine ranging from safety of this
18 platform to where this fits in our nation's energy policy.
19 In those considerations, I urge you to factor in the
20 concerns I have raised and the voice of the community that
21 does not want to industrialize the Sound, a community that
22 does not want Broadwater.

23 Thank you."

24 MR. STAEGER: Thank you for your comments. I
25 will call up the representative from Congressman Israel's

1 office.

2 MR. WEINER: My name is Harris Weiner. I am
3 here from the office of Congressman Steve Israel and
4 Congressman Israel asked me to read this statement.

5 "I apologize for not being here in person. They
6 are recording votes on the floor of the House of
7 Representatives this evening. However, I did not want to
8 allow this hearing to pass by without joining my voice with
9 those of the civic organizations, environmental groups,
10 concerned citizens and many others who are opposing the
11 construction of a giant liquid natural gas facility that
12 would be placed in the center of the Long Island Sound.

13 "I oppose the plan as a member of the Congress
14 and co-chair of the Congressional Long Island Sound Caucus.
15 This facility could jeopardize the environmental safety of
16 an already challenged national treasure, the Long Island
17 Sound.

18 "The Long Island Sound is an important part of
19 our region's history and remains a vital component of our
20 identity, economy and way of life. Today over 8 million
21 people live in the Sound's watershed, with 20 million
22 people living within 50 miles of its shores. Three New
23 York counties and 24 Connecticut counties border the Sound,
24 generating surface runoff from some of the most densely
25 populated areas of the country. Over one hundred sewage

1 treatments discharge, combined, one billion gallons of
2 waste into the Sound each day. However, recent efforts are
3 helping this important resource breathe new life.

4 "The Sound contributes over \$5.5 billion dollars
5 annually to the regional economy through tourism,
6 recreation and commercial fishing. This benefit is being
7 returned as states and municipalities spend millions of
8 dollars to restore the Sound each year.

9 "Public awareness is growing and the Sound has
10 become one of the best classrooms for young students to
11 learn about and appreciate the wonders of nature.

12 "We cannot take chances with the health of this
13 ecological treasure. In taking this stance, I am not
14 trying to prevent creative solutions to America's energy
15 challenges or even to prevent construction of liquid
16 natural gas facilities. I wish to ensure that such energy
17 facilities are constructed where they can safely operate,
18 where they do not threaten fragile environments, and where
19 the community is comfortable with their operations.
20 Different communities have different needs.

21 "Local concerns regarding the environmental
22 impact, the health and safety of the community, both here
23 and in Connecticut, should not be divorced from the
24 approval process. In fact, these concerns and state and
25 local government's ability to represent them ought to be

1 elevated in importance.

2 "For these reasons, I strongly oppose the siting
3 of this LNG facility in the Sound and urge the rejection of
4 the Broadwater application.

5 "Thank you very much."

6 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker is Jay Schneiderman,
7 Suffolk County Legislator, Suffolk District.

8 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Jay Schneiderman, Suffolk
9 County legislator.

10 As the Suffolk County legislator representing
11 the second legislative district, which encompasses the
12 region from Montauk Point to East Moriches, I wish to offer
13 the following comments with regard to Broadwater Energy
14 project.

15 First let me say that I have serious concerns
16 about the effect that the construction of the project of
17 this scope and size will have on the environment of Long
18 Island Sound. I have spent a great part of my private and
19 public life working to help protect Suffolk's unique
20 environment.

21 As a small business owner, I also understand
22 that this unique environment contributes immeasurably to
23 the vitality of our local economy. I strongly feel the
24 Broadwater project, as currently proposed, industrializes
25 the Long Island Sound to an unacceptable degree.

1 While the project may theoretically provide some
2 supplementation to Long Island energy needs, I believe this
3 theoretical benefit simply does not outweigh the long term
4 environmental and economic impacts the presence of such a
5 facility will have on our quality of life and overall
6 economic health. My legislative record on this point is
7 very clear and I have joined with a number of my fellow
8 legislators to support resolutions on the floor of the
9 legislature that express our opposition to this project.

10 I feel that it is very important, especially in
11 these times of rising energy costs, not to allow emotions
12 or short-term goals to drive the debate on a project of
13 this importance. We must remember at all times that we are
14 talking about potentially impacting a resource, the Long
15 Island Sound, that has merely been placed in our care for a
16 short term. We hold this resource in trust for all future
17 generations and must keep that trust foremost in our mind
18 as we determine how to proceed in regard to this matter.

19 Let me observe that in a world in which we are
20 increasingly called upon to pay strict attention to the
21 security implications presented by the construction of any
22 new public or private facility that has the potential to
23 become a target for terrorism, I feel that a facility of
24 this nature in this location is simply too much of a
25 potential target for persons or groups who would seek to

1 harm our nation and its citizens.

2 All levels of government currently face
3 significant challenges and responsibilities providing for
4 the security needs of the existing public. It is imprudent
5 from a security policy standpoint, as well as fiscally
6 irresponsible to add new facilities and the accompanying
7 security requirements to the list of those facilities that
8 currently require the attention of public and private
9 security agencies absent a strongly demonstrated need for
10 the creation of these new facilities.

11 Also, even in the presence of a strongly
12 demonstrated need, the decision to construct such new
13 facilities must only be made after a carefully conducted
14 review and evenly balanced review of the cost and benefits
15 of the proposed project as these issues relate to the
16 quality of life as well as the safety, economic and
17 environment concerns of the community. Viewed in that
18 construct, the Broadwater project simply does not pass
19 muster.

20 Before I conclude, let me just add one thing,
21 without reading. I have one minute left.

22 A lot has been said about Shoreham and how we
23 really are still recovering from the Shoreham disaster with
24 the bailout. We don't want a Broadwater bailout. You are
25 hearing from this group. There are lots more people who

1 are opposed to this project. Spare us all the anxiety of
2 worrying about the potential threat here.

3 On a smaller but not insignificant matter, as
4 you look at this -- and I talked about the
5 industrialization of the Sound. Light pollution is really
6 an increasing problem and this is one of the few areas
7 where you can look up and see the milky way still in the
8 sky. There is an observatory on the north fork of Long
9 Island and hopefully one day there will be one on the south
10 fork of Long Island. This is something that will benefit
11 future generations as well. I would hate to see that
12 incredible resource destroyed.

13 I have come to the conclusion that I simply
14 cannot support Broadwater. It is the wrong project in the
15 wrong location at the wrong time.

16 Thank you for giving me the opportunity to
17 comment.

18 MR. STAEGER: Kevin McCarrick, Brookhaven Town
19 Councilman.

20 MR. McCARRICK: Good evening. My name is Kevin
21 McCarrick and I serve as Brookhaven Town Councilman for the
22 Second District.

23 District 2 includes the communities of Wading
24 River, Shoreham, Rocky Point, Sound Beach and Miller Place
25 and Mount Sinai, all of which are only a few miles from the

1 LNG terminal proposed by Broadwater. More importantly, I
2 myself am a lifelong resident of the area. After much
3 consideration and research back in February of this year, I
4 became the first elected official of Long Island to oppose
5 Broadwater's proposal. Since then just about every elected
6 official in every level of government has joined me in my
7 opposition.

8 Back in May, I sponsored a resolution, passed
9 unanimously by Brookhaven Town Supervisor LaValle and the
10 entire Town Board that makes clear the town's strong
11 opposition to this plan as well. I will leave you a copy
12 for the public record.

13 I wanted to thank the FERC and Coast Guard for
14 holding these hearings over the last two days. I remain
15 hopeful that these hearings are more than just good public
16 relations and the testimony received will be taken
17 seriously.

18 Based on the testimony given thus far, it seems
19 pretty clear where state and local officials as well as the
20 community at large stand on the proposal. Unfortunately,
21 this is just not enough and I remain very disturbed that
22 the state and local agencies have been removed from the
23 process, leaving the final destination determination left
24 entirely in the hands of FERC. This is a major injustice
25 to my constituents and all residents who live around Long

1 Island Sound.

2 I remember voicing my deep concerns regarding
3 the negative impacts this would have on the Sound's fragile
4 environment, the threat it would be to our safety and
5 security, the horrible precedent the plan would set for
6 making Long Island Sound an industrial waterway. These
7 questions have been raised quite well by previous speakers
8 in the last two days. It is now up to you to answer them
9 sufficiently. Still, I would like to elaborate briefly on
10 a point already raised.

11 Back some years ago when after exhaustive study,
12 the federal government declared the Long Island Sound an
13 estuary of national significance. From what I understand,
14 only 28 waterways in the entire nation share this
15 distinction, yet the same federal government seems poised
16 to begin the industrialization of this significant estuary.
17 So I ask, what does estuary of national significance mean?

18 If this proposal is approved, it won't make the
19 distinction. Shouldn't this distinction protect the Sound
20 from the aggressive disturbance of the estuary? Hundreds
21 of millions of dollars have been invested at all levels of
22 government to ensure the health of the Sound and we are
23 just starting to see the results. Approval of this plan
24 would destroy all that has been done and make the millions
25 of dollars wasted. I am troubled by the mixed message

1 being sent from Washington regarding our precious natural
2 resource.

3 Finally, I don't want to make light of the
4 region's energy needs. There is no doubt we are desperate
5 for new energy sources, but the needs shouldn't lead us
6 toward ideas that threaten the fabric of who we are. The
7 only benefit Broadwater Energy has provided is it has
8 unified officials and groups on both sides of the Sound to
9 oppose Broadwater.

10 Seeing this back in April, I held a unique
11 gathering of elected officials from New York and
12 Connecticut for the purpose of looking beyond Broadwater.
13 I am happy to report the groundwork has been laid in
14 creating a permanent coalition of officials from both
15 states for the purpose of addressing issues we both share.
16 With our energy needs topping the list, we are ready to
17 work on a comprehensive regional energy plan that makes
18 sense. The only obstacle to the efforts is the time taken
19 to oppose Broadwater. The Long Island Sound doesn't divide
20 us. It unites us. Please help us to help ourselves and
21 turn down the application of Broadwater Energy.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be elected
24 official Daniel LoSquadro, Suffolk County Legislator.

25 MR. LOSQUADRO: Good evening. It is Daniel

1 LoSquadro, representing the 6th Legislative District, and I
2 welcome you gentleman to the 6th Legislative District.
3 This is not only the district I represent, but Shoreham
4 also happens to be my home. So not only do I have an
5 interest in this as an elected representative representing
6 81,000 constituents, but this also happens to be home for
7 me and I spend quite a bit of time on the beach myself.

8 That being said, I am here to present to you --
9 you see hundreds of faces out here today -- for the record,
10 over 2,000 responses which I received to my office in
11 opposition to the Broadwater natural gas proposal.

12 Legislator Schneiderman, who spoke before me,
13 also happened to mention that he and I cosponsored a
14 resolution within the county legislature which was voted on
15 and approved. That was Resolution 8, which I will also be
16 submitting for the record, which is in opposition to the
17 Broadwater natural gas proposal. The Suffolk County
18 legislature voted, it was signed into law by our County
19 Executive, who spoke earlier, and this is now the position
20 of Suffolk County officially on this matter.

21 Many statements have been raised in regard to
22 this proposal and I, of course, will go on the record as
23 saying -- and anyone who has spoken to me or received any
24 of my mail knows -- I am obviously firmly in opposition to
25 this. But I will raise a few specific questions because I

1 think that is the direction we need to be going in now.

2 I have done a great deal of research on this
3 myself and earlier you brought up the Sandia report. Based
4 on my examination of Sandia, no examination has been done
5 on a platform or on a scale of this size with the amount of
6 natural gas being proposed to be stored in a facility of
7 this size. We all know this is something that has not been
8 tested on this scale, and Sandia comes nowhere close to
9 examining the ramifications of a breach.

10 Sandia also only examines a breach up to a size
11 of three feet. We saw what a very determined group of
12 individuals did with inflatable speedboat and a shaped
13 charge to the USS Cole. I think honestly that we need to
14 examine a breach larger than three feet on a facility on a
15 scale that has never been tested. I think Sandia is
16 inadequate in this regard.

17 We also discussed security costs. And I know
18 much has been said that this has not been fully examined.
19 We talk about exclusion zone around tankers coming in. The
20 platform itself is a stationary object and, as I said,
21 Sandia has not examined a breach on an object of this size
22 storing this amount of fuel.

23 Who would be responsible for permanent security
24 costs and enforcing a permanent exclusion zone around a
25 stationary site such as this? We talked earlier about a

1 movable exclusion zone, but this -- let's not forget -- is
2 a moored facility, so we are talking about giving away
3 several square miles of the Long Island Sound estuary
4 permanently for an exclusion zone. Who will be responsible
5 for incurring those costs?

6 You talked about the Environmental Impact Study,
7 the EIS. I would ask that that include something very
8 specific, and that is -- what I have not seen
9 historically -- look at previous projects that have been
10 done, such as the Iroquois natural gas pipeline. People
11 talk about the time frame in which healing will occur on
12 the sea bottom. The studies that I have seen show that
13 this healing does not take place at nearly the rate that
14 has been discussed. I ask very specifically that that be
15 included.

16 Now we can save ourselves all of this trouble,
17 but I know that won't happen, and that is why I ask you to
18 include these items. And the way we can save that trouble
19 is, as was said by the speakers before me, the other
20 representatives, we know this is not a good proposal for
21 Long Island. We can just ask the individuals from these
22 companies to pack this up, go home now, save everyone the
23 trouble. But I think the reason we are here tonight is we
24 know that is not going to occur. So I ask these very
25 specific items.

1 I enter these over 2,000 petitions into the
2 record, as well as the voice of the 1.5 million residents
3 of Suffolk County, through our legislature.

4 Thank you very much.

5 MR. STAEGER: Our final elected official,
6 attorney for the Town of Huntington, Michael White.

7 MR. WHITE: Good evening. My name is Michael
8 White with law firm of Jaspan Schlesinger Hoffman. We
9 represent the Town of Huntington in connection with the
10 application of Broadwater Energy for the LNG facility in
11 Long Island Sound. I spoke at last night's meeting on
12 behalf of the town and, therefore, I will be brief.

13 First, let me reiterate the town's opposition to
14 the siting of the Broadwater project and its related
15 infrastructure in Long Island Sound. Based upon the
16 Sound's continuing commitment to the protection of the Long
17 Island Sound ecosystem and its overall concern that
18 Broadwater will have an adverse impact on the environmental
19 stability and economic viability of Long Island Sound.

20 At last night's meeting, I entered into the
21 record a certified resolution adopted by the Town Board of
22 the Town of Huntington.

23 The siting of 8 billion cubic feet of explosive
24 petroleum product that, if released, would cause a safety
25 and environmental disaster in Long Island Sound is simply a

1 contradiction to the enormous resources spent to study,
2 protect and improve this estuary of national significance.

3 The Town of Huntington renews its request for an
4 additional scoping meeting in Huntington to accommodate the
5 public of Huntington and other nearby Long Island Sound
6 communities. Last evening I entered into the record a
7 letter from Supervisor Petrone making that request and
8 inviting you to the venue of Huntington Town Hall for such
9 an additional meeting.

10 As the Iroquois pipeline, which makes landfall
11 in Huntington, is the contemplated recipient of the gas
12 flow from Broadwater, there are particular risks, costs and
13 impacts of the Broadwater project to the town. The town
14 has continuing concerns about the present operation of the
15 Iroquois pipeline that runs through the town. Broadwater
16 will also require a permit from the town under its marine
17 conservation law should it choose to utilize the Iroquois
18 system.

19 While the town will submit detailed comments
20 respecting scoping in writing, we ask that you give initial
21 consideration to the need for the project, aside from
22 profits to TransCanada and Shell. Consider what is the
23 plan to supply Long Island with sufficient energy.
24 Consider alternatives. Particularly, if an LNG storage
25 facility is needed and a comprehensive plan for Long Island

1 establishes such a need, consider alternative locations. I
2 mentioned last evening that the federal government seems to
3 be looking for a new use for Plum Island.

4 Certainly, you must consider cumulative impacts.
5 Numerous recreational and commercial activities already
6 occur in Long Island Sound. What is the impact of having
7 Broadwater and, perhaps, additional LNG storage facilities
8 occupying this precious natural and public resource?

9 Again, the town looks forward to a response on
10 its request for an additional scoping meeting.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. STAEGER: Our next speaker is Norris
13 McDonald

14 MR. McDONALD: Norris McDonald, founder and
15 president of the African-American Environmental
16 Association. Our office is based in the Bronx. I have
17 also been an environmentalist for 26 years and also a
18 boater. Also happen to be an asthmatic. I will address
19 some specific items of concern for the scoping meeting
20 tonight.

21 Land use. The FSRU will be built on a
22 shipyard. Since it is offshore, it will not have any land
23 use impact.

24 Recreation. Recreational boating should not be
25 negatively influenced by the FSRU or twice weekly shipments

1 of LNG. The FSRU will have appropriate night lighting to
2 eliminate any threat to recreational boating. I love
3 boating at night more myself than during the day.

4 The pipeline will be in sediment under the Sound
5 and will not affect swimming, boating or shipping.

6 MR. MARTIN: Let's be respectful, in the
7 audience.

8 MR. McDONALD: Wind power projects are
9 experiencing the same visual pollution objections being
10 used against the Broadwater project. I testified at the
11 Nantucket Sound Cape wind project there. The same sort of
12 protest yet when industry sites are proposed in minority
13 communities, the same people complain about spoiled views
14 are nowhere to be found.

15 It is to build absolutely nothing anywhere near
16 anything, BANANA. Not in my backyard, the NIMBY crowd,
17 that is putting needed infrastructure at risk. Anywhere
18 does not seem to register with the gated community shore
19 visibility protection crowd when the proposal is for
20 minority communities. Come down to the Bronx and look at
21 the project. And this isn't even a polluting facility.

22 And --

23 MR. STAEGER: Ladies and gentlemen, please, give
24 everyone a chance to speak.

25 MR. McDONALD: Allow me to play the race card:

1 Environmental justice.

2 Assuming that the EIS will state there are no
3 environment justice issues, it should state there are no
4 environmental injustice issues. The project will not
5 normally trigger threshold requiring analysis. The
6 important point from an environmental justice perspective
7 is the Broadwater LNG project will provide the least
8 polluting fossil fuel for generating electricity. Thus,
9 operation will be beneficial to human health and to the
10 extent natural gas is provided through the long haul
11 natural gas pipeline system, the project positively affects
12 minority communities east of the Rocky Mountains than it
13 disproportionately impacted by pollution sites.

14 Other people might not care about it, but
15 there are asthma incidences in minority communities going
16 through the roof. This sort of project for providing fuel
17 not as polluting as coal burning is very important for
18 asthma sufferers all over the region and this project is
19 important for that.

20 If opponents are successful in killing this
21 project by delaying it through litigation, they are saying
22 that although it is a good project, it is not good if it is
23 in their backyard. They must take the view that it should
24 be built in Harlem, South Bronx, Queens, or other low
25 income minority communities in New York. AAEA has a big

1 problem with this type of environment elitism.

2 Marine transportation. The auto and ferries
3 will not be inconvenienced but LNG will only offload into
4 the FSRU about two to three times a week. Air quality I
5 already mentioned.

6 Noise. In other words, the noise impact of the
7 FSRU will be minimal because it sits in the middle of a
8 120-mile Sound. There will be no ongoing pile drivings for
9 any type of industrial noise. Noise from small and
10 powerful motor boats -- my little 75 horse power Whaler
11 will make more noise.

12 Cumulative impacts. I served on the EPA panel
13 that drafted the impact analyses and the Broadwater project
14 cumulative impact assessment, the rewards far outweigh the
15 risks. I will conclude there.

16 Thank you

17 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker is David Ochoa
18 or something similar to that.

19 MR. OCHOA: Thank you. I am a resident of
20 Patchogue, New York and it is a pleasure to welcome you to
21 our community.

22 On Sunday I had an opportunity to do what I
23 normally do every other Sunday, and that is pay my bills.
24 My LIPA bill came in at \$1,013. I have to say to you, it
25 is the biggest energy bill I have ever paid in my life.

1 The second bill I paid was for the fuel oil. It was
2 delivered to my home in Patchogue from Dulles Fuel Company
3 and that bill was a record amount I ever paid \$633. Most
4 of us in this room have been paying incredible prices for
5 gas. Most recently I filled up my tank in my Ford Taurus
6 and easily it was in excess of \$49.

7 There is one thing in common all my friends and
8 Long Island neighbors have here today -- and we have no
9 reason to believe these bills are ever going to be lower
10 again -- and that is an outrage. Before continuing, I want
11 to share with you one message of perception as a citizen of
12 this community. Allow me first to preface by saying the
13 quality of the information that drives the political
14 process of a democratic society is the ultimate determining
15 factor of the quality of the decisions made by that
16 society.

17 Recently we have seen, as we have tonight,
18 elected officials announce their opposition to the
19 Broadwater project that have not seen any studies or
20 reports to substantiate their opposition. They have done
21 so without the benefit of the facts. From the detailed
22 technical review your agencies are charged with that
23 responsibility.

24 First and foremost, there is an imminent view
25 that power supply crisis looming on Long Island if we do

1 nothing. Doing nothing is a choice none of us can afford.

2 As a South Bay resident, a business owner, a
3 concerned citizen with knowledge of the energy industry,
4 here are the issues I am hoping you will address in your
5 review, if I may suggest the following.

6 What would happen to our natural gas and
7 electricity prices if we don't build the Broadwater
8 facility? How are we going to repower our existing plants
9 if we do not obtain more supply from diversified sources?
10 How will higher prices for natural gas and electric impact
11 the women, Hispanic and other minority-owned businesses on
12 Long Island and how will the same high prices affect the
13 quality of life for all the community now struggling day to
14 day to gain a foothold as part of the American dream in
15 Long Island?

16 With undisputed growing demand for energy, what
17 alternatives are there to natural gas to meet the need and
18 how would those alternatives affect the environment
19 compared to natural gas? Is LNG safe? Is a Broadwater
20 project as proposed safe? How are you going to weigh the
21 comments, including the informed, ill informed and the
22 opinionated, that the facility and our LNG is unsafe as
23 well as those assuring its safety?

24 My testimony will be submitted to you as a
25 citizen, a resident of this community, but in closing I

1 want to draw your attention to the Pulitzer prize-winning
2 author Daniel Yergin, chairman of Cambridge Energy Research
3 Associates. Mr. Yergin stated that public believes energy
4 projects should be stalled to protect the environment and
5 keep the energy industry at bay. He added that the public
6 neglects to note the cost of such delays to the consumer.

7 He went on to predict soon the public would wake
8 up to the need for gas, perhaps after a cold winter with
9 high and volatile prices or some other event. We should
10 all take note. Perhaps that moment is now.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. STAEGER: Next is Emelio Hernandez.

13 MR. HERNANDEZ: Emelio Hernandez, Suffolk County
14 resident and business owner. I do share a lot of the
15 concerns that the community has because I look at the same
16 issues. I also think that we have to take some time to see
17 what are the impacts of Broadwater project.

18 I do have concerns, but I think at this time,
19 with what is going on around the world, I feel, and this is
20 opinion, that we have to look at some other forms of
21 energy. The LNG may be a good project, but I think we need
22 to look at it a little closer than maybe the way it is now.

23 I think also that the project should be studied
24 and at that time is when we should make a decision as a
25 community, after the professionals have taken the time to

1 look at this Broadwater project.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. STAEGER: Next will be Jim LoScalzo.

4 MR. LoSCALZO: Hello, gentlemen. My name is Jim
5 LaScalzo and I have been a resident on Creek Road, Wading
6 River the last 21 years.

7 I am here to comment on the visual images
8 Broadwater presented in their proposal as to where the LNG
9 plant will be located, viewed from the Long Island side of
10 the Long Island Sound.

11 I have some photos that I downloaded from
12 Broadwater's website, so I will put these here for you to
13 look at.

14 First let me say that Sleeping Giant Mountain
15 that surrounds the area in Connecticut, which is directly
16 across from my home, is visible most of the year. Photos
17 presented by Broadwater do not clearly show the Connecticut
18 coastline or Sleeping Giant area. Where you can see
19 Sleeping Giant Mountain in the Broadwater photos in that
20 thing I just gave you, it is marked A. And actually, it
21 puts the LNG vessel also in the Connecticut harbor, nine
22 miles from the Long Island shore line, not as they claim.

23 The photo marked B shows the true image of the
24 commercial vehicle approximately 7 to 14 miles from the
25 Long Island shoreline. I have also downloaded several

1 other photos from the website that compare the photos most
2 accurately -- that is to where LNG tanks is going to be.

3 The photos presented are not a true
4 representation of the view from Long Island side of the
5 proposed site. I also have a large concern as to how this
6 vessel will be viewed at night. Broadwater has not even
7 submitted a simulated night photo for our inspection as
8 part of their proposal, and why is that? When the
9 commercial fishing boats are out there at night, they are
10 seen brightly from the Long Island shoreline and they are
11 only about a quarter the size of the Broadwater vessel. If
12 need be, I am willing to go out and take some pictures at
13 night and submit them to you guys.

14 It is in my opinion that Broadwater, in their
15 zest to locate this project in Long Island Sound, has not
16 been completely truthful in presenting their project
17 information. As you can see in the photos I have
18 submitted, there is an extreme difference in the view from
19 what Broadwater claims to be nine miles out from the Long
20 Island shoreline. Everything I have mentioned is a major
21 concern of all of us on Long Island, especially to keep the
22 aesthetics of the Long Island Sound true to nature.

23 Yes, I am against the Broadwater project on very
24 many levels, but I am also for progress, innovation and a
25 betterment of our natural resources. If Broadwater claims

1 this project is for the betterment of Long Island and not
2 endangering our precious waterways, why are they starting
3 out by presenting false information? If Broadwater is
4 trying to convince us the visual images they submitted in
5 their own proposal are true and accurate, what else are
6 they trying to convince us about?

7 Thank you.

8 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker is Doug Dittko.

9 MR. DITTKO: Good evening. My name is Doug
10 Dittko, president of ABCO, Affiliated Brookhaven Civic
11 Organization; president of MEPKA; and board member of the
12 Open Space Council. The Long Island Sound is at this point
13 open space to be enjoyed by all.

14 I represent all these groups tonight and these
15 organizations are all in strong opposition to Broadwater.

16 Recent events in the Gulf of Mexico further the
17 argument against placing a volatile floating regasification
18 g factory in the middle of the Long Island Sound. At the
19 first meeting held in November of last year Mr. Hritcko,
20 spokesman for Broadwater, assured everybody in attendance
21 that a platform such as the one proposed could withstand
22 stormy weather in the North Sea. Photos and videos in the
23 Gulf of Mexico of tilting oil platforms and completely
24 dislodged floating living quarters for workers lodged under
25 bridges did nothing to support Mr. Hritcko's claim that

1 this platform is secure.

2 We must remember one thing. This pivoting
3 platform is unproven technology and must be considered an
4 experiment that endangers area residents.

5 The Broadwater contingent continues to promote
6 this factory as an offshore facility. Nothing could be
7 further from the truth. Conversely, this is a to shore
8 facility that will have an adverse effect on residents of
9 Long Island and Connecticut aesthetically, environmentally
10 and regarding safety and security. Two or three times a
11 week tankers piloted by foreign crews will enter the Sound
12 through the race between two coast lines, at times passing
13 as close to one mile from shore. To the south of this race
14 lies Plum Island, the perfect target for terrorists. The
15 ramifications of a hijacked tanker detonated on the shores
16 of Plum Island are frightening.

17 The U.S. Coast Guard is an elite group, perhaps
18 the best in the world. During the recent rescue effort in
19 Mississippi the Coast Guard stood out. This Coast Guard
20 will be however hard-pressed to deal with a catastrophe the
21 size of what could occur should Broadwater go forward. One
22 has to ask how our Coast Guard could react to a natural gas
23 disaster and maintain effective control of our other ports?
24 Why should our Coast Guard, funded by all Americans, should
25 be responsible for protecting the interests of two large

1 foreign fossil fuel suppliers?

2 Even at the hearings tonight -- and you have to
3 go through all the committees -- who is paying for this?

4 Two further observations. It is a bit ironic
5 that our dependence on fossil fuel contributed to global
6 warming, which is what is creating the increase in number
7 and intensity of deadly storms, such as Katrina, the storms
8 that dislodged and damaged the oil platforms.

9 Mr. Hritcko at the onset of this ill-conceived
10 project, implored the public to comment. He claimed public
11 input was important, yet when countless environmentalists,
12 civic and public officials from both New York and
13 Connecticut to speak their opposition, Mr. Hritcko always
14 expresses his concern about we haven't given the project a
15 chance. This project, quite frankly, should not be given a
16 chance. We know the danger the project brings
17 environmentally to our safety and quality of life. Natural
18 gas prices have not gone down in areas with LNG plants. In
19 fact, recently, they have gone up.

20 MR. STAEGER: Mr. Dittko, can you come up and
21 repeat the affiliations you are representing for the
22 reporter? Anybody else who wants to mention and is
23 representative of an affiliation, please say it a little
24 more slowly.

25 MR. DITTCO: I represent ABCO, Affiliated

1 Brookhaven Civic Association, umbrella group for all the
2 civic groups in Brookhaven town. I am also president of
3 Manorville East Moriches Civic Association and board member
4 of the Open Space Council and Open Space Council firmly
5 believes the Long Island Sound is open space to be enjoyed
6 by all.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. STAEGER: Lorraine Dittko.

9 MS. DITTKO: Lorraine Dittko, Manorville, New
10 York.

11 In January 2005, the U.S. Coast Guard invoked
12 its right to stop the clock on BHP Billiton plan to develop
13 the floating Cabrillo Port LNG facility offshore
14 California. The Coast Guard must approve all offshore
15 projects in the United States and has twelve months to
16 appraise and approve any development proposals, but can
17 also stop the clock at any time in the review process, as
18 it did earlier this year with Cabrillo Port, to obtain
19 further information from the developers of any project.

20 The Cabrillo Port proposal to locate the
21 floating gas hub about 18 miles off the coast of the
22 California town of Oxnard attracted widespread opposition
23 from community and environmental groups. They believed an
24 LNG port should not be built close to populated areas and a
25 lead to LNG gas cloud could ignite with dire consequences.

1 Prior to the Coast Guard's latest move, a May 5th deadline
2 for final decision had been earmarked.

3 The residents of Long Island ask that our
4 Coast Guard, stop the clock on the Shell TransCanada plan
5 to develop a floating Broadwater LNG facility off Long
6 Island. The Broadwater proposal to locate the floating gas
7 hub nine miles off the coast from the Town of Riverhead has
8 attracted widespread opposition from community and
9 environmental groups.

10 The Long Island Power Authority and
11 environmental groups determined that the Broadwater LNG
12 terminal will add little, if any, relief to the region's
13 energy costs. In addition, there are solid examples why
14 this project poses a viable danger to Long Islanders as
15 Broadwater admits there will be at least one LNG tanker in
16 the Sound at all times. There are but a few recent
17 LNG-related disasters.

18 January 2004. At least 27 people were killed
19 and 72 injured when the explosion caused by a defective
20 boiler ripped through an LNG plant. Residents living
21 within 6 miles outside the LNG site felt the heavy blast
22 and windows were blown out of buildings.

23 It was described as the worst LNG accident since
24 1975 when 40 people died in an explosion on Staten Island.

25 November 2004. The freighter SCM Athina,

1 registered in Antigua and Barbuda, collided with the High
2 Island 207 gas platform owned by EOG Resources in the Gulf
3 of Mexico off the coast of Galveston, Texas. The rig was
4 set ablaze and all gas lines on the platform sustained
5 extensive damage.

6 January 2005. More than 10,000 people living
7 near a gas field in Malaysia were evacuated when a Canadian
8 company, Niko Resources, experienced the uncontrolled
9 release of dry, sweet gas and a fire erupted. The mining
10 of natural gas is also an endangerment to Third World
11 citizens.

12 John Hritcko of TransCanada Shell Oil, head of
13 the Broadwater Energy project, is aware of the foibles of
14 the natural gas and has said in the past that this region
15 is not practical for the siting of an LNG terminal. In a
16 November 2003 article, "Siting remains a huge obstacle for
17 LNG," Mr. Hritcko was quoted in the gas strategies
18 conference. "Areas such as the northeast have the fewest
19 practical sites on which to build an import facility. In
20 addition, objections from local residents and governments
21 already have curtailed the number of LNG proposals and are
22 likely to claim more."

23 Frankly, I would like also to comment on
24 Broadwater's deceptive tactics and misleading claim that it
25 has polled local residents and indicating the majority of

1 Long Islanders want an LNG terminal in the Sound. Listen
2 to this.

3 MR. STAEGER: You are running out of time for
4 your comments.

5 MS. DITTKO: Mr. Hritcko's team asked residents
6 if we wanted environmental review of the project. Of
7 course we would demand a review of any major project in the
8 Long Island Sound. The poll question never asked "Do you
9 want an LNG terminal in the Long Island Sound? "

10 Yet Mr. Hritcko and Broadwater regularly tout
11 this deceptive poll as a firm indication that the majority
12 of Long Island residents want an LNG terminal in the Long
13 Island Sound.

14 CAPT. BOYNTON: I would like to make a short
15 comment on the reference to the Coast Guard stopping the
16 clock in the Cabrillo project. As a technical matter,
17 there are two categories of review for LNG projects. One
18 of them comes under the authority of the Deep Water Port
19 Act. That is the case of the Cabrillo project that was
20 referenced. Those projects under the Deep Water Port Act,
21 the Coast Guard is the lead federal agency overseeing the
22 process.

23 Those projects apply in federal waters outside
24 of three miles.

25 Now, the Broadwater proposal is outside of three

1 miles. However, all of Long Island Sound is state waters.

2 SPEAKER: That is why they want to put it
3 there.

4 CAPT. BOYNTON: Therefore, the Deep Water Port
5 Act does not apply for proposal --

6 SPEAKER: That's right. That is why they want
7 to put it in Long Island.

8 CAPT. BOYNTON: Therefore, in this case the
9 Coast Guard is not the lead agency and the rules that you
10 observed with the Cabrillo project don't apply here. For
11 projects ashore or in state waters, the Coast Guard is
12 cooperating agency, with FERC as the lead agency.

13 Thank you.

14 SPEAKER: A quick question regarding that
15 statement? Is it true that -- I am sorry. This is a
16 little off. Is it true that your review, if you decide
17 that the threat, vulnerability and consequences is too
18 much, your review --

19 MR. MARTIN: We need to have all the comments
20 made from the podium, so they can be in the transcript. If
21 you have signed up, can you hold your question to that
22 time? We need to respect everyone else already in line.

23 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker is Tom Stock.

24 MR. STOCK: Tom Stock, Manorville, Town of
25 Brookhaven.

1 Consider the following scenario. Broadwater gas
2 breaks its warrants as a category 4 hurricane impacts it
3 carrying it to shore and gas escapes from the pipelines
4 under the water in the Long Island Sound.

5 My concern is not only for the people along the
6 Connecticut and Long Island shoreline who might be close to
7 that situation, but also the ecological impact of the Long
8 Island Sound and wildlife.

9 What is being designed by Broadwater to prevent
10 this scenario from becoming reality? The possibility of
11 pipes breaking underneath the water in a storm, the effect
12 of escaped gas on wildlife. And remember the Challenger
13 spaceship calamity? That was a design flaw. Couldn't that
14 happen to Broadwater?

15 No Broadwater, no. No Broadwater, no. No
16 Broadwater, no.

17 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker will be Sid Bail.

18 MR. BAIL: My name is Sid Bail, president of the
19 Wading River Civic Association and I will try to keep this
20 very cut and dry. Other people handle the emotions.

21 Wading River Civic Association believes that the
22 following issues deserve attention. I have identified 56
23 issues. I am not going to, mercifully, read them all.

24 One, what are security costs associated with
25 Broadwater?

1 Who will pay for them?

2 Are the topside decks of the FSRU and LNG
3 tankers more vulnerable to damage from accidental or
4 intentional impacts than the hulls?

5 Will there be a no-fly zone around the FSRU and
6 LNG tanker? If so, what procedures would the Coast Guard
7 be willing to use if an airplane penetrated that no-fly
8 zone?

9 Assess the Lloyd's register of shipping study of
10 LNG tanker vulnerability to terrorist attacks and its
11 applicability to the Broadwater project.

12 Assess whether the Coast Guard's resources are
13 adequate to carry out all the security and safety
14 responsibilities in the Long Island Sound.

15 Assess the fire resistance of the foam
16 insulation used on the FSRU and LNG tankers used by
17 Broadwater.

18 Assess whether required hazard exclusion zones
19 would protect people in the Long Island Sound region from
20 low risk but high consequence events, such as terrorist
21 attacks or accident caused by human error.

22 Assess whether the capacity of the FSRU or the
23 LNG tankers will be used in calculating the size of the
24 exclusion zone around the facility.

25 Assess the impact of differing sea states and

1 weather conditions on Broadwater. What is the maximum sea
2 state that the FSRU and LNG tankers can tolerate?

3 Assess locating the Broadwater pipeline away
4 from populated areas, remote areas.

5 Assess the implications of an LNG spill of
6 greater than 3 million gallons from the FSRU or LNG tanker
7 in the Long Island Sound.

8 Assess the size, type and age of LNG tankers
9 that Broadwater plans to utilize. Will all the LNG tankers
10 be owned by Shell?

11 Assess whether the amount of pollution generated
12 by idling LNG carriers is included in the applicant's
13 calculations of emissions generations.

14 Assess whether subtle, molecular differences in
15 imported LNG will negatively impact the integrity of the
16 underwater pipeline Broadwater is building and the existing
17 Iroquois pipeline system.

18 Based on the country of origin, examine the heat
19 content of the LNG that Broadwater will import.

20 Assess how the FSRU and LNG tankers will be
21 handled if they become adrift or go aground.

22 Assess how the Broadwater project will be
23 insured.

24 Assess whether LNG tanker owners would be
25 responsible for American deaths, injuries and property

1 damage resulting from an LNG spill or disaster.

2 Describe LNG tanker liability under U.S. law.

3 Assess alternatives to the proposed action,
4 other than the no project alternative that reduces impacts
5 beyond those associated with the Broadwater project.

6 Assess the accuracy of proven reserves of
7 natural gas in the Atlantic basin. Assess the impact on
8 the Long Island Sound of the taking in and flushing of
9 large amounts of water.

10 That is all I have.

11 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker is Richard Amper.

12 MR. AMPER: My name is Richard Amper, executive
13 director of the Long Island Pine Barrens Society.

14 This exercise is not about energy. It is not
15 about liquefied natural gas. This exercise is about
16 Broadwater, the specifics of this project, what makes it
17 different, what makes it challenging, what makes it a
18 threat.

19 Long Island is a special place. We have a
20 unique geography, considerable population and its location
21 is a potential target for terrorism.

22 U.S. Coast Guard recently was active in the Gulf
23 hurricane retrieval efforts. Ladies and gentlemen, you
24 performed admirably in the face of an unprecedented natural
25 disaster and we are most appreciative of your response.

1 But we'd also appreciate an ounce of prevention
2 when it comes to Broadwater. You have no obligation to put
3 yourselves and every obligation not to put Long Islanders
4 in harm's way. It is one thing to take risks in response
5 to an emergency. It is something else not to prevent one
6 in the first place, if you can, and you have the capacity
7 to do that.

8 We are asking you to please consider all of the
9 potential threats of accident or terrorist attack before
10 making your recommendations. Mr. Bail enumerated a mess of
11 them. We will do the same in writing before the deadline.
12 Specifically that is what you are here to assess, but we
13 ask you to understand that it is not enough to evaluate the
14 risks attendant to LNG facilities as a generality. We
15 entreat you to assess the danger of this proposed facility
16 on Long Island in particular, the special and unique
17 problems associated with us. We are not opposed to LNG.
18 We are not opposed to energy. We are opposed to Broadwater
19 because we think it has unique problems for this particular
20 place.

21 And please remember, your first obligation is
22 not to the bottom line of a multinational energy
23 conglomerate and a \$600 million project. But it is, as it
24 was in Mississippi and Louisiana, to the public health and
25 welfare of the citizens of the United States of America.

1 Thank you very much.

2 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. Next will be to be
3 Adrian Esposito.

4 MS. ESPOSITO: Good evening, gentlemen. I am
5 Adrienne Esposito, Citizens Campaign for the Environment.
6 We will be submitting detailed comments to FERC and also
7 the Coast Guard on the security and safety issues, but I
8 have just three brief points to make here tonight.

9 The first is, for both the Coast Guard and also
10 for FERC, we want to know specifically in your reports how
11 public sentiment will be quantified and evaluated in your
12 review.

13 We have -- and you may be aware of this, but you
14 may be not. This is an unprecedented outpouring of public
15 sentiment. We alone have 49,000 signatures on petitions
16 from Connecticut and New York opposing Broadwater. We know
17 of thousands of our members who have written you letters.
18 And I was very heartened to hear, Captain Boynton, that you
19 are reading the letters.

20 Many of our members also send us copies and I
21 have the opportunity to read them also. And some them are
22 repetitive, but many of them give personal experiences
23 about why they value the Long Island Sound and why the
24 public is opposed to this particular use of Long Island
25 Sound.

1 We know of 17,000 individual letters written to
2 federal agencies, elected officials, state officials and to
3 government entities like FERC and the Coast Guard. We
4 haven't seen the likes of this massive public outpouring
5 against a project since the days of Shoreham.

6 The reason I raise that is that the public
7 deserves to know how that gets translated into your
8 decision-making process, how that becomes valued, how that
9 becomes weighed and how that enters into a safety and
10 security report and how that enters into a DEIS, because
11 clearly it needs to be weighted and valued heavily and we'd
12 like to know how that occurs.

13 The second is to FERC -- put the sign down. I
14 will be two minutes.

15 That is, we want you to know two things. One is
16 that this whole EIS process, having you examine and to
17 evaluate how this is going to impact Long Island Sound once
18 you give away somewhere between one to four square miles to
19 a multinational corporation is offensive to us. The reason
20 it is offensive is, it is not yours to give. You can't
21 give it to a multinational corporation.

22 You have heard so very much last night and you
23 will hear it again tonight about industrialization, but I
24 do want to quantify that to you about how we feel that
25 needs to be laid out and evaluated in your DEIS. When we

1 say industrialize, what we mean is not only these big
2 corporate entities that might come in with additional
3 proposals. We mean the whole thing. We mean all the
4 estuaries in New York State that you will be putting at
5 risk by setting this precedent.

6 So when we say not only Long Island Sound, we
7 want to know what will happen to the south shore estuary,
8 our most shallow estuary whose depth is probably somewhere
9 on the average of four to eight feet? What will happen to
10 those open water bodies? Will we have, for instance, a gas
11 station come in and want to locate in the middle of south
12 shore estuary? It could happen. They would have people to
13 come and do it. There would be a need. How will you deny
14 them? Maybe we will have a bait and tackle shop in the
15 middle of the south shore estuary. Very practical. Could
16 happen. Absolutely they would have the people coming in to
17 buy bait and tackle.

18 What about the Peconic? I will tell you what
19 you have. We have a clam bar and eatery and winery. Call
20 it the boaters' market. But what you need to do -- maybe
21 it seems funny and maybe in some respects it is funny. But
22 that will be the reality 20 to 30 years from now because it
23 will be looked at as real estate, as a new business focus,
24 a new business venture and, unfortunately, those businesses
25 will succeed. But we have to stop it before it happens

1 because your EIS, we want to see it evaluate the whole
2 thing for all the estuaries in New York because that is the
3 reality. That is the Pandora's box you are opening, that
4 is the precedent you are setting, and that is,
5 unfortunately, what we will have to live with because of
6 this process.

7 Last but certainly not least, the comments to
8 the Coast Guard. I want to echo some of the previous
9 comments that we have seen over the last weeks even more
10 than we have in the past, the true value of the Coast
11 Guard. We know that our Coast Guard is effective,
12 efficient, dedicated. You may be the one federal agency
13 that we consider the people's friend. So it is with a
14 little nervousness and a little trepidation that I offer
15 the following comments.

16 We are scared to death that you won't be able to
17 tell the truth. We are frightened that you'll be mandated
18 by this administration to say how you are going to get the
19 job done, Captain Boynton. They don't want to know if you
20 can do it. They want to know how you are going to do it.
21 And that is not good enough for us.

22 What we want -- and we heard you in the
23 beginning. You said you are going to identify safety gaps
24 and figure out how to mitigate them. That is not good
25 enough, frankly. We want you to identify safety gaps and

1 eliminate them because that is what the public deserves.

2 And so we ask you for three things. We ask you
3 in your safety and security report to identify that if you
4 don't get additional funding, what won't happen? Will
5 there be less inspection of our ports? Less surveillance
6 of our harbors? Less aid to boat in trouble? What won't
7 occur?

8 Also, if you are promised more resources, more
9 staff, more men and women on the job, what will happen two
10 or three years from now when that federal deficit doubles
11 and triples once again and the budget is cut and you have
12 greater responsibility but we are back where we started
13 with the original funding base? What won't you do? How
14 will those priorities be made? Where will we fall in the
15 priority ranking in relationship to corporate America?
16 That is what the public needs to know.

17 Two last things. I know I am way over, but I
18 have to say, if you are going to base your safety and
19 security on Sandia's report, what if Sandia's is wrong?
20 What if flammable vapor clouds can migrate over a mile?
21 What if Dr. James Faye from Massachusetts Institute of
22 Technology is correct and they can travel 4.4 miles? What
23 if everything is wrong? What are you going to do then?

24 We think you know the truth. We think you know
25 that this project doesn't work for Long Island Sound. And

1 we need you, Captain Boynton, Lieutenant Blume, we need you
2 to stand with the public between this administration, this
3 forced and hostile takeover of our waterways. We need you
4 to stand with us because, frankly -- Jim, you are a great
5 guy, but -- FERC is not going to do it. Only you can do
6 it. And that is what we ask.

7 MR. STAEGER: We will have one more speaker
8 before we take a quick break. It will be Kyle Rabin.

9 SPEAKER: What number are you up to?

10 MR. STAEGER: Number 12. The elected officials
11 were not on the list.

12 MR. RABIN: Good evening. My name is Kyle
13 Rabin, director of Friends of the Bay, an environmental
14 group that looks out for the Oyster Bay-Cold Spring Harbor
15 area.

16 I gave more detailed comments last night so I
17 will be brief. I want to reiterate that Broadwater
18 proposal will have far reaching ecological impacts
19 affecting the entire Sound and its embayments. We fear
20 this industrial project will pave the way for other
21 projects that could ultimately affect places like Oyster
22 Bay, Cold Spring Harbor. We are concerned, though, for the
23 entire Sound. As you know, the Sound is easy to harm and
24 slow to repair. Please keep this in mind during the entire
25 review process.

1 Also, Long Island is environmentally conscious
2 and Broadwater is going to have a very difficult time
3 selling this project. For many reasons this project is a
4 terrible idea. You have heard many of these concerns both
5 last night and tonight as well.

6 I want to hit upon a point that Doug made a
7 little earlier today about false information that is coming
8 from Broadwater. Broadwater's credibility has been damaged
9 by numerous misleading statements. As a participant in the
10 Long Island Sound Study Citizens Advisory Committee, we
11 have heard Broadwater officials speak inaccurately about
12 the energy bill and what it would do in terms of effecting
13 local input on the project. I think this should be a
14 factor in your review of this project.

15 I also believe that the review should consider
16 that you are hearing from paid lobbyists. Broadwater has
17 brought people in. I recognize some of them. I recognize
18 one individual in particular -- I will protect his
19 identity, but I ran into him during the whole Indian Point
20 debate, a very unpopular energy project, another unpopular
21 energy project, and I see him here today. He is a paid
22 lobbyist. He is based in D.C., but he is using a front
23 office in the Bronx. I find that to be repugnant and
24 shameful.

25 To the Broadwater officials here tonight, I have

1 this to say. Take careful note of the opposition you face
2 here on Long Island and across the Sound in Connecticut and
3 make no mistake. We will stop this project. In fact, let
4 me save you a little bit of trouble and some money. We ask
5 you to go home now.

6 I want to hit upon something you have heard here
7 tonight and will continue to hear. This project is a
8 sitting duck. It is an accident waiting to happen and we
9 are the guinea pigs. Because we are going to have this
10 false dependency on this project, on the fuel that comes
11 through it, it is an ideal target for terrorists. And I
12 want to provide you guys with something here tonight. I
13 don't expect you to go home without getting something from
14 us in addition to our comments.

15 Well, I feel as if I should give this more to
16 FERC, as I think I have much more faith in the Coast Guard.
17 I don't intend any offense. With FERC, honestly, I see you
18 guys sometimes in the way I see FEMA. I am very worried
19 about the thinking. This is not a personal attack on
20 anyone here individually, but over the years, over the
21 decades, FERC has made many bad decisions and we don't want
22 you making another one now. I will give you this to
23 remember us and to remember the salient point: This
24 project is a sitting down and a disaster waiting to happen.
25 Thank you.

1 MR. MARTIN: I will take it back to Washington
2 if I can get it on the airplane.

3 We have gone through 18 speakers. We have 32
4 remaining. Let's take five minutes, if possible, and we
5 will try and start back up. Thank you.

6 (Recess.)

7 MR. MARTIN: We are going to get started now.

8 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker is Mary Graves, but I
9 don't see her.

10 MR. MARTIN: Is Mary Graves in the room?

11 SPEAKER: She left.

12 MR. STAEGER: Maureen Dolan?

13 MR. STAEGER: Mike Comando?

14 We will go back to Maureen.

15 MS. DOLAN: Good evening. Tonight I would like
16 to talk about two things that really haven't been talked
17 about. The first is air emissions.

18 For the record, I am Maureen Dolan, program
19 coordinator, Citizens Campaign for the Environment.

20 In the Broadwater project description it states
21 the FSRU itself will generate some air emission during
22 operation in order to provide power for use on board the
23 FSRU. Also the FSRU will burn natural gas to regasify the
24 LNG and other equipment. The amount of emissions produced
25 will be subject to state and federal air quality standards.

1 CCE asks FERC to discard the notion that
2 existing oil plants will shut down and be replaced by
3 natural gas consumption, thereby causing overall decrease
4 in some air emissions. Since Broadwater does not own
5 existing plants and has no authority to close existing
6 plants, this type of erroneous statement needs to be flatly
7 rejected.

8 In the draft EIS for the Cabrillo Port LNG
9 project, it was identified that there would be a
10 significant increase of harmful air emissions caused by the
11 LNG facility. In specific, 180 tons of nitrogen oxide, 50
12 tons of reactive organic compound, 162 tons of carbon
13 monoxide and nearly 15 tons of fine particulate matter.

14 These same pollutants need to be addressed in
15 relation to the Broadwater project for both construction
16 and operational phases. They need to be addressed as
17 additional pollution sources to air quality.

18 Also, in the DEIS for Cabrillo Port proposal it
19 states, "During operations, the FSRU would generate
20 emissions that would exceed regulatory levels and so would
21 require U.S. EPA permit and offsets. CCE has grave
22 concerns on the increase of harmful air pollutants to the
23 surrounding area. Counties surrounding the FSRU, both in
24 New York and Connecticut, do not meet several federal air
25 quality standards. Many have been designated by the EPA as

1 nonattainment area for both ozone and fine particulate,
2 including Bronx Country, Nassau County, New York County,
3 Queens County, Suffolk County, Westchester County,
4 Fairfield, New Haven and New London County.

5 This data needs to be taken into account when
6 evaluating the emissions the FSRU will produce. How will
7 the increase of harmful pollutants affect the air quality
8 in the regions? How will that affect New York and
9 Connecticut from coming into compliance with federal air
10 quality standards?

11 The Broadwater project has estimated there will
12 be two to three LNG carriers entering the Sound per week.
13 These carriers will also be burning LNG for their
14 operations, producing harmful air emissions. It is stated
15 in the draft EIS for Cabrillo Port project that LNG
16 carriers are internationally flagged and, therefore, not
17 subject to United States marine vessel regulations. The
18 DEIS for Cabrillo Port failed to do comprehensive analysis
19 of the air emissions that would be released by the LNG
20 carriers.

21 It is estimated that each carrier would emit 100
22 tons of nitrogen oxide, which is a significant component of
23 ozone. In a nonattainment ozone area, this must be
24 considered in the DIES for the Broadwater project. CCE
25 urges FERC not to ignore LNG carrier emissions that would

1 enter the Sound.

2 Broadwater representatives have stated the Long
3 Island needs the natural gas. However, according to LIPA,
4 Long Island currently has 6,144 megawatts of power
5 generation capacity. This summer, at peak demand, we used
6 5,267 megawatts, leaving an excess of 877 megawatts. In
7 addition, the Neptune cable will link Long Island to
8 mid-Atlantic states, adding 660 megawatts by 2007. LIPA
9 has already begun discussions to add an additional cable
10 that would also link us to mid-Atlantic states.

11 In addition, the DEIS needs to include the real
12 scenario of repowering existing power plants to fulfill
13 Long Island's energy needs. This process will reduce Long
14 Island's energy consumption by 30 percent. We flatly
15 reject Broadwater's false claim that repowering can only
16 occur if Broadwater exists. The numbers we already stated
17 show the additional capacity available needed to take
18 individual power plants off line to allow repowering to
19 occur.

20 Clearly, there has been some planning for Long
21 Island energy's future. LIPA and KeySpan have not been
22 sitting around and waiting for Broadwater to come up and
23 save the day. The DEIS needs to include all the current
24 and planned energy sources when projecting and evaluating
25 the energy need for Long Island.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker, Mr. Comando?

3 MR. COMANDO: My name is Michael Comando. I am
4 the candidate for the Suffolk County Legislature's 1st
5 legislative district. That encompass Fishers Island,
6 Shelter Island, Town of Southhold, Town of Riverhead and
7 nineteen ED's in the Town of Brookhaven.

8 My questions that I was going to pose to you
9 were rhetorical questions, not needing an answer. But even
10 if they weren't rhetorical questions, knowing what I know
11 about this administration, I doubt I would get a straight
12 answer anyway.

13 Most troubling to me about this whole situation
14 is that we have been outcrying our disdain for this project
15 for many, many months and now a multinational corporation
16 wants to impose itself on the good people, the taxpayers of
17 this Long Island, Suffolk County, and, at great expense to
18 them, cause them to fight a project which we all know in
19 our hearts is inappropriate.

20 I was wondering. If I was out there fishing on
21 my little boat and one of these moving security zones just
22 happened to come over the horizon and I just was in there
23 fishing, minding my own business, would I have to move my
24 boat? Would I have to reel up my line to let this moving
25 security zone pass me by?

1 And what if it was a commercial fisherman whose
2 livelihood depended on that? Would that commercial
3 fisherman have to yield his fishing area so that this
4 moving security zone could pass by?

5 I am totally and unequivocally opposed to this
6 project. We need to spend the money that we would be using
7 to fight this project on renewable energy sources for
8 Suffolk County.

9 In closing, I would just ask you to hear the
10 words that the citizens of Suffolk County are saying.
11 Their voices, their voices have to be heard at a federal
12 level and I don't think they are being heard right now.
13 When I get elected, you can going to be hearing a lot more
14 of these people's voices.

15 MR. STAEGER: Next is Lois Ruplin.

16 We will hold that. Next would be Marge Acosta.

17 MS. ACOSTA: Good evening. My name is Marge
18 Acosta. I am from Centerport, Long Island and I am with
19 the Long Island Citizen Action Network.

20 Before I start, I want to mention for some
21 people who brought up about hoping Broadwater would lower
22 their energy bills. Just quoting from the Houston
23 Institute of Energy Law and Enterprise, a consultant for
24 the industry, they said that just to equal -- because LNG
25 is a very expensive gas -- the wholesale cost, it would

1 take a gas to travel 2,200 miles in piped gas before it
2 would reach the price, wholesale price of LNG produced gas.

3 Broadwater said that they are going to outsource
4 all the construction jobs for this facility and the new
5 energy bill has said that no one, not even FERC, will
6 regulate the prices of any new LNG produced gas, which
7 means that the oil companies and this new LNG cartel or the
8 one that they have started already is going to decide on
9 what you are going to pay for your gas prices. Do you
10 really think they are going to keep them down?

11 Going on to my main considerations tonight,
12 safety. One of the things I hadn't mentioned before was
13 that I read in the U.S. Coast Guard report that 20 percent
14 of the time there is a fog on the Sound that allows only
15 about a half-mile visibility. I wonder what that does to
16 small recreational boats when this whole entourage of
17 security and the LNG tankers coming on. They won't even be
18 able to see them. How are they going to get out of their
19 way? I wonder how they are going to provide for all of
20 this.

21 I hope, of course, that I said before, that the
22 Coast Guard will take seriously all our concerns for you
23 have the power and responsibility to stop this disastrous
24 proposal and protect the people in your care.

25 Unfortunately, we have seen in the past few

1 weeks how casually and callously the federal government
2 ignores the real threats of impending disasters to the
3 populous. In order to steamroll through its nearsighted
4 energy program, this administration attempts to create a
5 Pollyanna aura of minimal threats, false assurances and
6 economic boons. We don't want our Long Island Sound
7 threatened and our people endangered so another oil company
8 can profit.

9 In several places Broadwater's proposal and your
10 report speak of the firefighting capabilities of the
11 proposed LNG facilities, tankers and tugboats. Capability
12 to fight what? We are told in every reputable safety
13 report that a pool fire cannot be extinguished. The Coast
14 Guard must evacuate. And your report indicates that the
15 nearest useful firefighting equipment is in New York
16 Harbor, which is over 50 miles away.

17 Your report does not address vapor clouds, but
18 Broadwater does. In the DVD it distributes it says vapor
19 clouds just dissipate; and if they ignite, they simply burn
20 back to the source. Simply burn back to the source.

21 James Faye, the MIT expert on LNG, tells us
22 there is a real possibility of these clouds traveling
23 several miles; and if they ignite, they flashback to the
24 source at a speed of about one mile per second with the
25 same heat intensity as a pool fire.

1 Unignited vapor clouds can cause death by
2 asphyxiation. Vapor clouds are so dangerous that Sandia,
3 the report that you are citing, recommends quickly igniting
4 a vapor cloud before it leaves the LNG site. Now, that
5 seems incredulous.

6 FERC does not allow for consideration of a worse
7 case scenario, yet all we have to consider is a plane
8 flying into Broadwater's facility as a tanker unloads, like
9 not one but two planes that flew into the World Trade
10 Center, another idea we were told was not credible; but it
11 happened, and so might this.

12 If not one or two but all of the tanks in these
13 tankers were compromised, 33 million gallons of LNG, along
14 with the facility, what effect would that have on boaters
15 and coastal communities? On wave formation that Sandia
16 does discuss, on the Iroquois pipeline and on the entire
17 economy of Long Island and New York?

18 I don't want to hear it is not credible. I want
19 to hear the impact it would have and what you could do
20 about it.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. STAEGER: Lois Ruplin?

23 If not, the next speaker will be Cynthia Bogard.

24 MS. BOGARD: Hi. I am Cynthia Bogard, president
25 of Wildwood Hills Property Owners Association, whose 100

1 households are located right on the Long Island Sound next
2 to Wildwood State Park.

3 In the wake of Katrina, our nation just
4 witnessed two weeks of horrible human tragedy made much
5 worse by an inept and unresponsive government, especially
6 at the federal level, with the notable exception of the
7 U.S. Coast Guard. I understand that the FERC board was
8 appointed by the same administration that appointed the now
9 former FEMA head, Michael Heck-of-a-job Brown. Forgive me
10 if this knowledge does not inspire trust.

11 FERC does not have our best interests at heart.
12 If Broadwater is so safe, why not urge Shell and
13 TransCanada to park it next to the start of the pipeline in
14 Northport? If Broadwater is so safe, why not urge Shell
15 and TransCanada to park it next to New York City, the main
16 beneficiary? The fact is, Broadwater is not safe.

17 Will it come loose from its moorings in our next
18 Hurricane Gloria and, like some Biloxi casino, wind up in
19 my front yard? We feel like those impoverished citizens of
20 New Orleans -- expendable people, people who will be left
21 behind when an environmental catastrophe or terrorism
22 strikes. I doubt we can count on FEMA to come to our
23 rescue when FERC's bad decision endangers our neighborhood
24 and lives.

25 Finally, to the Coast Guard I say, we feel

1 threatened, we are vulnerable, and we do not want to bear
2 the consequences when Broadwater fails. Please, help us.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. STAEGER: Next will be Jane Alcorn.

5 MS. ALCORN: My name is Jane Alcorn, a resident
6 of Wading River. Many speakers before me have spoken quite
7 eloquently about the safety risks and the economic risks
8 and environmental, ecological risks, accidental threats.

9 I am here in a rather selfish position because I
10 want to speak about a pollution of a type that hasn't
11 really been discussed too much yet.

12 I am here to speak about visual and auditory
13 pollution. I spend a lot of time at the beach in Wading
14 River and I enjoy it a lot. I go with a friend of mine.
15 We paint, we draw, we look at the scenery, we take
16 photographs. I probably have the largest collection of
17 sunset photographs in Wading River because every time I am
18 there in the evening, I take a picture of it.

19 One of my joys is to look across the Sound and
20 see an occasional sailboat, once in a while a tug pulling a
21 barge, but more often looking across to Connecticut and
22 seeing the Sleeping Giant State Park during the day when it
23 is clear and lovely. I have pointed it out to students
24 because I was a teacher and we would sometimes use the
25 coast for science experiments and learning, and they always

1 enjoyed looking at that. And I also enjoy it at night when
2 I can look out, sitting on the sand, and seeing the stars.

3 One of the other things I notice is that I can
4 see the lights from Connecticut. Not only can we see the
5 lights from Connecticut, but we can hear sound from
6 Connecticut. I have been at the Sound this summer, sitting
7 at the beach, and watched fireworks across the Sound in
8 Connecticut, in Bridgeport. That is quite a distance from
9 Wading River. I could hear and the people I was with, we
10 could hear those fireworks. Now, if we can hear fireworks
11 from Connecticut, over 20-some-odd miles away, I am sure
12 the sounds we would hear from an LNG facility would also be
13 audible.

14 I also know that that facility would be situated
15 in a place that would obscure my vision of Connecticut. It
16 would obscure the sight of the Sleeping Giant Park, it
17 would obscure the sight of many of the sailboats and things
18 I enjoy so much.

19 For those of us who enjoy nature, enjoy arts,
20 painting at the seashore, that would be taken away from us.

21 I don't like the idea of industrialization of
22 the Sound or any of those things, but for me the simple
23 pleasure, enjoying the Sound for its beauty would be taken
24 and I would like that to be considered as well.

25 MR. STAEGER: Lois Rutman? Have you returned?

1 Tiffany Blake?

2 MS. BLAKE: Hello. My name is Tiffany Blake. I
3 grew up in Connecticut and now I live on Long Island here,
4 so I have a lot of friends and family on both sides of the
5 Sound. Needless to say, it means a lot to all of us. This
6 is the first time a huge part of our Sound might be taken
7 away from us and handed over permanently to a multinational
8 corporation. If we set this dangerous precedent, allowing
9 Broadwater to come in and build on our Sound, we may never
10 see the end of its industrialization.

11 Broadwater is an unsafe form of energy. I don't
12 want it in my backyard or anyone else's. Broadwater is
13 nothing but a road block to renewable energy.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be Bill
16 Belmonte.

17 MR. LEMBOW: My name is Mark Lembow, speaking
18 for Bill. He had to leave. He is running for Riverhead
19 Town Council. He wanted to speak about whose role the
20 shores, hundreds of miles of patrols for security and who
21 would pay for that, whether municipalities, Town of
22 Riverhead, Southhold, Huntington, or would it be patrolled
23 and paid for by the federal government, or by Broadwater
24 itself? These are questions that have to be asked.

25 Environmentally, I don't think anyone is really

1 going to argue that anything that is put like this in Long
2 Island Sound is not going to be beneficial. But when we
3 talk about energy, I think we all have to look at ourselves
4 because I looked outside tonight to see what type of
5 vehicles we all are driving and we drive big vehicles. We
6 suck up a lot of oil, a lot of gasoline.

7 We are about 5 percent of the world's
8 population, ladies and gentlemen, and we consume 30 percent
9 of the world's energy. We need to look inside of ourselves
10 because if we weren't doing that, if we were conserving, if
11 we really thought about it, this type of proposal would
12 never, ever be considered here or anywhere else in the
13 United States.

14 So I want to thank you gentlemen for being so
15 patient, for sitting here listening to all of our concerns.
16 But in the end, it is up to us to change things, to change
17 what we do, how we live. If we do not, we are going to be
18 going down the road where not just this proposal is going
19 to be made but many, many others that we are not going to
20 like but are going to be forced upon us.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. STAEGER: Next will be Gordon Danby.

23 MR. DANBY: My name is Gordon Danby. I have
24 lived in Wading River for 43 years and I like it.

25 Last winter I read the Sandia report. It is not

1 a bad piece of work, but I paid particular attention to
2 safety experiments, and they are orders of magnitude
3 smaller than this facility. It would be totally
4 irresponsible to just rely on extrapolating from that
5 Sandia report to build a potential bomb like this.

6 The other comment I would make, which has been
7 made repetitively is, it could drag its anchor in a
8 hurricane. If the eye came over here, it would probably go
9 west of Port Jefferson. That is the direction it would go,
10 but it might land anywhere.

11 The comment has been made that maybe this is a
12 national priority because we need cheap energy. People
13 have referred to that and Broadwater has exploited that a
14 bit. But I am a physicist and understand cryogenics. You
15 might take gas out of the ground, run it through a pipe and
16 put it in a big refrigerator that operates with very low
17 temperature, with all that insulation. Then I have to put
18 it through special cryogenic pipes, put it into these
19 spherical cryogenic vessels on these boats, drive it over
20 here -- that is not the right nautical phrase, but bring it
21 here, transfer it into this ship, then liquefy it -- yes.
22 Turn it back to gas, I mean, and send it off to pipeline.

23 It is not going to be cheap. It is never going
24 to be cheap. If Washington thinks that, they also think
25 hydrogen is the solution to our cars. Hydrogen is

1 wonderful to burn. But to make hydrogen takes more energy
2 than when you burn the damn stuff.

3 SPEAKER: Not in fuel cells. They are 80
4 percent efficient. You get 80 percent of the energy --

5 MR. DANBY: Natural gas. So, that is my
6 comment on cost.

7 FERC, no reflection on you, sir, but it is
8 outrageous that the federal government assumes in its
9 wisdom that it sets up an organization to make these
10 decisions and forgets states' and local governments'
11 opinion. Yet recently , which is typical government
12 hypocrisy, when the same issue came up with offshore oil
13 and gas, the decision was that the state could use local
14 option. Florida and California don't want any part of
15 that. Well, it is ridiculous. I mean, it is just a total
16 double standard.

17 My final remark is that this is just too
18 congested an area for this experiment. If people want to,
19 in spite of my skepticism, try to import a lot of natural
20 gas, stick it in some isolated place where you can stick it
21 into a pipeline. That is where it belongs. Not in this
22 situation.

23 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. Next speaker will be
24 Wendelin Giebel?

25 Let's try Ron DeVergiles?

1 MR. DeVERGILES: : Good evening gentlemen. My
2 name is Ron DeVergiles. I live in Wading River. This is
3 mostly addressed to the Coast Guard.

4 First of all, I have here from Time Magazine a
5 picture of an oil rig in Alabama and a bridge stopped it
6 after it broke its moorings. Now, we are talking
7 Broadwater and safety experts in this region believe that
8 we are in for a category 4 or 5 hurricane in the very near
9 future.

10 Now, do you honestly believe that a rig of this
11 magnitude out there can sustain these type of waves for a
12 period of time without breaking loose from its moorings?
13 Because I really don't think it can and I believe you and
14 the Coast Guard, with all your experience, I really think
15 you would be under the same impression as I.

16 When that broke loose, where would it wash up?
17 Connecticut or Long Island? And who is going to suffer?
18 Because once it breaks loose, even though the gas is not
19 explosive in its liquefied form, don't forget it is being
20 processed on that rig into its gaseous form and is highly
21 explosive. As far as a plume and cloud going only a mile
22 or two, let's remember 30, 40, 50-mile-an-hour winds. That
23 plume will make the shore in no time at all and you will
24 see residents -- well, you may not see the residents
25 anymore or their homes, and that is a tremendous factor to

1 remember. I really do not believe this platform belongs
2 out here in the Sound.

3 Thank you very much.

4 MR. STAEGER: Next will be Sue Ditekowsky.

5 MS. DITKOWSKY: My name is Sue Ditekowsky. I
6 live in Commack, New York. I am a member of Long Island
7 Citizen Action Network.

8 I did want to say that as an artist, I feel the
9 beauty and serenity of the Long Island Sound. And as a
10 mother and grandmother, I see it as a place for harried
11 parents to relax and enjoy their families and senior
12 citizens who can be seen walking along the beaches for
13 health and relaxation.

14 The ecology and environmental issues are
15 important to Long Islanders, especially for those who use
16 the Sound for their livelihood. I am constantly reading
17 how environmentalists have become the enemy of progress, at
18 least what some call progress. I will leave that issue to
19 those who are more knowledgeable. My main concern is for
20 the safety of our citizens. For the past four years, we
21 have been kept on constant alert for terrorist attacks and
22 have set colors advertising of the extremes. Our
23 administration ran for reelection with terrorism and
24 security as their theme. How strange then is an energy
25 facility being forced on us by the same people and in the

1 new energy bill giving FERC the authority to site these
2 facilities without the blessings of local governments.

3 Each energy tanker carries 33 million gallons of
4 liquid natural gas, equaling 33 times the explosive power
5 of the bomb that fell on Hiroshima. The gas is so
6 dangerous that our own Coast Guard has orders to evacuate
7 during a catastrophic event.

8 How do people of Long Island evacuate? Has FERC
9 seen the LIE during rush hour? The tankers and, an
10 untested form of facility, standing out like sitting ducks,
11 are unmistakable targets for those looking for one.
12 Indeed, interceptions have reported terrorist mentioning
13 LNG in planned targets.

14 We don't want to hear the word "unlikely." It
15 was called unlikely that the World Trade Center would be
16 hit by planes and we all know exactly what happened.

17 Some years ago Commack, Long Island was under
18 siege by a lone sniper. People in diners or restaurants
19 were shot at. And it took weeks for him to be apprehended.
20 With today's weapons in the wrong hands or small planes
21 with few restrictions, I cannot even begin to think of the
22 horrors facing our citizens.

23 The Sound belongs to Long Island and
24 Connecticut. It should not be privatized by business,
25 especially foreign business. Everything should be

1 considered to protect our citizens and our government
2 cannot be counted on in an emergency. Just think of the
3 news from New Orleans and the destruction from one
4 hurricane. We are also in the path of many hurricanes and
5 nor'easters. Please do not saddle us with these potential
6 disasters. There are so many negatives without any
7 benefits.

8 I thank you.

9 MR. STAEGER: Next will be Mr. Cohen.

10 MR. COHEN: I am Eric Cohen from Sag Harbor,
11 which is on the south fork of Long Island. Sometimes
12 people get confused. They think it is on the north fork.
13 It is not.

14 I am here in the spirit of unity with the people
15 of this area because I want you to know this is not a NIMBY
16 issue. People all over Long Island, all over Connecticut,
17 all over this region care about this issue very much. In
18 fact, I am a member of the East Hampton Democracy for
19 America group and in late May we hosted a discussion about
20 this Broadwater issue at which we had representatives from
21 Senator Bishop's office and some environmental groups and
22 also a representative from Broadwater was there.

23 We had what I would characterize as a free and
24 frank discussion with the Broadwater representative, but
25 she was allowed to speak fully and frankly.

1 I came away with certain conclusions after
2 listening to both sides of this argument and I regret there
3 is nothing new I have to say tonight. You have heard it
4 before. I will quickly go through what I learned.

5 The Long Island Sound is a waterway of vital
6 importance to our region and both New York and Connecticut
7 have made great strides towards cleaning up and restoring
8 the vitality of this nationally recognized estuary over the
9 last 15 years. While the two states are sometimes at odds
10 over what is best for the Sound, local politicians from
11 both states and political parties believe Broadwater is not
12 an appropriate use of this important resource. The
13 Riverhead Town Council is so sure that this is a bad idea
14 that they turned down \$15 million a year that Broadwater
15 offered to pay in lieu of taxes.

16 While there is a great need for more energy
17 resources on Long Island, the Broadwater plan is neither
18 the only nor the best way to address those needs. For
19 example, according to KeySpan corporation, the already
20 approved Islander East pipeline will satisfy Long Island's
21 need for natural gas for the foreseeable future.

22 Of all the reasons to oppose Broadwater, two
23 strike me as being the most resonant. The first is that
24 LNG is a nonrenewable fossil fuel derived exclusively from
25 foreign sources. Instead of helping our nation and our

1 region develop energy independence, reliance on LNG simply
2 furthers our dependence on foreign, nonrenewable sources of
3 energy.

4 The second most important reason to oppose the
5 project is that this terminal would set a precedent
6 regarding the industrialization of the Long Island Sound.
7 While there is currently a certain amount of commercial and
8 industry activity in and around the Sound, allowing a
9 floating terminal the size of the Queen Mary II to be
10 tethered to the bottom of the Sound by cables extending
11 over 7,000 square feet and attaching it to an underwater
12 pipeline 25 miles long represents what undoubtedly would be
13 a big step in the industrialization of what up to now has
14 been primarily a great recreational body of water.

15 Other reasons to oppose Broadwater is its
16 potential as a terrorist target. Restrictions on the use
17 of the Sound in an as yet unidentified exclusion zone
18 around the terminal and around the LNG tankers traveling to
19 the terminal, possible disruption of shipping and ferry
20 service, negative impact on our environment, potential
21 hazards to recreational boaters, fisherman and others using
22 the Sound, and its negligible impact on the local economy.

23 In addition, the fact that only 10 to 20 percent
24 of the total amount of LNG processed at this facility will
25 find its way to Long Island is a further condemnation of

1 this project.

2 Thank you very much for listening to me. I just
3 want to say that it takes a great amount of dignity to
4 receive a large plastic duck on stage.

5 MR. MARTIN: Probably takes more to go through
6 security at the airport.

7 MR. STAEGER: Next will be Kevin Ward.

8 MR. WARD: I am Kevin Ward, proud citizen of the
9 United States and a resident of Shoreham.

10 Many eloquent speakers representing many groups
11 have spoken here and I guess when you speak this late in
12 the evening, you have heard it all before and I am only
13 reiterating so much, but I really have three areas to focus
14 on. One, of course, is safety.

15 There are many reports, Sandia reports and other
16 documents you can get off the internet that describe the
17 issues with LNG. Many of the computer modelling and
18 simulations and experiments that really have been done on a
19 microscale and don't represent the macro thing that we
20 could face.

21 The release of a large volume of a cryogenic
22 liquid on to a warm surface, the rapid gasification of that
23 if it should ignite, what happens when the thermodynamic
24 effects take impact, we don't know. It is not known and it
25 is scary to think that could be an experiment right in our

1 backyard.

2 There is also safety issues. Again, this was
3 brought up as maybe we should design for the category 6
4 hurricane. You say category 6 hurricane doesn't exist now.
5 Well, maybe we don't know how to design to make it really,
6 truly safe.

7 We thought we had many of the risks contained
8 down in the Gulf states, the Gulf region, but we saw what a
9 recent hurricane could do to that. Katrina made different
10 believers and different sensitivities.

11 Of course, the terrorist impact. There are many
12 things that could be said. Department of Homeland Security
13 has security levels beyond what us normal citizens would
14 have that will address those issues and take that into
15 account.

16 Next, of course, is economic. We look at the
17 fact that everybody knows what happened recently with the
18 spike in price of oil and gasoline and everything else, and
19 LNG was going to be a cheaper, lower cost alternative.
20 However, you can start to see in the papers that those who
21 rely on natural gas for heating, there is talk about
22 upwards up to 71 percent increase in their energy cost for
23 this winter because they keep in step with the oil prices.

24 Why is that?

25 We look at OPEC controls the oil. How many of

1 those same countries that are in OPEC will be supplying the
2 natural gas combined with other countries that are
3 politically unstable who will be joining them and they will
4 be controlling the economics of that.

5 Finally, of course, is the recreational, safety,
6 environmental. The Sound, a lot of investment has been
7 made to make it clean and enjoyable for recreation, to
8 enjoy the sunsets, to look across at Connecticut. We are
9 concerned about the pollution, concerned about light
10 pollution.

11 Finally, there is a 25-mile pipeline which will
12 be dug through the center of Long Island Sound. It may be
13 a dead area; it may not be. But if you start digging and
14 start disturbing the base of the Sound, you will have a
15 long time in recovering and establishing viable marine
16 life.

17 Those are some of the concerns. You have heard
18 them before and thank you for the opportunity of letting me
19 express it again.

20 MR. STAEGER: I will ask one more time for Lois
21 Ruplin or Wendelin Giebel?

22 Next is Richard Ambro. Proposed facility. My
23 dad, Jerome Ambro, served in the United States Congress
24 from 1974 to 1980 and before that was Town Supervisor of
25 the Town of Huntington from 1967 to '74. After he passed

1 away in 1993, among the many honors bestowed upon him
2 posthumously the Town of Huntington named a section along
3 Crab Meadow Beach in honor of my dad. The Jerome Ambro
4 Memorial Wetlands bears my father's name because over the
5 course of 30 years of public service nothing was more
6 important or sacred to my father than protection and
7 preservation of one of the greatest natural resources we as
8 Long Islanders enjoy, the Long Island Sound.

9 Indeed, the Federal Act which extended the
10 prohibition against ocean dumping of dredged materials to
11 include the Long Island Sound among the bodies of water
12 which is protected is known today as the Ambro Amendment
13 because my father authored the Act and had it enacted into
14 law.

15 My father must be turning in his grave at the
16 prospect of the federal government considering
17 green-lighting a project which would have this body of
18 water which he dedicated so much of his public life to
19 protect to be used as a gas station.

20 We live on an island. We forget that because it
21 is such a large island, but we live on an island surrounded
22 by water. The Atlantic Ocean is likely our most important
23 body of water, but the Long Island Sound is arguably its
24 most fragile body of water. It must be protected.

25 I am here on behalf of myself, my wife, my two

1 young children, neighbors and friends here in Wading River
2 and Shoreham and in my father's name to urge you in the
3 strongest possible terms to reject the application to allow
4 the construction of a liquid natural gas facility on the
5 Long Island Sound. The need to preserve the beauty and
6 sanctity of this magnificent body of water cannot be
7 overstated. To allow such a facility to be built would not
8 only pose significant and unnecessary risk to the residents
9 of Long Island and coastal Connecticut, but would set a
10 dangerous precedent of allowing for the industrialization
11 of a federally protected body of water.

12 I urge you to reject it and thank you for your
13 time.

14 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker will be Jordan Mauro.

15 MR. MAURO: I want to bring up something that I
16 don't think has been brought up much, aside from the other
17 reasons why this is a bad idea. I want to talk about the
18 economic reasons why I feel it is a bad idea.

19 Using liquefied natural gas is a nonsustainable
20 energy source. Nobody knows what the cost of liquefied
21 natural gas will be by the time this is built and
22 operational. No one on earth can tell you what the price
23 of liquefied natural gas will be in 2010. No one can tell
24 you what it will be in 2020. You look at the gas pumps.
25 In the last five years price of gas has gone up 400

1 percent. To say this is cheap energy -- it is not even
2 sustainable. It is a total unviable source of energy.

3 Earlier we heard a lobbyist talk about
4 minorities. If we want to talk about minorities? Let's
5 stop looking at the Bronx and Suffolk County and Wading
6 River. Let's look at the world. You want to look at who
7 the minorities are? Look in the mirror. We are the
8 minority. China has 1.2 billion people in it. That is 900
9 million more people than live in this country. In the next
10 eight years, China will have 200 million more drivers, one
11 new driver for every man, woman and child in America plus
12 110 million more. As those 400 million new drivers come
13 into needing a car and needing gas, the price of gas
14 today -- in five years you are going to look back and think
15 gas was cheap at 3.50 a gallon.

16 When those people need the oil, you can't
17 produce oil. All the oil on earth is being diminished
18 every day, just like natural gas; you can't produce natural
19 gas. You can mine for it, but there is a finite amount.
20 As China and India and the rest of the world need it, the
21 price will go up and it will be become scarce and at some
22 point Exxon, Mobil, Shell, they are predicting the world
23 will run out of oil in 2030 or 2035.

24 We need to look at other sources of energy that
25 are sustainable and cheaper. Right now the cheapest source

1 of electricity in America is wind. Wind energy is the
2 cheapest way to produce electricity in America. Keep that
3 in mind if that is a proposal. One of General Electric's
4 four megawatt windmills would power 12,000 homes. So, keep
5 that in mind. One windmill can power 12,000 homes.

6 My next point is to the Coast Guard. I would
7 like if you guys could answer a question. Right now I pay
8 the Coast Guard and everybody here pays the Coast Guard
9 with their taxes and we pay the Coast Guard to protect
10 ourselves and to protect our assets and to protect the
11 members of the world community if they need it, people in
12 Canada or Mexico or if someone else was in need, we lend a
13 helping hand when we can.

14 Broadwater will not be paying the Coast Guard
15 any money. The tens of millions of dollars they will be
16 making are not going to be taxed by the U.S. government.
17 They are a foreign-owned company and will pay taxes to
18 their foreign government, not to the United States like you
19 and I, and will not be paying for the Coast Guard. My
20 question is, is the Coast Guard's mission to protect
21 foreign assets?

22 CAPT. BOYNTON: The Coast Guard's mission is
23 safety and security and environmental protection and
24 national defense.

25 MR. MAURO: Even for foreign-owned assets?

1 CAPT. BOYNTON: The Coast Guard's mission is
2 safety and security for the public and those other missions
3 -- environmental protection and national defense. Really,
4 the answer to the question I think you are asking, when the
5 Coast Guard does a security zone or safety zone, it is for
6 the public safety because of potential consequences.

7 MR. MAURO: One thing I would like to bring up,
8 as you assess security risks, it is a tactic that has
9 fortunately not been used yet in America, but that is the
10 tactic of using a shoulder fired missile or
11 rocket-propelled grenades to possibly attack this terminal,
12 which has extensive range and are extremely destructive.
13 Please, consider that when you consider the safety aspects.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker is Bob Feinstein.

16 MR. FEINSTEIN: I will be redundant but quick.
17 My name is Bob Feinstein. I live in Wading River, Herrick
18 Point, due south of the proposed LNG platform. I would
19 like to make the Commission aware of clear and powerful
20 environmental impact the platform will have on a particular
21 species, a population if you will, and that species is us,
22 the residents of Wading River, because many of us who come
23 to swim, fish, picnic, swim, kiss, those who for varied
24 reasons come to bask in whatever the beach and Sound have
25 to offer.

1 For as long as I can remember, one can look from
2 the shore across a completely unmarked gentle body of water
3 to the distinguishable coastline of our neighbor
4 Connecticut. Sunrise, sunset, moon rise, moon set, this
5 exceptionally beautiful asset is ours. We cherish it for
6 the peace, solace, rejuvenation it brings.

7 Overly romantic? No. We are like all Americans
8 who, not having purple mountains majesty, cherish what we
9 do have, a shining little sea. If the platform gets built,
10 the undisturbed vista of the Sound will be gone. Platform
11 is bad enough, but the continual to and fro of the pregnant
12 behemoths of the tankers will mar the Sound's beauty
13 irreparably.

14 It is worth a lot, this kind of undisturbness.
15 Poets through the ages sung its praises. You wouldn't have
16 to wait long before you see a commercial selling a
17 Caribbean vacation or a cold beer, employing that gorgeous
18 empty sight line of water stretched undisturbed to the
19 horizon. This is what we have. This is part of why we
20 bought our houses here, and if you allow Broadwater to
21 build an industrial zone in the midst of it, you will force
22 us to travel at great expense and inconvenience away from
23 our own homes to seek the quiet solace we once had in our
24 own neighborhood. It is not right and I hope you know it.

25 This is a real question. Can I ask you a

1 question? Does FERC bother to weigh the impact of the loss
2 of a somewhat intangible but very real
3 recreational resource -- I mean in the true sense of the
4 word recreational resource -- beloved by a community? Do
5 you weigh that?

6 MR. MARTIN: Yes. We will look at all of the
7 impacts to the extent that they are measurable things we
8 can actually evaluate. We will definitely do an analysis
9 of those things.

10 MR. FEINSTEIN: Thanks. You had better.
11 Thanks.

12 MR. STAEGER: Next speaker is Melody Grosskreuz.

13 MS. GROSSKREUZ: My name is Melody Grosskreuz
14 and I live in Sound Beach.

15 I am just a local resident. I am certainly not
16 as prepared as many who came before me. I agree with many
17 of their points about losing our natural resource, about
18 turning our Sound into a parking lot for a foreign country.
19 I don't agree with it.

20 One point that was not brought up by many of
21 those who went before me is that down the middle of Long
22 Island Sound runs a fault line. Again, with 9/11 and the
23 fact that the World Trade Center became an inferno for
24 months, I would not want to see this in the middle of the
25 Sound over our fault line. I consider it very dangerous on

1 Long Island.

2 We are literally sitting ducks, made very
3 prominent with 9/11. We were trapped on Long Island. The
4 only way you could get off was the ferry. If you took your
5 boat, who was going to let you land? We really are sitting
6 ducks. Please, do not put something this dangerous in the
7 middle of our beautiful natural resource.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. STAEGER: Joseph Walsh left his comments. I
10 presume he is not here.

11 We will enter his comments.

12 Next, Rob Denig?

13 MR. DENIG: Good evening. My name is Rob Denig
14 and I am a resident of Long Island, licensed master,
15 professional mariner, who makes a living primarily from the
16 Long Island Sound. It is a subject of great importance to
17 me.

18 I have some of the same concerns that many of
19 the people who went before me had expressed tonight when I
20 first learned of the Broadwater project. But as I got to
21 learn more about the matter and investigated on my own I
22 found eases to my concern. I have been talking to
23 Broadwater representatives, reading posted letters from
24 senators and congressman, reviewing preliminary plans and
25 participating in early survey operations.

1 I developed a level of confidence with the
2 principal parties involved with this project. I have
3 confidence in the expertise, conduct and performance of the
4 American Bureau of Shipping and International Maritime
5 Organization and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,
6 Department of Homeland Security, and most of all the
7 dedicated men and women in the Coast Guard who selflessly
8 serve the Long Island Sound year in and out, all of whom,
9 among many other organizations and agencies, play a vital
10 role in assuring the safety of the general public and
11 environment during the construction and operation of the
12 Broadwater Energy project.

13 Broadwater, to this point, made a terrific
14 effort of working in conjunction with those agencies as
15 well as maintaining open and objective dialogue with
16 legislators and the public. Because of the regulatory
17 efficiency of the agencies involved -- national,
18 international and private -- Shell Oil Company and
19 TransCanada's safety record regarding energy facilities
20 worldwide and their commitment to maintain that record have
21 developed confidence in Broadwater.

22 Furthermore, I have confidence in the local
23 marine community and its ability to provide the essential
24 services and support that would be crucial for safe and
25 effective operation of a floating storage and

1 regasification unit. Local industry will rise to the
2 occasion in a manner that everyone in the region can be
3 proud of. Suppliers, operators, shipyards of the Long
4 Island Sound have the resources, integrity and, most
5 important, qualified people to fulfill the needs of this
6 project better than any other east coast location.

7 The project will bring the Long Island Sound one
8 of the most important resources and underutilized resource
9 of New York one step closer to reaching its full potential
10 and a balance that will not diminish the diverse
11 environment and beauty. I have confidence.

12 Tonight actually is encouraging. The community
13 involvement is a benefit even if the involvement doesn't
14 support the project. It only further ensures the project
15 can be accomplished safely and with everyone's best
16 interest in mind.

17 MR. STAEGER: Thank you.

18 SPEAKER: Excuse me. I didn't hear the
19 gentleman's town? Could somebody read it back to me?

20 MR. STAEGER: Can you repeat what town you live
21 in, sir?

22 MR. DENIG: I live in Commack.

23 MR. STAEGER: I want to let you know, we have
24 15 more speakers signed up and we will extend over, but we
25 have only about a half hour. If you feel things you wish

1 to say have been said by others, it would be great to let
2 somebody say something new. I will leave that up to you.

3 If we can get through, great. If we can't, I am
4 sorry but we might miss some folks.

5 Lester Davis, I believe?

6 MR. DAVIS: Something I would like to bring up
7 which I don't believe has been. The lady before referred
8 to the pollution from the processing and so forth, and I
9 would like to read -- this is environmental impacts of
10 repowering KeySpan electric generating plants in meeting
11 future demands, the sense of which is an adequate supply
12 of natural gas. This is written by Dr. Matthew Cordaro,
13 School of Public Service Long Island University. He is
14 former president of the largest -- one of the largest
15 electric utilities in the United States. This is on
16 pollution. The repowering of, okay, KeySpan's plants.

17 Among the most important of these
18 characteristics of repowering at least some available space
19 and potential access to natural gas supplies. Now, here is
20 some of the numbers, hard numbers, that he has come forward
21 with when and if the repowering of KeySpan plants happen on
22 Long Island.

23 He is saying another illustration of the
24 environmental benefits of repowering, it is instructive to
25 examine what the actual total emissions for the existing

1 plants would have been in 2003 if they had operated with
2 the same emission rates as repowered facilities with
3 natural gas. As would be expected, the emission reductions
4 from repowering are quite dramatic. Here are the numbers.
5 These numbers will -- I am not criticizing the numbers the
6 lady used before. It would be a drop in the bucket, the
7 powering of the natural gas barge, okay, the processing.

8 Noxious oxide reduction emissions for 2003 would
9 have been over 6,000 tons or 90 percent for Northport;
10 1,000 tons or 80 percent for Port Jefferson.

11 Sulfur dioxide reductions of over 31,000 tons,
12 which is 95 percent reduction at Northport; 6,000 tons at
13 Port Jefferson, 98 percent.

14 Last, but not least, carbon dioxide. The
15 reduction for CO-2 has also been seen significant over 5
16 million tons at Northport; 900,000 tons at Port Jefferson.
17 Believe me, this is pretty significant, especially coming
18 from Dr. Cordaro. The reduction of all the above
19 pollutants would average almost 90 percent reduction.

20 Also, I would like to touch on another subject.
21 I know it has been mentioned here. The 300 million that
22 Broadwater would pay to Long Island. Now, that is over a
23 20-year period, I believe. If the gas barge were moved one
24 mile north, it would be in Connecticut waters and
25 Connecticut would get that \$300 million and Long Island

1 would not. I think that is pretty significant.

2 Just to quote another gentleman who some of you
3 may know. He is so respected, he has been the bi-county
4 planner for both counties, regardless of politics, for
5 many, many years, decades, none other than Dr. Lee
6 Koppelman. Addressing Broadwater's proposal to moor a
7 natural gas storage regasification plant, Dr. Koppelman
8 actually had positive things to say. He told a civil
9 organization a few months ago -- I believe -- whatever.
10 Not Northport. On the north shore. "It was necessary to
11 face facts. Additional energy is needed. Gas is much
12 cleaner than oil," the planner said. "Of the safety
13 issues, the most cataclysmic action would have damage well
14 offshore," Dr. Koppelman added. The coauthor of "Urban
15 Sea, Long Island Sound." As coauthor, he said he is
16 familiar with issues of safety and pollution and those who
17 say the Queen Mary size plant would industrialize the
18 Sound, Dr. Koppelman noted it is an industrial body of
19 water now and has been increasing for a hundred years. You
20 have got twelve seaports on both sides bringing in oil.
21 And that would be reduced by the way.

22 MR. STAEGGER: Mr. Davis, could you complete your
23 comments? You are well beyond your time.

24 MR. DAVIS: Dr. Koppelman noted the Broadwater
25 process is still in a very early stage. The bottom line is

1 that before everyone panics and jumps on the bandwagons,
2 political or otherwise, let Broadwater make their case or
3 not.

4 Case closed.

5 MR. STAEGER: Next will be Charles Wood.

6 SPEAKER: Once again, we didn't get a name or
7 town.

8 MR. WOOD: Charlie Wood, Wading River. I have
9 been in town for 60 years. I remember 30 years ago
10 Dr. Matthew Cordaro, LILCO. He was their patsy. He said
11 "Hey, this is the greatest plan ever." He was their
12 environment engineer.

13 What happened there? A \$6 billion plant down
14 the toilet. The twin towers cost \$1 billion. That
15 monstrosity in Wading River was \$6 billion. Dr. Matthew
16 Cordaro. He is a good authority.

17 One thing I really am happy about is that
18 Michael Brown has left town and thank God the Coast Guard
19 has come into Louisiana and your guy is now the head of
20 FEMA. The head of FEMA, Michael Brown, was the head of the
21 International Arabian Horse Association. That was his
22 major qualification to be the head of the Federal Emergency
23 Management Association. And the number two guy and number
24 three guy that are still there -- Where are they there?
25 Because they worked on Bush's campaign.

1 And this is America. FEMA is a joke. Until you
2 guys got in there -- finally somebody has to be put in the
3 position that has the authority and that has the knowledge
4 and no thanks to our present administration.

5 You got to wonder what is happening to America
6 because we have two great senators in New York State,
7 Hillary Clinton and Chuck Schumer, and they don't want this
8 plant. New York State is the third largest state in this
9 country and their constituency -- they are both Democrats.
10 Half the people in the state live in New York City, where
11 most of the gas will go anyway, but they did the right
12 thing. They came out and said, "We don't want this plan
13 here." The Long Island Sound is not an industrial park.
14 It is a pristine environment used for recreation, used for
15 commerce, but not used for big business and big brother.

16 And you better believe it is big brother, too,
17 because all of a sudden, what is America coming to where
18 the states -- I mean, we elected two senators. The state
19 doesn't want it. Connecticut doesn't want it. Steve Levy
20 doesn't want it. Town of Riverhead doesn't want it. Town
21 of Brookhaven doesn't want it.

22 My nephew is in the Coast Guard. He just
23 reenlisted and I am very proud of the Coast Guard. You
24 should be independent. This is the United States Coast
25 Guard. Thank God that FEMA now has a head that wasn't a

1 friend of Bush.

2 I am sorry. It doesn't matter, Democrat or
3 Republican, but there is something damn wrong with this
4 country when the senators of this state and -- there is 50
5 million people -- 20 million people living within 50 miles
6 of this plant here. Where do they put the plant? Right in
7 the middle of the damn Sound. They put it the furthest
8 away they can, because why? It is not safe. If it was
9 safe, why don't you put it closer to Northport where the
10 pipe is? It is not safe.

11 Very quickly, where does natural gas come from?
12 What countries have the most natural gas in this world?
13 Our good friends, Iran, Russia and Qatar. Morocco has
14 natural gas, but all this gas is not going to give us
15 independence from fossil fuel. I mean, you just pass --
16 the government just passed the energy bill, Cheney's bill,
17 that says we should be energy independent. If all the
18 damned natural gas is not coming from this country, what
19 will happen when we can't get the gas from Iraq, from
20 Russia, from the Middle East?

21 This is the worst boondoggle, and we don't have
22 the authority anymore. What has the country become?

23 MR. STAEGER: Next, Jason Kulczyk?

24 MR. KULCZYK: Jason Kulczyk. I live on Main
25 Street, Long Island.

1 Couple quick facts. Suffolk County Legislature
2 voted this proposal down 16 to nothing. Why doesn't that
3 count for anything?

4 Secondly, there is no cheap energy anywhere, so
5 I mean, I will be curious to see what the new strategy is
6 on that to the general public. Everybody is aware of that.

7 I don't think that the Coast Guard should be
8 made to protect private interests or people. I know it has
9 been said. I know I am probably reiterating what people
10 have been saying all night. I was still under the
11 impression that what I said mattered independent of the
12 fact that somebody might have said it more eloquently or
13 less.

14 I will try to get through this for you guys as
15 quickly as possible. I know you must be tired.

16 I am not even from here. I think this is a
17 horrible idea. You are making 20 million people guinea
18 pigs. Something that was just brought to my attention was,
19 is it true that the Sound froze over in 1979? Where is the
20 nearest icebreaker? That is comforting to know.

21 I want to say that our armed forces are all over
22 the planet protecting seemingly private interests, and I
23 don't want this to be another case of the same misuse of
24 our armed forces all over the planet.

25 That is it.

1 MR. STAEGER: We are not tired of listening to
2 you, just trying to get through the list.

3 Steven Studnicki?

4 MR. STUDNICKI: My name is Steven Studnicki. I
5 am from Wading River and I was born in Wading River and I
6 am 80 years old.

7 Anyway, my big concern is about whatever there
8 might be some solution or something from the plant that
9 might be injuring the water, so that it would prevent
10 swimming. They might have to stop swimming in that area
11 around the plant. And, naturally, they won't get rid of
12 the plant once it is there. That is my big concern.

13 I lived around the beaches there and swimming is
14 very important to those people. That is my big thing. I
15 agree with all these other things also. That was my big
16 concern.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. STAEGER: Thank you.

19 MR. STUDNICKI: The other thing is like there is
20 no cesspool. What are they going to do with the sewage?
21 That is going to just dump in the water. That is one of
22 the things.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. STAEGER: Christopher Kent?

25 MR. KENT: My name is Christopher Kent. I am

1 Deputy Supervisor of Town of Riverhead and I am a resident
2 of Baiting Hollow. I live on the bluff overlooking the
3 Long Island Sound. I have been asked by Phil Cardinale,
4 Supervisor of the Town of Riverhead and a majority of the
5 members of Riverhead Town Board to offer the following
6 comments in opposition to the proposal to site a terminal
7 and a floating storage regasification unit in the Long
8 Island Sound just off the shores of our town.

9 I do represent an elected official.

10 Unfortunately, I don't have any advance team to come down
11 and set up cards for me. I was a little late. Not to
12 prolong our night, I just want to make a few comments.

13 I must express our town's concern for the
14 safety, security and disaster preparedness of the residents
15 of our town, a town of very limited resources and
16 approximately 30,000 residents.

17 Our town is concerned about the
18 industrialization of the Long Island Sound and the
19 destruction of the marine environment of a nationally
20 recognized estuary.

21 There is a short list of our environmental
22 concerns.

23 The mooring system.

24 The 25-mile pipeline which would take four years
25 in construction and will disrupt and possibly permanently

1 damage marine life and migratory bird patterns.

2 Use of sea water for regasification process.

3 The large tankers that will be delivering
4 potentially explosive cargo several times a week.

5 Introduction of non-native species from the LNG
6 tankers that will be coming into the Sound.

7 The heightened risk of catastrophic accidents
8 and/or terrorist attacks.

9 Pooling leaks or LNG spills, air pollution,
10 light pollution, which I already witnessed personally, and
11 disruption to commercial and recreational fishermen and
12 boaters.

13 All of these are issues that Broadwater asks us
14 to trust them with because they have no scientific research
15 that shows that any of their activities will be able to be
16 done without further damaging an already weakened
17 ecosystem.

18 Our town's concern for this nation's continued
19 dependency on environmentally destructive and nonrenewable
20 fossil fuels. Our town's concern for the absence of any
21 official standing for the Town of Riverhead with regard to
22 the following important aspects. These are my final
23 points.

24 The formal application. We have got no standing
25 on the formal application or the approval process of the

1 location of this type of facility just off the shores of
2 the Town of Riverhead. The town's inclusion in the
3 emergency preparedness process and planning efforts. The
4 town's land use and taxing authority and our town's
5 economic dependence upon tourist-related industry that
6 relies upon our waterways and the effect this proposal will
7 have on those waterways and our industry we rely upon.

8 Again, we are a town of limited resources and we
9 have severe concerns for the lack of clarity as to the
10 ultimate site location and the site selection process.
11 Broadwater's proposed location is only a starting point for
12 the public consultation and detailed social and
13 environmental analysis. They are anticipating a prolonged
14 period to complete the draft EIS and ultimate
15 identification of the location to provide for the most
16 appropriate balance of benefit and impacts. But since
17 there is no certainty where that would be located at this
18 time, we would like the town to remain included in the
19 process and we feel totally not included in the process.

20 We hope you will take our concerns to heart and
21 will listen to what the town has said. We have voiced our
22 opposition. We have rejected the \$15 million per year that
23 has been offered by Broadwater to our town and we don't
24 want this located off the shores of the Town of Riverhead.

25 Thank you.

1 MR. STAEGER: Next is Betty Mazur.

2 MS. MAZUR: Good evening. I have driven just
3 about 50 miles to attend this meeting tonight. I live
4 in -- my name is Betty Mazur. I live in Amagansett, a
5 hamlet in the Township of East Hampton. For those who said
6 we were being NIMBY-like, I live on the east end, but I am
7 here to speak for the protection of the Long Island Sound.
8 It is part of Long Island and it is part of this very
9 beautiful, beautiful area. I stand with people of Wading
10 River and the people whose homes are on the Sound.

11 I had a longer list of specifics, but you have
12 heard them discussed very, very -- in very great detail and
13 very articulately, so I just want to say this.

14 I want to say that this is deja vu all over
15 again. Broadwater equals Shoreham only worse. I want to
16 transmit a distress call to the Coast Guard. SOS. Safe
17 Our Sound.

18 MR. STAEGER: James Miller?

19 No?

20 Eric Hauck?

21 MR. HAUCK: My name is Eric Hauck and I live in
22 Wading River. I'm a senior at Shoreham Wading River High
23 School. I have grown up in and on the Sound, fishing,
24 swimming, snorkeling. The last of these has allowed me a
25 glimpse of not what many people have seen.

1 I've seen bare sand stretching hundreds of yards
2 where mussel beds once were. I've seen an astounding lack
3 of underwater vegetation where it should be. I've never
4 seen the dolphins that once played in the surf. My dad
5 told me of them. With Broadwater, they will never return.

6 I've witnessed the destruction caused by
7 pollution first hand. Many species once seen in the Sound
8 are now gone. We once had dolphins, but no more. Mussel
9 beds are only now recovering from pollution. The
10 Broadwater project will only worsen the condition of the
11 Sound.

12 I am strongly against this project. This
13 floating bomb will not only pollute the environment but
14 also pollute our senses with its light and noise. Let's
15 protect what we have. How often do you get a large group
16 of elected officials to unanimously agree on an issue? I
17 think the people made their points clear. If you don't
18 listen to them, it negates their purpose and that of
19 democracy.

20 Thank you.

21 MR. STAEGER: Julie Penny?

22 Mary Ann Johnston?

23 MS. JOHNSTON: I am Mary Ann Johnston,
24 president of Manor Park Civic Association and founder of
25 Coalition to Save the Woods. I am 58 years old and I

1 didn't think I would live long enough where the people
2 became irrelevant.

3 I am so tired. You can take a message back to
4 your leader in Washington. I watched him last week amidst
5 the debris and destruction that should have been foreseen,
6 should have been prepared for, watched him tell the people,
7 "Don't worry, I won't forget what I saw." I don't give him
8 a lot of credit, but I really didn't think he was going to
9 forget.

10 Don't forget what you heard here tonight. We
11 will vote in the ballot box. We will vote forever in the
12 ballot box. This is not irrelevant.

13 We care what happens to that Sound. It is ours
14 and no act of Congress and no stroke of the pen can change
15 it. It is ours. We will protect it. We will defend it
16 and we will keep it.

17 Thank you very much because we think you really
18 do care. I watched you respond to Flight 800. I know how
19 awful that was. And Broadwater makes that look like a walk
20 in the park.

21 Don't forget us. We are not irrelevant and we
22 will not have this project.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. STAEGER: Joe Muncey?

25 MR. MUNCEY: I am not used to speaking in

1 public. Joe Muncey, Riverhead resident.

2 I had the privilege of reviewing some of the
3 initial filings of Broadwater and in one of the reports it
4 indicates that Suffolk County roughly has about 1.45
5 million residents based on the last census taken. In that,
6 within 20 miles there is 945,000 individuals that live
7 within the proposed site off of Riverhead. That equates to
8 basically 64 percent of Suffolk County would be within 20
9 miles of the site off Riverhead.

10 So, it is just not a Riverhead issue,
11 Brookhaven issue. It is a Riverhead issue, Brookhaven
12 issue, also a Southampton issue. It stretches much further
13 than just the coast, off the shore of Riverhead or Wading
14 River.

15 One of the things I am surprised is that that
16 many people do realize that in Suffolk County. If you did,
17 you'd probably have a larger turnout than you have today.

18 One of the things I noticed in reviewing some of
19 the documents was that they make comparisons to the land
20 sites. Broadwater would be the second highest density,
21 even though it is on water, when compared to the radiuses
22 going out on the short mileage distance. Of course, it is
23 zero because nobody lives on the water. Forgive me if
24 there is a houseboat out there.

25 As they bring the data out further in the ring,

1 it is broken into larger increments and I would like FERC
2 and also the Coast Guard and others with authority to look
3 at those rings not as five mile rings but mile rings going
4 out ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, et
5 cetera, to see the full impact on potential loss of life,
6 property, and things that would be intangible.

7 There is a public report and there is a
8 classified report and it talks about nine anomalies. What
9 does that mean? Does that mean there is clay pots out
10 there or nine warheads in the vicinity where they might be
11 placing this platform?

12 The public -- well, I don't know as a general
13 public person. You need clearance, my understanding, from
14 Homeland Security to be able to know what those items are.

15 It is mentioned by others, the environmental
16 impacts of storms and hurricanes, et cetera, securely
17 crafted to the bottom in Gulf of Mexico, more than a
18 hundred being uplifted and moved. With Broadwater only
19 four legs -- I don't know how many anchors. The issue is
20 how secure is it during a natural occurrence.

21 MR. STAEGER: If you can complete, we may be
22 able to get the last three people in.

23 MR. MUNCEY: Another issue is, being Broadwater
24 does identify 20 miles out and limited access or ingress
25 into Suffolk County on different county roads, et cetera --

1 Route 58, LIE, Route 25A, Route 347, Route 25, 27 -- there
2 can be analysis done on how 945,000 individuals will be
3 able to leave safely. That would be, I think, a benefit to
4 the public.

5 I appreciate your time. Thank you very much.

6 MR. STAEGER: Thank you. Next is Fred Hauck.

7 MR. HAUCK: Fred Hauck, Wading River for a long
8 time.

9 We had a desk like this in the sixties, we had a
10 desk like this in the seventies, and we had a desk like
11 this in the eighties. Then the state bought a \$5 billion
12 plant for a dollar. Okay.

13 You know that in the eighties was the last time
14 we had an earthquake in the Sound. Correct? You do know
15 this.

16 FERC -- you don't have to worry about
17 evacuation. You really don't. Go get the Shoreham
18 documents. They are readily available. We paid for them.
19 And if you go look at those Shoreham documents, you will
20 find out that basically all the roads are covered and you
21 can't get people out, so if something happens they are all
22 dead. Not some of them, not most of them.

23 Let's see. What else? You are going to dig a
24 25-mile pipe in the Sound. Okay. You -- Sorry. LILCO.
25 They dug two mile and a half outflow pipes from Shoreham

1 and they were contracted to put the junk on a barge and get
2 it out of here. They pumped it all into the Sound. They
3 killed everything from Herrick Point to the other side of
4 Brookhaven Beach for about 150 yards going out. The first
5 mussel beds I have seen in years are starting to develop.

6 Now they said, well, the Sound is going to heal.
7 It did. Took about thirty years.

8 The fact that -- I wasn't coming today. My wife
9 made me. Well, why does this community have the honor of
10 it twice in our life? I mean there has got to be fairness
11 somewhere.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. STAEGER: The next speaker is Lori
14 Baldassare.

15 MS. BALDASSARE: I will have cheers for being
16 the last. Lori Baldassare. I live in Mount Sinai. Civic
17 activist. Past president of Mount Sinai Civic, ABCO,
18 currently president of the Heritage Trust, a nonprofit here
19 that is building an alternative energy building as we
20 speak.

21 What I wanted to talk about is really the
22 process and some of the fears of people that I have heard
23 across the north shore. It was about a week before
24 Thanksgiving, I think I got a phone call from one of the
25 people that were supporting the Broadwater project to ask

1 about who the civic leaders were in the area to do a
2 presentation. And I had said at that time that I would be
3 willing to put together those civic leaders because it
4 sounded like an important project that we should all hear
5 about.

6 The time of the year was an issue, a problem, a
7 concern. I have worked on lots of development projects
8 across the north shore, but those were on land. Now we
9 were talking about development of our waterways.

10 Up until that time, all the projects we had
11 worked on that had to do with the water had to do with
12 conservation and supporting our waterways, making sure that
13 the quality was controlled, and that is why they are
14 recognized in the national registry.

15 As we got into the project, we had not been able
16 to find any element of the project that was beneficial to
17 the area. But the thing that concerned us even more is,
18 from the day we started, the regulatory authority became
19 further and further away from us.

20 As somebody who works very locally, if we have a
21 project in our community and we want to go before our Town
22 Board, we know what that process is and we know we can
23 bring people to the Town Board and we can voice our
24 opinion, we can have dialogue with our town officials and
25 what will happen.

1 As you start to get to county, it gets a little
2 further away from us, but there is still a process of
3 dialogue. When we get to the state level it becomes even a
4 process that is taken away from us as far as dialogue.

5 Now we are talking on federal level. The
6 only -- we don't have dialogue. We actually have you
7 sitting here listening to us and our comments. That is a
8 big concern for the residents here. They are very
9 concerned about dialogue in the process. I can only ask
10 that you be receptive to those concerns.

11 MR. STAEGER: Thank you.

12 Tenny Spofford?

13 We will back up for the couple that we had.

14 Wendelin? Still not here.

15 Lois Ruplin?

16 Anybody else on the list I missed?

17 Thank you.

18 SPEAKER: Can I make a comment? Can I ask a
19 question of the Coast Guard?

20 MR. MARTIN: Sir, would you mind coming to
21 podium and stating your name for the record, please?

22 MR. ACOSTA: My name is Eli Acosta. I live in
23 Centerport, New York. The question I have for the Coast
24 Guard deals with the comments I have heard about that if a
25 pool fire or a plume were to develop and the dangers of

1 these vapors igniting became imminent, from what I
2 understand the Coast Guard is instructed to leave.

3 If the Coast Guard leaves, where does that leave
4 the people? How do the people fend for themselves when
5 their leaders, the people who are supposed to protect them
6 and possibly instruct them as to how to deal with a problem
7 are no longer there?

8 If you could answer that question?

9 CAPT. BOYNTON: Let me try to make a couple of
10 comments. We do use as guidance the rings that are
11 outlined in the Sandia report in terms of expected levels
12 of thermal hazard. Secondly, I am not sure I am
13 interpreting your question correctly, but for any type of
14 an incident, first responders, including Coast Guard first
15 responders, has general guidance. But not just Coast Guard
16 first responders. If there is an incident that they need
17 to respond to, they have to survive in order to respond.

18 I might draw an analogy if it is helpful. As a
19 lifeguard, not to render assistance immediately if it is
20 going to cause two people in trouble in the water.

21 I am guessing a little bit that the reference
22 you are making is a somewhat standard first responder
23 guidance that in order to respond and help, the responder
24 has to be able to survive and continue to operate. I am
25 guessing that might be the context of the guidance that you

1 are referring to, but I am not sure.

2 MR. ACOSTA: Basically, I have heard it
3 mentioned several times that the Coast Guard, according to
4 some report or another, is instructed that if a situation
5 was imminent that something was going to happen that was
6 going to be very, very bad, that the Coast Guard was
7 instructed to remove its personnel.

8 CAPT. BOYNTON: I am not familiar with the
9 guidance you are referring to, which is why I said I am
10 guessing that it might be in the context of first responder
11 guidance.

12 However, if there is a circumstances that is
13 such that as a first responder the Coast Guard has to
14 leave, we would not leave without giving warnings to other
15 people who were there. So I am a little concerned that we
16 don't have a full context of what you are referring to.

17 MR. ACOSTA: I will try and see if I can clear
18 it up and forward it to you.

19 CAPT. BOYNTON: I made a note of it, too.

20 SPEAKER: Excuse me? Can I comment? My name
21 is not on the list.

22 MR. SPAWNBERGER: Hi. John Spawnberger. I have
23 been in the area for 70 years.

24 I can't understand how you can approve a fixed
25 object in the middle of the Sound when there is a northeast

1 storm blowing ice all over one side of it or a couple of
2 miles of ice floating down the Sound with a good wind
3 behind it that will take that damn thing right off the
4 moorings. Tugboats and everything just turn and go the
5 other way while they chop the ice off one side. How the
6 heck can a 1,200 foot thing in the middle of the Sound with
7 ice forming on the side of it from a storm? Just the
8 spray. Boats roll over in the Sound.

9 That is all I have to say. I hope you take that
10 under consideration when you do approve this thing. And
11 the Sound does freeze over, because when I first come out
12 here in the 1930's, the fellow next door, he worked for
13 Local Lumber. They are no longer in Rocky Point. He had
14 an ice boat up in his garage and where do you think he used
15 the ice boat? Long Island Sound. Something to take into
16 consideration.

17 MR. MARTIN: Thank you. I think we can take one
18 more speaker. We have to close down before eleven.

19 MR. MORAND: My name is Stacy Morand. I live
20 in Wading River and I agree with most of the comments of
21 the residents tonight, but the one thing I don't think
22 people discussed is the health of our residents. The north
23 shore of Long Island is inundated with cancer, including
24 myself, and I think emissions from this vessel and all the
25 vessels that will be coming to it need to be considered in

1 addition to air pollution and water pollution.

2 So I hope you will consider these measure as
3 well because we don't really need to have polls or
4 statistics from American Cancer Society. You can ask
5 anyone in the north shore of Long Island and they all know
6 somebody very close to them that has cancer. So please
7 consider that as well.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I want to
10 compliment you on how courteous you all have been and
11 professional and, most of all, patient. We definitely will
12 take all your comments back to Washington and review them
13 and the Coast Guard will review them here.

14 And thank you for the duck.

15 (Time noted: 11:00 p.m.)

16 STATEMENT OF JOSEPH P. WALSH:

17 Questions and comments for the FERC concerning
18 Broadwater.

19 Questions:

20 Security: 1. Who will provide security for the proposed
21 floating terminal? Who will pay for this?

22 2. How many aircraft flyovers per day will be
23 needed for security? Who will provide them? Who will pay
24 for this?

25 3. What would be the total size of the

1 restricted area, including the floating terminal and the
2 "No Boating" zone?

3 4. How many tankers would sail into Long Island
4 Sound per week to deposit LNG at the floating terminal?

5 Comments:

6 1. If the answer to questions 1 and 2 are "U.S.
7 Coast Guard" we have a problem. No government agency
8 should provide security for optional private enterprise.
9 If that were to happen then:

10 a) All expenses for the security must be paid by
11 the Broadwater companies.

12 b) A payment of \$1.00 per day per person in the
13 2000 LI census shall be paid for loss of Coast Guard
14 service to Long Island residents "in perpetuity" or for as
15 long as the terminal exists.

16 2. For each square mile, or fraction thereof, of
17 restricted area of Long Island Sound, the Broadwater
18 companies shall compensate the towns of Brookhaven,
19 Riverhead, Southold, Huntington, Smithtown and Oyster Bay
20 the sum of \$1.00 per day per person in compensation for
21 "loss of use" of those waters, all of which are part of New
22 York State. This would be paid "in perpetuity."

23 3. The fishing industry of Long Island shall be
24 compensated for "loss of use" of the restricted area, and
25 also for the loss of use of any fishing areas which could

1 be rendered unusable by tanker traffic from the East end of
2 Long Island Sound west to the floating terminal. The rate
3 would be as in comment 2 above. This would be paid "in
4 perpetuity."

5 4. If this is a "Go," put it on Plum Island.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, DEBRA STEVENS, a Registered Professional Reporter and notary public within and for the State of New York, do hereby certify that I reported the proceedings in the within-entitled matter on September 14, 2005, and that this is an accurate transcription of what transpired at that time and place.

DEBRA STEVENS, RPR-CRR