

**Transcripts of FERC Public Scoping Meetings concerning
Kinder-Morgan / Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Energy Direct (NED) Pipeline
FERC Docket PF14-22**

Transcripts are kept in this separate file:

http://www.Mason-NH.org/FERC_Scoping_Transcripts.pdf

Contents: *(Bookmarks have been set for direct access by location name)*

20150727-4003	July 14, 2015 at Castleton-on-Hudson, NY.....	2
20151015-4009	July 15, 2015 at Castleton-on-Hudson, NY.....	61
20150727-4004	July 15, 2015, at Great Bend, PA 18821	108
20150727-4005	July 14, 2015, at Towanda, PA 18848.....	125
20150728-4006	July 28, 2015, at Pittsfield, MA 01201	134
20150729-4008	July 29, 2015, at Nashua, NH 03062	181
20150730-4012	July 30, 2015, at Milford, NH 03055	244
	<i>(duplicate transcript in 20150730-4014)</i>	
20150811-4005	August 11, 2015, at Dracut, MA 01826	308
20150901-4004	August 12, 2015, at Lunenburg, MA 01462	365
20151015-4010	July 16, 2015, at Schoharie, NY 12157	409
20151015-4011	July 16, 2015, at Oneonta, New York 13820	437
20151015-4012	July 29, 2015, at Greenfield, MA.....	471
20151015-4013	July 30, 2015, at New Britain, CT.....	523
20150929-4005	September 29, 2015, at Rindge, NH.....	537
	last page of document	589

{ note: most transcripts were appended as they were released onto the FERC site, which depended on when the reporting contractors finished transcription, hence the out-of-sequence order in this document }

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Office of Energy Projects
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC Docket No. PF14-22-000
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

Birch Hill Catering
1 Celebration Way
Castleton-on-Hudson, NY

Tuesday July 14, 2015

The evening public scoping meeting, pursuant to notice, convened at 6:45 p.m, before a Staff Panel:

ERIC TOMASI, Project Manager, FERC

With: JENNIFER HARRIS, Cardno

PROCEEDINGS

MR. TOMASI: Again, I invite everyone to have a seat.

Good evening, everyone. Again, I want to thank you on behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for coming to tonight's meeting. This meeting is for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline. The docket is PF14-22.

My name is Eric Tomasi and I am the Environmental Project manager for FERC, not for the company. I work directly for the Federal Government for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. We are the lead Federal Agency. I also work in the Office of Energy Products at FERC as well as being a project manager for this project I am also the technical lead for air quality, noise and pipeline safety.

I also have several people here that are working for me tonight. They are a contractor and their names are as follows. They work for Cardno. We have Jennifer Harris. We have Oliver Paul. We have Lorraine Woodman. We have Jonathan Hess, Doug Mooneyhan and Jennifer Ward. They all work for Cardno and Cardno is our contractor that is going to help us prepare the Environmental Impact statement.

A couple opening points, obviously, the bathrooms are out in the hall. Everyone has seen that. There is also water in the back if anyone needs water or anything like that. We will have a break. We are looking to having a break around 9 o'clock for about ten to fifteen minutes to give everyone a little break from here and basically having person after person come up and speak.

Now you also may have noticed there is a court reporter here tonight. His job is to transcribe the meeting. This is so we can have an accurate record of tonight's --.

(Audio problems)

MR. TOMASI: Okay, so again we have a court reporter here from Ace Reporters. His job is to transcribe the meeting so we can get everyone's comments accurately on the record. This transcript is going to be put into our E- Library System and it will be on the record so that everyone can see and read what everyone has said tonight. That is extremely important. We also as well have a transcription contract with Ace and if you wish to get the transcript prior to its placement in our record you have to make arrangements directly with race.

MR. TOMASI: Next slide.

Now why are we here tonight, the purpose. I think all of you know why we are here tonight. We are here to get your comments on this pipeline. Now, tonight there are a few things I want to accomplish that are not necessarily on the slides, I want to summarize the project for you. Most of you are very well aware of what this project is and how it is going to affect your life here in Rensselaer County.

Two, I want to explain the role of FERC in our review process. Three, I am going to outline how you can all participate in the process. The last point is I am going to allow you to come up and voice your concerns and comments in the meeting.

Now, when I say comments there are a few things we want to hear. We want to gather, as it says up there, gather the issues for analysis in the environmental document, the Environmental Impact Statement in this particular case. Also, we want you to identify new issues. Obviously, we have a lot of people working for us who know a lot about environmental matters. We have geologists, we have archeologists, we have air quality people, we have noise people. We have various disciplines.

One of the things that we can gather and look at a lot of issues, but the most important things for us is what the people in the neighborhoods that the pipeline is going through, what their concerns are. Not only that, but if there are issues in the neighborhoods or in the general area that we don't know about, we need you to tell us about those. That is what we mean by identifying new environmental issues is I do not live here. I don't know the area as well as you. I will never know the area as well as you. That is why I need you to tell me about the area you live in and what your concerns are. So that is really important.

Also, as I said before, I am going to explain the FERC process and we are going to go ahead and provide you all some time for your input. Now I know we have some questions. A lot of people have questions. I will ask you to reserve your questions until after my presentation. Cardno is out front. They can answer some of your questions. Not necessarily all of them and also at that, many of you have signed up tonight to be speakers and if at any time during my presentation if you want to speak, please go out there and get another number so that you can be a part of the speaking process here tonight.

If we manage to get through all of the speakers, we will allow people to come up and talk as they wish. Even repeats. I don't know whether we will be able to get through everyone but I certainly hope that we can. We have this room booked until midnight. I am willing to go later because I know this is an important meeting and I know that many of you want to speak. So it's really, really important that we spend the time to ensure that you guys get time to speak tonight.

I talk about other input opportunities. One of the things that is important for you to understand is that this is not your only opportunity to speak, or for that matter, to actually write anything to us. We have all these scoping meetings across the pipeline and we have in this particular pipeline we have a lot of coping meetings. More so than normal because we know that in a lot of these areas there have been other pipelines going through or we are going through areas where they don't understand the FERC process.

Part of my job tonight is to explain to you how FERC works and how you can be involved. Obviously, there are the written comments. We have approximately three thousand comments on the record for this Project. That is a huge amount of comments for a FERC project. Many more than you would normally have on a project of this size in other parts of the country. I think a good deal of that is because a lot of people are really, really concerned. I see a lot of signs out here today as well as there are a lot of people who don't understand what we are going to do in our Environmental Impact Statement.

So those written comments, you can send those in many different ways. Obviously, you can send them just US Mail. Most of you will have gotten if you are a landowner, the Notice of Intent. In the Notice of Intent, it explains all the different methods by which you can go ahead and file a comment with FERC. It has our address and it has other ways to comment as well. As I said, you can file just the normal letter to send to FERC, send to me or there is also a comment form on the table when you first came in. That actually has the address on it. Just send it to me at FERC, I will get it and make sure it gets into the Library in the comments and put on the record.

Obviously, there are other ways to do it. Electronic ways to do it. We have the E-Library System, which is you go to FERC.Gov and you go to E-Library there is a way to upload whole letters under the docket.

Again, for all these things the most important thing is you have to make sure you have the docket number. The docket number for this Project is PF14-22. You need to have that on all correspondence that you send to us otherwise we are not going to know necessarily what project it is for. We probably will but to make

sure that it does get there, you need to make sure you have the docket number on it. So you can send it to our E-Library system.

We also have a quick-comment. Quick comment is, you can even be anonymous for that. You can go to our E- Library system, put a really quick comment on the record. It doesn't have much of a character room in it, you could put a very long letter in there, but it's very quick and very easy.

One thing I would like to point out, if you use either electronic system, if you want to be on our mailing list, one of the things you need to understand is you need to have your mailing address on that comment letter. One of the things that we do is, now I will digress a little bit and talk about the mailing list is that anyone who comments on the record either tonight or through letter, we make sure that if you have an address on your letter that you are added to our mailing list. So anything that goes out, like a notice, like the EIS, you have the opportunity to get that document.

Also, anybody who is a landowner is going to go ahead and get that as well. Anyone who is within a half-mile of the compressor station will also be getting information and is also an effected landowner. Also, we have a mailing list sign-up out front which if you don't already get the documents from FERC and you are interested, I highly recommend adding yourself to the mailing list. You can make sure you get all of the documents we are going to be issuing.

Then I would talk to you a bit about what your public input opportunities are after we actually issue a draft EIS. We will be coming back out here, assuming the Project continues and we issue a draft EIS, there will be a draft EIS comment period and we are going to be sending out the draft Environmental Impact Statement to all of the people on the mailing list and then we are going to be coming up again for additional meetings, very similar to this where you are able to comment on the draft Environmental Impact Statement and tell me what you think of the document. Now, try to keep the language clean but we will talk about that later.

The one big point I want to stress. Again, written comments are given the same weight as verbal comments. I cannot stress this enough. I know we are going to have a time limit tonight. Either three-to-four minutes and it will depend on how many people have signed up. So most people are not going to be able to actually give all of their comments in verbal form tonight. However, it is really important for you to know that when we get a comment on the record, it's a comment. It doesn't matter what form it comes in, we are going to analyze it the same.

So again, if you are not able to tell me everything you want to tonight, please take a comment form. Please send that letter in so that I can get your full comments and full concerns. You can give it to me up front, you can give it to the Cardno folks at the front tables, however you need to do. It's really important that you do that.

Next slide please (to assistant). Meeting decorum. One of the things I want to talk about briefly is I know that emotions are very high tonight. I know that we have people on both sides of this who are both pro-pipeline and people who are anti-pipeline. I want to please ask you a few things. One is again --

(Cell phone rings.)

MR. TOMASI: Turn off your cell phones. I'm going to be turning this podium around and I am going to be asking people to come up when I call their number and talk to me up front at the front desk, the front table I should say. We are going to be putting people sort of on deck so that as one person is speaking, another person is getting ready to come up and speak.

Last, as I stated, please try to be, please summarize your point as much as you can. I now again apologize we can't give you an infinite amount of time in these speeches tonight but we want to give as many people the opportunity to speak as we can. That is one of the reasons why we came out here for two nights in a row was so that we could give everyone the opportunity. So if you can't speak tonight and you want to speak and you don't want to give written comments, you obviously can come back tomorrow.

We also have a third meeting this week in Schoharie. We have another meeting on the same night in

Oneonta. You can go to any of those meetings. These meetings are not dedicated just to the area that the project that we have them. Anyone from anywhere can come to these meetings. They are open to the public meetings.

Again, back to the decorum issue is even if you don't agree with what the person is saying, and I want to stress this, please do not interrupt the speaker. Do not boo the speaker. Do not yell at the speaker. Everyone needs to respect that everyone has their opinions. Even if you do not agree with it, okay? I want to talk to everyone and make sure that you know we will go ahead and I will stop the meeting for a while if people become too disruptive, okay?

It's real important that everybody has respect for their fellow citizens when he or she is speaking to be quiet, polite applause is fine. I have no problem with that. Just let them finish what they have to say. We will enforce the time-limit and then the next person can come up and speak. Again, like I said, any disruption is just going to slow things down and that means less people are going to be able to speak tonight.

I want to talk a little bit about who FERC is. I know this is going to digress a little but I want people to understand who FERC is, what we do and do not do. Many of you already know this. FERC is an independent agency and what that means is our decisions are not reviewed by the President, our decisions are not reviewed by Congress, they are in fact reviewed by the courts.

We are an independent agency as I said that regulates interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas and oil. Now, when it comes to interstate natural gas, we review proposals and authorize construction for those specific projects as well as L&G terminals and also hydroelectric projects. We have the responsibility under what is called the National Environmental Policy Act. The NEPA requires us to do an environmental review. That is effectively why we are here tonight. NEPA requires us to do an Environmental Impact Statement or an Environmental Assessment for every project where we actually issue some sort of authorization.

For this project, this is a very large project obviously. We will be doing, as I stated earlier, Environmental Impact Statements and in that we are required to do what is called a "Hard Look". We will go ahead and look at all the environmental impacts of the planned project. I am going to talk a little bit more specifically what we do for the EIS a little later.

Let me tell you about what we don't do, however. FERC does not regulate at all the exploration, production or gathering of natural gas or distribution. We have no authority to regulate fracking or any other drilling activities with the exception of natural gas storage facilities. All those fracking issues, all those fracking wells have to be approved by the states. We do what is called a 'Cumulative Impact' which I will talk about a little bit later where some of those other cumulative issues can be discussed.

Now, the heads of FERC. We have five commissioners. One of them is the Chairman. My job is to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and give that to the public for review as well as give that to the Commissioners. My EIS that we are going to prepare is effectively a recommendation to the Commissioners on ways to minimize potential environmental impacts of the planned project, okay? I do not approve anything. The Commissioners, they vote on the Project. I will talk a little about how they make their decisions a little later but environmental issues are merely one of the myriad of factors that they look at when they choose or choose not to approve a project.

Next slide. I'm going to talk briefly about the project. Most of you are probably very familiar with the project. As you are aware it is about four hundred and twelve miles of pipeline with associated facilities in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut. There are several laterals. One of the laterals in Massachusetts they did delete and there are nine new compressor stations. Yes, one of them is planned to be here in this county.

The purpose of the project, very briefly. Tennessee has stated that it is to supply about 2.2 billion feet of natural gas to the Northeast market and also to Canada. So that is really generally what the Project is and hopefully you can see these maps. This is a little smaller than I planned it to be.

The next slide, it is difficult to read, I apologize for that but this is the Western portion, which we are at now. Again, it's too difficult to read so go through these slides. Go through next two -- (to assistant).

Okay, now I am going to talk --

AUDIENCE: Closer to the mic, sir?

MR. TOMASI: Oh yeah, sure. I'm sorry, I just turned my head to talk. I apologize for that.

AUDIENCE: (Inaudible.)

MR. TOMASI: Again, that is pretty much the closest I can get to it without actually eating the microphone. So where are we at this point? Now obviously we are trying to identify public concerns and we have, as I said, around three thousand comments on the record. Again, I keep turning my head, I apologize for that. I want to look at everyone here and it is hard to do that when I am on the microphone. (Adjusts something.)

Okay, that's a little better. You know, we have to identify all the different concerns that other people have so that we can -- is this a little better for everybody?

(Cheering.)

MR. TOMASI: Okay, this actually is a lot easier, thank you. Let me just stop here and I went through several slides here. Is there any slide anybody wants me to -- should I go back and look at any other slides? I thought everyone could hear me but I could go back and do a few more. Okay, we will just continue forward. Right now we are in the process of identifying all the concerns that people have, all of the different concerns. A lot of the concerns have been repeated many, many, many times but that's fine. Even if it's repeated a thousand times it is still important for you to put your comments on the record.

Perhaps you have, if you are concerned about alternative energy, which is the number one top concern that we have for the project is. For instance, a lot of the people in New York, Massachusetts as well as New Hampshire have told us 'well, why are we getting natural gas? Why are we not using alternative energy?' That is something that you are going to have to address in the document and we have to address also in the order and the Commissioners have to take into account because you have brought those issues up. But just because it's been brought up so many times does not mean that you shouldn't also put your comment in.

Why do I say that? Well, perhaps you have a specific spin on that question. One person might have a lot of details about say for instance 'why isn't wind power being provided?' One other person's detailed information about for instance 'why can't we get more conservation of natural gas due to leaks or something like that?' Another person might have specific information about renewable like salt water.

So even if every comment has been repeated many, many times it's still really important to get your spin or your specific comment on the record. So keep on with the comments. I know it's a lot of comments as you probably see on the record but we are required to look in every single comment that we get to and we do. I'm going to continue on the public concerns.

Also there has been a lot of public concern about exporting natural gas from the United States. I'm going to briefly comment on that. Obviously, we are going to address that in the document but one of the things I do want to point out is that anything that gets exported out of the US will also need authorizations. You know, any export of natural gas from a pipeline through across borders has to get another authorization from FERC. Any LNG facility that intends to export natural gas has to get approval both from the Department of Energy as well as FERC. So we understand your concerns about that specific issue and we will have to address that because it's something you brought up.

Another concern is rural character. Man, I have a hard time saying that word, rural character. I know I have spoken to many of you, many of you actually in this county about 'well, we don't want this pipeline, we don't want this compression station because we live in a rural area. We like the fact that the air is clean, the water is clean'. All of those issues are something that we need to address. We will address that. That's something we have to.

Speaking personally, as I mentioned earlier, I am the technical lead for air quality. That's very close to

my heart in fact. We've been really struggling over the last ten years to make sure that our documents are really, really vetted when it comes to air quality. We have increased what we do on modeling to make sure that every single aspect of the project's are modeled and so I really understand when people are concerned about "well, what is this going to be for mean when it is next door, half a mile away or down the street from me."

It's something that will be taken into account and something that is personally my area of expertise. We will definitely be looking very hard at this particular project. Because the compressor station proposed for this county is very large, if you want, we will make sure that it gets as much vetting as we require. As I stated earlier we require what is called a "Hard Look" and in fact, in many cases, FERC will go above and beyond what the State and even the EPA requires when it comes to air quality issues, well at least modeling and disclosure.

So we will go ahead and do that as much as we possibly can to ensure that we get everything in the public demand so that you are able to see those impacts. Also, we should see cumulative impacts, aquifer damage, those sort of things and of course noise and air emissions.

Next, we are going to talk about, please hold all of the questions until later. Please go to the next slide. I am going to talk a little bit about the FERC process. Actually, before I talk about the FERC process, I will talk about where we are at right now in the project. As you know the Project, we sent out the notice of intent back on June 30th and that has a comment period that ends on October 5th, sorry, ends August 31st.

Again, I'm going to keep coming back to this point. We need your comments and we need them as soon as possible. One of the things that is really important to me is that we are able to look at alternatives. And the earlier we get in alternatives the better we're able to actually analyze. If you give us alternative comments or any really complex comments late, late, late in the game, we may not be able to do as rigorous an analysis as we can right now. Right now, we want those comments early, we want them often so we can go ahead and analyze that early in the process. So please keep those coming.

Next is paper process. As you are aware of, the application right now, initially they said it was going to be September 2015 and they moved that back to October 2015. It looks like they're going to file their formal application. There will also be a refilling within the next two weeks by Tennessee Gas. We will be filing revised resource reports which will incorporate hopefully a lot of the questions that we have in our first go round. We went them about a 50-page data request requesting a lot of information on the Project and hopefully this next step within the next two weeks will allow more information in it.

Basically, where we are at now is you know we are in the process of filling in the gaps and that is the reason why we are coming out here and that's why we ask questions. Now, after the application of course, we will go ahead and probably issue additional data requests because we always, even though we keep asking additional questions, in fact your questions keep us on our toes to ask even more questions down the line. So even when they file the application we are going to go ahead and ask additional questions.

Once we feel that we actually have all the information that we need, we are going to issue what's called a notice of the schedule and what the notice of schedule does is it outlines when the actual final draft of the EIS. In the interim, in between that notice of schedule in the final EIS we will have the draft EIS and for the draft EIS again we will come back out here for comments and after that we will go ahead and issue the final EIS. After that point, as I said, the EIS is a recommendation to the Commissioners and the Commissioners will make a decision based on that as well as other issues.

One of these other issues that the Commission uses. The Commission uses things like the competency of the company itself. The technical competency. Rates. Whether there is actually a market for the gas. These or any other issues they use to determine whether this Project is going to be approved or not. Things like rates, cost to customers, those sort of things and all of those issues including environmental ones, go into their decision-making process.

Next slide please. Again, EIS. I talked a little bit about this but as I stated, FERC is the ones that are going to do the environmental review and it is an analytical document. Now, what that means is whether we

get on a very specific issue, if we get a hundred people to say we want modeling, we want modeling of say all the criteria pollutants everywhere around the compressor station. Whether we get that once or a hundred times, it's the same. It's an analytical document, which means we do an analysis. We don't take into account necessarily that one hundred people want this. If one person wants it, it's the same as if a hundred people want it.

Now if the Commission itself, they take into account support or opposition of the project as part of their analysis. Now we also have a lot of information from, we don't just get information from you, we get information from agencies, we get information from our own studies. We do get information from the company and as I stated earlier, we ask them a lot of questions and will be asking additional questions and we will also do field work if we didn't as well as we also reach out to the local communities.

I would want to give a special thanks to the offices of Senators Gillibrand and Schumer, they were actually very -- their assistance has been pretty valuable in getting our meeting location tonight, finding meeting locations that have been really convenient for everyone to get to hopefully. Also they have been working. I've been in contact with him on numerous occasions and even filtered information they've been getting from their constituents. It's been very useful to understand what your concerns are. I definitely want to thank them for that.

Next slide please. We are going to talk a little bit more but once we get to the EIS stage like I said, we are going to mail that out and you are going to get a copy of that if you are on our mailing list. If you don't want the EIS then you don't want to be on our mailing list. Everyone will get CDs. If you want a hard copy of the document you need to send something in to me stating you want a hard copy. If you are not on the mailing list and you want to be as I said earlier, please sign up in the back.

Again, I talked a little bit about what happens as we get these issues so I wanted to talk a little bit more about the forum here. Again, I will repeat the issue of please turn off your cell phones because although I don't mind being interrupted, I don't want any of you being interrupted by cell phones. I would ask when your number is called to please come up to the microphone. Please come to the microphone when you're called.

I would ask you, again, since we have a court reporter here that is going to be taking everything down, even though I may not do it myself (laughs), please speak as clearly as possible so we can get your information down and also spell your name for him. If you wish to give your name, please spell it. There will be an enforced time limit.

(Pause)

MR. TOMASI: I don't think anyone wants to be here until 1 o'clock in the morning so we will have to enforce the three-minute time period. However, if we finish before midnight, I will invite people to come back up and if people want to speak and they haven't, I will invite them to come back up and speak after everyone else is done, okay? I know three minutes is not long but you know it's long enough to get some information in. If you want some more, please go ahead and give me your comments.

Now as I said, it's going to be three minutes. I'm going to ask you to come up to the podium and what's going to happen is this little, in front of Jennifer there, you see the little stoplight. Obviously when it's green it means you can continue speaking. Once it turns to yellow, it means you're going to have thirty seconds left. When it's red, your time is up, I am going to ask you to please stop and if you don't stop we are going to, if we have to if need be we will shut off the microphone, but you want to stop here.

So why don't you give me one minute here to get this set up, we are going to turn this around so that we can get everybody started here.

AUDIENCE: Can we use this microphone instead of the other one?

MR. TOMASI: Yes, we are going to use this microphone if possible. Can we use this microphone?

ASSISTANT: I can give you a wireless one.

MR. TOMASI: Yes, that's fine.

We have a mic so that everyone will hear you but we will address this on the table. We do have a request. There are two young children who wanted to be able to speak tonight. If anyone wanted to let them go right before them who has a low number I think they would appreciate that. Does anybody want to let them go? You are number one? Okay, now before we start the numbers there are a couple of elected officials. We let them go first because they do represent more than just themselves. They represent a town or community so we let them go first. So I am going to go ahead and call up Kathleen Gemell?

AUDIENCE: Why don't you let the kids go first?

MR. TOMASI: Let the kids go first? Okay guys.

(Applause)

MS. HARRIS: You ready? Okay.

CHILDREN: I love the lake and I love the fish. I love to swim and I love to look at the starts and I don't want it to go away.

(Applause)

EMMA: My name is Emma and I don't want the lake to go away because it's a great experience for me and there are also bald eagles at the lake. They are an endangered species and we don't want them to go away.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Okay, okay. Thank you very much. Would you like to come up? You okay with holding the microphone.

MS. JIMINO: Good evening. My name is Kathleen Jimino, J-I-M-I-N-O and I serve as a Rensselaer County executive, representing the 159,000 residents residing in our great county. I appreciate the opportunity to come this evening. The latest iteration of the Northeast Direct Pipeline would put in place over twenty-five miles of a pipeline that would cut across three towns in Rensselaer County with a compressor station located in one of those towns, specifically Nassau.

This proposal has generated an enormous amount of concern by residents, businesses and local officials, including myself. Tennessee Pipeline's declared need for this Project is to provide natural gas to homes and businesses throughout the Northeast, currently in need of natural gas as well as to electric power producers who are forecasting increases in electric rates due to constraints on receiving natural gas.

At this point the need is absolutely crucial to the discussion and must be clearly addressed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as the impacts on our residents are too great. From what we have ascertained thus far, potential impacts to areas along the route include disruption of public and private drinking water systems, significant wear and tear on our local roads and highways during construction, loss in values of those properties on or abutting the route and especially those near the compressor station where noise and light pollution will exist, health and safety concerns along this pipeline as well as significant demands on our first responders.

Public health concerns as expressed by the American Medical association, especially for those living and working in close proximity to the pipeline and compressor station, degradation of our natural resources such as the Rensselaer Plateau, one of the largest and most ecologically intact native habitats in New York State, which this proposed pipeline would traverse.

All of these concerns cut to the issue of quality of life, something we are all striving very hard to protect. These concerns pose a significant amount of risk that must be questioned if the main purpose of the pipeline fails to meet a high standard of public good.

As was mentioned earlier, there is a concern as reported in the Albany Times Union that this natural gas will end up in a liquefied natural gas export plant in Nova Scotia and ultimately be shipped overseas where the cost of natural gas is higher. This potentially raises the significant question as to who will benefit from the pipeline and where is the greater good? Certainly not the homeowners and businesses living or operat-

ing along the route, who themselves suffer the impacts but have no access to the product and not the gas and electric rate-payers whose cost would actually go up if the product is shipped abroad.

It is with those thoughts that I ask FERC to address the basic question of whether or not this proposed pipeline meets the criteria established of a public benefit and if the answer is no, as it appear to be, please deny this application. Thank you.

(Applause / boos)

MR. TOMASI: Okay, again thank you. Reasonable applause is good. We are going to invite the next up. David Fleming from the town of Nassau.

(Applause.)

MR. FLEMING: All set? Good evening. My name is David Fleming, F-L-E-M-I-N-G, and I am honored to be the supervisor of the town of Nassau representing five thousand people here in Rensselaer County. I will be brief as the Nassau Town Ward has already filed a unanimously passed resolution in opposition to this current plan to construct a high pressure gas pipeline across our community. This resolution and the detailed report of the impacts of this project have already been filed with FERC.

The Nassau Town Board and our Natural Resources Committee have spent months meeting with consultants and residents, attending meetings and accumulating information in relation to this project. The recently produced analysis by our Natural Resource Committee, utilizing experts in ecosystems and the town's natural resources have made it abundantly clear that this project as proposed would impact Nassau's groundwater, sensitive habitat and economic development.

Additionally, the proposed impact on the environmentally sensitive and economically important Rensselaer Plateau would be counter to County-side economic development efforts encouraged by the Town of Nassau. The town board has also formally opposed the granting of eminent domain rights to private businesses that would be in the position to take private property, purely for their own financial gain while there is absolutely no gas or other benefit provided to the residents of the town of Nassau.

Perhaps the most egregious part of this proposal is the plan to place a massive industrial compressor station in a hamlet area of our community where no such development is allowed. This is an outrageous violation of our property rights. Let me be very clear: Construction and operation of such an industrial facility in our town is contrary to town laws, since at least 1986 as well as the Town of Nassau Comprehensive plan as updated and approved by the community in July of 2011.

The location of the proposed construction of this facility will negatively impact our town infrastructure as well as our families. However, it will also constitute an uncompensated taking of property within a vast radius of this compressor station as the entire makeup of this area would be compromised from demolition of this rural residential zoning which is frequently enforced by the community. Because of the abundant unanswered questions, impacts and concerns brought forward by our residents and consultants, the Town of Nassau must formally oppose this project as proposed. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. TOMASI: Okay, next is Dennis Dowds, Supervisor from the town of Shodack.

(Applause.)

MR. DOWDS: My name is Dennis Dowds, D-O-W-D-S. I am the supervisor for the town of Shoack, approximately twelve thousand, eight hundred residents. What we did has a town board and all of the town board members, including Frank Curtis, Mike Kenny, Jim Bolt and Scott Schwartz; unanimously passed a resolution a couple months ago in opposing the pipeline as it's currently proposed so that our biggest concern is what our citizens are saying.

In that document that we submitted to FERC was a compilation of the thoughts of the residents of the town that we fully support so we will be submitting additional documentation but I think in the sake of moving along, a lot of what Kathy Jimino said and a lot of what Dave Fleming said echoes the opinions of

our board and at this point we oppose the pipeline as it is currently proposed.

(Applause.)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Mark Cioffi from the Town of Sand Lake. Thank you.

MR. CIOFFI: Hello, my name is Mark Cioffi and I am a councilman in the Town of Sand Lake.

AUDIENCE: We can't hear you.

MR. CIOFFI: My name is Mark Cioffi, C-I-O-F-F-I and I am a councilman at the Town of Sand Lake. I would like to introduce a resolution that was passed by our town board and put it on record on June 10, 2015. The resolution was unanimously passed by our supervisor Clara Thessel, myself Mark Cioffi, Barbara Glass, Ray Turner and Chris Furnhau, all council-people.

The resolution goes as follows: Whereas a large natural gas pipeline called the Northeast Direct Pipeline Project has been proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary Tennessee Gas Pipeline, LLC to be routed through Rensselaer County including the neighboring towns of Shodack, Nassau and Steamtown.

Whereas the proposed NED pipeline would operate at a much higher pressure than currently operating natural gas pipelines in Rensselaer County and whereas the pipeline is proposed for running through the neighborhood's and towns will be approximately thirty-six inches in diameter and routed on existing rights-of-ways along with nearby private properties and include a large gas compressor station or stations that will encompass extensive acreage and possibly be located near residential areas.

Whereas the proposed Northeast Pipeline would transport natural gas from other parts of the country for intended export out of New York State and possibly overseas with no natural gas benefit for the residents of Rensselaer County and whereas neighboring towns directly impacted by the proposed NED pipeline have endeavored to be fully informed of this Project and have documented and reported the potential detrimental impacts of this Project to include but are not limited to: 1. As proposed, the pipeline will run across private property, directly adjacent to homes and through waterways. 2. As proposed, this Project will impact residential wells, natural ground water, recharge areas and aquifers. 3. This proposal is expected to blast through the Rensselaer Plateau --

AUDIENCE: Time's up -- three minutes.

MR. CIOFFI: Which is one of New York's largest intact forested areas that has brought academic opportunity through tourism and responsible business through many of Rensselaer County. This proposal could impact designated areas of archeologically sensitive areas --

(Interruption; complaint about time limit.

MR. TOMASI: We give elected officials longer. They represent more than just themselves.

(Further interruption)

MR. TOMASI: Be quiet.

MR CIOFFI: The proposal would impact designated areas of archeological sensitivity. As currently proposed, this pipeline has significant potential impact in areas of public health, safety, home values, businesses, sensitive habitat and further stalling the economic development.

The Project applicant, Kinder Morgan is seeking Federal Domain status to allow for property to be secure for routing of the pipeline which will not benefit the residents of our neighboring communities and give the company and its affiliates an unfair advantage over property owners in those communities.

The proposed NED Pipeline would closely follow the high voltage right-of-way, raising reasonable concerns for the detrimental interaction between the pipeline and electromagnetic fields established by the high voltage wires. The thickness strength and proposed NED Pipeline, the depth at which it would be buried in the ground and the inspection method for necessary wells are proposed to be significantly less for rural areas than those required by urban areas.

The proposed NED Pipeline carries inherent risk of leaks, ruptures, fires, explosions and accidents which

may cause disruption and undue burden of emergency services and would significant increase the potential for catastrophic damage to lives, property, roadways, streamways, wells, aquifers, wetlands and other neighboring rural communities. Neighboring towns believe the level of compensation and mitigation would not allay the long-term fiscal, health, safety, business, environment and quality- of-life impacts to those neighboring towns.

This proposed pipeline is contrary to the rural residential character of these communities. It fails to follow the already existing pipeline corridor. The proposed use of the land for industrial compressor station necessary to operate this pipeline would have dramatic and long term environmental social and economic impacts on rural residential characters on our neighborhoods and neighboring towns. The proposed use of this land for this Project is a direct contradiction to the town law as well as the comprehensive plans of these communities.

Now therefore be it resolved that due to the widespread serious concerns that have been raised by the residents and potential significantly impact the proposed Project, the Town of Sand Lake stands in solidarity with the neighboring towns in Rensselaer County in opposition to the construction of the proposed NED Pipeline. Be it further resolved that the Town Clerk of Sand Lake is hereby directed to transmit certified copies of this resolution to United States Senator Charles Schumer and United States Senator Kristen Gillibrand, Congressman Chris Gibson, Congressman Paul Tonko, Governor Andrew Cuomo, New York State Senator Marchione, State Assembly Steve McClaughlin and Rensselaer County Executive Kathy Gimino. Thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: We are going to go ahead and start with number one, Mr. Fred Nuffer.

MR. NUFFER: My name is Fred Nuffer, N-U-F-F-E- R. I am here this evening to speak in opposition to the proposed Kinder Morgan NED Pipeline and specifically the proposed route across the Northern portion of the Town of Nassau. The NED Pipeline if constructed across the northernmost proposed route will cut across the Rensselaer Plateau, one of the most unique geologic and bio-diverse areas in Rensselaer County and the state.

It is so ecologically distinctive that New York State has given it Priority Project Status for every Open Space Conservation Plan since 1998. FERC should consult with and seek input from both the NYS Division of Lands and Forests as well as the New York State Office of Parks and Recreation Historic Preservation, the impact the project would have on the Plateau as it relates to the goals and objectives of the Open Space Preservation Plan.

New York State has identified the Rensselaer Plateau as an important area for protection due to its diversity and bird-breeding features and the Audubon Society has designated Rensselaer Forest Tract as an important bird- breeding area. FERC should consult with and seek input from the New York State Chapter of the Audubon Society, the Rensselaer Land Trust and the New York Chapter of Nature Conservancy on the impact the proposed NED Project would have on the plateau. The US Department of Agriculture, the USDA Forest Service has designated the Rensselaer Plateau as a Forest Legacy area. The USDEA has awarded a 5.5 million dollar grant to NYSDEC to work with the Rensselaer Plateau Alliance to create a program designed to protect forest lands from conservation of non-forest uses.

FERC should consult with and seek input from the USDA Forest Service on the impacts of the proposed route with the NED Rensselaer Plateau. The proposed northern route of the NED through the town of Nassau will impact many headwater streams and wetland areas of the Valatie Kill and Pasawasa Creek. Both of these streams are protected CT streams and in the most recent rule changes to the Clean Water Act, EPA and the US Army Corps of Engineers indicated the intent to extend protection to headwaters of protected streams.

The proposed northern route of the NED will also cross over a major unconsolidated aquifer within the

Town of Nassau and Steventown providing the water supply for many homes in the town of Nassau and the Village of East Nassau. FERC should consult with and seek input from the town of Nassau, the Town of Steventown on the proposed route of the NED over the Rensselaer Plateau as it relates to the impacts on streams, wetlands and groundwater quality and quantity.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty Seconds.

MR. NUFFER: FERC should prepare and delineate how these headwaters, streams, wetlands and gravel aquifers will be afforded protection both during initial construction and post-construction. Many other organizations are working to open space quarters and trail systems. FERC should consult with and seek input from the managers of Dyken Pond Center, Grafton Lake State Park, Pittsford State Forest, Capitol District Wildlife management area and Dickerson Hill Fire Tower.

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time is up. Feel free to submit your remarks. Next is number two, Andrew Kahnle. After Andrew is Frank Marchese.

MR. KAHNLE: My name is Andrew Kahnle, that's K- A-H-N-L-E. I am a retired fishery scientist with over thirty years experience in management of the Hudson River Fisheries. I am here to talk about impacts of the proposed NED pipeline to the river. The proposed pipeline appears to cross the Hudson at an existing pipeline right-of-way just upriver of the Village of Castleton. It will cross the mains down Hudson as well as the tidal stream and marsh complex just to the east of the river. The reach of river containing the proposed pipeline crossing is used as a spawning and nursery area by the short-nose sturgeon, American shad, striped bass and as a feeding area for Atlantic Sturgeon. Both the short-nosed sturgeon and Atlantic sturgeon are Federally listed endangered species. The marsh and stream complex to the east of the river is an important spawning and nursery area for many Hudson River fishes. This tidal complex has been designated as a significant fish and wildlife habitat by the New York State Department of State. This formal designation means that activities such as pipeline construction requires special scrutiny to avoid environmental damage. The applicant's environmental reports are silent on construction techniques for crossing the river.

If excavation and backfilling are used, construction should not occur at times of the year when the area is used for fish migration, spawning, rearing of young or feeding. Turbidity must be controlled with turbidity curtains or settling. The bottom sediments of the Hudson and tidal marshes contain many contaminants. Before excavation, the applicant must test sediments across the entire width of the proposed trench. If contaminants are detected, contaminant and contaminated sediments must be contained during construction.

The river and marsh bottoms also support a rich variety of natural invertebrates, which are important food for fishes. Construction will disturb or eliminate these organisms and this loss will impact fish especially the endangered short-nosed sturgeon.

Finally, the NED Pipeline is just one of several pipeline and power cables being proposed for the Hudson River. Given the importance of the Hudson to endangered short-nosed sturgeon and Atlantic sturgeon, I urge you FERC to ask the National Marine Fishery Service for a biological opinion evaluating the cumulative impacts of all of the proposed projects for these endangered fish species. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, sir.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: After Frank is Gary Ero.

(Applause)

MR. MARCHESE: Good evening. My name is Frank Marchese, M-A-R-C-H-E-S-E and just bear with me my notes are a little scattered here because the more I hear tonight, both outside and inside, the more disgusted I get with the entire process that we are involved with here. (To audience member) Please ma'am, no interruptions, thank you.

I want to start tonight by talking about the members that you see in this room with the orange shirts on.

Orange shirts paid for by their union dues. Orange shirts that built the United States of American and screen-printed in Cohoes, New York. You see us hold signs that are screen- printed by a union printer in Green Island, New York. That's a little bit of the economic impact. Tonight, we have a dinner here for our members, paid for by our members, to help support local businesses. That's who we are.

So when you talk about pipeline projects and you want to talk about all the negative things and your facts and all your scientific stuff you want to bring up here, understand basic economics: when people in this area, in this county, go to work they have money to support their families, support their homes, support the communities and support businesses that sell t-shirts, businesses that make signs and restaurants. That's basic economics.

Everyone here wants to talk about the environmental and the health issues here and we understand that too. Our members are concerned with safety. They live here. They raise their families here. They raise their children here and they educate their children here. They would never do anything.

AUDIENCE: (Someone calls out.)

MR. MARCHESE: I will ask the commissioner to add two more minutes to my time for the interruption.

MR. TOMASI: Just keep going.

MR. MARCHESE: Okay. But I will tell you this. Literally, this is what it's all about. It's about economics and nobody wants to face that reality. The environmental folks in this state, what they did in December of last year is a disgrace. They took antiquated data from the 1980's and cost twenty-five thousand jobs in the Southern Tier and I had the misfortune, and it is a misfortune, in my job, and I have been around these hearings for twenty years. I beg you, all of you in this room, go travel to the Southern tier. Go to Oneonta. Go to Delhi and you will not believe that you are in the State of New York. Go to Binghamton. No restaurants, no hotels, no viable businesses. You know why? Because environmentalists hijacked this argument five years ago and they burned-door the Governor for five years.

We used an interim Department of Health Commissioner to make a ridiculous and ill-advised decision that cost the livelihood of twenty-five thousand people. Our members watch their children and their grandchildren flee from New York, okay. They will not see their grandchildren but once a year.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. MARCHESE: Thirty seconds? Okay, thank you. So, you know, you want to come up here and talk about all the impacts. We understand that. We live here also. We want to make sure this is done properly. We train our members. You will hear about that later. But, it's about economics. There is a system in place. DEC on the State level, EPA on the Federal level. FERC on a Federal level. Trust the system. That's what it's there for. You don't like it, move.

AUDIENCE: (Shouting and booing.)

MR. TOMASI: Next is four, Gary Ero. Quiet, quiet.

MR. ERO: My name is Gary Ero, last name is E-R- O. I'm with the Laborers Local 190. I represent Union Labor.

AUDIENCE: Can you speak in the microphone a little bit.

MR. ERO: A lot of people will say that Laborers will sell out for a job that won't last the construction but what people don't realize is construction doesn't last. Once it's built, we're done. We just want everybody to know that if it is going to go we want it to be Union and we want to build a Union with qualified, trained men and women and to be as safe as possible. New York State has some of the strictest laws and regulations to even be able to work in this state. Just look at Malta. You can't even drop a drop of oil on the ground without having the DEC there.

So I know I speak for the rest of my fellow laborers here when I say we support this Project. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Dave Topino. After Dave Topino is Anthony Fresina.

MR. TOPINO: Greetings. My name is Dave Topino. I am a Project Manager with Laborers Local 190. I also teach at our training school and I can show you that the safety is a cornerstone of anything that we do down there. I'm going to show you how to be well-trained. I am going to show you how to be fit for duty. I'm certain you are going to be qualified for every task they do on that pipeline. We do want our members to come home to their families and at night.

I support the NED Project. I believe that it's a safe effective way to transport natural gas as it will be built using local union labor. I have got a couple of things to say. We want what?

AUDIENCE: JOBS!

MR. TOPINO: What do we want?

AUDIENCE: Jobs.

MR. TOMASI: Please address the table, thank you. Next is Anthony Fresina. After Anthony is Frank Marchese, Jr.

MR. FRESINA: Good evening. Anthony Fresina, F- R- E- S- I- N- A and again I had prepared statements. I am going to go into a few of them but mostly I am a little disgusted as to what I heard from elected officials. I am also an elected official here. I represent several families that live in this community, pay taxes in this community. Hundreds of families, members and their families.

I have worked on pipelines myself. I have worked on several pipelines myself through rural areas, through farmlands, paid attention to the aquifers, paid attention to the rivers, paid attention to the lakes and to the ponds. That's not what we are all about. We are all about safety. As Dave just said as one of our training directors and instructors at the training center, it's safety. It's safety first.

I'm ashamed to say that we have elected officials in this room that represent constituents in this area that don't pay attention to that. They pay attention to what their staffers or somebody else wrote for them and prepared for them tonight. Well I can assure you that I'm going to pay attention and my members are going to pay attention because it's ridiculous. We're all about jobs, safe jobs. These are jobs that are going to bring jobs to this community.

I'm going to just go off a bit on this. According to the Center of Governmental Research, the NED Project will create twenty-three hundred direct and indirect jobs. Now I heard out there some nonsense. Temporary jobs. This building was built. When it was done, it was done. It's got to be maintained. It's got to be added on to if we have to add on to it. There's got to be people working here. The staff here.

They did a great job and I give you guys a round of applause that you did a great job, not only with the dinner here tonight that put people to work but maintaining this building after we leave. These are jobs. Every job is temporary for the time being. They turn into permanent jobs. The roads you drive on are temporary jobs. When we update them, those are permanent jobs.

So the nonsense that I'm hearing today and the rhetoric I'm hearing today by elected officials. I'll address that with them personally myself through the Union and as a building trades participant and as a member of the building trades and a member of the Labor specifically, I'm ashamed to say that we backed some of these politicians, ashamed to say it and I can say that we are in full support of this pipeline. I've worked on pipelines. They do them safe. Research was done and I hope we build this thing and it's going to be done union. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up is Frank Marchese, Jr. After Frank is Fred Butwell.

MR. MARCHESE, JR.: How are you? I'm John. I want to let everybody know that our local here is one of the best training centers there is around and I want everyone to know that you know, we do work the safe way, the right way and this job, this pipeline here is going to bring a lot of work to our members and our family. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Fred Butwell. Is that you sir? Thank you. After Fred is Chelsea Zantay.

MR. BUTWELL: Hello, my name is Fred and I'm here at the 190 Union and everything they do. My son's worked for the Union the last ten years and he went to school, he's trained and this job will be done professionally and right. I'm backing him one hundred and fifty percent. That's all I have to say.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Chelsea Zantay.

MS. ZANTAY: Hello? Oh, sorry.

MR. TOMASI: Hold on one second. After Chelsea is Kenneth Scallon.

MS. ZANTAY: I think this is one of the construction guy's.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MS. ZANTAY: Chelsea Zantay, Z-A-N-T-A-Y. Before giving my testimony, I would like to state for the record, giving the incomplete nature of the information in Kinder Morgan's resource reports. These scoping meetings are being conducted prematurely and failing to provide information that would benefit the NEPA process. It is also clearly unfair that almost no scoping meetings are being conducted in the communities most impacted. Those who will bear the brunt of impacts from compressor stations, several of which are among the largest ever built in the US.

I live on Burden Lake in Amber Park, New York. I am concerned about the effects of the ninety-thousand horsepower compressor station slated to be built on Florence Chapel Road in Nassau, New York, less than three miles away from Burden Lake by Kinder Morgan's construction workers. Living on the lake my entire life, I have seen the appearance of American Bald Eagles, our national bird. They built two nests on our lake. In addition, the lake is host to a plethora of wildlife included painted turtles and blue herons. These species could all be at risk due to the changing ecosystem that compressor station would cost. Perhaps of most concern is the fact that the sections of pipeline will be laid on Logan's fault line. Disturbance of this fault line can trigger potential earthquakes as cited by the US Geological Survey. Furthermore, if leaks occur along the pipeline it could affect Kinderhook Creek, which flows southwest and has a drainage area of over three hundred and twenty-nine square miles. If this creek or any other creek in the vicinity is contaminated we could be looking at water contamination to Albany, Rensselaer, Columbia and Green Counties.

The Environmental Impact Statement should include how these habitats, creeks and fault lines will be avoided by the pipeline compressor stations. The Director of the Institute for Health and the Environment at the University of Albany, David Carpenter, who participated as a researcher in DEC's fracking study, calls compression stations upon the worst of all the fracking infrastructure, and I quote 'Our previous studies show that some of the most serious air pollution came from compressor stations. There needs to be a statewide analysis of the health of the population of New York from these compressor stations.'

I ask, why have we banned hydraulic fracturing in New York State but we allow compressor stations if said stations are worse for the environment. This compressor station will be lying extremely close to the Dewey Loeffel Landfill Site, which is a Superfund Site. The Environmental Impact statement should specify how the habitat that lives in and surrounds the lake will be avoided. Members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, please do not close the scoping comment period until 60 days after Kinder Morgan files new, complete resource reports. I implore you to reconsider this site as a potential location for a compressor station and pipeline and to consider a no-action alternative. Thank you for letting me speak here.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up, Kenneth Scallon. After Kenneth is John Sober.

MR. SCALLON: My name is Kenneth Scallon, S-C-A- L-L-O-N. I live on Alderbridge Road in Nassau. I live about one mile north of the two existing pipelines in our area. It's clear to me and others as we look

at this that we have what could be labeled a negative synergy issue with the pipeline as proposed. Synergy is defined as combined action or operations. Negative in this case of course refers to the fact that it is not positive and potentially cumulative.

At least two other major environmental issues exist in the area of the proposed pipeline. Number one and earlier sited the Dewey Loeffel Landfill an actively leaching, toxic site affecting the Valatie Kill Creek and Nassau Lake now monitored by the EPA. The second one is the proposed Troy sand and gravel quarry near Route 66 would would take place involving blasting and onsite processing.

Both of these sites are within one and a half to two miles of the line and the proposed compressor station site. With regards to this overall situation, we must now take into account the psychological and social effects which often get ignored. Southern Rensselaer County is a mix of suburban and largely rural land prized by many who live here as a buffer to the demands of society.

However, we now find ourselves targeted by multiple threats to our way of life as a price of progress but it is the residents who will pay the price and take the risk of this negative synergy situation. We already have two pipelines through our area. The disbelief and concerns of residence is now more clear and shown by the mistrust of this corporation Kinder Morgan and even of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

More US citizens are saying enough of corporate arrogance, enough being bought and sold for private profit, political gain which leads to lobbying for even more profit. We who live here must demand that our well-being, psychologically, physically and socially be first on the impact list on page five of the Notice of Intent. We look forward to the Environmental Impact Statement. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is John Sober and after John Sober is Sally Sober.

MR. SOBER: Good evening. My name is John Sober. My wife and I reside at 173 Schofeld Road in the Town of Schodak. We are here to speak against the pipeline which would run adjacent to and through our property as it is currently proposed across Schofeld Road. We purchased our property with the two existing natural gas pipes currently running through it. We were not then particularly concerned about the safety of those pipes. They exude no odor, so we don't know if they're leaking. We have, however, a serious concern about their integrity if the proposed new line goes through. Heavy equipment, possible blasting and shifting earth could compromise them in many ways. There have already been reported explosions of old Tennessee Gas pipes from broken wells in 2006 and 2011. This last with three homes destroyed. The portion of our property effected by the pipeline also includes a designated water collection area which we weren't and can't, are not allowed to interfere with. This area supplies water for birds and animals and frequently spills into our back lawn.

We are concerned about the contamination caused by leaking fracked gas and the chemicals that can potentially find their way to our well. Kinder Morgan plan to bury the spike at a minimum depth required for a rural area is simply unacceptable. Studies show that a pipeline leaks continually. That means we and our children and grandchildren, who visit daily and also own homes close to the pipeline, will be constantly exposed to fracked gas containing known carcinogens.

Several of our family members suffer from asthma. We are seriously concerned about air quality for them. Kinder Morgan doesn't have an exemplary track record for pipeline safety. We know they have had at least twenty-one reported explosions of natural gas pipelines including some with personal injuries and homes destroyed. They were lucky in April in the one in Texas. No trees. Only one home to evacuate. No injuries.

We will not be that fortunate here. We live on nine acres of forested land and there are literally hundreds more surrounding us. If we aren't killed in an explosion, we and all our neighbors will likely lose everything in the firestorm. A cloud of fracked gas with the chemicals it contains including methane and ben-

zene will blanket our area and endanger people and wildlife. If a temperature inversion occurs at the same time, it will be an unprecedented health disaster.

In 2013, the investment research firm,

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. SCALLON: Next Risk Management concluded that Kinder Morgan's business strategy was to start their pipelines and related infrastructures of routine maintenance to maximize profits. Also, the NTSB has determined that the Pipeline Hazardous Material Safety Administration's inspections are inadequate. How can we believe that Kinder Morgan holds our safety and the safety of our environment above its own interests? Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Sally Sober. After Sally Sober is Katie Garrity.

MS. SOBER: Thank you. My name is Sally Sober, S-O-B-E-R. To recount our concerns and my husband's, we are concerned about the integrity of the existing natural gas pipelines, the continual leaking of gas and known carcinogens into our air and groundwater, the danger of rupture and explosion of the high-density, high pressure pipe and the lack of maintenance and procedural oversight by a qualified and dedicated outside agency.

I would like to add a couple of other points. First of all, the people representing the labor seemed to feel that we are anti-labor. I belong to a labor union. My husband does as well. We don't have any problem with the quality of your proposed work, it's the abatement and aim of Kinder Morgan, which is simply to take, to make profits. We think it's very unfair that they are going to take our property and destroy the value of our home which we built specifically as a retirement home when we moved here to be near our children. That was the plan, now we don't feel that it's very viable because we don't feel that it is going to be safe in our home.

So we would ask FERC to look very, very carefully at the requirements, make Kinder Morgan uphold high standards if you are going to approve this project. We are not simply a little rural community. New York has banned fracking. Why should we be endangered by its product for the profits of those who take no risk themselves. We implore you to put the safety of our family and the environment we are trying to protect over Kinder Morgan's profit margin. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Katie Garrity, after Katie is Lucy Murray.

MS. GARRITY: I'm Katie Garrity, G-A-R-R-I-T-Y. When my husband and I were looking for a home eleven years ago, one of the main characteristics we wanted was a rural setting. Being asthmatic as well as being prone to migraine headaches, this quiet setting and clean, fresh air of country living was important to my health. I love where I live. It's rural but not desolate. I have many neighbors and often hear the sounds of their children and pets playing outside. I love my neighborhood.

Now Kinder Morgan wishes to move a monster into our neighborhood. This ninety thousand horsepower death machine threatens our neighborhood in so many ways. Having done some research on pipelines and compressor stations, I am concerned about my environment. Compressor stations are known polluters, releasing tones of hazardous chemicals each year.

In research by the Southwest Pennsylvania Environmental Health Project, it has been found that high levels of toxic chemicals have been found at compressor stations as well as in the surrounding air, land and groundwater. These chemicals include benzene, toluene, formaldehyde, methane and ethylene chloride to name a few. These are dangerous chemicals that are known carcinogens and they are nervous system attackers.

There are concerns about radon and radioactivity in the vicinity of the compressor stations. Anecdotal records show high percentages of breathing issues, skin problems and cancer in people living within a two

hour radius of these polluting monsters. Then there is the light and sound pollution of the station.

My migraines are triggered by sound and smells. The constant, low-frequency drone of a compressor station has been shown to cause fibroacoustic disease in a five to eight mile radius surrounding the station depending on the station's size. This disease can cause migraine headaches, ruptured eardrums, loss of hearing, depression, anxiety and even brain damage. In looking at the documents that were sent by Kinder Morgan, I find that my home is approximately 300 feet from the proposed compressor station property. I will likely suffer with illnesses caused by compressor station pollution.

I worry that being so close will put me in the incineration zone. How is it possible that in our democratic society that homeowners can be involuntarily forced into living in fear of everything they love being incinerated in the case of a gas disaster? You might think that this rarely happens but in looking into Kinder Morgan's safety record, I found that since 2003 there have been thirty-six major disasters in this group's pipelines. Property damage is in the millions. Fines, in the millions. Loss of property, loss of wildlife habitats.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MS. GARRITY: Pollution of bodies of water, groundwater and surrounding land. The most costly damage of all, death of several humans. This is just the cases in which Kinder Morgan was involved. In the same amount of time, there have been one hundred-eighty significant disasters based on pipelines. I do not wish to be a part of one of these disasters. The probability of there being an accident with the compressor station or pipeline in my area is high. I feel it's necessary to do more research into Kinder Morgan's safety record before even considering issue of approval for this project.

MR. TOMASI: Time's up.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Lucie Murray. After Lucie Murray is Richard Murray.

MS. MURRAY: My name's Lucie Murray, L-U-C-I-E M- U-R-R-A-Y. I live on Clark's Chapel Road in Nassau, New York. I live within the half-mile buffer zone of the proposed compressor station. When I first bought my property almost forty years ago and it was designated then and still is a rural zone. Our land consists of pastural land and forest land. We grow our own vegetables. We have a small apple orchard and have sold Christmas trees for many years. We built our own home and have invested all we have into this dwelling.

One week after I retired in June of this year, I received a letter from Kinder Morgan informing me they have rezoned my property into a buffer zone. My house, my property, nor my neighbor's home and property cannot buffer anything. We are totally helpless to defend ourselves from anything that the proposed compressor station will inevitably throw at us such as their toxic wastes, constant noises and the fear of possible bodily harm or incineration and property damage in case of an accident or leak in the pipe.

We believe it will inevitably reduce the quality of our lives and our environment and the value of our property. Our local fire department is not equipped to rescue us or our property from any accident that would occur at this compressor station. The Kinder Morgan has not made any provisions to deal with this accident, which in all likelihood will be catastrophic because of the volume of gas transmitted and the huge pressure generated.

From our understanding, the proposed buffer zone is, in reality, a dumping zone for the compressor weights. Our town has not yet completely recovered from the waste products dumped in our area by other companies which contaminated our drinking water and killed our animals and fish in our lakes. The people in our neighborhood have waited fifty years for the bald eagle to return to our area. It was designated as an endangered species only a few years ago.

My husband and I recently witnessed the bald eagle return to our community. We saw him perched on a dead tree on the very property targeted for the compressor station. He was a majestic sight and we want to keep it in our neighborhood.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MS. MURRAY: I took the liberty to represent him here today as he cannot talk for himself. My parents immigrated to this country when I was very young to get away from the devastation in Europe which resulted from one man's wanting to rule the world. And now, towards the end of my life, a company which I never heard of until now a month and a half ago is proposing to invade my privacy, my private space, take away my right to peace and quiet and tranquility and my right to clean air --

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am your time is up.

MS. MURRAY: And clean water.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Richard Murray. After Richard Murray is Eric Lapier.

MR. MURRAY: Hello, my name is Richard Murray, M- U-R-R-A-Y. I live at 110 Clark's Chapel Road and as my wife just said we are within the 'buffer zone'. We live in a rural by nature area and the homes in there, while they are in a rural zone, still have families and many children. I would like to address the siting of the natural gas compressor station on Clark's Chapel Road. The location that Kinder Morgan has picked is for their convenience only. I recommend that they consider moving this. I have looked at Googlemaps and they are just east of us, East of Firetower Road. There appeared to be nobody lives there. So there is a hard rock mine I believe up in that area but it wouldn't care whether the compressor station was there or not.

Where they have it proposed right now there are sixty-four homes. At least they did it three times, twice sixty-four and once sixty-six of the little yellow dots on Kinder Morgan's map that they sent to us. Those are all homes with families. Some may be two, just like Lucy and I because our five kids have left, along with the two dogs and I don't know how many cats.

AUDIENCE: (Laughs.)

MR. MURRAY: But anyway, we ask that they move it, move it away from, and also the thickness of the pipe. How can FERC allow Kinder Morgan or any other pipeline company to come up with a thinner pipe in rural areas. What? I live in a rural area. What am I, chopped liver? It just, you have to ask for the thickest pipe that there is so that everybody is protected. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is Eric Lapier. After Eric is Danielle Lapier.

MR. LAPIER: Yes, my name is Eric Lapier. That's spelled L-A-P-I-E-R.

MR. TOMASI: (Laughs at his pronunciation.)

MR. LAPIER: Thank you. To me, the greatest concern lies with poor location choice for the compressor station proposed in the town of Nassau. This is a three compressor unit facility totaling ninety thousand horsepowers of output. The proposed site is located in a residential zone on the opposite side of the road from my house. I am likely to be the nearest inhabited dwelling from the proposed station.

I have raised my two children in this house and expect to continue to do so. I have spent years improving the systems and grounds of the house. I often sit outside at night in the summer and listen to the peepers in the swamp out back and the owls on the hills, the crickets in the grass. I catch lightning bugs with the kids. I look up at the stars. My five year old can already recognize Venus, Mars and Jupiter.

I am not alone. The half-mile buffer zone has I got sixty-three little dots. You know, that's what we are. We are numbers to these guys. We are sixty-three little yellow dots on a map. Each one represents a residence. A large portion of these dots are inhabited by children. I know because my eleven year old daughter told me so, that they ride her school bus. Those are sixty-three families who will directly be affected by the proposed compressor station due to spillage, maintenance and pressure relief.

The majority of the chemicals found in well-pads will likely be released to the environment at the compressor station. A study published by Science Direct by Lisa McKenzie found residents living within a

half-mile from wells are at a greater risk for health effects from natural gas development than are residents living greater than one-half mile from wells. Those that aren't in the half-mile buffer zone will be affected too. Another article published by Plus One on June 3rd, authored by Bruce Pitt, correlated low birth weight to the proximity of natural gas wells and that is up to ten miles away. The findings indicate that a small but significant association between proximity to unconventional gas development and decreased birth weight was noted after accounting for a large number of contributing factors.

With so much data available, why would a chemical polluting compressor station be located so close to so many residents? I have hiked, biked and off-roaded this area for most of my life. I was raised here. There are locations less than ten miles in either direction by the way, from this proposed site that has zero residences within a half-mile radius.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. LAPIER: Why were these locations not chosen? In addition, I would also like to just mention the light pollution will affect looking at the stars with my kids. The sound will obviously prevent us from listening to the sounds of nature. I highly suspect that most of the wildlife in the area will not appreciate the compressor station and will likely move on, as will I.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: After Danielle Lapier it is Richard Sahr.

MS. LAPIER: My name is Danielle Lapier, L-A-P- I-E-R and I would like you to hear my thoughts on the compressor station. One of my biggest concerns about the compressor station is the location it will be placed. My house is right across the street from where the compressor station is planning on being. My father has already said that if the compressor station goes up we will likely be moving. I don't want to move. I grew up here. I like the School District and I like the town of Nassau.

Another concern I have is for the wildlife that thrives in this area. It would be very upsetting if the animal's homes got polluted. The next reason I am against the compressor station is because I like stargazing. If it goes in, then I will not be able to see the stars at night. My last concern about the compressor station is the health risk it could cause the residents that live near the compressor station. Many people will be breathing in the poison gases. Those are just some of the reasons I am against the compressor station. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Richard Sahr. After that is Patricia Sahr. I apologize for the misspellings.

MR. SAHR: It's S-A-H-R.

MR. TOMASI: Did I get it right, Sahr?

MR. SAHR: Yes. One of the first people. I can't believe you said it right.

MR. TOMASI: Laughs.

MR. SAHR: My name is Richard Sahr. My wife and I live at 98 Coldwater Tavern Road in East Nassau.

We originally moved into the Town of Nassau in 1979 because it was a rural residential community. We valued our home and our land for a number of reasons including its quiet setting. The opportunity to view and enjoy wildlife, the ability to grow our own food organically and the ability to raise our two children in such a setting.

During that time, I studied and became a healing touch certified practitioner. Healing touch is an alternative therapy that can compliment traditional medicine or it can stand alone. Healing touch can work on physical, mental, emotional and spiritual issues by facilitating the ability of patients to heal themselves. I have regularly worked on patients at Albany Medical Center and Veterans at the Albany VA Hospital. At Albany Medical Center I've worked in all of the departments, including the ICU and periodically accompanied patients into preop, OR and postop.

After becoming certified, I also established a private practice in my own home. Our home and my practice

are now in jeopardy. If the pipeline and compressor station are approved in the proposed location, it will detrimentally effect my ability to conduct my home occupation. Quiet is one of the essential ingredients in this kind of work because my clients have to be able to focus inwardly without being shocked by loud noises.

I am concerned that the periodic blow-downs and the constant anticipation of them will interfere with their and my ability to focus on the healing process. I am obviously against the gas.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Next is Patricia Sahr. After Patricia is Madeline Collins.

MS. SAHR: Okay, Patricia Sahr 98 Cold Water Tavern Road in the Town of Nassau. Nassau is a town that values its history. I am speaking tonight on behalf of the dedicated people who do the preservation work and in this statement I hope to address the impact the pipeline might have on the historic structures located on Clark's Chapel Road, County Road, Route 15, China Hill Road and Mud Pond Road, all of which are close to the proposed pipeline route.

Existing buildings in the area date from the late 1800's and mid 19th centuries and include farmhouses, barns and outbuildings. The owners have striven to preserve them and increase their values so that they have a viable future. Two examples of the restoration work are the farmhouse owned by John Kegan where he lives and operates a perennial landscaping business and the 1950 home of John Marsh.

An extremely important part of this Nassau Historic District is located on Mud Pond Road. East Field Village is a fully functional colonial village and repository for 18th and 19th century Nassau buildings and artifacts. The site has twenty-five structures, including an 1860's Greek revival church and a large tavern with many rooms. Individuals come from all over the world to study and reside at historic East Field Village during its workshops.

They escape their busy, noisy city life to journey to an authentic, 19th century, early village in Upstate New York. Classes are ongoing and well-attended. East Field Village is open during spring, summer and fall to educate individuals in the early crafts of colonial America. The areas of study are timber framing, masonry, fireplace building, plaster and lathe treatments, slate roofing, tinsmithing, woodworking, blacksmithing, open hearth cooking and so on.

East Field Village is the creation of the late Don Carpentier who was one of the foremost preservation experts in the world. He acquired through purchase or donation many of the parts for the East Field Village from local Nassau residents. He used all these items for the purpose of reconstruction and maintenance of the village. Don would pick up these items and reuse them at East Field.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MS. SAHR: Okay. I will skip ahead. The NED pipeline as planned will go right through this area of town that is of great historic and cultural importance. I ask that a study be made from the damage that will result from pipeline construction near historic structures and of the detrimental effects of the nearby compression station which is just about of a mile away which will have on the operation -

MR. TOMASI: Okay, time is up. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Madeline Collins, and Stephanie Victoria.

MS. COLLINS: Madeline Collins, C-O-L-L-I-N-S. Before I give my testimony, I would like to state for the record that given the incomplete nature of the information in Kinder Morgan's resource reports, I believe these scoping meetings are being conducted prematurely. I would like FERC to research why we need this pipeline. I don't understand the need for it.

I certainly don't understand why, when FERC has banned fracking, we should have fracked gas transported through our state and why the leaders the world over including our own are saying we need to reduce our carbon footprint, this project is being planned. Please also research what the impact would be

of not building a pipeline and ways we could reduce our need for energy or get it from renewable sources. Please research all the potential impacts to human, animal and plant populations along the route, both during and after construction.

We are a mostly rural area. Every single portion of pipeline laid will affect each of these. How will the emissions from the compressor station, both planned for and accidental, react with the chemicals and any supervised sites along the route such as Dewey Loeffel and other places nearby that may hold chemicals or toxic waste.

How will the compressor station and pipeline affect our wetlands and waterways, up to and including those within a half mile or more of the compression station such as Burton Lake? How will this project affect our health, especially the health of our children and senior citizens as well as those who already have respiratory or other health concerns and the health of both the farm and the wild animals in the area?

Again I would like the research to include the effects in both the best-case scenario and in the case of a pipeline and compressor accidents. With so many pipelines planned, what will be the interaction between them and the cumulative effects on the environment from them? What would Kinder Morgan do to protect us and our environment? How have they protected people in the environments in other areas where they have installed pipelines? How will the loss of our undisturbed, rural areas be calculated? How will the loss of lifestyle for those of us who are here for peace and quiet be calculated? What will the impact -

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MS. COLLINS: What will the impact be on our low- income residents? What will the financial cost to those whose land will be devalued, their land polluted or wells impacted? Who will make up that cost to them? I ask FERC to refrain from accepting Kinder Morgan's formal filing until the resource reports are complete and please do not close the scoping comment period until sixty days after the Kinder Morgan files new, complete resource reports. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Stephanie Vioria. After Stephanie Vioria is Michael Dundon.

AUDIENCE: Eric, there's a twelve year old that needs to go to bed. Can she go before?

MR. TOMASI: Do you mind it? If you mind --

MS. VILORIA: It's fine.

MR. TOMASI: Are you sure. Yes, if the child wants to go that's fine. If you could come up please? Okay.

CHILD MNORGAN CROSS: Hi. My name is Morgan Cross. I am nine years old and I live on 115 China Hill Road, Nassau, New York. I live on a farm and this pipeline is going right through my yard. I am concerned that all of my animals on my farm and my family's health. All of the gas, all of the poisonous gas we breathe in will cause very bad damage to us. I really don't want this pipeline to go in. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MS. VILORIA: Stephanie Vioria, V-I-L-O-R-I-A. I'm a lifelong resident of Skodak. I grew up less than a mile from the proposed pipeline and also two from the proposed compressor station. I am a homeowner of the same property I grew up in for the last ten years. Despite the addition of a few homes, families and paved roads, the neighborhood that I grew up in and have lived in for the last thirty-two years has been virtually unchanged. Quiet, beautiful and full of fresh air.

I would like to speak to the proposed ninety thousand horsepower compressor station to be located on Clark's Chapel Road as stated in the Southwest Pennsylvania Environmental Health Project Summary of Compression stations and how fast emissions are produced during normal operations of a compression station. Formaldehyde was one of the one hundred one chemicals found in association with methane in the study. Formaldehyde is considered a hazardous air pollutant by the US EPA. Compressor stations are the highest unconventional natural gas development source for formaldehyde. Air exposures to formaldehyde

target the lungs and mucous membranes and in short-term can cause asthma-like symptoms.

The EPA classifies it as a probable human carcinogen. It has been associated with childhood asthma and has been linked to adverse pregnancy outcomes and reproductive and developmental toxicity. It is well-known that compressor stations emit formaldehyde but it has also been found that formaldehyde may be formed at these sites through a chemical reaction between methane and sunlight. I mention formaldehyde specifically because I have a documented allergy to formaldehyde.

In addition to the health concerns previously mentioned, I will have to worry about serious rashes and breathing conditions that can only be helped with a steroid and cannot be on steroids for a long period of time. Breathing conditions while picking apples and berries in my yard, playing outside with my daughter, running through the neighborhood during my daily marathon training runs, often while pushing my daughter in a jogging strolling.

The CDC's website states that formaldehyde can make you feel sick if you breathe it a lot and if you are exposed to more of it for a longer time you are more likely to have symptoms. The higher level of formaldehyde and the longer the exposure the greater the chance of getting cancer.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MS. VILORIA: Exposure to formaldehyde might increase the chance of getting cancer even at levels too low to cause symptoms. What is most interesting is that the CDC says to protect yourself from formaldehyde exposure, you should open windows as much as possible to let in fresh air. Spend as much time outdoors in fresh air as possible.

How am I supposed to do this when my air quality will be compromised from the proposed ninety thousand horsepower compressor station? How will I protect my family from overexposure? The only way for this to be done is for FERC to deny Kinder Morgan's gas pipeline applications. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Michael Dundon. Michael, number twenty-two.

(No Response.)

MR. TOMASI: Okay, moving on. Next is Jack Spillman, twenty-three.

MR. SPILLMAN: Hi. I'm Jack Spillman, SPILLMAN. I live next to the Black River in Stephentown Center. Three miles upriver is the Black River Dam. It is a five hundred and sixty foot earthen dam which makes it twenty feet wide at its top. It was built in the 1930's and holds back a thirty-five acre lake which is twenty-feet deep.

In 2007 and again in 2014, two extensive engineering assessments by Civil Dynamics Engineering, PC and Acom Engineering Company were conducted for the New York State Office of Parks and Recreation and Historic Preservation. Both reports are in agreement and state that anything over ten inches of rain or rainfall within a 24- hour period will overtop the dam and in all probability cause the dam to collapse.

Depending up the extent of that collapse, a three hundred foot wide flood of water between five and eleven feet deep would devastate my house. Ten inches of rain has happened a number of times in Upstate New York. Most recently thirteen inches of rain fell in Schoharie County during Hurricane Irene and devastated large areas of Schoharie County. Kinder Morgan has proposed locating this NED pipeline downstream from my property.

The proposed location is eight hundred feet away and ten feet lower than my house. If the dam fails, it would unleash a huge flood of water down the river's length potentially destroying everything in its path, including the proposed pipeline. A catastrophic event would be unleashed and made drastically worse by the presence of a hydro- fracked gas pipeline buried a few feet under the river bed. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Mary Jo Molloy. After Mary Jo Molloy is Susan Phelps.

MS. MOLLOY: My name is Mary Jo Molloy, M-O-L-L- O-Y and I live at 16 Stables Road, Stephentown

New York. I'm against the Kinder Morgan gas pipeline because it is not good for me, not for my neighbors or for New York State. The government of New York State decided to ban fracking, even though it would bring money into the state. Ban fracking because New York State considered it a health risk. Now Kinder Morgan wants to come into the state, bring the fracked gas right through our state using a quality of pipe that can only be used in rural areas because it is such inferior quality that it cannot be used in densely populated areas. Rural people and farmer's lives don't matter.

The gas and cheap piping is going right through our state. Only the gas leaks and the terrible unhealthy noise and bright lights from the huge compressor stations. Compressor stations taking up hundreds of acres of land that will contaminate our towns, take away our rights to enjoy our property that we purchased with the expectation of being able to enjoy the peace and quiet of the country. Our rights are being stolen by Kinder Morgan for their profit.

Also, New York State gets none of the gas and to boot, Kinder Morgan is a Southern Company who brings most of their workers with them. We don't even get many temporary jobs. Many of us landowners already have an easement for power lines. Kinder Morgan plans to use that as an excuse to take more property from us. Their pipelines have to be at least one hundred and fifty feet from the powerlines or there will be serious corrosion problems.

Who knows if one hundred and fifty feet is adequate with such a huge project? Running the pipeline adjacent to a power line is asking for corrosion problems. Cheap pipe added to corrosion problems. Obviously, safety is not an issue for Kinder Morgan. Rural people and farmers lives don't matter.

Kinder Morgan wants to take the best of our land and leave us with paying taxes --

MR. TOMASI: Thirty Seconds.

MS. MOLLOY: with the possibility of contaminating our well water which will be unable to plant trees on the right-of-way. I'm against the Kinder Morgan gas pipeline because it is not good for me, for my neighbors or for New York State. Please, FERC, do not issue a certificate of public convenience and necessity to the Kinder Morgan project. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Susan Phelps. After Susan is Libby Reilly.

MS. PHELPS: Hi. My name is Susan Phelps PHELPS and my home is about five hundred feet away from the proposed pipeline. I have a very unusual set of circumstances that I would like to bring to FERC's attention. My father was born on a farm on Florence Chapel Road and I grew up on this same farm. When I got married, my husband and I built our home and raised our four daughters on a piece of land from my dad's farm. We then bought the farm land that was next to my father's farm on Florence Chapel Road and gave each of our daughters land to build their homes on.

My daughters and their husbands worked hard over many years to build a beautiful and healthy environment for our nine grandchildren, ages two to thirteen to live. They built barns and gardens in which to raise their organic animals and food. Then one day the farm bordering our land came up for sale and my youngest daughter and her husband bought that. They raise organic beef, cows, chickens, pigs, sheep, Christmas trees and maple syrup.

The farm was built in 1777 and is beautifully preserved, pristine and located right across the street from the proposed ninety thousand horsepower compressor station which runs 24/7. She will be condemned to live with noise pollution, light pollution since they are lit up all night long and chemical pollution spewed into the air by blow-downs. Which are so loud they will most likely terrify her beef cattle causing them to run through fences. These cattle are not pets. It would be almost impossible to catch them.

Within a one and a quarter mile stretch of the proposed pipeline compressor station, my family members number thirty-six people. This is a unique and unusual situation. They consist of my sister and her family, nieces, nephews, cousins and my children's families consisting of nineteen adults and seventeen children, all living in the incineration zone. This number doesn't include the many lifelong friends and their

families that have lived there their entire lives also.

This proposed pipeline and compressor station will create a huge safety, health and financial burden too great for one family to have to bear let alone all the others. If we decide to move because of the danger, who will want to buy our homes at their current assessed value. Buyers will not pay full market value for a home on pipeline and certainly not next to --

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MS. PHELPS: -- ninety thousand horsepower compression station. I am asking you to please take into consideration the human element in this unusual situation. What if these thirty-six family members were your children, grandchildren, nieces, nephews, cousins and siblings? Could you ask them to make so great a sacrifice? Would you want them to live in a toxic noise air and light polluted incineration zone? Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next, Libby Reilly. After Libby is Jane --

AUDIENCE: My sister is going to give up her time because mine is kind of lengthy, can I do that?

MR. TOMASI: That's fine. I will just cross her off.

MS. REILLY: My name is Libby Reilly, R-E-I-L-L-Y

MR. TOMASI: You can get up on the microphone more. MS. REILLY: My husband Scott and my two children Tyler 6, Andrew 2, own a hundred-acre organic farm across the street from the proposed ninety-thousand horsepower compressor station. In a one mile radius, we have eleven other households of family members along the proposed pipeline and compressor station route that consists of sisters, nieces, nephews, cousins, aunts, uncles, and my parents. My children, along with their cousins are the fifth generation to inhabit this road.

My six year old son Tyler has been crying almost nightly since he now knows of the industrial structure that may potentially invade his neighborhood. If this structure were to go in, we would have no choice but to sell our farm that is currently valued at three hundred and fifty-five thousand dollars. He knows moving means leaving his seven cousins, grandparents from both sides, the only neighborhood he has ever known and all his animals he loves dearly.

I would like to let FERC know that this neighborhood is more than just a neighborhood. It's a family that will be torn apart. My farm Homestead was built in 1777. It is a beautiful and spectacular piece of history that is currently under review by New York State Historic Parks and Recreation to be on the National Register. Please explain to me how this industrial infrastructure will hinder my farm's historical status, specifically with the visual effect and the noise that will be generated 24/7?

It is also proven that homes values can drop by fifty percent when located next to these stations. I will lose over one hundred and sixty thousand dollars of my farm's worth. Who will compensate me? We are a starter farm looking to seek organic certification. We purchased the farm two years ago and have been focusing on bringing the farm back to working condition. In order to be certified organic, one criteria is to be pesticide free for three years. Since we have only owned the farm for two years we cannot certify the third years's history.

Prove to me that the emissions and documented toxins proposed from a compressor station will not hinder my farm's ability to receive and organic certification. When the blow-downs occur a thirty-six inch, one thousand four hundred and sixty psi pipeline will generate noise equal to a jet engine taking off. My cows' pasture is extremely close. This will spook the cows and they potentially will jump or run through their fencing. Who will be responsible if this were to occur? Getting back in a herd of cattle when they are spooked is not an easy task if at all possible.

This could be a threat to anyone in the cows' path. If someone were to be injured or if I sustained economic loss, who will pay? There is also research that proves cropland near compressor station sites suffer

up to thirty percent reduction in crop growth. We rely on a full crop production to sustain our herd of cattle. A reduced crop reduction year after year will cut into my farm's business. Prove to me the acid rain produced by the turbines or evaporators, cooling system and blow-downs will not hinder the growth of my crops.

There is twenty acres of cropland that will be lost in the transfer of the compressor station property from agriculture to industrial. This map I have here is from the county outlining the croplands on the parcel. I also has beehives that are sensitive to chemicals. Cornell University has done research on how acid rain is causing loss of valuable Northeast sugar maples. How will having a ninety thousand horsepower industrial compressor station effect my sugar maples as well as the Wells Maple Farm, who is in direct line of the station's emissions? Prove this to me. Please.

We operate a Christmas tree farm in the winter months. I have thousands of customers who come to the farm for a quiet, rural, historic country setting. The compressor station locations will create an industrial field right in that classic, historic field. Once again cutting into my business profits.

Also, looking at this map you can see a string of farms on the property of, my property. It flows south through the compressor station site and then links up with the Valatie Kill, flows into Nassau Lake to Kinderhook Lake and out to the Hudson River. The Valatie Kill is part of the clean-up efforts by the EPA Superfund Site known as the Dewey Loeffel Dump. This site sits 1.2 miles from the proposed compressor station and the Valatie Kill is tested on a regular basis.

Three miles east of the compressor station site, the line is slated to pass through the property is currently pursuing a mining permit. How is this a safe practice to allow blasting and a pipeline to be collocated?

I have also included a picture of a bald eagle that inhabits the area. He is seen here on the actual property for the compressor station. There are sixty-three residential households and fifty small children who live within the marked buffer zone with many more in close proximity. Prove to me that the compressor station's emissions are safe and that these children of the future will not be hindered with short and long term health effects due to toxins like benzene, toluene, formaldehyde, and methane?

I have come across sites such as the one from the Southwestern Pennsylvania Environmental Health Projects, which states that they detected sixteen to eighteen chemicals in the air surrounding these compressor station sites. Benzene is now being linked to childhood leukemia and most of the other chemicals hinder the neurosystem. Ultimately, the children will be the ones who suffer since their little bodies are still growing and trying to develop.

Prove to me that the government studies that these compressor stations are good neighbors so they supercede town zoning to be allowed in rural residential hamlets. My son and I suffer from a MTHFR gene mutation. He is heterozygous to the 6771298 combination which is the worst to have. Ninety-eight percent of Autistic children have this MTHFR condition. This condition can lead to a variety of medical problems but people with MTHFR are exposed to more toxins than their bodies can handle.

According to research, nitrous oxide can cause severe problems or death in people with NTHFR Gene mutations. Compression stations are documented to release nitrous oxide into the atmosphere on a daily basis. How will I protect my son from this? I have also included studies for you.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty Seconds.

MS. REILLY: When Kinder Morgan conducted their twenty-four hour sound level testing on May 21st and 22nd, box number five was placed around a telephone pole on the other side of the road. During the twenty-four hour telephone pole -- I can't explain any more (exasperated).

In conclusion, ultimately this is my home and my neighbors' home. We reside in rural residential neighborhoods to protect the way of life we want for our families. If this project truly was a public necessity, Kinder Morgan would not be having issues gaining customers to sign on. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. I did say we were going to go ahead and do a quick little break at 9 o'clock. We will both have signs so let's go ahead and take a ten minute break. We are going to get back together. Well, it's a little more than ten. Let's say 9:20.

Back at 9:20.

MR. TOMASI: Okay everyone. It's twenty after. Let's everyone take their seats and continue.

(Talks with assistant.)

MR. TOMASI: We are a little under halfway through so we should hopefully finish before midnight.

Again, I want to go ahead and call up the next speaker which is going to be Jamie Don and after Jamie is going to be Margaret Ford.

AUDIENCE: Can you give us those numbers?

MR. TOMASI: Yes. Margaret Ford is twenty-nine, the speaker after this.

AUDIENCE: (Laughter.)

MR. TOMASI: Go ahead.

MS. DON: Ready?

MR. TOMASI: Yes, ready.

MS. DON: My name is Jamie Don, D-O-N. I live on a quiet, dead end, dirt road with my husband and three daughters. My property, which was given to me by my father is located in the incineration zone of the proposed pipeline and only a half mile from the proposed compressor station. If the pipeline and compressor station go in I will sadly have to move. I don't want to, but cannot subject myself or my family to the harmful effects or dangers of such and industrial infrastructure. I built my property from the ground up.

We have spent the last ten years planting, seeding, building. Blood, sweat and tears have gone into our small, fourteen acre farm in which we raise organic chickens, honey, maple syrup and vegetables. I also give riding lessons and pony rides to the neighborhood children. I will have to stop when they are constructing the pipeline.

We eat organic as much as we can and we try to keep as many harmful chemicals out our home. My daughter and I suffer from chronic, long-term Lyme disease and need to live a clean, toxic-free lifestyle because the antibiotic regimen did not work for us. We love our home and have never, ever even considered the thought of moving but now with a single decision that could all be taken away from us.

Never would I have ever thought that a private corporation could move into our quiet little neighborhood and rip it apart. Also, I am a fourth generation resident. I am surrounded by eleven other households of family members. My great grandparents purchased Anarana Farm, just a half mile from my home.

Roughly twenty-five years ago my father purchased two hundred acres of land right down the road from their farm. My dad loved this land and would often be found reading the morning paper on the spot that I now have my house on. It overlooks a beautiful five acre pond surrounded by beautiful rolling hills that is now my horse pasture.

My dad gave me this land. I always knew how much he loved it and in my heart I always knew I had to hold onto it. My dad not only gave me land but gave my other three sisters land as well. Our lands connect and we often walk back and forth to each others' homes. Our children do the same. On any given day, they can be found bouncing back and forth from each other's houses.

If we all have to move, this will never, ever be able to be replicated. As much as I try to shield my children from this, they still know what is going on and often confront me with tears in their eyes asking if this is really going to happen. It breaks my heart to tell them that I do not know. I can only pray it does not and that you have enough compassion and wisdom to know that this project is not necessary. So many people will suffer and lose what they have worked generations for at the profit of a private company. So is this necessary?

Locally, I see many, many homeowners installing solar panels. If, as a nation we are working towards sustainable energy sources then why are we building more pipelines? Please, do not approve this project. It is not necessary and it is not welcome in our neighborhood. Also, would you want this type of project, literally, in your back yard? Could you sleep peacefully at night knowing that your children are sleeping in an incineration zone?

Please, do not base your decision on Union jobs. These jobs will come and go. The workers will benefit for a short time however our lives, landscape and environment will never, ever be the same and what will my family's benefit be? Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is Margaret Ford, number twenty-nine. After that is thirty, Bob Connors.

MS. FORD: That's Margaret Ford, F-O-R-D. From the outset, Kinder Morgan has not been a hundred percent trustworthy. Our December 12th notice claimed their pipeline was a Federal undertaking. Not true. They said they had an excellent safety record. Not true. They've just paid out ninety million dollars for blasts in California.

Recently, a representative of Kinder Morgan stated that methane was a 'safe gas'. Definitely not true. Our immediate concern is that our research has not found a single case where FERC has directly denied a pipeline project. We found that since 2013 over forty different pipeline projects have been proposed in the US. We have found that a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity is really a green light for private taking of private property for private profit.

We, as a family, do not have the deep pockets to do surveys, hire experts and find out all of the potential impacts of this pipeline on our property. We know our land will lose value. Habitat will be destroyed and our peace of mind will be conditioned on living in an incineration zone. We know the excess capacity of this mega-project is destined for export.

Please, FERC, do not consider the Public Necessity and Convenience of citizens in Asia to be more important than the rights of American Communities to have clean air, water and enjoy their rural lifestyles. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is number thirty Bob Connors. After Bob is thirty-one, David Fleming.

MR. CONNORS: Yes, hi. Bob Connors, C-O-N-N-O- R-S, a resident of New York.

AUDIENCE: We can't hear you.

MR. TOMASI: Can you put the microphone up for --

MR. CONNORS: Resident of New York and I am definitely opposed to this project by Kinder Morgan and any pipeline company for that matter. I believe that it's the height of callousness and disregard for all life and property for FERC to allow any pipeline company legal permission to treat rural locations differently than urban locations.

For example, in rural areas, the FERC regulations regarding the thickness or gauge of the pipeline, the distance between shut-off valves and the depth of the pipeline burial are just plain unfair in the sense comparing urban to rural requirements. The kill-zone or incineration zone losses in urban areas will be much higher than in rural areas and therefore higher construction standards are required by FERC in these urban areas to reduce losses.

But I ask you, FERC, why do you allow the distinction to be made that rural human life and attending property is less valuable than in urban areas? It seems that FERC has God-like powers to choose who will have improved chances to live based on where they live.

In addition, with this NED project, allowing Kinder Morgan to place methane gas pipelines very near high-powered electro-transmission lines is dangerous to say the least. It's a well-studied, scientific process that the electromagnetic interference of the transmission lines has a negative effect upon the integrity

of the methane gas pipelines. Pipeline leaks can and will develop over time.

Allowing the electromagnetic radiation near gas pipelines is akin to parents allowing their children to play with matches near a gas grill. Of course, this is something that no parent would allow a child to do. So I ask you, FERC, why do you allow this? Likewise, FERC regulations regarding the low frequency sound-ing issues, the blow-off noise reductions and toxic emissions at compressor stations and other infrastruc-ture are woefully substandard.

Kinder Morgan's weak assurances that it has safety measures in place to avoid or mitigate any potential negative outcome belies the fact that Kinder Morgan is considered the poster-boy for pipeline accidents and explosions due to its well-documented and continuous neglect of safety measures throughout the con-struction and maintenance process. FERC needs to completely change its mission statement from prevent-ing the building of fossil fuel infrastructure while merely attempting the mitigation.

MR. TOMASI: Sir, time's up.

MR. CONNORS: It's imperative for FERC to change its ways, the Earth needs you.

MR. TOMASI: Sir, time's up. Thank you. You want to give that to me, that would be great. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is David Fleming, number thirty-one.

AUDIENCE: David has left.

MR. TOMASI: David Fleming has left.

AUDIENCE: He is the ground supervisor in Nassau and he spoke earlier.

MR. TOMASI: Oh, sorry. I apologize. After that is thirty-two. Stephen Pechnik, again, thirty-two.

AUDIENCE: It's thirty-five actually, Pentak.

MR. TOMASI: Well, after thirty-two I have thirty-three Peter Wood. Thirty-three, Peter Wood.

MR. WOOD: I am sorry that some of my Union brothers left. I want to thank them for the lovely greeting they provided us, calling us idiots for wanting to protect our homes and our property. My name is Peter Wood. I live in West Stephentown. I believe that Kinder Morgan has a track record of skimping on safety and compliance and an above-average incidence of pipeline explosions, fires and other safety issues.

The proposed Northeast Direct thirty-six inch, high-pressure gas pipeline passes through rural areas and is permitted to use lower safety standards in the construction and operation compared to that required in more densely populated areas. Yet the proposed pipeline will pass closely by hundreds of houses which will be located in the so-called 'incineration zone'. Our towns and county have passed resolutions ex-pressing the people's will against the construction of this pipeline.

The proposed pipeline compressor plant located in Nassau New York will burn gas contaminated with hydro- fracking chemicals. Residents in that area as well as those living downwind of it, will be breathing those contaminants. The compressor plant will be operating 24/7 and its noise will reverberate for miles through the Burden Lake basin and the surrounding hills and hollows. The fumes and noise will become a constant presence in the lives of hundreds, if not thousands of residents in the vicinity.

The proposed pipeline will reduce and degrade parts of the Rensselaer Plateau, which is a unique and ir-replaceable natural area and a reservoir of natural diversity. Over thirty years ago we bought a derelict, late 18th century farm house and barns on thirty-five acres. We have since spent time, sweat and money; more time and sweat, fixing it up. It will never appear in any fancy magazine but it is home.

Older generations have sat in front of the fire, telling us about the times past. We have shared beers at campfires in the woods and shrieking children have happily stalked and caught frogs and salamanders. The proposed pipeline will slash through and bulldoze two hundred-year- old stone walls, a sugar bush, a low and high blueberry bush, a rare leg-gravel, vernal pools and an aquifer recharge area. As bedrock is close to or even on the surface, I question what effect blasting or other excavation techniques might have

on our water well.

The pipeline's approval would force us to sell at least several acres and create an unnatural, leveled strip separating our house from the main part of our property. This is through what I call --

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time is running out.

MR. WOOD: our backyard. The thirty-six inch, high-powered gas pipeline will pass closely around.

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time is up. I thought I gave you a thirty-second warning. I apologize.

MR. WOOD: On you. I get thirty seconds extra.

MR. TOMASI: I will give you thirty seconds if you want to continue.

MR. WOOD: (Very fast). The thirty-six inch, high-powered gas pipeline will pass closely around our house on two sides. This strip, which will be owned by Kinder Morgan, will be a magnet for --- running 24/7. I do not think that --

MR. TOMASI: Whoa, please slow down sir, there is no way he is getting that.

(Laughter.)

MR. WOOD: I do not believe that they can ever successfully fence off or otherwise restrict this space. The pipeline will reduce our property's value and destroy part of what we have worked for, saved and accumulated. This amounts to an unfair taking of our property. This pipeline is not about convenience or necessity but an industry taking profit by forcing risk and cost onto individual private property owners. This is wrong and un-American. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is David Flint number thirty- four. After that is thirty-five Steve Pentak.

MR. FLINT: Yes, my name is David Flint, F-L-I- N-T. I live on Calvin Cole Road in Stephentown. My wife and I are Rensselaer County landowners with property ubutting the proposed Kinder Morgan NED pipeline route. We estimate that the construction area for the project will come within 100 feet of our house and well. The amount of gas proposed to be delivered at high pressure through this thirty-six inch pipe is far more than needed in Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

The stated need has been reported as 0.7 million cubic feet per day for regional electrical generation and that's only on some ten to twenty-seven peak demand days per year. The proposed pipeline is supposed to deliver 2.2 billion cubic feet per day. So apparently most of the gas is intended for export up to Nova Scotia and overseas. Export to benefit Kinder Morgan and the natural gas industry. No gas for New York State or Rensselaer County is intended for this pipeline.

But we shoulder the risk, the economic cost, the legal costs, the irreparable damage to our wells, the plummeting property values. We even pay tax on any minimal compensation we might get for easements, as if it were some kind of windfall. Congressman Chris Gibson does not support this proposal. 'Our community should not bear the burden of the project, take on all the risk and not benefit from the construction and placement of the pipeline', the Congressman said. He goes on to say 'and with several other projects recently approved or close to approval, it is important that we not overdevelop which could increase risk and significantly decrease any offsetting economic benefits to those communities.

Please investigate the abysmal status of pipeline safety oversight. Recently the National Transportation Safety Board has spoken of systemic weaknesses and how natural gas providers maintain their pipelines. A top official at the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration has admitted that he has 'very few tools to work with in enforcing stated rules.'

As a state level the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation says they conduct no air monitoring at compressor stations and rely on self reporting by pipeline companies for any incident. Please note, too, that frost in our area this past winter was reported to be as much as six feet below ground. Kinder Morgan proposes to lay the pipeline only three feet down. We are not qualified to suggest any alternate route for this pipeline. We believe this pipeline is not needed --

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time is up.

MR. FLINT: and is convenient only for Kinder Morgan. Please deny the certificate.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Steven Pentak.

MR. PENTAK: Yes, that's Steven Pentak, P-E-N-T-A-K and I8m from Stephentown. I'm speaking for myself but I'm also speaking with the blessing of the Homewaters Chapter of Trout Unlimited. Trout Unlimited is a national organization and the homeowner's chapter is in Rensselaer County.

Now I just want to preface this by saying that this is now about protecting our sport fishing. It's about conserving a resource. The streams I'm going to talk about are spawning streams for brook trout, which are the native trout, a char actually, but the native fish of the state of New York. Actually the state fish too. The mission of Trout Unlimited is to conserve, protect and restore North America's coldwater fisheries and their watersheds.

By our account, the proposed pipeline would cross or become tangent to no fewer than six brook trout spawning streams in Stephentown and adjacent Dunham Hollow in Rensselaer County. Our question/comment for the purpose of the scoping period and EIS is this: What assurances can be made to protect the viabilities of these coldwater streams? And specifically, what guarantee is there that the methods for crossing these streams won't cause harm? The potential harm of erosion and sedimentation and the possibility of the stream flow being diverted underground and cutting off fish migration are risks.

These are freestone streams. They are not spring-fed and they have periods of low flow in the summer. Any stream collapse would damage the stream viability and trout migration. This gets a little bit of support from a report I found from the Nature Conservancy in Pennsylvania in 2011 with funding from the Neinz Foundation, RK Mellon Foundation and William Penn Foundation. It gives some credence to our concern and I quote 'Stream bed and wetland crossings may create erosions and sediment problems as well especially with an open-cut process but there is also a risk of stream-bed collapse with core crossing techniques.' That would be the other alternative, to just simply trench across.

The streams we have identified are brook trout spawning streams and this is documented by DEC and it is even acknowledged in the resource report that was provided by Kinder Morgan. But, it's not complete. There is some understatement of the streams that are spawning streams and these places have names too. It's Tacessec Creek, Roaring Brook, Randal Brook, Black River, West Brook, East Brook --

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. PENTAK: And their unnamed tributaries. So I will cut to the chase here as time goes away, we urge FERC to fully consider the impact to native and wild trout and their watersheds during the EIS process. Oh, I wanted to say very quickly. This habitat area is at the edge of the existing brook trout range, below it is a historic range of the brook trout so we are talking about the boundary of the existing brook trout range in this area. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is thirty-six, Sarah Carr. After Sarah Carr is thirty-seven, Deborah Bennett.

MS. CARR: Good evening. My name is Sarah Carr, C-A-R-R, and I live within the half-mile buffer zone of the proposed compressor site. I live next door to the house that I grew up in and based on the map submitted to you, FERC, we are one of the most densely populated proposed sites in the New York State with sixty plus homes within a half-mile buffer. I have many concerns. The health impacts on the residents alone, the size of the compressor station? Ninety thousand horsepower is more than four times the size of compressor stations in which smaller health impact studies have been conducted.

In those studies for smaller compressor sites, residents suffer from a variety of severe health conditions

directly related to the compressor stations. Some of these include but are definitely not limited to extreme tiredness, severe headaches, runny noses, sore throats, muscle aches, vomiting, dizziness, chronic nose bleeds, and severe respiratory disorders as well as sleep disturbances.

I also urge FERC to look into the spike in stillborn births after compressor stations were erected in Utah. The long term health effects of a compressor station of this size have very limited if to no study done. Additionally, exposures to constant and many emissions all the time. One of these is benzene which has been proven to cause leukemia and is also argued in literature that there is probably no safe exposure to benzene and all exposures constitute some risk in a linear if not superlinear and additive fashion.

My second concern is safety. In the event of accident or explosions, our community does not have the resource to handle a catastrophe of that size. Our fire department and EMS personnel are volunteers. They're friends, family and neighbors and they cannot handle an explosion of that magnitude. There is no clear or safe evacuation routes or plans for the residents themselves and I would also like to point out that Westchester County is the closest burn unit to this area and we have limited med- flight capabilities.

Thirdly, the farmlands, wetlands, crops, livestock and wildlife. Noise alone from the blow-downs that can last on average of three hours. There are only a small number of the many concerns that I have. There are too many understudied variables in the long-term effects of this project and the impact they have on the community. I am not just asking you, I am begging you to deny Kinder Morgan's request to place this industrial facility in a rural, residential community.

Unlike the union members misrepresenting the voice of my community tonight, I do live here. I do work here and myself and this child have to live with the lifelong impacts of this project. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up is Deborah Bennett thirty- seven. After that is thirty-eight, Russell Bennett.

MS. BENNETT: Thank you. My name is Deborah Bennett. I am an RN working in the field of public health as a school nurse. I am a resident of Averill Park, Burden Lake. I urge this commission to take a hard look at the issues laid out in the New York State Department of Health Public Health report submitted as a one hundred eighty-six page supplemental document to the 2015 final supplemental EIS of High Volume Hydraulic Fracturing. Please note an evaluation of the study cited in this document reveals critical information gaps that need to be filled to fully understand the connections between risk factors such as air, water and soil pollution and public health outcomes.

Among populations living in proximity to HVHF Gas operations and their infrastructure, many of these studies are ongoing or still need to be initiated to fully explore the effects of HVHF and its infrastructure as well as the necessary mitigation measures to protect communities and the public health.

Some examples of ongoing studies referenced in this document relate to studies funded by The National Science Foundation, looking at the incidence of birth defects which are longitudinal and require time to complete. In order to take a hard look at such profound public health impacts, FERC should wait for the analysis of these studies before considering this application.

The compressor station is just twenty-eight hundred feet from the southern tip of Burden Lake in an area that is otherwise extremely quiet. Portions of the lake are within the half-mile buffer from the compressor. Once the sound reaches the lake, there is no topographical barrier to attenuate the noise or prevent its travel over the water. The extremely loud sounds produced by blow-downs will be carried far further than other locations, particularly since the prevailing winds are from the south and directly to the lake as pointed out by New York State and the EEC using a 6 decibel increase in sound pressure can be annoying against existing rural background levels of only thirty decibels.

FERC should study the effect on the topography, prevailing winds and quiet background. Burden Lake hosts a children's summer camp and Wounded Warriors events for recreation and recovery of severely disabled veterans. It is inconceivable that we would subject these veterans, many of whom may be suffering from post-traumatic stress syndrome or traumatic brain injury to constant, sudden and extreme noises

or force them to find another host site.

Aside from hosting a nesting population of bald eagles and numerous osprey, Burden Lake is a regular stopover for migratory waterfowl in the spring and fall. A large number of Canada geese and all migratory arctic ducks.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MS. BENNETT: Thanks.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up is Russell Bennett. After Russell Bennett is number thirty-nine, Lisa Zimmerman.

MR. BENNETT: I am Russell Bennett, that's B-E-N-N-E-T-T. I also live at 14 Caucus Barn Road at Averill Park in the Town of Sand Lake. I'm going to be extremely brief. I submitted written material covering about ten points so I will just concentrate on one to give other people an opportunity. I want to speak about the Hudson River Crossing.

The Hudson River is a Superfund Site for two hundred miles from Fort Edward to New York City. The crossing at Queenman's Landing and Scodak is just twenty miles south of the Troy Dam, where General Electric has performed an expensive dredging and cleanup operation of PCB deposits in the sediments to prevent their further downstream migration. The river is over fourteen hundred feet wide at the proposed crossing point. This is much wider than can be crossed with horizontal drilling, which I understand is limited to about four hundred feet.

Suggesting that the applicant use open or what is known as wet blasting, it should be determined whether and how Kinder Morgan's river crossing method will disturb and re-suspend PCB deposits at the crossing site. FERC should study the effect on downstream communities such as Reinbeck and Pohkeepsie, which use the Hudson water for drinking water. Additionally, the town of Bethlehem, immediately adjacent, uses wells next to the Hudson as Clapper Road Treatment Facility in very close proximity to the proposed pipeline crossing.

The Hudson is an estuary river which changes its direction of flow four times a day. The danger to the public water supply requires a hard look. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, sir.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Lisa Zimmerman number thirty-nine. After Lisa is Alan Opresko.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: Hi. My name is Lisa Zimmerman. I live on 80 Rice Road and I am an abutting landowner to the proposed pipeline. I am concerned about an environmental air, water and soil quality effects during the construction process, on the compaction of soils that aren't farmed, the aquifer and the quality of life of residents and the presence of wildlife, including bald eagles sited at Clark's Chapel and Rice Roads.

The potential for contamination of groundwater to the streams supplying the aquifer, it is a consolidated aquifer which flows east to west in the Hudson River, continuing the waste levels from the proposed compressor station exceeding 55 decibels at the nearest house, especially during blow-downs. Toxic chemicals emitted by the compressor station blow-downs include formaldehyde, benzene, talium and radon with serious health effects according to MSDS sheets.

Significant light at the compressor station should be considered effecting the wildlife, migrating birds, bats, and the quality of life of surrounding residents. Who takes in mind our public safety? There will be co-location of the NED with two other pipelines that will parallel the NED from right to Lake Logan in Skodak. A crack in aged pipelines from cross-Ts or corrosion and leakage could lead to a catastrophic explosion in populated areas like Glen Rock, Bethlehem or Castleton. Especially all three pipelines if all three pipelines are affected. The cumulative effects need to be considered.

A potential for tear, especially if the compressor station is left unmanned and not fenced with a significant

structure. I have socioeconomic concerns. It is well-known that the production of Marcellus Shale is fracked natural gas far exceeds the capacity for use in the Northeast. There is enormous pressure for both the natural gas industry and Wall Street investment firms who finance them to export the gas out of the United States.

Excessive gas exportation could raise domestic gas prices, use a finite resource and allow excessive construction of infrastructure that does not directly benefit US Citizens. Gas transported in the NED will not benefit Rensselaer County and most of the natural gas will not benefit New York State or New England.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MS. ZIMMERMAN: You should stop the application process. I ask you to deny the certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. If the project moves forward, then please do not close the scoping comment period until after sixty days after Kinder Morgan files new complete resource reports because they have left so much to be determined. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Next is Alan Opresko. I hope I'm saying that right. Next after him is forty-one, Kathy Pratt.

MR. OPRESKO: My name is Alan Opresko, O-P-R-E- S-K-O. I live on the third Burden Lake in the Town of Sand Lake. I want to begin by just saying that I concur with all the statements and positions taken by the people that are in opposition to this project. I would just like to focus on a couple points for the sake of brevity.

One of which is that taking a cynical view. If sixty-three households living in the blast or incineration zone is acceptable in somebody's calculation, I want to point out that this project does have a much wider impact. As our previous speaker noted the air pollution and potential noise and light pollution from this project will also affect the community of the lake dwellers, both seasonal and residential year round lake dwellers. In addition to the Boys' Club summer camp and the Wounded Warrior Projects out there.

The people on these lakes will be affected. Sound carries on lakes. We occasionally can hear the trains from these nearby railroad tracks so I can't imagine what the constant droning of that compressor station is going to sound like or worse yet, the blow-downs that occur.

Secondly, these communities are going to, affected by this pipeline will suffer a negative economic impact. Property values will go down, not only for the people that live right near this compressor station along the pipeline but for the people on the lakes who spent thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars of their own money to improve and maintain the quality of their lake water and their surrounding environment. When those property values go down we are all going to be affected. Our nest eggs are going to be diminished.

That leads me to another point. The FERC's strategic plan, its first scroll says is to promote safe, reliable, secure and efficient infrastructure that serves the public interest. This project does not serve the public interest of New York State. It certainly does not serve the public interest of anybody in these surrounding communities.

The Attorney General in Massachusetts has recently commissioned a study to find out what the real need for natural gas is in that state. It is questionable as to whether this project serves the public interest. We think this pipeline is going to serve the interests of the company and abroad.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. OPRESKO: I don't see how FERC can do this study and make a decision without knowing absolutely for sure where that gas is going. How else can you determine what the public interest is? Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next we have forty-one, Kathy Pratt. After Kathy is forty-two, Ken Stokem.

MS. PRATT: My name is Kathy with a K Pratt, P- R-A-T-T and I've been a New York State Licensed Clinical Social Worker for thirty-three years. I worked with child welfare, seriously, emotionally, mentally disturbed clients. I live on Burden Lake and I'm very concerned about the proposed site of the compressor station and the affect that a compressor station will have on the mental health of the residents and recreational users of Burden Lake.

Throughout the year, both residents and recreational users with cardiac issues, other health issues, grief and loss issues, anxiety disorders, post-traumatic stress disorder and other mental illness and emotional issues depend on the peace and tranquility of the lake for a place to renew their emotional stability and mental health, decrease their stress level and to engage in physical activity to distract from disturbing emotions, build self- esteem and increase feelings of control.

Victims of childhood trauma, chronic adversity and veterans groups such as Wounded Warriors use the lake on a regular basis. They pursue outdoor activities and enjoy the peace of nature that is components of the treatment for PTSD. These traumatized individuals are hypersensitive to noise, which can trigger flashbacks and extreme distress and vivid memories of the original trauma. Noise magnifies over water.

The chronic noise that the compressor station would produce would negatively affect the quiet atmosphere that is the peace and tranquility of the lake. The noise of a station blow-down could actually trigger flashbacks and re-traumatize victims. Just the general public needs to feel safe and secure and to not be under constant stress in order to maintain good mental health.

The pipeline and the compressor station threatened the public safety of this quiet residential area and make the residents feel helpless in the face of danger from toxins and explosives. Everyone benefits from the relaxation, seclusion and peace that comes from being in the natural world and particularly the most tragic of our population.

Kinder Morgan and this compressor station will destroy the peace and secure well-being of the residents and visitors to Burden Lake. I believe that a hard look needs to be taken into the pipeline compressor station's effect on the mental health of everybody.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is number forty-two Ken Stokem. After Ken is Sue Carrillo.

MR. STOKEM: I am going to yield back most of my time in favor of speaking more completely tomorrow. What I do want to do is urge everyone that is here to see this not as the end of this process but the beginning of the process and to make sure that you take time to sign up on the contact sheets that they have just outside the door at the table so that you will be in the line of communications as this process goes further in terms of how it is organized in our community.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, sir. Forty-three, Sue Carrillo. After Sue is forty-four Tom Quimby.

MS. CARRILLO: Thank you. My name is Sue Carrillo, that's C-A-R-R-I-L-L-O. I'm an official intervener in the FERC proceeding. I originally filed a motion to intervene under the Constitution Pipeline Docket number CP13-499 and CP13-502, however I was shocked to find that FERC is now requiring that all interventions for the Northeast Energy Direct Project be filed under Docket number PF14-22 as well.

Since these pipeline projects are listed under the Northeast Energy Direct Project I officially complied with filing all of my interventions under the requisite docket numbers. I only until this evening realized that there actually are two parallel pipelines, the Constitution Pipeline and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline going along the same route which is highly illegal to start with, but preposterous. It is an absurd proposal and it needs to be denied immediately.

As an Official Intervener, I move into evidence in this proceeding any comments by individuals at this meeting or filed via the FERC e-Library prior to August 31, 2015 any comments written or verbal that are in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project, its affiliated pipelines and any ancillary compressor stations or related facilities.

As an Official Intervener, I concur with the Pipeline Awareness Network Northeast, Inc. FERC should grant an extension of thirty days for public comment period beyond the FERC stipulated deadline which begins after the filing of the resource reports that Kinder Morgan intends to file in July 2015 and has not yet filed.

I would like to state for the official record that the original Environmental Impact Statement EIS, published by FERC with regard to the Constitution Pipeline must be revised since it fails to analyze the cumulative environmental impacts of the seven newly proposed compressor stations in New York State associated with the Northeast Energy Direct Project in addition to the one already proposed in the Constitution Pipeline Project. These are now docketed under a new Docket number of PF14-22. This is in my opinion in attempt by FERC to prevent --

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MS. CARRILLO: The due process that we as citizens have a right to and they are violating our Constitutionally protected right to due process by not allowing sufficient public comment or sufficient disclosure of information. Per the President's Council on Environmental Quality, a Division of Executive Office, the CEQ official guidance to all Federal agencies from December 2014 requires Federal agencies including FERC --

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am your time is up.

MS. CARRILLO: To consider the effects of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in their evaluations for environmental impact statements.

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am your time is up.

MS. CARRILLO: Under this guidance, a NEPA review must consider emissions. I'm actually an intervener so I have special.

MR. TOMASI: Miss, you're an intervener in the Constitution however this is a different one. I understand. You can feel free to give me your comments and I will put them in the record.

MS. CARRILLO: Okay, I will just finish the last sentence. You are required under the guidance of NEPA to review and consider emissions from activities upstream and downstream of proposed projects, especially if the construction projects are scheduled to occur simultaneously.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Would you want to give me your whole speech?

MS. CARRILLO: As an Official Intervener I have written documents that will be filed through the correct docket numbers, our official documents in the proceeding including my formal comments.

MR. TOMASI: I want to point out that the Consitution is the project. Interveners in the Constitution is one thing but this Project hasn't gotten an application and you can't actually become an official intervener in this project until such a time that they actually file the application. Anyone who can, who wants to file an intervener status after the application of course can, it's just to intervene, you can't intervene at this point in time in this particular project. But you can after the application, you can. So I apologize . Okay, after Sue is forty-four Tom Quimby. After Tom is Becky Meier.

MR. QUIMBY: Good evening. My name is Tom Quimby, Q-U-I-M-B-Y. I've been listening to a lot of what's been said and one of the things I am having trouble with is figuring out where the public is in whose interest this is. The only thing I can think of is Mitt Romney doing his campaign and you remember he said 'Corporations are people, my friend.' To which somebody else replied, 'you know what? I would believe they are people when they go to jail and they come back in body bags from foreign conflicts.

(Applause)

MR. QUIMBY: But I can't see the benefit of this anywhere. That's number one. Number two, with the argument that it's good for economic development made by the Union people. I have a proposition for you here. Let's suppose I work for the carpenter's union and I say 'you know what? I want to destroy your

house, maybe burn it down or something?' Well, gosh I don't want that. 'Well, it's going to give us work putting it back up. You know, it'll generate economic activity and we will pay for it.'

You know what? That's a better proposition than this pipeline because this pipeline is going to leave behind a bomb. You got shutoff valves every ten miles in rural areas, is that correct? Right? It's going to leave behind a bomb that is ten miles long and thirty-six inches high compressed at fourteen forty psi. My burning down your house to put it up and get money out of that wouldn't do that. It doesn't leave behind that kind of damage. That's number two.

Number three, somebody who has worked on pipelines said that the way that they do it is they take the pipeline, they weld it, they x-ray it to make sure it's a good weld and then they shrink wrap it and then they pick it up in multiple sections and they put it in the ground. Now how they keep it from going you know, like that when they put it in the ground, I don't know. But I do know that the shrink-wrap is going to cover up any visual damage that's underneath that so I don't have a lot of confidence in the integrity of the pipeline.

I blew a bicycle tire once up to a 150-psi. Unfortunately it wasn't rated for that. I heard a hissing. I put my ear right next to where the hissing was, which was pretty dumb and it went off and I was deaf for a long time. So 1440 is not trivial. I have thirty seconds, thank you.

But the long-term benefits for this are the investors. There is no benefit to anybody else. The benefits to the Union are transitory. The long-term consequences are to the rest of us. They are intolerable and I ask you, even though you may not have done it before, to please deny this. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Becky Meier and after Becky Meier is Janette Roberts.

MS. MEIER: Becky Meier, M-E-I-E-R. The universal concern by scientists about the survival of our planet due to pollutants produced by humankind. I want my future grandchildren to enjoy a healthy and verdant world and not worry about their survival. We have to do something to cut down our harmful emissions. We have to move away from the extraction and use of fossil fuels or we endanger our very survival.

Investing billions upon billions of dollars on hundreds of gas pipelines across our country, keeps us invested in fossil fuels. Once we spend the money on the pipeline we want to make that investment useful. We need to spend those same billions and billions of dollars figuring out how to find renewable and non-destructive ways or creating the energy we need and want.

I keep reading about the need for this gas. I have heard many reports that shatter that there is such a need. Other reports suggest that fixing leaks, conservation and renewable can close that gap. But more importantly, even if you believe there is a need, is our current need enough to jeopardize the planet's survival? There is a difference between need and want.

I believe we want this gas, but we don't need it to the detriment of our survival. I am not willing to jeopardize my grandchildren's future for a current want. Somebody has to look at the big picture. New York was brave enough to ban fracking and acting Commissioner Zucker's conclusion that he did not feel comfortable asking, if he didn't feel comfortable asking his family to live near a fracking zone, he did not feel it was fair to ask other families to do so.

The same principle is at stake here. The gas pipelines are just an extension of the fracking fields. If we build pipelines, we encourage fracking. Pipelines leak and explode and compression stations are noisy and make constant lights and off-gas dangerous chemicals on a regular basis. I do not want my family to have to live near a compression station, nor do I want anyone else's - I see the light (to Mr. Tomasi) -- family to do so.

We need to ban the continuation of gas pipeline permits until we are completely sure that it's safe and in doing so does not endanger our planet. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next, Janette Roberts. After Janette is Craig Cahill.

MS. ROBERTS: I'm Janette Roberts, R-O-B-E-R-T- S.

MR. TOMASI: I will give you a couple more seconds, it's alright.

MS. ROBERTS: I live in the town of Stephentown and I don't think we need that pipeline. It's taking the livelihood away from our farm. We've got cows. My husband has worked hard to put that land together and now they are taking all the trees down and what is there to look at? Who wants to look at a pipeline. It's not going to do us any good. I guess we were brought up in the old country.

If this is technology, I don't want it. We don't need it. Why are they putting this in Stephentown. We've got water, they've got to pollute it. They're going to put chemicals in it and we're going to die right there when this whole pipeline. Do something. Do it now before we are all gone. We want to enjoy our country. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Craig Cahill and after Craig is number forty-eight, Wesley Petrone.

MR. CAHILL: Hello, my name is Craig Cahill, C- A-H-I-L-L. I reside at 214 Chupote Road in the Town of Skodack, New York with my family for the last twenty-one years. The current Kinder Morgan/Tennessee Gas pipeline, which consists of two twenty-one inch pipes currently runs through our property as well as the new proposed thirty-six inch pipe for the NED.

We are in the incineration zone and we oppose the NED. Please bear with me while I set the stage for my concerns. I retired from New York State after thirty-two plus years. My last position was as Agency Safety Director responsible for ensuring that the New York State Right-to- Know was adhered to. You have a right to know about the hazards you are exposed to in the workplace. The law requires that your employer make you aware of the hazards that involve you with the information you need to work safely.

Under Federal Occupation Safety and Health Administration, as it is communication standard, your employer must develop a comprehensive program to help inform you of hazards you may encounter in the workplace and also provide you with training and use of handling the products containing hazardous chemicals. The HSC provides people the right to know the hazards identified and identify the chemicals they are exposed to in the workplace. Where employees have this information, they may effectively participate in employers prospective programs and take steps to protect themselves in addition to the standards gives employees information they need to design and implement and affective, protective program for employees potentially exposed to hazardous chemicals.

Together these actions will result in a reduction of chemical source, illnesses and injuries in their workplace. Chemicals pose a wide range of health hazards such as irritations, sensitizations, and carcinogens and physical hazards such as flammable, corrosion, reactivity. OSHA's Health Standard of Communication Standards is designed to ensure that information about these hazards and associated protective measures is assimilated.

This is accomplished by requiring chemical manufacturers and importers to evaluate the hazards of chemicals they produce and import and to provide information about that through labels on shipping containers and more detailed information sheets called Material Safety Data Sheets, MSDS. All employers with hazardous chemicals in the workplace must prepare and implement a written hazard communication program and must be sure that all containers are labeled and employees are provided MSD sheets.

Well individuals are protected by OSHA in the workplace. The Federal Government does not protect the citizens living in our homes. What Federal Agency protects our citizens in the home? Apparently there is no one. Will FERC protect us? If I want protection the APA used it up until 2005 with the Bush-Cheney Energy Bill among the many dubious provisions of Energy that was called the Haliburton Loophole, which was in - .

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time is up. If you want to give me your sheet I will put that in the record for you.
(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Wesley Petrone. After that is William Jackson.

MR. PETRONE: Good evening. My name is Wesley Petrone, P-E-T-R-O-N-E. I live at 16 Clark's Chapel Road, Nassau, New York. I have personal concerns that I and my neighboring residents have in the Town of Nassau where we live, Clark's Chapel Road in Rensselaer County and again also neighbors on County Route Fifteen as been discussed here concerning this project.

I've got things I want to list and number one being the most important down to number five being more or less the least important, supposedly. Number one: The overall daily safety and health of the residents concerning every aspect of physical destruction and ongoing daily 24/7 operation of these facilities and the proximity to each of us. We are aware of facility operations and failures of these facilities in the past. Number two, the 24/7 constant decibel level from the ninety thousand horsepower gas-fired turbines and the number of unknown instances of purging cycles. I am aware of this from working as an employee of the 'Niger' More Power Corporation, working with gyrating facilities that use natural gas and what was going on those facilities.

I'm also aware of the current Teneco compressor stationed on Route 66 in Alderbridge Columbia County at ten thousand horsepower and at its noise level. When I had representatives visit us, the regional directors from Senator Schumer's office and Senator Gillibrand's office. When they came to our homes I said to them 'what do you hear?' and they said 'nothing'. I said 'that's the way I would like to keep it.

The loss of natural quiet, rural character in this area we have lived for so many years. In a sidebar to that is loss of home and property values for us, the raising of taxes for others in a town with a loss of property values for us. There have been twelve new homes built in the vicinity of this project and as a sidebar, municipalities go through quite a lengthy process of putting in zoning and planning and I was involved in that in town here at a comprehensive planning and zoning committee and it's amazing how this project can go through where we are talking four hundred and twelve miles, thousands of acres that is going to be done at a relatively I believe, short period of time, where other municipalities have had ongoing projects that have taken years and years to accomplish minor subdivisions. It's just mind-boggling.

My last point is if you review a New York State Utility Power Bill such as Nation Grid and others, you will notice that there is what they call an SBC assistance benefit charge. The SBC is a state-mandated charge for all the electricity and natural gas customers. The electricity SBC is used to fund energy efficient programs to meet state energy use reduction targets, provide assistance for low-income customers and conduct energy research. The natural gas SBC has used to fund initiatives is focused on reducing natural gas use in the state by part of the energy efficiency standards portfolio. So far in New York State --

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time's up.

MR. PETRONE: Okay, thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is William Jackson and after William is Lucy Jackson.

MR. JACKSON: My name is William Jackson. I live in Stephentown New York with my wife Lucy who will speak next. Nine hundred feet from the national grid of high tension electric right-of-way, which is well within the potential impact area and therefore we represent two stakeholders in the town of Stephentown. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. I want to reiterate that given the incomplete nature of the information in Kinder Morgan's resource reports, I concur that these scoping meetings are being conducted prematurely. Consequently, information that would benefit the NEPA process will not be a matter of record because Kinder Morgan's current resource reports have twenty-thousand plus cases of to be determined. Those are data gaps in my mind. Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline should not be allowed to file until that information is more complete.

It is impossible to comment on what one does not know and cannot review. I urge that the scoping and comment period be extended at least sixty days after a new and more fully compete resource report is filed and made available for public review and comment. The ninety thousand horsepower magnitude of the proposed local compressor stations and all of the associated emissions and environmental risks are already detailed makes this request critical for regional stakeholders, particularly when the NED project is touted by Kinder Morgan for its scalability.

I don't sense this implies downsizing but it does suggest adding capacity over time. We don't need this pipeline or its progeny. The complexity and scale of this proposed project is daunting. Advice from Kinder Morgan land agents is to negotiate with the company, scarcely reveals many good falls that would best be addressed by legal council that few stakeholders cannot truly afford, even though such would better serve their interests given the complexities of eminent domain laws.

The NED project brings with it a host of near and long-term challenges for the private citizen. Here are just a few of the points of concern. First of all, potential damage to air and water, particularly private wells located near areas where blasting would be required. We live near major, deep rock outcroppings which are adjacent to our property, this is a case in point.

Pipeline corrosion, mitigation and control is only as good as design, installation and maintenance. Moderated and controlled remotely from Houston Texas according to the Tennessee Pipeline folk, these systems, can they possibly be secure and reliable?

I will just add quickly, among many points, I spoke with a FERC biologist who told me that the purpose of the NED was in fact to export gas to European or foreign markets and this was part of our obligation to support this as Americans because this was an effort to stabilize the price of the natural gas in a global market. I thought this absolutely outrageous. A Kinder Morgan representative also added in another meeting that I was going to be on the energy forefront. Thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, sir.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Lucy Jackson. Lucy is number fifty. After that I am taking a five minute break because just five minutes so we can stretch our legs a little bit.

MS. JACKSON: Okay. I am Lucy Jackson. That's L- U-C-Y J-A-C-K-S-O-N. Thank you so much for this opportunity for input. My comments and questions are intended to challenge the actual need and necessity for this NED project. Given the considerable potential environmental hazards, risks and damages along with the lifestyle and land use changes that both the construction process and the infrastructure itself will generate, it does seem that the environment as well as the resident populations and landowners will be negatively impacted. I urge the thorough independent and non-partisan studies reveal and make public exactly which energy markets may benefit from the natural gas proposed for shipment. Exactly what are the needs and necessities that drive this project for possible permitting? What alternatives are being considered and do these include non-construction? If any of the gas is intended for export, the studies should also include thorough analysis of the impact of such export upon local energy markets and local consumers, especially if we continue to hear that the NED Project serves public need and convenience and that such determinations will allow Kinder Morgan the authority to take land easements through eminent domain.

Shunting such concerns off to the Department of Energy or to any other federal agency is not acceptable. I additionally urge that the local and regional economic impacts, both short and long-term of this project be weighed accurately and objectively against the private for-profit motives that presently appear to be the primary economic drivers of the NED pipeline. Stakeholders, tax-paying populations and communities should not be subjugated by uninvited guests. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are going to take a real quick five minute break. After the break, Dan Zo-

bre is up.

MR. TOMASI: Okay, we have hit the five-minute mark and we are going to start again. If everyone wants to sit down and again we are going to have Dan Zobre. I apologize for any mispronunciations.

MR. ZOBRE: Hi my name is Dan Zobre, Z-O-B-R-E. I live on Shoefellow Road right next to the Cahills. My wife and I bought this land twenty-two years ago, built a house, been improving it over the years and from an economic standpoint this is a disaster for us. I mean you know, a nice house, you do the right things and this project comes through and the value to all the homes along this project is just devastating. Out of all the information I have seen that has been available, I have not seen any statement that the existing pipeline will not meet the need that is being stated for domestic usage scenario for the East Coast. The proposed pipe size I think is ridiculous. It's easily three times the stated volume of what they wanted. It's clear that it's not, the size of this project is not in scale with the stated objective put forward by the company. I would like that confirmed and I would like it right-sized if this project goes forward.

There is no real US need as far as I could find. It's crystal clear that the goal of this project and infrastructure and asking people to sacrifice their value and their property in a way they don't want to, the goal of the company is to export the product at the expense and the risk of US citizens and there is no local advantage to doing that.

The route is disruptive and I would like you to consider alternate route. The Massachusetts pipe is an existing infrastructure that seems to go to the same general area and I would like them to consider putting it down that right-of-way if the project goes forward rather than going through the middle of people's property. Use existing right-of-ways.

There is a disruption. I would like to know a lot of the areas that you are talking to today are rural. Their wells, septic systems, those types of infrastructures that we own, I would like to know how they are going to be protected. I'm thinking I am going to have to go out and get the value confirmed prior to the project so that I can protect my interest. There is lots of shale and rock along this project path and it's going to require blasting which is going to be pretty disruptive.

Overall, as this project is currently scoped the safety, because of the size and the pressure, seems unique and I would like FERC to be more aggressive on the safety measures that are put in place.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. ZOBRE: I got it. Rather than every ten miles as people have been saying, I would like them to be more aggressive on the shutoffs and containment of something this unique because within this inner wall and with the higher pressure, I think the risk goes up. Also, ongoing air-testing at this huge compression station. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: After Dan was Sean Smith, number forty-two. After Sean is Bob Elmendorf.

MR. SMITH: Hello (real loud). Sorry. Hello my name is Sean Smith. I just turned twenty two weeks ago and I'm here to represent the college-aged students of this community. I go to the University at Albany. I'm a psychology and biology major. I am a vegetarian, nature-lover and I value life more than anything. I have personal reasons for opposing this construction. I walk the nature trails and relax by the Hudson River on a regular basis. I suffer from severe insomnia, anxiety and depression. The natural scents, the sounds of plants and animal life and the feeling I can avoid the effects of human intervention in this world is soothing to my mind.

I am young and one day I will have children that are younger. I want to take my children fishing by Burden Lake and catch them fish like my father did to me. These are the personal reasons for my opposition but I am also an amateur, practicing scientist. I do research up at the University and I have practical reasons for opposing this pipeline as well.

In organic chemistry II, I was taught that benzene, formaldehyde, taurine, methane are all carcinogenic and I have to wear crazy protective gear when we work with them in the lab. They can cause neurological damage. I think there are many alternative energy sources that we can use.

For example, Denmark provided one hundred thirty percent of its country's power the other day with just the turbines alone. They actually made a profit from it. Solar energy. France figured out before us, it is a very efficient method of collecting energy. We can provide energy for our whole country using up a very small percentage of our land surprisingly. In fact, people putting them on their homes can allow them to have excess power and actually sell it back to the national grid to make money, stimulating economic growth.

I also would like to talk about the workers. I respect these union workers. I admire their passion but their jobs are outdated and they need to change their skills for changing times. We don't fight for the jobs of the milkmen, the shoe-shiners or the workers or the former ice industry workers on the Hudson, which they do out the loop, based on Kinder Morgan's history. You don't work for the sake of work, especially not at the public's expense.

The science is not on your side, Kinder Morgan and neither are my future children who could suffer birth defects from your carcinogenic compounds. I want to move toward the future and not get stuck in the past of this nasty, unrenowable and unsustainable energy that will hurt our children and the environment. I'm done (to Mr. Tomasi).

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Bob Elmendorf? Is Bob here? Okay, next is number fifty-four, Donald Blake. Is Donald Blake here? Donald Blake? Moving on. Number fifty-five, Terry Nord?

MS. NORD: Thank you very much. I have changed my notes so many times throughout the evening after listening to people speak that they become a little bit pointless but it's Terry T-E-R-R-Y N-O-R-D. I reside at sixty-eight Helenwood Drive, Avril Park, New York. That is on Burden Lake.

I have been fortunate and blessed to have spent my life there. I am the second of four generations that are still living there on Burden Lake. My mother is ninety and the youngest generation you heard speak first tonight about their love of the lake and love of fishing and their love of wildlife and what a wonderful way to live.

Before I came here tonight, I sailed on Burden Lake and I sat in my boat and listened to the water lap on the side of the boat and I watched the eagle dive down into the lake and pull out a fish. I looked to the south from where the wind was coming and wondered what the future would bring based on your decisions for this project.

I am strongly opposed and rather than reiterate all of the many things you have heard tonight, I will tell you that I am in agreement with what has been said. I too believe that the compressor and pipeline significantly impact and will impact the quality of our lives on the lake and in Nassau. I believe that the concerns cited regarding the correlations between the toxins and the emissions and the risks and diseases including cancer and pulmonary disease and neurological diseases are legitimate concerns. I am a health professional. That's a legitimate concern.

I too am concerned about missing the starry nights because of the light pollution and the sounds of the crickets. I too am concerned about losing the wildlife that we enjoy watching and losing the use of the lake as we now have it. I think Nassau has already suffered an impact through big business with the Dewey Local Landfill and I worry about the lining and its impact with this project.

I ask you to really think about the passions and facts brought forth to you tonight and would you want this in your back yard? I don't want it in mine. I want Burton Lake saved as it has been in my lifetime for my grandchildren. Thank you

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Michael and I know they were the children who spoke first.

MS. NORD: That was my grandson Michal Marchiony, M-A-R-C-H-I-O-N-Y and Emma.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Okay, next is Morgan Cross. Is Morgan Cross here.

AUDIENCE: She already spoke.

MR. TOMASI: She did speak? Okay. Sorry. Next is Mary Therse (?) Julien.

MS. JULIEN: Theresa.

MR. TOMASI: Theresa? Okay, it doesn't look like Theresa to me, sorry.

MS. JULIEN: Sorry. (Laughing.) Okay. I apologize in advance. I have been just scribbling things down so, my name is Mary Theresa Julien, J-U-L-I-E-N. I live in Scodak Landing and I'm a geospatial analyst. I have worked and contributed to EIS, NEPA, seeker assessments for various agencies, engineering firms, US Corps of Army Engineers.

I wanted to request so that we have the adequate data needed to submit comprehensive and accurate comments. Please request from the contractor Kinder Morgan the GIS files or Geographic Information System files from the project engineers and make them available in a timely fashion to municipalities and other interested parties. Also, please include the details in those GIS files of the portion of the route which does not follow right-of-ways of utilities.

This proposed project runs on top of one of the largest or possibly the single largest freshwater aquifer in New York State. Please look in your analysis of impacts to the aquifer at the soils data, the topography and the groundwater recharge rate and recommend mitigations in the event of a breach in the pipeline.

Please recommend to the Commission mitigation requirements for every negative impact found in the Environmental Impact Statement including measures to protect the aquifer and the water supply. Also, please request the GIS files of the pipeline move again after submission of the final plans and application by Kinder Morgan. At that time, when they do finally submit plans that we can adequately comment on, please extend the comment period sixty days.

If after considering all known possible mitigation measures they are found to be inadequate to protect the natural and human environment, please return a no-action recommendation to the Commission. If you do return a recommendation, please recommend to the Commission all possible mitigation measures available to address every identified impact and that's it. I'll yield my time to anyone who needs it after me. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: We were probably going to end it a little earlier than expected so we will open it up for more questions afterward. More people will speak and we will have more questions. We still have some more people that are on the list. Next is Dan Stillman, number sixty.

MR. SPILMAN: I don't know if any Union leaders are here but I hope tomorrow night they tell us that they were as vehemently opposed to the trade pact that just passed Congress and I doubt they would if they were here with the energy they had for that amount.

I'm going to speak about the need basically. From the reports I see the consumption of all fossil fuels peaked in 2007 and as of 2014 was down seven percent. Electrical generation, which I would imagine they will be proposing most of this gas to use for over the same period from 2007 to 2014 is down twelve percent. So the need for fossil fuels to generate electricity down twelve percent in the last seven years. Hopefully in your report you will analyze all facets of the consumption in the Northeast.

Every state in the Northeast if you include New England, New York and New Jersey, we all have state conservation renewable standards in place. This is what's really driving a reduction that we are seeing and we are really in the infancy at this point of the reduction. Most of the work is ongoing and probably over the next five to ten years you will really see the effects and those numbers will continue to drop.

What makes it possible that these numbers have dropped considerably? It's obvious that the Northeast is much older so the infrastructure is a lot older so there will be greater savings as we replace motors. It's re-

ally pathetic what you see, especially when you get to Boston, Providence and New York City. You have hospitals, you have universities that have infrastructure from before the fifties. Completely inefficient and huge savings are had when you go and replace these.

The money is being spent in New York. New York Governor Cuomo has Executive Order eighty-eight. Last year at this time, it was dictating a twenty percent reduction in all State buildings by 2020. These are the type of numbers that all the states in the Northeast, twenty -- thirty percent reduction they are shooting for. Even if they don't make it in the timescale you are still going to see these drops as we go ahead. So obviously the need is not going to be there for an increased consumption.

You know, the fossil fuel industry is certainly shifting toward natural gas so that is what the demand is. People are trying to utilize more gas and get rid of the oil but a pain for a few people to endure higher costs is really not a reason to build up an infrastructure that we don't need for the next century. Along with what's going on with the states, five out of the top ten states in the country as far as energy efficiency by independent council are actually in New England so we are, along with Oregon, Washington and California, a relative leader so you will see a considerable drop over time.

That's really all I have to say. Hopefully you will really analyze demand and where it's headed in the future state by state and analyze all the negatives that these states have and what their goals are and put that in writing as part of the project. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next is number sixty-one, Anthony DeFrancesco. After that is sixty-two, Max Nerenberg.

MR. DEFRANCESCO: Well, great. I thought I was the last person.

MR. TOMASI: No.

MR. DEFRANCESCO: Anthony DeFrancesco. Capital D-E Capital F-R-A-N-C-E-S-C-O. My concerns where the same as everybody here tonight. The local residents of the area of the state, Rensselaer County. I am not seeing many people if not anyone that was in positive reinforcement of this plan. We have gone through a lot in this area. We've had the Mead Road Exposure to the GE PCBs from the '50's. We are still dealing with that pollution. There's many areas of land in that vicinity that have dealt with this.

There have been mistakes made in approvals for different programs over the years. I feel this would be an extremely poor decision to allow this, based on all the information that we've just heard tonight. They don't need it, there is obviously some secret agenda for them wanting this pipeline and it's not for us. They do not care about the human lives that live around here.

If we took a five horsepower air compressor and put it in the back of that room and ran it, you would not hear it. We live on North Slodak Road area and we can hear five hundred horsepower engines racing at Lebanon Valley on a clear, calm night. What is a ninety thousand horsepower compressor unit going to make for noise? I would encourage them to allow a group of our supervisors that are not in position of this to at least visit a ninety thousand horsepower compressor unit, smell it, see what happens and live around this to actually come back and tell us 'Hey, you know what? This is fine. It doesn't make any more noise than a vacuum cleaner.' I think they are going to come back and vehemently disapprove it.

Secondly, we have got the pollution from the chemicals that are going to be emitted in the blow-off. Back in the seventies and eighties I worked for a private investigation company. We worked for electric insurance which insured General Electric. When they had the plastic plants in Selkirk, they knew that plastic came out. I see the light (to Mr. Tomasi). They knew that the smell came out. They sent us out to mitigate it, visit the people, tell them 'oh, it's not GE. We didn't make the noise or didn't make the smell.'

But yet, if we went down and talked to the plant people, 'yes, we put out that smell.' Especially in different weather conditions, it would go for miles and from Selkirk into Slingerland, into Delmar area. This is a really bad choice and I really disapprove it. Thank you for this forum.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, sir.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Max Nerenberg. Max Nerenberg? Next is Jeff Waggoner. Jeff Waggoner, number sixty-three? Next and last on the list is Dave Dietrich, number sixty-four. Oh, there he is.

MR. DIETRICH: Hi, my name is Dave Dietrich. I live at 5 Rice Road, Nassau, New York. We are the property right along the current utility line. We are going to be near the proposed NED pipeline. I would like to state that I'm opposed to this project for health reasons and also economic reasons. It is just not clear to me whether we will be allowed, we farm some land that the pipeline is going to go through in our land and our neighbor's. It is not clear to me whether we will be able to continue to farm that after this pipeline goes through. I'm not sure I want to be over the pipeline with tractors. My other concern is the construction of the pipeline itself. It's going to be a tremendous disruption to soils as they dig the trench and whatnot. All the heavy equipment. There will be a lot of soil compaction. That kind of damage is permanent. I have farmed there over thirty years and would like to continue to do so however we will be living with those impacts for a long time. I would ask if there would be some mitigation for that.

The other factor is we raise livestock. I sell pasture-raised beef. I'm very concerned about the release from the compressor station. All those potential chemicals are going to come down on the crop land, the cows will consume it. My customer base is very health-conscious. They are not going to want to be eating food products that can potentially contain harmful chemicals.

So I would ask if this were to go through that there be some mitigation to that. Personally, I would like to see it denied. In addition to the damage to the soils we have a lot of concern about the water quality. We do live over the aquifer. Any kind of potential leaks or spills from the pipeline could affect this during construction if there is any disruption to our wells. It's not just our water supply. We've also got about fifty plus animal units and so what I'd like to see is there be requirements and testing, independent testing of our water and air quality before.

If this thing gets approved afterward and that those expenses can be borne by Kinder Morgan but that the testers be independent. That's all I have. Thank you FERC.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Well, Dave was the last speaker. Is there anyone else who has not signed up who wanted to come up and speak?

AUDIENCE: (No response.)

MR. TOMASI: Is there anyone who has spoken before but would like to come up and add their previous comments? Sir, come on up.

AUDIENCE: Can I finish my comments?

MR. TOMASI: You can just come right up to the mic.

AUDIENCE: Can I have my comments back.

MS. HARRIS: Oh, of course.

MR. TOMASI: Meanwhile, I will be taking a couple of questions. Let me take a few comments real quick as you walk me back. One of the things that we are going to be doing and I'm asking people a lot is we have to give a pretty detailed alternatives analysis and a lot of people have asked well, what about alternative locations for the compressor station? We don't like it where it's at. All the information tonight is really good for me to understand a little bit more about why there is such opposition necessarily to this particular compressor station in this location.

I would again like to stress feel free and please do give alternative locations for this compressor station. I know you may not want the compressor station, may not want the pipeline but I always encourage people that if it were to be built, even though you don't want it, where would you think the place that you could live with it would be. That's what I'm trying to --

AUDIENCE: China.

MR. TOMASI: (Laughs.) That's not what I'm saying but I just encourage people to you know, tell us that, because at the end of the day we want to understand how to minimize the impacts as much as possible. Go ahead, sir.

MR. CAHILL: Do I have to state my name again?

MR. TOMASI: If you could, yes, please.

MR. CAHILL: Craig Cahill, C-A-H-I-L-L. Well, individuals are protected by OSHA in the workplace. What Federal agency protects us as American Citizens living in our homes? Apparently, there isn't one. Will FERC protect us? The Environmental Protection Agency EPA used to until 2005. The Bush-Cheney Energy Bill, among the many dubious provisions of the bill was one dubbed the 'Haliburton Loophole' which was inserted at the behest of then Vice President Dick Cheney, a former Chief Executive at Haliburton, exempted natural gas drilling from the Safe Drinking Water Act. It exempts companies from disclosing the chemicals used during hydraulic fracking. Essentially, the provision took the EPA off the job. So I am asking FERC to protect the public whose homes about the pipeline or are in close proximity to the compressor stations. I ask that they include the chemicals that are contained in the fracked gas pipeline and compressor stations in the scope of the environmental impact statement for the planned Northeast Energy Direct Project. I also ask that you consider the chemical impact to human, plant and animal, air, land and water in areas I have already outlined.

Also, decibel and light levels of compressor stations should be addressed and mitigated. I further ask that Kinder Morgan be compelled to use OSHA-like procedures to notify the public of the chemical hazards that these chemicals pose. I ask that they employ Material Safety Data Sheets, MSDS to notify the public and that training be provided for anyone who abuts the pipeline who are in close proximity to the nine compressor stations along the entire length of the pipeline from Pennsylvania to Massachusetts. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Does anyone have any questions? I can answer some questions on process but I can't really touch upon the merits of the case obviously since we are still looking at it but just stand up and talk to the mic and I will answer some questions for you. Somebody beat you to it.

AUDIENCE: Okay, first I just have one thing that has not been brought up tonight and I feel remiss that I sat down without telling you this. The residents of Burden Lake worked for seven years with our government and especially our town government to bring sewers to Burden Lake because we participated in the Federation of the Lake to study the water quality and realized over the years it had gone down because of antiquated septics.

So it took us seven years to get a sewer systems and it's the residents in the Town of Nassau on Burden Lake that are paying for that. These are not wealthy people. These are people who care about the lake and preserving it, who are willing to spend twelve hundred dollars a year for the next thirty years so they had a sewer. I think you need to understand how important that resource is to us so to put this pipeline and this compressor station just off of the south end of the lake is devastating to us and it's just not acceptable. So I wanted to say that.

The other question I have, and maybe you can or can't or will or won't, how is it? Why, why are the safety regulations for rural areas different than for urban? Why, can you give me the rationale for that?

MR. TOMASI: Well, I can give you a little of the rationale. Now, the FERC doesn't actually have any jurisdiction over the safety regulations. That's actually, the safety regulations are actually written by the United States Department of Transportation and we have an understanding with the USDOT that basically states the following in essence: The USDOT will write the regulations, we will make sure the company conforms with those regulations when they are constructing the pipeline.

Every few years the USDOT does go ahead and look at revising those regulations. Their calculus for

why they have rural areas different than suburban or urban areas is something you would have to direct to them. It has to do generally with the class locations. Class locations are based within certain, about three hundred, well the distance of either side of the pipeline. It's based on the number of people and type of buildings around any specific type of pipeline. So it's a risk-based analysis is what it is.

AUDIENCE: And that is exactly what I expected. My concern with that, so here's a follow up comment, is first of all we pay taxes just like the people in urban areas so we are entitled to the same level of safety. The other issue is now we have the Department of Transportation over here, we have you here, we've got EPA over here and everybody has their little piece and in the meantime, it is our homes. It is the value of our homes and the quality of our life with this agency having something to say, and this agency and this agency, when you are actually all arms of the government which is put in place for the people. We are the people.

MR. TOMASI: Well, again. There have been many times in fact where the local residents have been concerned about these issues, the company has agreed to actually operate the pipeline to a higher classification to make it in laymen's terms to make it a bigger pipeline. That's not a technical issue but in essence that's what it is. So I encourage you to keep adding these comments, keep saying this because the more pressure you put on the company, the more likely they are to go ahead and --

AUDIENCE: Well, my pressure would be for the company to put the pipeline in their backyard.

MR. TOMASI: I understand.

AUDIENCE: And that doesn't change the emissions that are coming over the south end of our lake and continuing onto the second Burden Lake, the first Burden Lake, Crystal Lake, Glass Lake and Crooked Lake, all within a very short area. I guess I wonder, have you been there?

MR. TOMASI: Actually, I will be there tomorrow. I will be visiting tomorrow morning.

AUDIENCE: I would be glad to take you sailing so you can hear the sound of the water lapping against the side of my boat, which I will not hear if that compressor station goes in.

MR. TOMASI: I have had a lot of comments tonight. We've gotten calls from, including yourself, from many people in the area and I felt it was important to go out there and both see the compressor station location, visit a couple of farms near the compressor station and also see the lake. We will be there tomorrow morning. I can't spend all day there but we will be there for a few hours in the morning and go visit the, a lot of the residents and we will continue on from there.

AUDIENCE: Well, maybe I'll leave you my number. You can come and meet my ninety-year-old mother who grew up on the lake and she will tell you a few stories.

MR. TOMASI: I will give you my number and will be happy to give you a call in the morning. Are there any other questions about the process. Sir, were you going to ask?

MR. DOLEN: My name is James Dolen. I have lived in Skodak for twenty years. I have some environmental experience retiring from the State Department of Environmental Conservation as an engineer. I don't want to comment on the various merits or demerits of the project tonight but I want to ask on what basis will the FERC approve or deny this project. What are the requirements to be met? Where are they established?

I also kind of wonder how we got this far? I mean there is nobody in support of this project, there is massive opposition to this project. The compressor stations are across from two historic farms, near lakes. It's like the stupidest thing in the whole world. How a company can be continuing this project this far? How can FERC be allowing this far? Someone has to carry the necessary, what the FERC has to do is carry a message back to Kinder Morgan is to forget it. This isn't going to go through because you are going to have thousands of residents in this town suing them for the next fifteen to twenty years to stop this.

Anyway, what are the requirements? On what basis can you deny this or approve this?

MR. TOMASI: Well, the Commissioner is actually the ones who finally decide. As I stated earlier, my job

is to file the documents and my statement and it is a recommendation to our Commissioner, our five Commissioners.

MR. DOLEN: The DEIS, the FEIS or both?

MR. TOMASI: Well the way it works is first, we issue the draft EIS. That is the draft version.

MR. DOLEN: Who prepares that?

MR. TOMASI: I along with my staff and Cardno prepare that. We issue that for comments and then we finalize it in what is a Final Environmental Impact Statement. That is a final recommendation on the environmental side to the Commissioners. The Commissioners go ahead and take that and vote on that and vote on the project as a whole. That is one element of their decision. They also look at whether the project has customers, what the rates would be, they have a myriad -- there is eight or seven or eight to ten issues that they would look at; rates, tariffs, the actual cost of the project, whether the company has the ability to maintain it as well as any other issues they decide to actually incorporate into the decision making. So they are the ones who actually make the final decision on this. I do not. My job is to just write the Environmental Impact Statement. So, there is also a very influential document which was issued in 1999 which is the docket number is PL99-3, which is actually the Commission's statement on need.

MR. DOLEN: Could you give me that?

MR. TOMASI: PL99-3.

MR. DOLEN: Okay, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: It is basically states about when a project has the appropriate need. I encourage everyone to look that up. It's a very technical document but it does have a lot of information in it. But I can't speak for the Commissioners. They can use whatever means or whatever it is, whatever reasons they want to make an outline of the order for their decision. I can tell you that one of the biggest things that will make the Commission deny a project is if they do not actually have the customers of the, if there is no customers to the project. The Commission has in the past denied projects because of that reason.

MR. DOLEN: No customers where?

MR. TOMASI: At the end of the line. If there is no customer.

MR. DOLEN: In Massachusetts?

MR. TOMASI: In Massachusetts, yes.

MR. DOLEN: On what other basis can they deny it?

MR. TOMASI: They use, they have multiple reasons they would deny it. I can't speak for the three Commissioners. They can use whatever reason they want to lay out any order for reason to either approve or deny a project.

MR. DOLEN: Where are the criteria for approving or denying a project spelled out? Is there any regulation or law?

MR. TOMASI: As to my knowledge, there is no actual regulation. The policy delineates how they actually make the decision and what criteria. There is about eight of them like I said. But they really can, like I said when you are an independent commission they can use the reasons, whatever reason they wish to actually approve or deny a project.

MR. DOLEN: Do they not have regulations?

MR. TOMASI: They have regulations but I referred to it at the Public Law of PL99-3 is where it really outlines a lot of the issues where they, the reason behind whether they will approve a project or not so I encourage you to read that.

MR. DOLEN: Now, in New York projects people can ask for party status and hearings and bring in lawyers and challenge people in the hearing setting against the applicant in front of the agency that is approving it. Is there a similar process for FERC.

MR. TOMASI: There is not exactly an analogous process. The closest process we have is what's called intervenor status, which I mentioned a little earlier. After the company files their application there is a relatively short window for which you can file for intervenor status. Now intervenor status for your average person does not give you a great deal more than they have as commenter.

Your average commenter puts comments on the record and we answer those comments either in the draft EIS or formally in the final EIS. If you become an intervenor, what that gives you is number one, if you file anything you actually have to serve it to the entire list. So any other intervenors including the company would have to actually provide the documents to them. You can do it electronically but you have to. The other thing it allow you to do is after the Commission makes a decision, be it pro or con, an intervenor can challenge the Commission's order under rehearing. That is the most important part of being an intervenor is allowed to challenge the Commission's order in the hearing and also it gets you status within if you want to challenge that in court as well.

MR. DOLEN: Okay, thank you for providing -

MR. TOMASI: Not a problem. Any other questions?

MS. BENNETT: Hi. My name is Shelley Bennett and I live nine hundred feet away from the proposed pipeline and a little over a mile away from the compressor station. I have three very short questions for you. It just requires a yes or no answer and then I have a comment to make.

Where Tennessee Gas Kinder Morgan NED in this pre-application process before public and political outcry forced them out of Columbia County and the Berkshires?

MR. TOMASI: The question was they actually came in for pre-filing a long time ago, back in October. The original route did go to the south of here and then went across Massachusetts. Very briefly after they filed their initial set of what is called Resource Report One, which is just a very brief description of where the pipeline is going. Then in December, about a month later, not even a month later, they filed an update which has it's current route which comes through this area as well as the New Hampshire Route as well.

MS. BENNETT: Okay. Has any company in the pre-application stage been denied a license by FERC?

MR. TOMASI: There is in a pre-licensing, pre-application, what's called a pre-filing stage, what we are doing right now. There is nothing to deny. There is no formal application. So the companies have dropped out during pre-filing stage for a myriad number of reasons but there is no way to actually formally keep them out of this because they can always just come back with a formal application. Okay?

MS. BENNETT: Does it make any difference to your recommendation that no one here tonight, other than organized labor, is for the pipeline and compressor station?

MR. TOMASI: That's a difficult question. I mean, obviously we take that into account. The Commission takes that into account, takes opposition into account as part of the decision. One of the things I said earlier is this is an analytical document I am writing. We actually analyze whether the actual environmental impacts of the project. Now we do take into account if a lot of people say this is the wrong area for whatever pipeline for whatever compressor station, we think it should be moved because of these number of reasons. That is important because we have concrete reasons for why people object to it. We need those concrete reasons so we can look at alternatives.

MS. BENNETT: Okay, well following on that you said you should give an opinion or offer a suggestion as to where a compressor station should go. If a compressor station has to be built, I think that it should be built in an area that is miles, perhaps ten, from any human dwelling because the term "buffer zone" used by the industry and by FERC is purely imaginary. There is no buffer which contains air or chemical pollution.

The other comment that I wanted to make on the voice of you saying you are going to be at Reilly's Farm tomorrow. There's been a lot of concentration on the farms in the area but in reality within two miles of the compressor station there are three hundred and twenty-eight homes and only six working farms.

MR. TOMASI: No. I completely understand. It's just we, it doesn't matter whether we look primarily at

all of our facts, be it farms, be it people, be it livestock, be it a lot of animals. We look at it equally so the fact that people brought issue to farms, people obviously were concerned about that. That is part of what we are looking at to be brought up with compassion. That is something we address and we get concerned about looking at your farmland.

But of course, we are always concerned about proximity to homes. That is always a concern. In fact, that's one of the reasons why we look at some of the alternatives analysis to make sure we can try to move it in an area where people are not going to be, we want to try to move it to areas where there are at least five people in general.

The companies notice. They typically try to route it through areas where there is the least amount of people but many times, a lot of that conflicts because especially in the Northeast. Not so much in New York but in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. There is always a problem and it is that the further you get away from people, away from homes you end up enacting conservation lands or critical habitats or things like that.

So there is a very strong tug between environmental issues for wildlife and water. That's one thing on one hand. On the other hand is proximity to people's homes. So it's just a balancing act that we have to make with an alternatives analysis.

MS. BENNETT: Well, I just wanted you to know we want to dispel the portrait in the picture we've been given of this other, the rolling hills of Southern Rensselaer County and a farm dotted here or there. There is quite a few residences that greatly outweigh the number of farms. I thank you for letting me make the comment.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Any other questions? You can come up, sir.

MR. JACKSON: William Jackson. I am sort of following up on some of my other unfinished comments within question form. One of the things that concerns me about this project in general is the security of the entire pipeline. According to Kinder Morgan representatives, the system will be monitored from Houston, Texas at Mission Control, as they said by some guys down there that 'keep an eye on things'. I have no doubt that they keep an eye on some things but this is by essentially a hookup maybe by satellite, maybe by a combination of wifi, scatterbase systems, which sound terrific but we all what happened with the personal management files that have been hacked by any number of unknown but probably Chinese hackers.

MR. TOMASI: We have heard of that. (Laughs).

MR. JACKSON: So both of you are probably wondering where your social security numbers went. In any event, I am wondering if you could address the problem of pipeline security in terms of valve control, compressor station security. Again, Kinder Morgan assured me 'don't worry about compressor stations. They are surrounded by fences. We have padlocks on those fences with cobalt hasps and no one can cut those.' So I said in response to that little comment 'How about a sawsall or a battery-powered drill with a diamond bit?'. 'Oh I don't know, we never heard of that.'

So, furthermore, all the valves are locked with real chains and real padlocks. Okay, this is serious stuff. Is anybody there? 'No, nobody's there. The guys in Houston are taking care of them. So I am wondering if you could just address security number one as a starter.

MR. TOMASI: Again, that is a little closer to the merits. Right now, we have very limited information on the compressor stations on this point. That's something that will have to be asked about.

MR. JACKSON: That's 'to be announced' or 'to be determined'?

MR. TOMASI: A lot is TBA at this point. We will see what they come back with in the next set of draft reports. We have and we do ask generally about valves and the type of valves that they are going to use. I would definitely recommend you have a record of concern along these lines. Obviously, they're on the record tonight but if you have any more detailed questions, please put them on the record. I can't necessarily talk about until I know the answers.

MR. JACKSON: Okay, that was filing. I have raised the issue before. Of course there is no response. We don't know where this goes. The second question has to do with public access to what in fact is going on with communications with FERC. My understanding is there are two tiers of communication. One is actually between the industry itself and FERC and that is sort of on one plane, which is inaccessible to the general public and then there is a general public Public Comment Events like this and being able to file you know either FERC online or what have you. So the two things going on here simultaneously but the general public is not, as I can see, allowed full access to what is really happening in this process. Is that correct?

MR. TOMASI: The way it works in pre-filing is there is no such thing as what's called *ex parte* communication. I can talk to any -

MR. JACKSON: I'm sorry. I misspoke.

MR. TOMASI: *Ex parte* -- first of all, right now when we're in pre-filing I can talk to any of you. I can talk to the company, I can talk to any other stakeholder from the agencies or political figures or anything and without any sort of legal issues going on.

MR. JACKSON: Kind of off the record.

MR. TOMASI: We're not off the record. If you notice when we talk with the agency, we have a biweekly call with all the agencies along the pipeline route and we do put those in the record. I have spoken a lot of times with the local landowners and you know a lot of them will tell me just general issues and I would just tell them 'look, these issues need to get in the record so please file them.'

I do talk to the company, not very often in fact. The issue is mainly providing status updates that you see in the record as well as updates when we have our biweekly meetings with all the agencies. Things change once they file the formal application. At that point there is an actual application in front of FERC. At that point, I have to, everything becomes much more formal where any communications with the company have to be on record, any communication with any interveners have to be on record.

The reason for that is because, again, I'm not an attorney so I paraphrase, is that I can't as a potential person who, even though I'm not the ultimate decision-maker, things that I do can influence the project as a whole and influence the environmental impact statement. So when I speak with anyone after the application when I speak with people, I need to make sure that all the stakeholders know what I have told them first. If I give for instance a person, say for instance you decided to file as an intervener. If you called me after the application and asked me all these questions and I provide answers to you, I gave you special information that no one else would have. That would give you an unfair advantage. Same thing with the company. I can't talk to the company about any of the merits of the case or anything like that during really any of it, most especially after the application because then I would be giving them special preference and I can't, I'm not allowed to do that and I can't. So any communication with the company has to be on the record.

Now there are some exemptions for process questions. For instance, somebody said 'well, you know what happens after the application?' I was able to say well we looked at their request and at some point we will issue the notice of schedule. That's a process issue. That is something in the regulations. It is something that people know about so we will not be giving any special information to that individual.

Right now we try to, I try to put as much as possible into transparency to make sure that people understand what is going on behind the scenes. Yes, I spoke with the neighbors, I notice here on every single conversation that they told me has gone into record. When I speak with various agencies we talk about the environmental issues that they are concerned about and they give me that information and we make sure that their concerns are documented either in that biweekly call or I make sure that they file and it's in turn on the record because again, one of the things that is important is that things told to me are not on the record. I need to get every single concern on the record or frankly, I can't use it. Privileged information, some of you may see that some of the information is privileged in the docket.

Right now the only privileged information in the docket is right now the landowners. But there may be, once the application comes in, there may be privileged information in the application. That I cannot use in the Environmental Impact Statement. Everything I use in the Environmental Impact Statement has to be public and in the record.

MR. JACKSON: So is there anything that is, everything is available under the Freedom of Information Law or not?

MR. TOMASI: Before that, there are certain exemptions of FOIA. I can't tell you all the issues of FOA but when we do get a FOIA request, you now I turn all of them, I look over all of my issues on that, whatever the request is, to our attorneys with my recommendation on whether it should or should not be released and then they look and see whether they agree with my decisions. Personally, I tend to err on the side of just release everything.

MR. JACKSON: So, there may in fact be exemptions from FOA?

MR. TOMASI: You have to look at, the rules are very specific exemptions under FOA but usually FOA is an internal question. Usually it's internal stuff but there are some FOA exemptions for instance. We've had that problem before with well-drilling. Unfortunately wells are somehow exempted from FOA requests. But, again, if you have specific questions about things that might be going on in the background, I encourage you to follow a FOA request and explicitly state what your concerns are and we will get that information to you.

MR. JACKSON: Okay, thank you. One last thing, you mentioned in a sense customers and markets and I am wondering what the strict definition of a customer is as that seems to be a significant driver in terms of deciding whether this project should go forward or not.

MR. TOMASI: You have to go look in the definition of it in what I mentioned earlier PL99-3. That's where they talk about that issue. Again, I work on the environmental side. I don't work on the certificate side, I don't work on the rate side, I don't work on the tariff side. I don't necessarily know all the details that go on in minutia in those specific things. But again, if you have a question about that, file it out. I may not be able to answer those questions but certainly somebody at FERC in that department can answer those questions for you.

MR. JACKSON: Okay. So just one follow up. In terms of your role in looking after the environmental issues associated with a project, if I got the scope of your main primary attention correct, as one begins to look at the cumulative market for the volume of gas that's under consideration in this project, how do you evaluate the environmental impact on escalated increased volumes that may well be on the local or domestic markets because that clearly is an adder when it comes to the generation of toxins, volatile organic compounds, the massive tonnage of emissions from compressor stations, you know, greenhouse gases and all the rest. That is all part of your domain and if you promote a larger market it would seem from one way or another, it actually is also driving the environmental impact on domestic soil.

MR. TOMASI: I'm not sure I can actually answer that question. We will attempt a cumulative analysis. Our analysis and actually we are getting together some questions that we have asked a lot of the, and you might have see in some of the notes that we posted onto the file that I have requested another agency's comment on our cumulative sort of what's called a 'rates of impact.' We do look in the area where the pipeline is to be built at a certain distance. That is what we do in cumulative analysis. That is generally what we do. We will be asking some questions of the company about cumulative impact issue.

There is also concerns, you might have asked -- people has requested previously, Sierra Club amongst others, what is called for a problematic EIS or pretty much all the gas coming out of the Marcellus or other shale regions. I can't really comment on that. It's in the merits. You can look in other documents where we have addressed things like that.

Also, people brought up the issue of the most recently seen Council member to final guidance. That is another issue that we are looking at. We are looking at their, what the final guidance looks like and we will

find a way to conform to the guidance.

MR. JACKSON: So I'm a little confused. If you look at the Constitution for example, which you are going to say probably is a separate project and not relative in this discussion and the NED is on its own. The truth of the matter is these things connect right in New York. So we are talking about segmentation if I understand, the issue of segmentation.

MR. TOMASI: No, no. we looked at -

MR. JACKSON: I don't think that's appropriate.

MR. TOMASI: Well, no. Where your term of segmentation is, we look at pretty much any other projects in the area, be they pipelines, be they other things, that sort of stuff. That will all be operating much more detail in the EIS. If you have concerns about what we should be looking at the cumulative impact level and you do have concerns about segmentation, please get that in the record so we can make sure we address that properly. Getting more into detail about those, you know, right now we are still looking at what is the distance we are going to be looking at? How far away from the pipeline are we going to include all these other projects?

So that right now, that is in development. That is something we have to get prepared to put into our EIS.

MR. JACKSON: Okay -- thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Any other quick questions? It's getting time to leave but --

AUDIENCE: Two questions. Can you tell me whether FERC has ever denied a permit?

MR. TOMASI: I have only worked for FERC for fourteen years (laughs). I know we did deny one project, which is the Keyspan L&G Facility and I believe at least one of the project had been denied due to the fact that it didn't have customers. But again, I am not an encyclopedia of every product that has gone in front of FERC.

AUDIENCE: Okay, and I am sure you introduced us to the lovely woman here but I missed it.

MR. TOMASI: She works at Cardno. This is Jennifer Harris.

AUDIENCE: She works for who?

MR. TOMASI: Cardno, the contractor that is helping to prepare the Environmental Impact Statement, and she's the Deputy PM on Cardno's side, and and she's been pretty valuable taking all these leads up.

AUDIENCE: Thank you.

My sense of understanding when FERC was established that really it's jurisdiction really has to do with where it's routed and what mitigations need to take place to prevent any terrible environmental impacts, but I am really not hearing much about considering whether or not the pipeline is necessary. I mean when you say what we're really interested in is why it shouldn't be in this specific place and where you think it should be instead. I think most of us feel it's not needed and it shouldn't be.

How do we get that heard? What kind of evidence are you looking for to consider the do-nothing alternative?

MR. TOMASI: Well, we will look at the 'no- action alternative' which is effectively, it is not being built. That is something of course we will look at in the EIS. The decision on whether to approve the project or not is solely at the discretion, solely at the discretion of the Commissioners. We will of course convey a little opposition to the commissioners and they can take that into account when they decide on the project, but as I stated earlier this is an analytical document and we will look at the potential impacts for no action, system alternatives, the other various types of alternatives we are looking at. But it is the Commission that makes the final decision on whether or not the project is needed and whether it should move forward.

AUDIENCE: Maybe tomorrow night there is a different answer. I was really floored to hear you say that the Commission has no criteria and no oversight and no regulations to make such I mean.

MR. TOMASI: No, no, no. Don't convey that, we have plenty of regulations. We have plenty of oversight.

In fact. We have oversight, the entire construction process we will have inspectors out here inspecting the project.

AUDIENCE No, I mean the criteria on which they make their decision, whether to permit or not.

MR. TOMASI: Again, there is a list of seven or eight different things which I, like I said, you base it upon the --

AUDIENCE: But somebody asked where that list is.

MR. TOMASI: Again, I don't know specifically the answer --

AUDIENCE: So that is what I am asking about tomorrow night. Maybe you can bring it to us tomorrow night.

MR. TOMASI: Tomorrow night, I will get that information tomorrow night.

AUDIENCE: That would be very helpful. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Is that all? That's good for you? Okay.

AUDIENCE: You spoke about alternate sites. My property as I said before has two twenty-inch pipes running through it. The center line, a pipeline shared between me and the other t folds over it. So I have seventy-five feet of the right line right-of-way on my property. My house is probably, and this is an estimate, one hundred feet from the center line. Okay, to my side of the house is the second pipe. When Kinder Morgan sent me a map saying where the pipes were going, I said can you put it on the other side so it's further away from my house. They said they could do that.

But, my question is, what are the setbacks from the pipeline in which they have to consider rerouting the pipe in some sort of way? Are there any feet and inches?

MR. TOMASI: Well, I'm not sure what you mean by, you mean regulatory setbacks or generally?

AUDIENCE: Well, I mean they have to come in and do the construction. If they dig the trench, put the pipe in, how much do they need for construction?

MR. TOMASI: Typically -- and this is typical. We will talk about this in the EIS. We do, when a pipeline is being constructed very near to homes we look at that a lot more robustly and many times if they were within fifty or twenty-five feet of the home, we have very site-specific construction plans they have to provide.

AUDIENCE: See, when the first pipe was put in sometime between 1950 and 1987, that was in the center-line. There were no houses on either side. It was a farm. The property owner sold several lots, okay, and my lot, I purchased it right after he did a deal with Tennessee Gas Pipeline, the second pipe. He gave me the money for the trees they cut down, which was nice of him, but there were no homes there. No one put up a fight because there was no one there to do it. I don't know what the procedure was in 1987.

MR. TOMASI: FERC was around in 1987,+ but in the Fifties probably not much. In 1987 there probably would have been some sort of environmental document to prepare.

AUDIENCE: And is --

MR. TOMASI: But again, I would have to have a docket number and things like that to try to look it up.

AUDIENCE: To your knowledge, do you know what type of, is it just natural gas that is being transmitted through there. Do you know?

MR. TOMASI: Again --

AUDIENCE: The company told us it is fracked gas.

AUDIENCE: Currently going through?

MR. TOMASI: I mean, the existing pipeline is a FERC jurisdictional line; it would be purely natural gas. FERC does not have any regulation over oil or say CO2 or regular gas pipelines at all. We only regulate natural gas pipelines.

AUDIENCE: So are you saying you do or don't know? Could it be fracked gas going through there now?

MR. TOMASI: I mean, I would suspect anything. I don't know, I will talk. Again, I don't know every pipeline in the world and existing pipelines you know I don't know the exact composition of the gas going through that line right now.

AUDIENCE: Okay.

AUDIENCE: Kinder Morgan specifically told me, we all asked. Yes, it is gas line.

MR. TOMASI: Any other questions, anybody want to come up?

AUDIENCE: I have a couple of questions. If there are two pipelines that were built in the Fifties and Seventies will you require Tennessee Gas to replace those from Wright all the way through where it intersects the powerlines on Lake Road? I think that would be a reasonable request because it's very well-known that age contributes to corrosion of the pipeline.

MR. TOMASI: Well, you just made that request. So it's good you put that on record. That's what, this is exactly what we are talking about. Things like this, moments like this are very useful to get on the record. Again, I can't answer that question because it's very much on the merits of the case. I mean, it's something that we can certainly analyze and look at as an alternative but you know safety is also noted so I would highly recommend if you want to expand on those comments, please put that on the record in writing.

AUDIENCE: Yes, I have. I also have a question about the compressor. Most of the concerns are about the light, the pollution and the sound. I think there should be very serious mitigation of the effects if that compressor goes in. I think there should be a very tall sound barrier wall around every compressor station. There should be armed guards for protection of the public safety.

There should not be lights going on all night. Those should be on a timer. They should be no more than ten feet above the ground. That is ridiculous to have all those bright lights out there all night long. All of the species that migrate through there are going to be directly impacted by it. The insects they affect, the trout in the streams are impacted by it. Those need to be considered.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

AUDIENCE: You're welcome.

MR. TOMASI: Are there any other comments. Yes?

AUDIENCE: You know, I'm kind of new to what's going on.

AUDIENCE: (Laughs). We all are.

AUDIENCE: I feel I have come ill-prepared. That I would like to have done more research. I did do some but after listening to all the people clearly they have done a lot. So I guess my questions are more your place in this. I have heard, other than the people from the Union who I think all have a pipedream that they are going to get these jobs. So other than that opposition, other than those people being in favor I have heard nothing but opposition, including strong opposition from all of our elected officials who have been listening to people and the Town of Nassau had their environmental committee study this and the impact. They are saying they don't want it. It's against the town law.

So is this just a case that the Federal Government can trump everybody else.

AUDIENCE: Yes.

AUDIENCE: So is that what it boils down to? Because I just need to know where to go next.

MR. TOMASI: There is Federal Preemption over any local laws.

AUDIENCE: Okay, so the Feds have top billing. So the only way really if people believe that there shouldn't be a pipeline, is to go to the Federal Government and say no more pipelines and then they are going to come to you and say 'your job has changed'.

MR. TOMASI: I can't tell you.

AUDIENCE: And because we fought long and hard to get sewers. If we have to fight to stop this, to protect our homes that we care about and love, I mean you're doing an environmental Impact Study when the people here are saying we don't want this. We like our environment just the way it is. We don't need to service a natural gas pipeline that's going to benefit big business. We've been hurt enough by big business in our community. Seriously Nassau and now blasting and we've got the GE dumpsite and now these toxins when we're here because we want to breathe clean air.

So in your Environmental Impact Study, I don't like that the people in the Federal Government, that I pay their salaries are not listening and I think your impact study needs to say that. People are unhappy. We pay their salaries. They got to listen to us.

MR. TOMASI: Okay, I mean, again, we've heard you and if you --

AUDIENCE: I apologize to you because it's really the upper levels that are probably having their campaigns funded.

MR. TOMASI: I appreciate that and I encourage you again. There's many ways to comment on the docket and I know many of you have contacted your local representatives so I encourage you to take whatever steps that you need to you know, get your concerns addressed by any level of Federal or State Government.

AUDIENCE: That's why I want to talk to you about getting --.

MR. DEFRANCESCO: Can I just say one more?

MR. TOMASI: Yes.

MR. DEFRANCESCO: Just one comment and one quick question. My name is Anthony DeFrancesco again. You did say you're making an analytical report? So you're going to take the human factor out of it and addressing what you are talking about, we're expendable. Because the numbers of people involved are minimal compared to the larger. That's why the pipe is thinner and that's why they are following our area. This is the problem. No, we have round out tonight that there's not that many times that they have denied these things.

So, this has been my question right along. We are kind of fighting an uphill battle that we're not going to have any chance in God's green earth of resolving unless people start realizing we're not numbers. We are human beings. We all have children. My granddaughter is here tonight. My daughter expressed her concern about the formaldehyde.

My question to you is, what would you do if your home was within fifteen hundred feet of this compressor station? What would you do if all your family was within a mile of this pipeline? When, we know, whether you say it or not, that this fracked gas is going out of our country. We're not going to profit from it. Tennessee Gas is going to. They're making the money and this is what happens. What do we do here?

MR. TOMASI: Again, there are many, many times we get projects that come in to FERC and again I'm going to keep hitting on this point is that most projects do not leave, even if they get approved, they don't get approved in the same form that they did when they came in. I know that you may not be pleased with that answer, but many times the pipeline will use the many, many alternatives. The pipeline will be moved, the compressor station locations will be moved, they will even do things for instance like change the type of compressors or motors they use for compressor stations.

So, again, there are many, many times that the projects come out very differently than they came into our process. again, I encourage you, if you -- again, what I do, personally I can't ever put myself in your shoes. I mean I would never -

MR. DEFRANCESCO: Try to. For one second, try to.

MR. TOMASI: I would try to put myself in your shoes but again, I don't live in a rural area or community. I know as many of you I'm sure most of you would be upset, things change in any neighborhood be it rural or urban. I see it many times in my community when you know two auctioneers of a huge devel-

opment going in. People were very upset. I mean and I understand that people are concerned about air pollution and are concerned about safety. All the things that we can address. What is pertaining to me, I would do, I might do something completely different from what he would do or any other person.

MR. DEFRANCESCO: Sell?

AUDIENCE: But you have to know the impacts.

MR. TOMASI: I understand that people were very concerned about the impacts and we are going to try our best to address that.

MR. DEFRANCESCO: I understand. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Any more questions? We are going to go ahead and wrap this up.

AUDIENCE: I would like to say that I am really, really disappointed that you were not able to answer that question, that you were not able to project yourself into our situation and to tell us what would you as an individual do if you had saved all your life, rebuilt an old farmhouse and then now have just retired and your property values, according to the local realtor have plummeted fifty percent if this pipeline should come through. This is your savings, this is the equity you've built up for yourself and your family. What would you do, sir? Certainly you have the imagination to answer that question. You've got to.

MR. TOMASI: What I would do is immaterial. I understand your that people are upset.

AUDIENCE: It's not immaterial because it might give us some guidance. We might be able to gain some wisdom from your expertise.

MR. TOMASI: I can't give you advice. I mean, again, my experience is very different than yours. Again, anything that I answer is going to touch upon the merits of this case. I've been to many, many compressor stations around the country. I have looked at many, many air quality modeling for all these facilities. It's the end of the day, but wise as you would be is not material to this project. It is what you would want to do and what your concerns are.

AUDIENCE: It is not what want to do. It is what we are being forced to do and is some cases that is nothing other than to stay put where we are and suffer the consequences of what has happened to us. The uninvited guest who has come into our lives at the end of our field and is making our lives less, the quality of our lives much less than it would have otherwise have been. It is not what we want to do. It is forced upon us by big business and by the Federal Energy Policy and Citizens United, etc, etc, etc.

MR. TOMASI: Do you have any other questions?

AUDIENCE: Can you give us the names of the Commissioners.

MR. TOMASI: The question was, real quick, can you give us the name of the Commissioners. On the front there is a little sheet on who is FERC basically and it has the names of all the Commissioners as well as the Chairman. You can take this one here but there are also ones out front. Sir?

AUDIENCE: You mentioned that a major factor in determining whether a pipeline would be approved as to whether they were adequate or sufficient customers, are exports considered customers?

MR. TOMASI: That, actually, in the past, yes. They have been considered customers.

AUDIENCE: So this could be going to Massachusetts to be exported to wherever and not in use in the United States and that is considered a customer?

MR. TOMASI: Again, the final decision is made by the Commissioners and we haven't had a lot of pipelines that actually have, we've had every short pipelines that have been exported for gas, but longer pipelines, this is one of the earlier ones. They do have designated customers that they have stated that are in the Continental US. Again, this is something your Commissioners are going to have to take into account when making this decision. Like how much of that gas is going to be domestic, how much is going to be exported.

AUDIENCE: I am not familiar with the details but the people tonight presented evidence that maybe two

percent of the gas could be used in Massachusetts and 98% would have to be exported, which doesn't seem fair to the people in New York State or to Massachusetts.

MR. TOMASI: Again, at this point the company has not provided us with all of the customer list. They have only subscribed I think around 0.5 bcf of the 2.2 bcf that they actually proposed. They proposed, right now they have 0.5 subscribed, 0.5 bcf, billion cubic feet, out of the 2.2 billion cubic feet that the pipeline would be designed to carry. So they will have to give us those customers and they will have to designate those customers for the Commission.

AUDIENCE: Would it not be appropriate to determine need first before we go through all this other stuff? If there is no need, let's just stop the process.

MR. TOMASI: I understand those questions. At the end of the day, it's the Commissioner's vote yes or no whether the project gets built or not so if there's no customers, the Commissioner is going to have to take that into account and yes, in essence we will have gone through this entire project for the EIS and they could vote no.

AUDIENCE: Okay, does the technical staff, you guys, when you pass on the FEIS to the Commissioners, is there recommendation of approval with these alternatives, approval with that alternative or a no-action alternative.

MR. TOMASI: I would definitely encourage you to look at similar EIS since the way it works you now we have within a document there will be the proposed action and alternatives and there will be multiple conditions within the, well I should say recommendations within the EIS. Probably yes, we always have those and all of those recommendations get bound and put again and attached to the, basically given to the Commissioners which basically says 'If this is the way it's built, these are our environmental recommendations' and then the Commissioners can decide whether they will vote yes or no. If they vote yes they can decide whether they will keep all or none or some of them.

AUDIENCE: But this -

MR. TOMASI: We do not make the recommendation on whether the property should be built or not. That is purely the Commissioners decision.

AUDIENCE: You don't send it on saying 'We recommend the no-action alternative'? That's what I'm saying.

MR. TOMASI: We could, that could be a recommendation. Just like we could recommend any alternative. I mean, in general those are all attached. It is part of the, when we give the EIS, they see all of the conditions and those are the conditions they will take into account but they vote on the project.

AUDIENCE: Thank you for listening to our concerns.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, that's what I'm here for.

AUDIENCE: Hi. Kinder Morgan is an LLC, limited liability so I wonder if you can shed some light on who would be liable if there was a breach?

MR. TOMASI: Well, actually any time there is an incident, they would have to report that to the USDOT as part of it. Also from an environmental standpoint, we look at still within environmental matters for the length of the project, even if the pipeline is ten years old, they will have to restore the area. Liability-wise, I am not an expert in liability when it comes to especially losses. When it comes to actually replacing things that were destroyed or damaged that would be the responsibility of the company so I think we would certainly make sure of that. When it comes to liability when it comes to any loss of human life or injury, that's not something I can really address.

AUDIENCE: Yeah, it would be really hard to replace humans.

MR. TOMASI: Yes. Well, it's still a liability. Yes, this will be the last question.

AUDIENCE: Where you the project manager on the Constitution by the way?

MR. TOMASI: I was not.

AUDIENCE: Have you been the project manager on any other local?

MR. TOMASI: Yes, I was the project manager before I turned it over for the New Market Project. I had the

AUDIENCE: Tuselmore Project and a few others in the general area.

AUDIENCE: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Okay, so that's going to be it. Again, I will see probably a good chunk of you tomorrow night. Again, I want to thank first of all Hertschel Catering for really, you really did a great job tonight. I really want to thank them, they did a great job. They provided water, it wasn't something that we required, but I think it was really nice of them to provide that for everyone here tonight. Again, we are going to go ahead and close up the meeting and I will see you all again tomorrow. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 11:55 p.m. the meeting concluded.)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Office of Energy Projects
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC Docket No. PF14-22-000
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

Birch Hill Catering
1 Celebration Way
Castleton-on-Hudson, NY

Wednesday July 15, 2015

The evening public scoping meeting, pursuant to notice, convened at 6:45 p.m, before a Staff Panel:

ERIC TOMASI, Project Manager, FERC

With:

JENNIFER HARRIS, Cardno

PROCEEDINGS

MR. TOMASI: MR. TOMASI: Good evening, everyone. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory I want to thank everyone for coming here tonight. In this meeting, this is the pre-filing scoping meeting for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project that is proposed by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline. The docket is PF14-22.

My name, for those of you who do not know already, is Eric Tomasi, and I am the Environmental Project manager for FERC. FERC is the lead Federal Agency that is going to do the environmental review for this project and decide whether to grant this project a certificate. I also work in the Office of Energy Products at FERC and I am also the technical lead for air quality, noise and pipeline safety.

I also have several people here which you probably saw as you came in, who are very integral to the whole setup and running of this meeting and they're from our contractor Cardno. Cardno is assisting us in preparing the Environmental Impact Statement. People here tonight at the table is Jennifer Harris. The people you saw as you came in are Lorraine Woodman, Jonathan Hess, Doug Moonihan and Jennifer Ward. In front here, is Oliver Paul. Again, they all work for Cardno.

A couple other points, the bathrooms as you probably are aware are out in the hall. Water is in the back of the room and that is for anyone who needs it. We will have at least one break. Last night we had a break at nine, we are probably going to do another break right around 9 p.m. as well tonight just to give mainly our court reporter as well as myself a little bit of a break.

You may have noticed, as I mentioned, we do have a court reporter here tonight. The court reporter's job is to transcribe the meeting. This is so we can have an accurate record of all of tonight's comments as well as of anything that I say. Eventually, an electronic copy of the transcript will be available and that will be placed into the FERC's eLibrary System, which one of the things about the FERC ELibrary System and to access that you just go to our FERC.gov website, look through our ELibrary System but you have to use our docket number. As I mentioned it is PF14-22 and that is the whole public record for this proceeding.

I know right now we have around, a little well, slightly over three thousand records for this project in our ELibrary System, about three thousand of those are public comments and so we understand that it might be a little difficult for you to find everything. I might try to go ahead and give you little tips as the night goes on on how to find specific documents in our ELibrary System because I do realize that it is difficult to find stuff in three thousand odd documents.

I digress a little bit. About the transcript that will be placed into our eLibrary System. Our court reporter

is with Ace Federal Reporters and if you wish to obtain a copy of the transcript prior to its placement in our public files you have to make arrangements directly with Ace. (Slide)

And I will talk a little bit about why we are here tonight. There are a few things I want to accomplish here tonight. One, I want to go ahead and summarize the project for you. I want to make sure, all of you who are here tonight are obviously interested in the project and many of you have received what is called the Notice of Intent, which describes the project in general. Many more of you will have actually looked, maybe not as many but many of you in fact will have looked on our eLibrary System and looked at all the resource reports that have been filed and so many of you will know the progress and to keep this I am going to be very brief about the project.

Secondly, I am going to explain the role of FERC in the review of the project. Third, I am going to outline how you the public can participate in the process and five, I will of course allow you, the public, to come up and voice your concerns as a public comment. Now there's purposes too as you see up on the board up here. Obviously, one of the big issues in regard to the comments is gathering information for analysis for the EIS. The EIS is the Environmental Impact Statement.

One of the things that is important for us is for you to tell us what your concerns are. Obviously, with three thousand comments, many of you have. But, and I stressed this last night, I want to stress this again. Just because other people have made that comment, we want to hear your take on that comment. For instance, maybe you have concerns about, a lot of people have concerns about air quality or noise or issues with concerns about water. You may have very specific concerns that perhaps no one else has brought up in those general resource areas.

So please, even though your friends and neighbors may have filed a comment, I encourage you to keep filing your specific comments on a project. We are required to address all of the comments in our EIS.

Secondly, not just the issues that have already been identified but we want to hear about new issues. I tell this to everyone that I meet. I don't live around here. I live in Washington DC. I will never know this area as well as you do because you live here. I don't pretend that I am ever going to understand the area as well as you do so I need to hear from you about what your specific concerns are and what your specific ideas about alternatives or other things that the pipeline might cross or interfere with. I want to hear about those issues from you.

I am of course going to explain the FERC review process and of course tonight as I said earlier, this gives you the opportunity for public input by speaking here tonight. the Environmental Impact Statement in this particular case. Now I keep talking about public input, about how you can be a part of the process. (Slide)

There are multiple ways for you to be involved in this project through public input. Obviously, if you are here tonight that is one avenue. You can speak tonight. As I mentioned your comment will be on the record and it will be transcribed and we will address your comment.

Another way is obviously through written comments either through the US mail or the ELibrary System. If you want to mail those comments to us, we did have a form on the front table which actually has a place for you to fill out your comment. You can either give that to us tonight or you can take it home and mail it in to us. Obviously, you can just write a letter yourself, put your address on it, put the docket number on it, that's very, very important and then mail it to us and that will get it into the record.

There's another way is through our ELibrary system where you can upload comments where you can go through FERC.gov, you can go through our ELibrary System. You can go ahead and again using the docket number which is PF14-22. You can upload your letter into our ELibrary System and that will be on the docket.

There is another way which is even quicker which is called our quick comment which (uh oh -- hopefully (sudden low humming background noise) will stay at that level.) Our quick comment, what that does it allows you to do just a very brief comment on the record. It doesn't have any forms or putting in your ad-

dress or anything like that or your name so you can leave it anonymously if you wish. Just write a quick comment, go to the docket number. But again, you still need that docket number when you are filling that form out. You have to include that.

Of course another way for you to do it, there's other ways for you to input. Obviously the comments we are going to address throughout the entire project. So we have we have these comment meetings right now we will be back after we go ahead and submit and prepare our draft Environmental Impact Statement. We will go ahead and issue that for comment. We will be back in the area for comment meetings as well on our draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The reason for that is, like I said earlier is we want to hear from you about what you think about our document. If you think we missed something, you think we didn't go further enough, if you think that some of your findings were not to your liking, we want to hear about those because ultimately our goal is to try to get as much public input as well as other inputs so that we can go ahead and write the best docket that we can.

(Slide)

Another issue is this. Now I know everyone wants to speak tonight and it's important, but you need to be aware that written comments are given the exact same weight as the full comments so it is very important that even if you don't have the ability to speak tonight or time to speak or you weren't able to get to your entire speech, please, if you have the speech right now and you weren't able to get through it, please give the speech over to the front table and we will make sure that gets into the record. Or if you want to make a more detailed comment, with addendums or appendices or whatever you need to do, please go ahead and make sure you file that and we will address that just as if you had spoken that tonight. I know we had spoken to many towns along the pipeline route, many of them are doing studies and they want their experts to go and speak and I said 'Well, you are obviously welcome to speak but we can't give you the time to basically put your entire study into the record verbally but please go ahead and file it so that we make sure that we have it on the record so that we can talk about it. Real quick, I will if time allows, I will go ahead and answer any questions afterward but I want to make sure I get to everybody before I answer very specific questions. (Slide)

Decorum. I know there is high emotions on this project both on the pro and con side and so I want to make sure that a few things are done. One is please turn off your mobile phone ringer and I will see when we can get to the point where we can get to your comments. I'm going to ask you to come up here. This podium can be turned around so that you can address me at the table. What I am going to do it I'm going to call out numbers and your name, you can go up to the table.

Again, I do recommend that you summarize your points because three minutes are going to go by very quickly and submit the additional information in writing. Again, please do not interrupt the speaker. Even if you do not agree with that person, everyone has the right to come up and speak for three minutes. Even if you do disagree with them, please give them the respect of another citizen and let them speak their mind and then after three minutes they can move on.

Also, I don't have any problem with clapping or cheering. We are trying to keep it so that I want to keep this going and the longer people clap or cheer, the less time you know we are going to go longer and longer tonight. I understand emotions are high and I have no problem with polite clapping and cheering; that's fine.

Lastly is any disruption is only going to interrupt only restrict time for fellow residents to go ahead and speak so that should be pretty self explanatory.

I'm going to digress and talk a little bit about FERC and who we are. Now FERC, we are an independent agency. What does that mean? What we do, what that means is FERC is not an Executive agency, it's not a Congressional agency. Our decisions are not reviewed either by the President or by Congress. They are reviewed if people want to challenge what we do, it has to be challenged by the courts so that is what we mean by independent agency.

What we regulate is we regulate the interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas and oil. Now, many of those, like for instance natural gas pipelines, storage facilities and liquefied natural gas terminals as well as hydroelectric facilities, we actually do review the proposals and authorize construction. As a Federal licensing agency we have a responsibility under what is called the National Environmental Policy act to consider the environmental impacts of the decisions and the approvals that we would make. So that is why we are here and that is why FERC does the environmental review. It is all because we grant a license and by doing that we are beholden to that National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA to do an environmental review.

We do regularly, the interstate transportation of Natural gas but we also regulate non-federal hydropower of electric rates and oil rates but not the siting of power lines or oil pipelines. So that is important to know. Also we do not regulate any exploration, production or gathering of natural gas or drilling activities. So those activities are regulated by the states. That is not to say that we can't look at some of these issues regarding fracking or regarding drilling under cumulative but that is not we are directly responsible for.

Our agency, and I'm going to repeat this a couple of times, our agency is run by five Commissioners. One of them is our Chairman. All of these Commissioners have been appointed by the President of the United States and they are approved by Congress. They are the ones who make the final decisions on this project. I do not make the decision on this project. My job is to write down the Environmental Impact Statement.

What does that mean? That means my job is to look at the environmental impacts of the project as the company has proposed. We look at reasonable alternatives. We look at the environmental impacts of the project proposed and compare those to alternatives and then we actually have recommendations in our Environmental Impact Statement. As I said before, we are going to have both the draft environmental impact statement that you can review then we are going to have the final Environmental Impact Statement.

Once we have the final Environmental Impact Statement, that is a recommendation to, that is basically a document that is given to the public, as a disclosure document that is also given to our commissioners as a document for them to review as part of the decision-making process on whether to approve or deny the project. I'm going to talk a little more later about what is actually in the EIS. (Slide)

Project information. Again, most of you are familiar with this project. I want to go ahead and apologize, the maps I have on the next couple slides did not show very well on this particular presentation. Again, this project, the Northeast Energy Direct Project is four hundred and twelve miles of new pipeline and facilities in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut; nne new compressor stations, one of which of course is here in Rensselaer County. We have fourteen meter stations and then one modified compressor station that is already existing in Pennsylvania and there are nine pipeline laterals of varying lengths in Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Hampshire.

Now one of the things that people have been talking about is the need. Tennessee has stated that the pipeline will provide around 2.2 billion feet per day of capacity to transport natural gas to markets of the Northeast United States and Canada. At this point, they have identified 0.5 bcf as the amount that they actually have contracted or have commitments for. (Slide)

Again, this is a map, this does show this general area. Again, I apologize for the size of this. It is kind of difficult to see but this is the general pipeline route moving through Pennsylvania up in through New York. (Next slide.)

And this is of course the east side as the pipeline moves in through Massachusetts up in New Hampshire. The Connecticut loop you can see at the bottom portion of the map. Then of course the delivery point.

I'm going to talk a little bit about where we are at right now in the process. I mentioned earlier, I think I mentioned earlier that we are in what is called a pre-filing stage. Now in the pre-filing stage we don't necessarily have all the information on the project. In this particular project, we do have some draft resource reports which were filed on March 14th. They were not fully fleshed out but we expect that at this stage of the project.

You might have seen a rather lengthy, in fact, data request or comment letter that we sent to the company wanting to fill those data gaps. Then more recently of course, most of you in the room, I would hope so, those that are affected landowners or within a half mile of the compressor station will have received what's called a notice of intent to prepare and Environmental Impact Statement. We issued that June 30th. Now the comment period is going to be ending, the formal comment period is going to be ending on August 21st.

Now, I want to talk a little bit about what that formal comment period means. Now, the formal comment period, from FERC's standpoint, we review every comment that comes in, whether it's in the formal comment period or whether it's in outside of that formal comment period. We will address all of your concerns regardless of when you file those comments. Now the company has to respond within fourteen days to the comments that were filed in the formal comment period. So that is the difference between the formal comment period and basically any other time that you file the comments.

One thing I want to point out is it does take some time to analyze and research the issues that you bring up. The earlier you get us your concerns, especially about alternatives, especially about alternatives, it allows us to review on those and analyze those early on. So I encourage you to go ahead and file your comments about alternatives as soon as you possibly can so that we can really start working on those. Some of you might have seen in the last day with us, we did have a lot of questions, a lot of (loud noise interruption.)

I apologize for that. I have not idea what just happened there. As you have probably seen, we have asked the company to look at various types of alternatives, one of which is the original route that we proposed through New York following their existing line. There is the I88 Route which we have seen through New York as well as the route that is going down Route I90 into Massachusetts.

Now there is no guarantee of course those are going to be picked but we want a much more rigorous analysis and that is why we went ahead and asked the company those detailed questions about those. So now I'm going to talk a little bit about the data requests. The data requests, not only did we have -- we just issued, but the company will be going ahead and filing another set of draft resource reports that will be much more fuller and more fleshed out sometime this month.

After that of course we will go ahead and issue another set of comments to the company, wanting them to fill in those data gaps. So that is where we are right now and that's where we are moving to and the company plans to file their application in October. But at one point, even after the application comes in, we are going to go ahead and ask additional questions. Very rarely do we ever have a project come in to FERC where we see the application and there are no more questions that we ever have. Obviously, between the questions that you have and the questions that our staff has, we will be asking additional data requests. (Slide)

Next, is identify public concerns. This is what, I talked a little bit about the three thousand comments that we have on record and some of the comments that we have, these are sort of like we went through top numbers of comments to be done. A lot of this it's not so we drill down this particular area. I think in this particular area most of the comments we have gotten have been mainly about compressor station, compressor station location, about air quality issues, that sort of thing. But some of the biggest comments we have had so far have been the preference for alternative energy. Another one is concern regarding the export of gas. Those are just some of the issues we have seen that the public has told us they are concerned about. Obviously, we have a lot of concerns around here as well around construction in a rural area. I was out tonight, this morning, looking in Rensselaer County and obviously it's a gorgeous area and I understand your concerns about if this pipeline went in, if the compressor station went in, how would your neighborhood change, how would the community change?

So that is something you know we take very seriously and we have to look at this to figure out how can we, are there alternatives to where it's at? Are there alternatives for moving it? One of the things I always tell people is we can't just move a pipeline from one person's property to another person's property be-

cause the first person doesn't like it. We need reasons. We need valid and solid reasons why any pipeline facility would need to be moved from where it's currently proposed.

So I tell people, I know you may not want it on your property, you can't just put it on your neighbors or the neighbors down the street or in the next town, we have to have solid environmental reasons why it would need to be moved and that is why we do our alternative analysis. All these public concerns, they bring up all of these issues that we need to analyze and so there we go.

Obviously, after tonight, maybe some of these numbers will change. After we go through this comment period we still have a lot of time left in the comment period so these concerns might change a little bit but ultimately whether we get one person questioning giving us a comment about very specific issue or a thousand people, we will address that the same. We have to analyze that.

There are a couple of other things which came up in last night's meeting which I sort of addressed in some of the comments at the end of the meeting but I wanted to go ahead and address them early on here is two things. Two of the words that always scare people the most and upset people the most is eminent domain. So I want to talk briefly about that. As part of our certificate, if the project were to be approved, under the Natural Gas Act any project that is approved by the Commissioners would have what is called a Certificate of Need and Public Necessity and that can be with it. The right for the company, for eminent domain for portions of the pipeline project to get easements. So that is something that I want to let people know that yes, that is what we would look at as the last ditch, that basically is the last alternative that we want to see.

We want to see the company and we want to encourage the company, it's required that the company goes out and negotiates with landowners for easements. I can't give you any recommendations on easements. All I can really tell you is that is a private contract between you and the pipeline company and as with any legal document I encourage you to get legal counsel and read any legal document like that very, very carefully to make sure that you understand everything, if you have anything on your property, that can and cannot be done on your property. So I encourage you to really, really look at that very strongly, very strenuously and in fact if you can, if it's possible, obtain legal counsel that will help you look at that.

So next I am going to talk a little bit about the FERC process. I said already, we plan to receive the application from the company. They plan to file the application in October of this year. That is the beginning of the formal application. As I mentioned earlier, that is, we still have a long time after that before the Commission would ever vote on the project. After that point, we would still have to issue a draft Environmental Impact Statement and a final Environmental Impact Statement before the Commissioners would vote on that project. So you are looking at a year or more before the final completion of the Environmental Review and the Commissioners would be voting on that.

As I mentioned, we will be asking additional data requests of the company to fill in any data gaps that we have and of course we will issue the draft and will be back again for meetings. Now, I mentioned at the meetings as I mentioned earlier, we will be issuing the draft EIS and then we will have draft comment meetings. Those will be very similar to this format, where I will discuss a little bit about our findings and then we will invite the public up to give comments on the draft EIS. We will have them again along the pipeline route to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to come to one of these meetings.

Just like in the comments, it doesn't matter whether you would file those in writing or verbally, we would look at them exactly the same. Of course, after the comment period we would have to address all of your comments and incorporate all of those within the final EIS. Now, the comments during the draft EIS stage are a little different than the comments that we get at this stage. At this stage, what we do is we make sure that we address all of your concerns. For the final EIS what you will see is all of your actual comments in writing, in an appendices and our distinct response. So that's a much more formal thing that you will see in the final EIS.

Then of course after the final EIS is the Commissioners' decision. As I said, they are the ones who make the final decisions on any pipeline project as well as other type of Commission issues and my job is sim-

ply to go ahead and give them the Environmental Review Document so that they can incorporate it into their decision making. They can use a number of factors for the decision --making. Those are things like tariffs, rates, they can look at the market forces, they could look at the demand, at the supply or and also they could look at the actual opposition or support for the project. They look at all these issues in making a decision.

I talked a little bit about pre-filing and what we do in pre-filing. Again, what do we do in pre-filing? A lot of it is outreach. A lot of it is meetings like this. We do a lot of meetings with various agencies. Many of you who have been following the docket have seen that we have meetings every two weeks with all of the various state agencies and in this particular project I have made sure to reach out to every agency that I possibly can to see what their concerns are. The purpose of the whole NEPA scoping process is to encourage involvement very early in the NEPA process so that we can get those issues identified and then addressed.

Obviously, the FERC and the FERC staff are the ones that are responsible for the environmental review. Our findings will be full contained within the EIS. As I said earlier, Cardno is going to work with FERC staff to go ahead and mutually develop that Environmental Impact Statement. Again, I talked earlier about where we are in the process and the fact that Tennessee will be filing another set of draft resource reports.

I guess one of the things about information about what we need during scoping is surveys. I know many of you have gone ahead and refused survey access for Tennessee. Obviously, this is your right. Landowners, you can refuse people to come on your property at any time. However, as somebody who is writing an Environmental Impact Statement, I would encourage you, with my encouragement but of course you have a right to refuse, to allow surveys on your property. Why am I asking this? If you have a sensitive resource on your property, we need to know about it. Otherwise, we have no idea that there's something sensitive there.

Or if you want to avoid, I don't know -- an apple tree was planted there fifty years ago or an oak tree that your grandfather planted, unless we see some survey on there or unless you provide information or if survey crews are unable to see that and when I say surveys I don't mean just civil surveys. I meant the biological surveys, the archeological surveys, the indigenous species surveys, all of those surveys, that we need to see that so we understand what is going on with your property. Otherwise, we have no idea what's there.

At this point there is no low boundary by which the Commissioner would say 'well there is not enough survey access, we can't approve the project'. The Commission has never said to my knowledge that we can't approve this project because we don't have full survey access. So that's important for you guys to know. I want you to understand that. Obviously, again like I said, it's your right to say no, but I encourage you to please let them on your property so that I understand what is on your property, what conditions are there and what resources are there.

Even if for whatever reason you do not allow them on your property and the project would be approved, we would require some sort of survey before we allow construction so at some point, if the project were to be approved, we would require the company to go back out, obtain probably legal access to your property, go out and actually survey and then give us that survey back so we understand what's on your property. We could modify the route based upon what we see at that point but you have a lot more influence if you allow them on early and that we can understand what is there. But again, like I said, it is your right to say no.

Now we also go ahead and get a lot of input as I mentioned from Federal agencies, local agencies, state agencies. We have meetings every two weeks with all the state agencies and try to get their concerns about how much the project would affect the state as a whole or from a local level in a local level in a local setting. In fact, I just had a meeting today with numerous state agencies in New York and that cooperation between those state agencies and FERC is very, very valuable because they have a wealth of information of the environment and socioeconomic data on the communities of which the pipeline is proposed

to go through.

Also, I did want to go ahead and thank the offices of Senators Gillibrand and Schumer. Their assistance has been pretty valuable in getting a meeting location here and a location that is amenable to all of the groups that are concerned about this project. As well as they've been really, really aggressive at informing me of your concerns and so that has been very useful for me to understand, not that I only get calls from you but I also get calls from your elected officials so that have been very helpful to have that done.

(Slide)

Now, what is EIS? Again, Environmental Impact Statement is what it is. Once we got all this information that we need, we analyze and prepare the Environmental Impact Statement. It is an analytical document. That means, as I stated earlier whether we get one comment about an issue, or a hundred or a thousand, we analyze that the same. There is a specific legal standard that we have to look at when we do an Environmental Impact Statement. It is what is called a hard look standard. It is when we take a hard look at all of the impacts of the project and we compare the project with all of the impacts that would occur if we go with an alternative.

Again, the EIS will address all the environmental issues that people bring up here as well as in written comments as well as those very specific issues as well as cumulative issues. I know there is a lot of concerns here about fracking and cumulative issues. That's something that we will go ahead and look at and have to address.

One of the things about the EIS is those of you who received an EOI or are otherwise on our mailing list, you are going to go ahead and receive a copy of the Environmental Impact Statement, both the draft and the final unless you specifically tell us you don't want one. There's always a few people who don't want to see it, that's fine. Right now, we send out CD copies or DVD copies of the EIS when we issue that for comment.

So if you want a paper copy, you need to go ahead, there is a form on the back of the very last page of the EIS. You need to send that in and check 'I want a paper copy'. Of you don't have that, please let us know up front and we will make sure that you are on the list to get a paper copy instead of a CD copy. Okay? Now if you're not on the mailing list and you want to be, we do have a mailing list sign-up sheet out front and that will put you on the list to get the not just the EIS but any sort of notice that we issue. Like the notice of schedule, those sort of things.

So I mentioned before that there will be another opportunity for you to comment on this after we issue the draft and after we take those comments we incorporate them into the EIS. I talked to you a little bit about how the commissioners make their decision. They can make their decision on multiple criteria. There are multiple issues which they incorporate into their review and the EIS environmental issues are only one factor. (Slide)

We're going to go ahead and start the comment portion of the meeting right now and I'm going to remind everybody that again, turn off your cell phones so the speakers are not interrupted. Please hold all of the questions until the end. I will be available again to answer some questions at the end if we don't go too late. For those of you who have signed up to speak, you're going to come up to the microphone here and this will be turned around so you can address me at the front table and I would like you to speak clearly and spell your name for the stenographer. There will be a time limit.

(To Ms. Harris:) How many people do we have here tonight?

MS. HARRIS: We have about forty-seven signed up.

MR. TOMASI: We have about forty-seven people signed up to speak tonight so that is going to take a significant amount of time. We will be taking a break at nine and we will be enforcing the time limit of three minutes, just like last night. You will see, those of you who did come last night, you will see the little stoplight thing up front. It's green when you have time to speak, it will turn yellow when you have thirty seconds and when it turns red, your time is up.

Again, I want to stress, please, even if you disagree with the speaker do not heckle them, do not cheer them. Please let them speak for their three minutes and everyone will have their turn. So again, we are going to go ahead and turn this around and then we will go ahead and bring people up. Thank you.

We did have a request, we have a few children that wanted to speak and last night I allowed a couple of the children to come up and speak first. I would like then to allow them to speak first and then after the children speak we are going to let a couple of the elected officials speak and then we will call everybody's numbers. What I'm going to do is turn this thing around here and so why don't you guys come on up and you guys can speak.

MISS CROSS: Hi, my name is Morgan Cross. I am nine years old and I live on - Road, Nassau, New York. I am concerned about this pipeline. It is going right through my back yard and it will concern me and my family. We live on a farm and we don't like all the noise because then it will disturb all of us and our animals and it will scare them. I really don't want this pipeline to go in. Thank you.

(Applause)

MISS LUCCI: Hi, my name is Madison Lucci and I am nine years old. I live with my mom and dad, my two sisters and my dog. My family owns thirty-eight acres of land and I have been here for all along and my family have been here for almost a century, starting with my great grandparents to my grandparents, to my mom and dad and now me. My grandparents are my neighbors as well as my aunt, uncle and cousins. This pipeline will run on the side of our land and the compressor station will be across the street from our house. This is supposed to be the biggest one in New York. It is loud and lets off toxic fumes that we have to breathe. The compressor is going to be automatic so no one is going to be watching it and what happens if it explodes. What about all of the farm animals and wild animals? What about my family's health? Please consider a different location that is not heavily populated. Thank you.

(Applause)

MISS GOEBEL: Hi, my name is Anna Goebel, G-O-E- B-E-L. I am ten years old. The compressor station will wreck my family's farm. We will have less crops and our cows will be more likely to die. We will not be able to sell our hay and feed to help take care of our family.

(Applause)

MISS GOEBEL: Hi. My name is Martha Goebel, G- O-E-B-E-L. I am eight years old. The station will wreck our farm. The hay will not grow as much. We will not be able to sell our beef and hay.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

SPEAKER: I would clarify that their property and Martha Goebel, the hay is within the half-mile radius and the property and the cattle abuts up against it.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Okay, we're going to go ahead and call elected officials now. The first elected official is Mr. Bill Jennings. Bill Jennings?

MR. JENNINGS: It will be a hard act to follow the kids. My name is Bill Jennings, J-E-N-N-I-N-G-S. I am a member of the town council in the town of Stephentown. I think I speak for the vast majority of residents of Stephentown when I state simply we do not want this pipeline in our rural community. We do not have a pipeline now. We do not want to start with the largest diameter, highest pressure pipeline you have proposed, plus one that in our rural community will probably have dangerously thin walls, will have poorly inspected wells and will be buried less deeply and less securely than it would be in more populated areas. That's what I understand the rules are for rural communities.

It is also important to know that this pipeline will have no positive economic benefits for Stephentown. Only a negative impact. It will lower our property values at a time when we're struggling for survival and it will hinder any future development that we might wish to undertake within our town. Most importantly, this pipeline will expose us to a risk of a catastrophic event. Huge risk absolutely no reward.

We see no credible need for this pipeline at all and I simply urge FERC to say no to this application. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much.

MS. RICHARDS: My name is Lani Richards, L-A-N-I R-I-C-H-R-D-S. I am a Nassau Town resident and a Nassau Town board member. I believe Supervisor Fleming read our resolution opposing the pipeline last night. We are not only opposed to the pipeline but to place a compressor station in one of the most beautiful areas in the town in one of the most beautiful towns in the area is of utmost cruelty to this area and to the residents here.

A compressor station is not only not allowed according to town law, it is also completely incompatible with the rural nature of the area. In determining if a compressor station should be placed in this town, the answer should be a loud, resounding no. Regarding the pipeline itself, using the eminent domain process to essentially take property from residents and you may argue with that process, that that is essentially what's going to happen. Residents will no longer have the full benefit of their property if that goes through.

Hundreds of residents in the Town of Nassau alone will be affected. Some of these folks grew up in Nassau and chose to stay because of its quiet nature. Other folks moved here specifically to enjoy the country life and to get away from noisier, busier, urban or even sub-urban areas. All of these folks have made the largest investments of their lives to be able to live in Nassau on property that they choose and I know that they did not choose to live next to a pipeline or a large and loud compressor station.

If this pipeline is approved, they will never again have the full use of their entire property and the town has heard from many people that they would not have purchased their property to begin with if they had a pipeline running through it. Some residents depend on their home businesses for their livelihood, which could be destroyed during the construction phase of the project. For instance, there are riding stables in the areas, horseback riding stables. Both adults and children take riding lessons. That would be completely interfered with during construction because for safety reasons, due to loud noises that scare horses they would not be able to do those instructions.

Let me restate that these people depend on those businesses for their livelihood. All for no benefit to the town or any other nearby town for that matter. On behalf of myself and the people in the Town of Nassau we implore you to disapprove any application that proposes a pipeline and compressor station in the Town of Nassau.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Next is Mr. Larry Eckert.

MR. ECKHARDT: Thank you very much and good evening. My name is Larry Eckhardt, ECKHARDT and I am honored to be taking my turn at being the Supervisor for the Town of Stephentown. The Stephentown Town Board has already unanimously passed a resolution in opposition to the current plan to construct a high-pressure gas pipeline across our community. The resolution was the result of months of public comment, emails, phone calls and others regarding this proposal.

The town board held a public meeting that hosted the largest gathering for a public meeting in Stephentown in decades. The comments received by our town board from concerned residents of our small community were numerous, sincere and thoughtful. This resolution with more details and concerns for the impacts of this project will be filed with FERC as part of our written comments.

The Stephentown Town Board has spent months meeting with other municipal leaders and residents, attending meetings accumulating information regarding this project. It's abundantly clear that this project as proposed would impact Stephentown's groundwater, sensitive habitats, infrastructure and economic development. Much of the project would also impact the environmentally sensitive and economically important Rensselaer Plateau, which is part of the region in our town.

The Town Board is also opposed to the granting of eminent domain rights to private businesses that would be in the position to take private property for their own financial gain while there is absolutely no gas or other benefits, financial or otherwise provided to our community or our residents. Recent issues that have surfaced that we would like to bring to FERC's attention are the concerns about the stress to the town's infrastructure such as heavy weight traffic on our narrow roads, small bridges, stressed emergency services and rerouting traffic, which, no doubt will cause expensive repair damage to our town.

Also, the water needed to perform any hydro- testing of the pipeline will be drawn from what water resource and voided into what water body? Do we have to have PCB-laden drawn water from the Hudson discharged into our local streams and brooks? Because of the plethora of unanswered questions, potential detrimental impacts and legitimate concerns brought forward by our residents and officials, the town of Stephentown must oppose this project as proposed and calls on FERC to deny a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline for construction of the proposed project. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Okay, we're going to call our first person with ticket one, Clark Shaughnessy. After Clark Shaughnessy is Shelly Bennett.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Well, thank you. My name is Clark Shaughnessy, S-H-A-U-G-H-N-E-S-S-Y. Before I go into my little prepared speech here, I want to mention that there are approximately three hundred and thirty houses, single- family residences within a two mile radius of the proposed compressor station site at Clark's Chapel Road. There are also six working farms with residences in that same radius and of all that, nearly a hundred and fifty of the homes are on Burden Lake or a very short distance from Burden Lake. Burden Lake is directly north of the compressor site by about three eighths of a mile.

What I am concentrating on here tonight is nitrogen dioxide, which is the result of combusting oil, gas and any of the other similar. The fracked gas is included in that. The emissions from the fracked gas that's used to power the turbines in the compressor station have a lot of unburned fuel, a number of toxins still left from the fracked gas and other miscellaneous bad things that you find in gas that will not burn completely.

It's impossible to actually burn one hundred percent of any of the fossil fuels. The Federal Environmental Protection Agency lists nitrogen dioxide as one of its top six pollutants and toxins that the EPA is trying to reduce the levels of and be safe for humans. Nitrogen dioxide will combust. Sometimes explosively. It combines readily with many compounds such as hydrocarbons and hydrocarbons are what the human being is made out of as are all plants and animals.

The primary way that the nitrogen-type compounds reach a human being is through inhalation. In small amounts --

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: Pardon?

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds, sir.

MR. SHAUGHNESSY: In small amounts, it can cause dizziness, aggravate heart muscles, aggravate asthma and other pulmonary conditions. In larger amounts and accumulated over time it can actually destroy lung tissue and other organs. I'm going to save the rest of my speech for written comments to you.

MR. TOMASI: Okay. Thank you, sir. Did you want to give them to me now?

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Shelly Bennett. After Shelly Bennett is Sheila Forracher.

MS. BENNETT: My name is Shelly Bennett, B-E-N- N-E-T-T. I would like address the very real health consequences to residents in close proximity to these compressor stations. I am referencing a 2014 sci-

entific health study of air quality around natural gas drilling wells and compressor stations in five states. This study was coauthored by Dr. David Carpenter, Director of the Institute for Health and the Environment at the University in Albany.

In June 2015 the Research Institute was re-designated as a World Health Collaborating Center in Environmental Health. The study found air samples taken near existing compressor stations in Pennsylvania revealed unsafe concentrations of benzene and formaldehyde and levels that exceeded Environmental Protection Agency levels. Benzene is a known human carcinogen. Chronic exposure to Benzene increases the risk of leukemia, birth defects, respiratory effects including pulmonary edema, laryngitis and bronchitis.

The study specifically includes benzene as a fugitive emission along numerous points of production such as compressors and pipelines. Formaldehyde is a suspected human carcinogen. It can affect nearly every tissue in the human body leading to acute dermal allergies, asthma and chronic health effects including neuro, reproductive, genetic and pulmonary toxicity. It was another volatile compound that exceeded health-based risk levels near compressor stations in Pennsylvania, Wyoming and Arkansas. As with Benzene, formaldehyde emits along the production chain and compressor stations.

In a radio interview yesterday on Capitol Press Room, WCNY Dr. Carpenter stated that in his five-state study, compressor stations were the greatest source of pollution and of adverse effects to human health. He stated that breathing in carcinogens and toxic chemicals are agents that cause cancer and would have long-term effects. He names hydrogen sulfide as an emission, which would in the short term cause degradation to the central nervous system and disrupt the quality of life with symptoms of headaches, brain fog and fatigue.

When asked specifically if fracking and transporting of natural gas could be done safely, he responded 'it could be, if the industry's feet were held to the fire. The problem' Dr. Carpenter expressed 'is that whole industry has been exempted from all the regulation other industries have to apply by the Federal Government.' When asked again --

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MS. BENNETT: When asked again if he thought it was safe under these existing current political parameters, Dr. Carpenter concluded 'absolutely not. The industry is not held to the same standard as every other industry is held.' Granting this application would be giving Kinder Morgan a license to kill. Granting this application would give Kinder Morgan a license to kill.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Sheila Foraker. After Sheila is Dan Stillman.

MS. FORAKER: What.

MR. TOMASI: After you is --

MS.FORAKER: Sheila Foraker, S-H-E-I-L-A Foraker F-O-R-A-K-E-R. I represent a non-profit, religious organization incorporated in California. In 2005, we relocated from California to New York at great cost and sacrifice. I donated nearly forty acres of land that has been in my family for one hundred years to build a center for our organization. This center is used by locals, national and international non-members who come for retreats in the peaceful, rural setting. It has been an ideal location with its contemplative environment offering a place for silence, serenity to meditate and pray. It has been a safe place. The air is pristine, the spring water is clean and pure. The atmosphere is peaceful and quiet. We have an organic garden and we raise honeybees.

If a ninety thousand horsepower compression station were to be built on Clark's Chapel Road within walking distance of our property, all of this would change. We would be bombarded by noise pollution twenty-four hours a day as the fracked gas aided by three huge gas turbines would be pushed along the pipeline which is proposed to be on our property. But light, noise and toxic gases will disrupt our peaceful environment, a public nuisance.

The compression station would pollute the air and the water. We would no longer be in a safe environment. The noise alone would inhibit our ability to practice our faith. The dangers of a pipeline in our backyard and a compression station very close to our property would make it an unsafe place to hold retreats let alone live. We also protest the robbery of the community's wealth by Kinder Morgan through their proposed compression station and pipelines. As soon as they would be established all property values would go down to nothing.

After all, who wants to live next to a pipeline and a compression station. Would any of you? Would any of you members of FERC? Members of our government? Anyone from Kinder Morgan live in a place where there is a fracked gas pipeline and a compression station of ninety thousand horsepower in your back yard? I think not. Well, we don't want it in our backyard either. We want the same right to a peaceful quietude as the decision makers.

Please find another place that is not populated to put your fracked gas pipeline and your compression station. FERC, we know that you have never denied a pipeline application, but now you should deny Kinder Morgan's application. There is no place in our populated area. The truth is hard to accept but look at the truth. The scientific evidence. The track-record of safety of Kinder Morgan and other pipelines' compressor stations. You know that a pipeline and compressor station would be devastating to our communities and will destroy us. If we are to survive then we must not be consumed by corporate greed, money and power. You must make a decision that will be for the good of the people, for humanity, for the environment, for our government which is of the people, for the people, by the people. After all, the Declaration of Independence says: We are endowed by the creator with certain inalienable rights,

MR. TOMASI: Time's up, ma'am.

MS. FORAKER: That among these is life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Do not take away our life, liberty or our ability to pursue happiness. Deny the application to the pipeline to Kinder Morgan.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Dan Spilman. After Dan Spilman is Ruth Foster.

MR. SPILMAN: Well, everyone has to take a deep breath for a second here. That was good. I'm glad to be following that. Since I spoke about midnight last night, I will be brief and lessen my, let other people get in. My name is Dan Spilman, S-P-I-L-M-A-N, Mountain View Road, Nassau. The beauty of this process, the way it's supposed to be run is this is to be a scientific process.

Science is really a lot about truth and fact and this project, if it were to be awarded on its merits it would have to prove that there is a demand and a public need. I talked briefly about that last night that the demand in this country is actually decreasing. It would also have to pass the test that there is public acceptance or public good by this I guess is the proper terminology and obviously, by your three thousand plus comments that you mentioned in the beginning, which I'm sure the vast majority do not see the public good in it.

Also it has to meet the environmental standards that we have set in this country. The reports coming out obviously that were mentioned just prior to me. The State of California just released their government study that was an independent study that the Governor had done in California, similar to results that New York had. There is no denying the environmental impacts of this. So on all three factual statements it would be a definite no.

What we do have to look for is how we're going to move forward in this country and obviously the gas pipeline is not it. We have other countries in the world that are already on close to one hundred percent, actually Denmark is over one hundred percent renewable. As of a little while ago Germany was at the thirty percent to forty percent range. City of Burlington Vermont passed forty percent renewable energy so it is possible. There are a lot more jobs in the renewable sector than there are in the fossil fuel sector. So I really think that we need to look good and hard at our demand.

As far as individually, both people at FERC and all of us here, I think anybody that will be around in two

to three generations will have to answer to their grandkids as far as exactly what did you do to help this problem? And we're all going to have to look them in the eye and say that we did facilitate this problem. Did we make it worse or did we do what we could? Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is number five, Ruth Foster. After Ruth Foster is number six, Ken Stokum.

MS. FOSTER: Hi, I'm Ruth Foster, R-U-T-H F-O-S-T-E-R and I live in Skodak. I'm a member of the 'Stop the Fracked Gas Pipeline Coalition'.

MR. TOMASI: (To assistant.) Having problems there?

ASSISTANT: I'm figuring it out.

MR. TOMASI: We have a new guy on the mic. He needs a sign so (laughs).

MS. FOSTER: I want to echo what Dan just said. A lot of people have been talking about our community and I am very concerned about the compressor station in our community and our environment. But I also want people to know that this is part of a national effort to build a pipeline infrastructure that is going to impact all of our children for years to come.

Natural gas is a greenhouse gas. The compressor stations spew thousands of tons of it into the air every year and they make matters worse. But what's worse is that the pipelines last for fifty years. That means for fifty years these pipelines need to be fed natural gas. That means that for fifty years there is no economic reason to build more sustainable energy.

So this pipeline it's outrageous to me that it would be built at this time when we should be building renewable energy and that we're building an infrastructure that will last fifty years and move us into the future that is a dangerous future of climate change. Our children just can't wait. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next, number six is Ken Stokum. After Ken Stokum number seven is Michael Dunom.

MR. STOKUM: Ken Stokum, Maple Hill Road, Skodak. Despite all the passionate, sincere comments we had I found nothing that encourages me that FERC will be swayed or concerned about our people, homeowners, farmers and landowners when it comes to putting in more and more gas pipelines. Woody Allen once said 'Mankind faces a crossroads. One path leads to despair and other hopelessness and the other total destruction'. With FERC, this is where we're at. There is no pathway as far as I can see, that comes through FERC. FERC may round off the edges a bit of some proposals but they never do much to mitigate a pipeline. They never stop a pipeline. In spite of that, I want to beseech FERC to correct one inequity that they can correct with relative ease.

FERC needs to hold another one of these hearings in Southern Albany County. Albany County has the area's greatest population and you've ignored it. Additionally, I want to demand that FERC hold to a minimum one mile impact zone on each side of the NED, providing at least a two mile wide impact zone. FERC must evaluate whether that impact zone should be increased even wider when the NED runs alongside one or more adjacent pipelines. The impact zone should also be significantly greater in circumference, like maybe three miles, around the compressor stations. Since stations are above ground, they are more vulnerable to leaking, vandalism and other hazards and they are uncontained in any way.

Everything I learn about pipelines informs me that FERC is an industry capture and quazi-governmental regulatory body. The purpose of FERC is to facilitate the industry that it should be regulating. FERC expedites pipelines without regard to determining what the higher good should be for an impacted area in populations. They do it without concern for what may be best for our uncertain future driven by greenhouse climate change. They don't even take that into consideration.

To the audience that is here, I emphatically urge you, do not stop your resistance to the NED after you submit your written and verbal comments. If you want to dissuade the NED you must become even more proactive. You must be aggressive in protecting your self-interests. At least, you must join local orga-

nized opposition to the NED. You must join the regional opposition to the NED and you must commit a part of yourself and your time and even a few of your dollars to join with your neighbors to oppose the NED.

Tonight, before you go, join the 'Stop New York Fracked Gas Pipelines' Group. SN --

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. STOKUM: SNYFG is an organization that is leading the opposition to this pipeline in the capital region. Sign up as you leave at the desk on the outside there and be sure to become a member and get yourself on the contact list and in the loop for information on what follows from here. Do not let this slide. You're not solving anything by speaking here tonight but it's a good start.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is Michael Dundon and then Tony Delacqua.

MR. DUNDON: Good evening ladies and gentleman. My name is Michael Dundon, D-U-N-D-O-N. I'm a member of the Laborers' Union. First, I would like to say I support the NED project. I've worked on many pipeline projects and I have taken my union's pipeline safety course. This project will be built on an existing right-of-way which will keep the environmental impact minimal. The impact this pipeline will make is to the local economy by putting local Union people to work it will be creating real economic stimulus.

Some people like to argue that these are temporary jobs but I have Union brothers here that have made a good, middle-class living on these so-called 'temporary jobs'. Hopefully you make the right decision and approve this project so honest, hard-working Americans can be put to work. Thank you and God bless.

(Applause and boos.)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Tony Ilacqua. After Tony Ilacqua is Kathy Ilacqua. I hope I pronounced that correctly.

MR. ILACQUA: Yes. It's Tony and it's I-L-A-C- Q-U-A. My main emphasis today is going to be the adverse effect on Burden Lake. I am the President of the Burden Lake Improvement Association. This is going to have extremely close proximity to and directly north of the planned compressor station like has already been told, for three eighths of a mile.

Burden Lake flows north so anything that comes from, and the prevailing wind direction is from the south. There is also all lands between the compressor station and Burden Lake. So every time there is any form of exhaust from the compressor station, the winds will flow directly to the lake. Any fluids will be dropped into the lake. Burden Lake is spring fed at this section. The coldness of the water acts as a magnet for any effluent particles being exhausted from the compressor stations.

Also, all the houses on the lake have wells for the residents. So the Burden Lake, even though they are wells, still has some effect on the wells. In addition to that, their bald eagle nesting areas are in a close proximity to the lake. The bald eagles use the lake as a feeding ground. This in addition to the blue heron and other native species.

In addition to this, Bur Lake is the home of Rensselaer County Boys and Girls Club, in this case is called Camp Adventure. For summer months, the last week of June through July and August, there's eighty plus inner-city kids that are bused to the facility on a daily basis. They are there to enjoy the water. Camp Venture is also open to rental on weekends.

It's also used every year by the Wounded Warriors Adapted Sports Program. This has been Burden Lake has hosted the Wounded Warrior Water Sports Program for the past decade. It's a permanent part of the Wounded Warrior Adapted sports program. One week in each summer the Wounded Warriors and their family members are welcome to enjoy the lake in a variety of water sports and special adapted water sports equipment. We have anywhere from ten to twenty families, in which case this is one of the only events that the entire families come to are the Wounded Warriors.

Also, another thing is to reduce the effluent matter going into the lake, one hundred and twenty-two residents agreed to paid three million dollars over thirty years to install a sewer system. We just went operational last April. That entire bill is being paid by those residents. We just got finished paying sixty-four thousand dollars to have the lake treated for milfor infestation and that's done on a permanent basis every so many years. So what it is, this is going to definitely have an adverse effect on the quality and health of that lake. Thank you very much.

(Applause and boos)

MR. TOMASI: Sir, you left your, sir --

Next is Kathy Ilacqua. After Kathy Ilacqua is number ten Brian Weist.

MS. ILACQUA: Good evening. My name is Kathleen Ilacqua, I-L-A-C-Q-U-A. I just want to address the fact that you had said you took a tour of the Chapel Hill. I want to invite you to take a tour in the evening on Burden Lake, look up in the sky and you will see the most beautiful stars. With that compressor station, we won't be seeing stars any more. We will just be seeing lights. You will hear the nature during the evening, what will you hear? You will hear the compressor station.

I hope you will consider the fact of it doesn't need to go to somebody else's neighborhood. It should not even be in New York State.

(Applause and boos)

MS. ILACQUA: We have a slogan 'I love New York' and I do love New York and the reason I love also Burden Lake is that it's a beautiful area. This evening as we were coming here we drove over Chapel Hill and there is this sign 'compressor station -- here'. There is a house right next to where this compressor station is going to go in. How are they going to survive living in that home with this humungous thing that I understand is supposed to look like Walmart's, the size of Walmart's.

You can't possibly think people in that area would even want to stay and continue generations that have lived there and the same thing, even on our beautiful Burden Lake, generations of family have lived there. Why is any company going to come in and destroy what we have? Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Brian Weiss is number ten and after Brian is number eleven, Charles Sullivan.

MR. WEISS: My name is Brian Weiss and my family and I live on Clark's Chapel Road about a half a mile from the proposed compressor station. I would like to start off by referencing a few statements on FERC's strategic plan. On page seventeen of the 2014-2018 FERC strategic plan, it states one of FERC's objectives is the responsible development of interstate natural gas infrastructure, pipelines, storage and LNG facilities is a critical link in ensuring the natural gas supply can reach the market areas. This document also states that FERC's purpose is to promote the development of safe, reliable, secure and efficient infrastructure with the key part being 'that serves the public interest'.

I would think that a critical factor in both of these statements would first and foremost be location. Instead of repeating what has already been addressed, I would just like to add a couple of things to the record that continue to show why this particular proposed location is just not a suitable one. First, with the construction of this type of project, our local roadways are in no way rated to handle the heavy equipment required and needed for this construction.

Most of the country roads surrounding, including Cark's Chapel Road, have weight limits of 10-ton. An empty tri-axle dump truck weighs about 20-ton which is two times that limit. With a full tri-axle dump truck being 40-ton. A low-boy trailer with equipment weights about 50-ton. We also have multiple roads that will have to be accessed for the pipeline installation that are dirt roads only.

Another item of concern that I have is the Nassau Sportman's Club, where the pipeline is proposed to pass through their pond and property. Over the past two years, they have made major investments into their property to be better suited for weddings and events. They hold anywhere from fifty to seventy-five

events annually. They have just had their annual fishing derby where it was estimated that around four hundred people took part. This site should be considered a high consequence area because of the number of people that could be impacted if there should be a catastrophic event.

And finally, the expectations that are going to be put on our emergency first responders will be unreasonable given their current membership and equipment. Mapquest shows that it is a nine-minute drive from the Hope's Corners Fire Station to the proposed compressor station site. You tack that nine minutes on to the time needed for our volunteers to reach the station and you now have about a fifteen minute plus --

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. WEISS: Response time. I know that a gas fire they can't address, but they can work to save the surrounding homes and a lot of change can happen in that 15- minute time period. I think the key in this whole process is summed up with does this project meet FERC's stated standard of serving the public interests? There no known customers receiving this gas in New York State but is proposed to travel throughout New York State and the gas moving through these proposed pipes --

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time is up.

MR. WEISS: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Charles Sullivan, number eleven. After Charles is Rebecca Rice.

MR. SULLIVAN: Good evening. My name is Charles Sullivan S-U-L-L-I-V-A-N. I live at 419 Tunnel Lodge Road, Averill Park, New York. My family and I reside in a home which is located about twelve hundred feet from what we understand to be the path of the proposed pipeline. In terms of scoping, I would like FERC to consider the following.

One is the definition of project, subject to NEPA review. Since this pipeline project is one component of a larger project to connect the fracked gas fields of Pennsylvania and elsewhere to export terminals in the Northeast and Canada, the EIS should consider this project in the context of that larger project. To do otherwise segments the environmental assessment of the actual project which is to take gas out of the ground and then ship it overseas.

This full project review requires consideration by a number of Federal agencies. Paramount among them being FERC itself, the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration, US EPA and the Department of Energy. FERC should not declare beyond the scope of inquiry by FERC, matters under the primary jurisdiction of a Federal Agency other than FERC itself. The NEPA review is conducted by the Federal Government after all and cognizant agencies have a responsibility to ensure proper environmental evaluation of a project subject to federal jurisdiction.

So when an issue is raised for one agency for which another agency has primary responsibility, the first agency must get the other agency's input and place it into the first agency's decision-making process. It should not simply state that another Federal Agency has primary jurisdiction over that matter and so take the matter off the table for consideration. In terms of project impacts, segmentation, this is but one project trying to achieve the same thing: to move gas from the fracked gas fields in the northeast and beyond.

The cumulative impacts associated with all of these projects proceeding at the same time needs to be assessed. These projects cannot be reviewed as though each one was the only one in terms of need. It is clear from Kinder Morgan's open houses that if this pipeline proposal serves to provide gas to the Northeast United states it is badly oversized to satisfy that need.

I find no statement from the Federal Government stating that supplying Europe with fracked gas is necessary for furthering foreign policy objectives. Without such, this is purely a private enterprise, seeking private profit while burdening all of those along the pipeline systems's pathway with the possible loss of life and property and compensating a time minority of those people with chump change while providing a massive revenue to Kinder Morgan.

I have other comments, I guess I will be out of time to provide them. They will deal with eminent domain and the issue of pipeline safety. We are in a class four area and that's unfair because it treats us as second class citizens. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Rebekah Rice, number twelve. After Rebekah is thirteen, Lucy Jackson.

MS. RICE: My name is Rebekah Rice, that's R-E- B-E-K-A-H R-I-C-E. I'm a farmer in Albany County in the Town of New Scotland. It was mentioned earlier that Albany County didn't get a FERC hearing, which was a little unfortunate for us because you are going through a lot of miles in Albany County.

Albany County was never going to be a fracked County because Albany County is limestone karst and my farm, which is an organic farm, we are certified naturally grown, is on limestone karst. Our house was built two hundred and thirty-three years ago and this farm has been basically in three families over the last two hundred and thirty-three years. Our family is the third extended family to farm there.

Our house is built out of limestone that was in the ground at that piece of property when people first arrived. It was laid up in subsoil, in clay from the same land. It's a very fragile, very beautiful, traditional Dutch style stone house. There are a lot of those along this pipeline route, I would like to add. A number of them in the town of New Scotland alone. That particular construction type is extremely vulnerable to vibration so small explosion, a little bit of dynamiting to put that pipeline down in the limestone karst could be enough to knock down any one of a dozen very beautiful, historic homes of which mine is one.

But I'm not so concerned about my house, although it would be a big grief to lose that. The water system for our farm is a spring-fed pond. That is the water for our house, it is the water we bath with. It is the water we use to water our sheep, it is the water that our bees drink from, it is the water that our chickens drink and it is the water that we water our crops with.

So there are two sources of water that make it into our pond. Stuff that comes up from the limestone karst in the springs that are under the pond and water in the watershed going down into our pond from the high point on our property plus about twenty feet of our neighbors' property. So we're about three hundred feet from our property to the pipeline. There is already an existing pipeline there. I know (to Mr. Tomasi).

Now it turns out that they want to put a staging area on our neighbor's property, three hundred feet from our corner, another 150 feet or so from our pond. We have no idea how that's going to impact our pond. We don't know whether it will do it on the surface or whether it will do it down on the level of the limestone under the soil. If we lose our water, we will lose our certified naturally grown certification, we will destroy our crops, we will lose our farm. That's our livelihood. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is (laughs).

MS. JACKSON: My name is Lucy Jackson, L-U-C-Y J- A-C-K-S-O-N and I live in Stephentown. I attended last night's scoping meeting here and had the opportunity to just speak and to go on record to question the proposed NED pipeline project. I am very grateful for the time allowed me and many others to voice their views. I also want to thank you for staying until well after midnight to hear additional questions. I sincerely appreciate these opportunities and I hope that it is as important for you to gather our comments as it is for us to offer.

Last night you made it clear that both the written and spoken comment carry the very same weight in this process. you did so very plainly again tonight. This is good, since not everyone feels comfortable speaking into a mic or to a large crowd. My concern, however is that perhaps neither the written or the scoping comment carries much weight at all. Maybe they carry almost none. That's a question for which there seems to be no answer.

The many people who have spoken in opposition to the pipeline have articulated clearly why they are

opposed. Many comments have been supported by experience, by professional knowledge as well as by abundant and compelling scientific data about public health, the environment, security, etc.

My comment tonight includes no science at all. It is based in humanity. I implore you to listen with your hearts and to consider fully the plights of those opposed to the construction of the NED project along all the entire market path. My questions remain, where in this process is the human element as it relates into the Environmental Impact Statement? Do the comments and the testimony both filed and verbally presented serve as anything more than a Democratic experience which offers no more than a feel-good experience?

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Mr. William Jackson. After William Jackson is Douglas Mahoney.

MR. JACKSON: My name is William Jackson J-A-C- K-S-O-N. Good evening, thank you again for the opportunity to offer some comments. I picked basically three issues this evening to highlight. I am hoping that these do not pertain to the project at hand, the NED, but I do think that FERC will have to consider issues such as these along any pipeline route and for any pipeline project, wherever it is. Hopefully, we won't need to address these here.

First of all, I feel that these projects ought to require intensive longitudinal inspection protocol by third party independent inspectors, reporting both to the Fed, State and Local authorities. These cradle-to-grave services should be paid for by the pipeline developers and operators, not by taxpayers.

Now, the reason for this in part is just two bullet points. One, valve control pipeline valves are notoriously unreliable and connected to remote control devices, scatter systems and so forth and the fact that they cannot be pigged, means that they frequently seize or are inoperable. Operation is absolutely critical for the safe operation of a pipeline if it could be safe at all and particularly to those who are in a sector where there might be a catastrophic accident.

Additionally, corrosion mitigation. As you know, the location. The co-location of this particular project along many existing electric power right-of-ways in conjunction with national grids-work poses many problems and many challenges for mitigation. It's only as good as the people that do this and inspect it.

Okay, secondly. Environmentally responsible filtrate and condensate management at sites such as pigging stations and pig-launchers. I see no evidence of how that is going to be managed. I assume it will be done scrupulously. Reports that I have state there are often spills at these sites and they go into ground water ultimately. This is irresponsible from an environmental perspective.

Thirdly, security as I have mentioned previously. Along the entire route and especially at compressor stations. Cyber and physical attacks are genuine issues. Your former director, Jon Wellinghoff, cited in comment in response to an April 2013 sniper attack on San Jose California Electric sub-station the following, or maybe you know it by heart. 'A very well-planned, coordinated and executed attack on a major piece of our electric grid and infrastructure.' Part of your responsibility. Even if, as the SPI suggested, it was only a matter of vandalism, vandalism with issues of this magnitude are just as serious as those of terrorism. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is Douglas Maloney. After Douglas Maloney is Bob Cohen.

MR. MALONEY: Good evening. My name is Douglas Maloney, M-A-L-O-N-E-Y. I am a member of Local 190 here in Albany, New York and I and my brother members both men and women, we take safety very seriously. I not only would like to work on this project but there are many men and women throughout here that would like to work on this project as well. Also, they are local people who live in our community here in Rensselaer County.

I am a landowner here in Rensselaer County. I believe that this project could be produced safely by Kinder Morgan and their representatives. I also understand the concerns that people have but I believe the benefits outweigh the risk. The NED Project will put folks to work and have a positive impact not only on

our economy, locally but nationally. Things need to change. Progress is important.

Energy is what we all need. Safe, clean, reliable energy. I believe natural gas produces what we need. I believe it's safe. Given the opportunity there are many men and woman in our industry that have provided clear, conscious work ethics in order to perform their job. There are many welders, fitter, laborers that have come to work on these projects before without incident. We work safely, we are trained, we live in this community.

We believe this project can help this community. We understand the concerns of local people. We also believe that it's important that we have the alternative and the opportunity to bring this through this area in order to help us locally. Thank you for your time. (Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Bob Cohen. After Cohen is Mr. John Zario, number seventeen.

MR. COHEN: Hi. My name is Bob Cohen, B-O-B C- O-H-E-N. I live with my wife and one daughter, another daughter off to college in Schodack in Nassau County. I'm also the Policy Director of Citizen Action of New York, an organization with thousands of members in New York State including many here in Rensselaer County.

I share the views of so many speakers tonight and last night in regard to the safety and environmental issues presented by this massive project. My focus tonight is the bogus job claims made by Kinder Morgan as to the positive job impacts of a pipeline, of this pipeline. I share the concerns of our Union brothers and sisters here that we create jobs locally but this pipeline simply is not the way to do it.

Quite simply, a June 2015 study funded of the Massachusetts impacts by the Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University which incidentally has accepted lots of coal money, found that only one thousand seven hundred thirteen temporary jobs will be created in that state, the State of Massachusetts. This study concedes that many of the jobs or most of the jobs and other income generated by the pipeline will go out of state. For example, in the form of skilled workers brought into Massachusetts to work to build it. I assume the same is true in New York.

Long term, this study only predicted nine thousand four hundred twenty jobs by 2020 and these jobs will only materialize if we accept this study's projections, which are by no means certain that decreased energy prices will result from the increased supply of gas which will, in turn, expand the state's business climate. New York is not currently slated to get the fracked gas, as several other people have said already so we won't even get anything close to this number of jobs in New York, even assuming the study is right in its projections concerning Massachusetts.

More importantly, the BHI Study, funded by Kinder Morgan does not even consider the alternatives, the positive employment effects that would come from investing in alternative fuels like wind, water and solar and increased energy conservation. Estimates are that spending on green investments creates roughly three times as many jobs as spending the same amount of money on maintaining our existing fossil fuel sector. This is primarily because clean energy jobs are much more labor intensive and a greater proportion of spending would stay in our country.

In a study done by Stanford Professors has projected that conversion to one hundred percent clean, renewable energy by 2050 would create one hundred four thousand permanent construction and operation jobs in Massachusetts and in New York the number would be two hundred and seventy-seven thousand, two hundred jobs. In light of the environmental and safety concerns highlighted by other local residents tonight and last night this dangerous white elephant should be rejected. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Number seventeen, John Serio. After John Serio is number eighteen, Richard Reich.

MR. SERIO: Hi. My name is John Serio, S-E-R-I-O, Stephentown. My property abuts the right-of-way, where it appears that the pipeline is going to be. I say appears because almost everything about the details of this project is vague, uncertain and confusing. The only thing we know for sure is that there is a huge company from an industry known for price and product supply manipulation that is planning a venture

that will enrich that company.

We also suspect that the only way the project will be stopped is if the company decides to withdraw due to financial reasons. It should not be the international market for gas that drives the decision about this project. It should be the public good and we are relying on FERC to make that decision for the right reasons. It appears to us, the community, that FERC's role only seems to be to make sure the pipeline does the least damage, but not to consider whether the pipeline should be built at all.

The company filings contain hundreds of 'to be determined'. What is the final proposed path? Is the pipeline going on the north or south side of the road? How far will the pipeline and associated construction encroach on property that is not in the right-of-way? How much land will be disturbed during construction? How close will any above-ground facilities be to my home? What construction methods will be used?

How will the two intersecting rivers behind my home be protected? How will they be crossed? Will there be blasting along the steep rock ledge behind my house? Should I believe that there will be erosion and silt runoff controls that will not damage these beautiful natural rivers and my property? Who's going to be watching? Will the river that runs parallel to the path for many yards ever be the same? Will recycled timber mats be used to protect sensitive areas from heavy construction equipment and will those mats carry invasive species along the right-of-way and my property? What else are they not telling us about the construction process that we might comment on?

My point is, we seem to be participating in an enormous charade? How can we raise issues when so much about this project is unknown and characterized by the company as 'to be determined' or 'confidential and privileged'? I hereby request that each public comment period be extended sixty days beyond the point when the details of the project are fully disclosed to the public.

I ask FERC to convey the good reasons that this project should not be approved to Kinder Morgan so they may have an opportunity to withdraw their application. Please take a hard look at the cumulative effects of the government decisions that harm our community and about how --

MR. TOMASI: Your times's up.

MR. SERIO: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up is number eighteen, Richard Reich. After Richard Reich is Wendy Dwyer.

MR. REICH: Hello, how are you? My name is Richard Reich, R-E-I-C-H and I have been a member of the Laborer's Union for twenty-six years and I am in favor of this pipeline. this project will create many well-needed man-hours for our members who live, pay taxes and raise their families here. Local unions will be able to provide skilled, trained, experienced pipeline professionals who have safely built gas lines in New York State for over fifty years.

This project when completed will add to the gas line infrastructure of New York and help to empower our economy and energy future. It will also allow us to provide a reliable fuels source to our homes and businesses we need to desperately. Kinder Morgan has provided, as proof that they are able to build, operate and maintain pipelines in our country for over 50 years. I also believe that while we work towards creating other clean, renewable energy sources, which we are all in favor of, that we must complete this project to keep up with the massive demand for fuel sources to power our homes and businesses.

Kinder Morgan has already signed an agreement with the Laborers International Union to use our skilled, trained, drug-free workforce which we work diligently to prepare for them by providing our members with many hours of pipeline safety classes well as teaching them all aspects of pipeline installation to prepare them, sorry about that (lost his place) sorry I messed up here.

MR. TOMASI: You have about a minute left.

MR. REICH: Also, I believe that while we work toward other clean, renewable energy sources which we are all in favor of that we must complete this project to keep up with the massive demand for fuel sources to power our homes and business. Kinder Morgan has already signed an agreement with the Laborers International Union to use skilled, trained workers by providing our members with many hours of pipeline safety classes well as teaching them all aspects of pipeline installation to prepare them for any scenarios we may encounter on the job, which may include environmental accidents and how to quickly and safely deal with them in the rare event that something happens.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. REICH: Let's talk about the own interest and Kinder Morgan owns interest in and operates approximately eighty thousand miles of pipelines and over one hundred and eighty terminals. They also employ approximately eleven thousand five hundred people throughout the US and Canada. They also own -- Kinder Morgan is committed to operating their assets in a safe, ethical and transparent manner.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MR. REICH: Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up is Wendy Dwyer. After Wendy Dwyer is Sandra Nathan.

MS. DWYER: Hi my name is Wendy Dwyer. I have a picture for you here of the White House with pipeline running up to it. One of them is named the Kinder Morgan pipeline. I will be a little more enthusiastic about Kinder Morgan when I see the pipeline running into the White House. I would like to tell you a little bit about myself.

MR. TOMASI: That's the Capitol Building.

MS. DWYER: Pardon me?

MR. TOMASI: That's the Capitol Building. (Laughs.)

MS. DWYER: I am a registered nurse for forty years. I am a former volunteer firefighter believe it or not. In Canaan, New York where we have a pipeline, I have property in Albany County which you have not included in your comments as has been pointed out. My property in Albany County has the bomb trains full of Bakken oil running across the street from it.

I work with Haus Energy in Albany and I have flyers here that I would like to pass around to people that address the issue of jobs created by coal, oil, gas versus green energy. The Jacobson Study done at UNS Amherst show that we can have clean, green, renewable energy by 2030 as Ken said, Germany is almost there. Other countries are. Climate change, which is affecting us all, produced by methane et cetera as we see fracked gas and all of these oil practices there is a prediction of a six foot rise in sea level which will wipe out Manhattan, Long Island, many of our islands.

Okay, so we don't need pipelines. We don't need pipelines. We don't need fossil fuel, we need to get rid of it. Fossil fuel is dead. We are stuck in time. This oil is going to be gone and so are we and this infrastructure will be level there to rot. The damage that has been done to beautiful places like Clark Chapel Road, like Canaan. To bring through fracked gas that has damaged someone else's area to our area to export it, it's all insane. We don't need any of this, okay.

We need to do unto others and I ask FERC, do unto others as you would have them do unto you. You may have children, I don't. I don't have any children. I don't have anybody to leave this planet to but we need to leave them something better than what we are leaving them now, which is crap. It's crap, okay. I know, I have to talk quick.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MS. DWYER: Terrorism was addressed. The block explosion. There wasn't enough foam to put out that fire. That was Bakken Oil. This is fracked gas. I don't know why anybody would trust the government.

I don't know why anyone would trust oil, big oil, Exxon Valdes, Gulf oil spill. They are all liars and I don't trust what we are being told.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next we have Sandra Nathan and after Sandra Nathan we have Wesley Trump.

MS. NATHAN: I gave up my time to her.

MS. MCPHERSON: I was number forty. Christine McPherson.

MR. TOMASI: Excuse me?

MS. MCPHERSON: I was number forty. Christine McPherson.

MR. TOMASI: Oh -- okay. So you're Christine McPherson?

MS. MCPHERSON: McPherson. Yes.

MR. TOMASI: Okay, go ahead.

MS. MCPHERSON: I stand with everyone here who has expressed concerns on so many issues that come with this project and I will be submitting a very long, written comment and more like an Environmental Impact Statement on my own, I guess. Right now I want to focus on three issues.

One is Kinder Morgan's safety record which anyone who does any amount of casual research will realize they have a horrible safety record. I ask that you include that in your analysis because of the companies that receive the rights to build these projects seem to act very recklessly and don't even abide by the most baseline industry standard safety standards. We have seen accident after accident on these fracked gas pipelines across the country, obviously the biggest ones being up in Quebec and that would be one of my core concerns around Kinder Morgan coming to my community.

The second core concern I am going to share tonight is I live on Burden Lake and I just move out there a few months ago with my family. In addition to the impacts of my individual family meaning we would most likely have to move, my child has asthma and my husband has asthma, I wanted to focus a little more on the wildlife in the area as Tony brought up, it is spectacular.

We have migratory birds that stop at the lake on their way to Canada every spring. I don't know if that's included in any of your resource analysis yet, but I ask that you include that. We have bald eagles, as Tony mentioned, osprey and other raptors that fish in the area. There are also recreational uses in the area. Many, many people of the capital district come to Burden Lake to recreate in the summer. They have friends or family at the lake and they come out to enjoy the clean area and the clean water on the lake.

My third comment tonight is over the last three weeks I have done a lot of research about energy use in our country and future markets and what's been made very abundantly clear in study after study is we don't need this fuel. In fact, the influx of new fuel in the Northeast Market tends to drive markets up, not down. There is no need for this project.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MS. MCPHERSON: I have links to studies I would like to share with you, but just over the last few days very prominent media like the Huffington Post and the commonwealth of Massachusetts has published studies, very detailed energy analyses showing this is not needed. There is no rational justification for this much environmental destruction for fuel we don't need in this country, except greed and profit.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is number twenty-one Wesley Petrone. After Wesley Petrone is Barbara Nuffer.

MR. PETRONE: Good evening. Wesley Petrone, P- E-T-R-O-N-E. I live at 16 Clark's Chapel Road in Nassau. I spoke last night and I just want to kind of finish up with what I was speaking of. If you review a New York State Power Company utility bill such as National Grid, there is a particular line of concern we should notice. Under terms and definitions it is listed what they call an SBC. It is a systems benefit

charge. The SBC is a state mandated charge for all electricity and natural gas customers.

The electricity SBC is used to fund energy efficiency programs to meet state energy use reduction targets, provide assistance for low-income customers and conduct energy research. The natural gas SBC is used to fund initiatives focused on reducing natural gas use in the state as part of the Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard.

These charges were required by the Public Service Commission of the State of New York and here's my point. The State of New York is mandating that we, as utility customers, pay this SBC for the above-mentioned programs. Particularly energy use reduction and reducing natural gas use. Now we have a proposed project going to transport a product through the State of New York that the state is making us pay a charge to reduce the use of this product here.

FERC may approve this project and will be able to enact eminent domain rights against people who are paying to reduce the use of this product here and are not going to benefit from the product going through New York. This is a double slap in the face. The Federal Government can take our land, the State of New York takes our money. Therefore, it would be greatly appreciated if you would close this project because there is not one single benefit to almost all of the residents of New York State, Rensselaer County and the Town of Nassau.

The health, safety and lifestyle we enjoy and value now and hopefully in the future outweighs any economic value of this project. So far, since 1996, under the New York State Public Service Commission and on their website under the systems benefits charge, we have paid as energy customers in the state of New York a total of 2.353 billion dollars to reduce the use of natural gas in this state and this is projects and items that are put through the SERTA Program. So I would ask that you take this into consideration that what is going on in New York State, what we have paid and I ask you to rescind this project, thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is Barbara Nuffer, after Barbara is twenty-two, scratch one name out so we move to twenty-four, Nancy Brandt.

MS. NUFFER: Barbara Nuffer, N-U-F-F-E-R. My educational background includes a degree in Biology Master's Level. I worked at the Department of Environmental Conservation in New York State for thirty-two years, specializing in air toxicology and I've attached some information. I am sure you are familiar with the National Air Ambient Air Quality Standards and how they might relate to the compressor station. I have lived on Bradley Road in the town of Nassau for forty-one years with my husband Fred and raised our two children in the bucolic rural setting of this dirt road. One of our boundary lines is a stream with waterfalls and brook trout emanating from Pike's Pond on Route 66.

About six hundred feet above our house is a National Grid power line and this is the site of the proposed NED pipeline. We will be well within the incineration zone. Back to our life on Radley Road, living in the Upland Forest of the Rensselaer Plateau has provided many opportunities to view wildlife. We recently had black bears in the back yard three weeks ago. We have turkeys, ravens, a very large, unique raven population at Pike's Pond. A large variety of nesting song birds and birds of prey including eagles and osprey and fisher cats and fox.

Also, I specialize in wildflowers and write profiles and do photography for the Conservationist Magazine. Many vulnerable, native wildflowers are found on our property and in Rensselaer Plateau. The construction and operation of the pipeline will severely disrupt the native birds and animal habitats and destroy many native plants.

The NED pipeline if constructed along the northernmost proposed route will cut across the Rensselaer Plateau one of the most unique geologic and biodiverse areas in Rensselaer County and New York State. The ecological distinctness of the plateau has led it to be given priority status in New York State and subsequent Open Space Conservation Plans and is the fifth largest, un-fragmented forest in New York State. New York State has identified the Rensselaer Plateau as an important area for protection due to diversity

and bird breeding and the Audubon Society has designated it as an important breeding area. This is an unnecessary project that people are fighting for many reasons. This is not a NIMBY fight although our health, safety, property values and quality of life are threatened. Many New Yorkers, including our Governor, support a future freeing ourselves of fossil fuel. Continuing construction of fossil fuel infrastructure seals the fate of our children as they face the alarming effects of climate change on our delicate planet. Dramatic shifts in weather patterns, severe storms, temperature extremes, rising sea levels will affect --

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MS. NUFFER: millions of people, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: The next person is Nancy Brandt. After Nancy Brandt is twenty-five, David Hunt.

MS. BRANDT: Hello, my name is Nancy Brandt, B- R-A-N-D-T and I live at 16 Pike's Pond road in Averill Park which is in the Town of Nassau. I also live on the Rensselaer Plateau and on Pike's Pond, which has been referred to several times. I am a resident of the town of Nassau and I am in opposition to routing a fracked gas pipeline and compressor station in the Rensselaer County.

I am requesting that FERC use new and independent data specific to Rensselaer County as requested by residents, local, county and possibly state and federal officials and to use this new data as the basis for review and in making an informed, uncompromised decision regarding how the health, safety, welfare of residents including our air quality, drinking water quality, soil quality, current rural residential noise levels, property values, forests, lakes, streams and wetlands, plant and animal life, and historic and cultural landmarks of our peaceful rural communities will be preserved, way more than just protected.

And more, that this new data become the basis for the standard measures in developing an environmental impact statement for the large-scale industrial gas pipeline and compressor station in rural Rensselaer County. This would take this exploratory operation beyond the existing scope that FERC uses now and make it much more particular and specific to Rensselaer. The Town of Nassau Natural Resources Committee Analysis by the experts at Echo Systems and the town's natural resources made it clear that the proposed project would impact Nassau's groundwater, sensitive habitat and economic development.

In addition, the proposed project would negatively impact the sensitive and economically important Rensselaer Plateau and oppose any county-wide economic development efforts.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MS. BRANDT: As a result of these findings, the Nassau Town Board issued a strong resolution in opposition to the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project and Compressor Station proposed by Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary, Tennessee gas pipeline. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is twenty-five, David Hunt. After David Hunt is Fred Nuffer.

MR. HUNT: David Hunt. Rensselaer County Biodiversity Greenprint Project. I provide written comments on nine biodiversity features that I suggest be addressed in any Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline throughout Rensselaer County. These features relate to NEPA's sections on fishery, wildlife, vegetation, water quality, geology and soils. The focus of my written comments is on ecological features of various scales that have regional importance for their rarity and their outstanding biodiversity value.

I suggest that their presence, importance and the mitigation of impacts all be addressed in the EIS. Associated with each feature are cited documents that detail the nature and relevant composition of important sites of those features, plus an estimate of how many sites of those features are to be crossed or potentially impacted by the pipeline across the county.

Three reports that I recently wrote for local residents summarized numerous important biodiversity sites

throughout different sections of the pipeline route and probably contain the most detailed information on the regional importance of these various features. I suggest that these documents be reviewed for the EIS and addressed there plus ideally supplemented with more careful field surveys during the growing season for sufficient evaluation of impacts at all important biodiversity sites along the route.

Features of high diversity importance known today include two large, intact forest landscapes: The Rensselaer Plateau and the Taconic Mountains. Five regionally important stream systems all designated as trout streams by the state plus the Hudson River, a unique tidal river. Five large, regionally important examples of restricted ecosystem types. One rocky summit, one lake complex, one tidal complex and two large peak lands, four large forest interior areas on the Rensselaer Plateau and Taconic Mountains, several large road-less areas on the Rensselaer Plateau and Taconic Mountain.

Over twenty regionally significant natural community examples of streams, wetland and lake tapes plus a land gravel, a globally unusual geological feature. Over two hundred and thirty-two examples of community pipes that are vulnerable to pipeline impacts, mostly streams, wetlands and lakes. Lastly, numerous rare species at about --

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. HUNT: --- twelve sites and now that you have violated rule number seven, please do not interrupt the speaker, how can I do justice in thirty seconds? Residents have been along the pipeline for hundreds if not thousands of years so you can read about them in the comments.

AUDIENCE: I am willing to cede my three minutes, David. (More comments -- can't hear.)

MR. TOMASI: Fred Nuffer is next.

MR. NUFFER: Thank you very much. My name is Fred Nuffer. I happen to be chair of the Natural Resource Committee for the Town of Nassau. I would encourage the FERC folks to please take a look at the town of Nassau's website. We have a lot of information on that concerning this particular project. The natural Resource committee did a study with Dr. Hunt to try to document the environmental concerns along the path through the town of Nassau. We did a compare and contrast of the proposed, the current proposed northern route versus the existing pipeline route.

I am pleased to hear that FERC is going to also be considering another potential route, which is the I90 Corridor, which I think perhaps would make the most sense in terms of least impact to individuals and I would hope to the natural resources as well. I was a little dismayed when you encourage people to allow Kinder Morgan on their property to do the analysis or to do studies. Quite frankly, I don't know how I can trust a company that has lied to public officials and to the public on numerous occasions about this particular project. I have no interest in letting them on there.

I do intend to provide information to FERC on concerns about my property and I would encourage people to do that. Again, I cannot trust this company. They have shown in dealings with us that they are just not willing to tell the truth.

I'm also concerned about the nature of the topography, particularly the town of Nassau. There is a lot of steep ridges, I'm not talking about side ridges, I am talking down gullies or valleys that are going through. They all have streams going through them. The nature of the pipeline is it's going to have to be laid where it's not at sharp angles in order to allow the pig to go through to clean it.

That means you are going to be moving tremendous amounts of earth in order to put that pipeline at a gradual angle to allow the pig to go through. That amount of disturbed earth is going to impact those headwater streams. They are going to have an impact on CT streams that are throughout the county and particularly in the town of Nassau. There is no way those streams are not going to be impacted with the amount of earth that is going to have to be moved.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. NUFFER: I'm done. Thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, sir.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up is number twenty-seven, Mr. Tim Croft. After Tim Croft is twenty-eight John Russo.

MR. CROFT: My name is Tim Croft, CROFT. I live at Skodak Landing. I appreciate you, Mr. Tomasi, coming out to listen to our concerns. I'm a man of literal proportions here, so I want to present a little math to you. FERC approved the Constitution Pipeline. That pipeline had an initial capacity of 150 million cubic feet with a maximum capacity of 650 million cubic feet.

Now from what I understand, if my math is correct, most of these pipelines leak or lose about five to seven percent of their total capacity. Let's say five percent. We'll be generous, okay? What would have happened if the Constitution Pipeline folks said to you "well, we have a little issue. Our initial capacity, about 45% of that gas is going to leak out on a daily basis." You might have an issue with that, with air quality, would you not? Well, on 2.1 cubic feet of natural gas, I don't like the word billion, let's use a thousand million, because most people have a hard time getting their head around a billion. Two thousand, one hundred million cubic feet, five percent of that daily is one hundred and five million cubic feet of natural gas.

We are in the situation where when this thing is built and put at complete capacity, it will lose the equivalent of sixty percent of the gas that flows through the Constitution pipeline daily in its initial incarnation. You folks need to be looking at this as a cumulative situation here. I want you to take a very hard look at that. Number one, because of that and number two because this is burning fuel, this compressor station --

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. CROFT: That is not disclosed. It is a secret sauce that goes into this ground. We do not know what was put in when this gas was fracked. We do not know what is coming out. So I ask you, this is collocated along electric power lines. Why are we not discussing using electric power to power this compressor? Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is Mr. John Russo. After John Russo is Colin Murphy.

MR. MARCHESE: Good evening Mr. Chairman. I'm on number thirty-two, Frank Marchese.

MR. TOMASI: You're number thirty-two?

MR. MARCHESE: Thirty-two. John Russo is not, I'm taking John Russo's spot twenty-eight. So thirty-two will not be speaking.

AUDIENCE: Gee, is that allowed?

MR. MARCHESE: Sir, that is allowed. No more outbursts, please. Marchese, M-A-R-C-H-E-S-E. You know, this has been a second night here and I know people have probably heard enough of our side and the other side as well so I will be brief. Basically, this isn't about orange versus green and unions versus environmentalists on this issue. We talked about it last night in depth.

Our members also live here. They raise their families here. They educate their children here. They own homes here so we have the same concerns you do. There is a time in our lives that I think we all have to trust the process. I can tell you as a New York State resident that we have a pretty good process in place. We have the most rigid process in place.

Like we talked about last night, the environmentalists, the actions of December of last year by banning hydro-fracking. Based on a lie, approved by a commissioner who was interim but at this point that is irrelevant to this project. So like I said, it's not orange versus green. We are all on the same page on this issue. We want the ECU to do their homework, go through the process. we want FERC to do their job as well.

You know, I also serve as a little league coach so I'm going to fast forward to little league here for a second. There are some children in the room. You know, when young man and women start out at five and six, they play t-ball and there are no rules. If nine kids or twelve kids get up in an inning, there are

no outs, there's no strikes, everybody has a great time. The last batter hits a homerun and the inning starts again, the next inning.

Then you advance to like a farm league, those are eight and nine-year-olds, that is when the rules come in to play. Okay, there's umpires, there's balls, there's strikes, there's outs, there's hits. So really the message is there is a process and you know, we wouldn't want our eight and nine-year-olds sitting on the bench complaining about the umpires. We wouldn't allow it as coaches but yet we sit here meeting after meeting after meeting and we hear environmentalists complaining about the process. They don't agree with the process. They don't agree with the decisions.

You know, the life lesson here for the children that are left in this room is if you don't like the outcome of something doesn't mean you complain until you get the proper outcome. That's not the reality of life. But we've heard it for five years from the environmentalists. Like I said last night, twenty-five thousand jobs went up in smoke in the southern tier.

Again, I implore everyone in this room, go to Oneonta, go to Afton, go to Sidney, go to those areas in the southern tier and you will not believe your eyes. You will not believe that you are in the State of New York still. These are areas that are hanging on by a thread. These are parents and grandparents that watch their children and grandchildren leave every single day, leaving the State of New York because there's no opportunity in those areas.

I'm about ready to finish up but once again, the life lesson is: Trust the process. The DEC and FERC are here, they are part of that process. They will come up with their conclusions whether you like it or don't like it. That's the conclusion. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next, we have twenty-nine, Colin Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: My name is Colin Murphy, C-O-L-I-N M-U-R-P-H-Y. I live at 160 Clark's Chapel Road in Nassau. It would be the closest house to the compressor station. Now, I work long, hot days. I like to come home and sit on the deck and have a beer, listen to the spring peepers or whatever, watch the deer in the field. I won't be able to do that if we have a compressor station there, spewing all these chemicals up into the air.

Now, I have a spinal cord injury I suffered eleven and a half years ago. I already have nervous system damage. You know, is this going to increase that damage? I don't know. What about all the kids that are living around here. They are going to be inhaling all these chemicals when they are out playing, doing whatever.

Kinder Morgan's reasoning to put this pipeline is based on need in New England. There might be a shortage of natural gas, there might not be a shortage of gas but I do know that FERC has already approved the Algonquin Pipeline from Spectra Energy which is going to add an additional 1.1 billion cubic feet per year. That pipeline is supposed to go online next November. Now, after that's online, where's the need? There isn't going to be any more need.

Also, I heard a couple people talk about terrorist attacks on the compressor station, you know, the one out in San Jose. Well, we have terrorist attacks every year. It's called the first day of rifle season. I would like FERC to come out on the first day and it sounds like a war zone out there. These guys go out there. They think they're snipers, you know, with their scopes and high powered rifles and all of a sudden you hear 4 or 5 shots right in a row. Those aren't all going right into the deer. There's four misses right there.

What happens if the compressor station takes a 308 round right inside of a sensitive area? Is it going to blow up? What's going to go wrong with it? That is all I have.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Okay, I did say earlier we were going to take a break at 9 o'clock. We are going to take a

break right now for fifteen minutes and we will be right back with number thirty-three Brenda Jenkins. We will be back in fifteen.

Started again 9:17 p.m.

MR. TOMASI: Okay, we are going to go ahead and get it started again. If everyone could take their seats. Okay, I want to invite up number thirty-three, Brenda Jenkins. Brenda Jenkins, number thirty-three. Brenda Jenkins, thirty-three and we're moving on to number thirty-four which is Charles Mayrer.

MR. MAYRER: My name is Charles Mayrer, MAYRER. My family and I live on our farm on Burden Lake Road, East Skodak less than a half mile from the proposed pipeline and about two miles from the proposed pumping station. We have resided there for over thirty years. We have raised three children there and now my daughter and son-in-law are expecting our first grandchild. They too live next door in close proximity to this proposed project.

In addition to my previously submitted written comments to FERC, I welcome the opportunity to speak publicly and comment on the Kinder Morgan NED proposed pipeline project docket number PF14-22-000. My concerns are many and very troubling. This pipeline and compressor station will have a devastating effect on our air and water quality along with a major and lasting disruption of the ecological balance.

The 24/7 noise generated from the compressor station will forever change our right to live peacefully. The proposed pipeline and compressor station will be less than one and one-half miles from the very toxic Dewey Loeffel Superfund Site. An accident or explosion could further fracture the substrate under Dewey Loeffel and contaminate our water for miles around. This site is still leaking.

The proposed pipeline and hug compressor station three thirty-thousand horsepower turbine engines could be targeted by terrorist groups, not the ones with the deer licenses, as a soft target, increasing the chances of an accident or explosion of cataclysmic proportions. I understand this facility will be unmanned and remotely monitored.

New York State has banned fracking. This proposed project does not benefit my state at all. This is Pennsylvania fracked gas. Why can't Kinder Morgan pipe it to Philadelphia, an industrial port and ship it from there. We have not seen any alternative solutions to the pipeline routes or pumping station locations. Maybe because this is only about Kinder Morgan, a goliath and big money.

I urge FERC and the Commissioners to do the right thing. Become David and slay this Goliath. Please deny Kinder Morgan it's approval of this pipeline project. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is number thirty-five, Denise Mayrer. After Denise is thirty-six, Joseph Jensis.

MS. MAYRER: Good evening, my name is Denise Mayrer. I live with him, the previous speaker Mr. Mayrer M- A-Y-R-E-R. So I want to take a little bit of a different approach because again most speakers have been most eloquent about their opposition to the project so I don't need to reiterate that. I think we are all in agreement.

I am a chair of the planning board of the Town of Schodack. I am here in an unofficial capacity but I am very familiar with public hearings, hearings in general and how the process works. I do respect the process for what it does. So what you need to hear is the proposed alternatives that people need to think about relative to this project. When the public is so acutely impacted by any type of project and you have to hear all of their comments, you need to take into consideration the alternatives that one can support and cost cannot be the issue when the public welfare is concerns or to the applicant and that they need to justify their hardship if they are going to call it intolerable in order to approve the project or protect it.

So they will need to consider the alternatives and at this point I'm going to propose that the I90 Corridor be of serious consideration. There are several reasons for that and they are the following: Most of the

land has already been taken by eminent domain as it runs through the I88 and I90 corridors. So you are on State and Federal lands anyway and you are not impacting private property. There are large tracts of land available in that corridor for the purposes of building a compressor station, which by the way is being overbuilt. It's a megastation but that's a whole other subject.

The evacuation plans that one would need to evacuate any citizens or any resources in the area would be easily executed. Fire and disaster removal equipment would also have easy access. The security for the compressor stations would be provided through state and local authorities due to access to the interstate itself. The mitigation for the risk to the Dewey Loeffel site will also occur. It wouldn't be impacted by the blasting. Additionally, the risk of the electromagnetic fields goes away because you wouldn't be dealing with that either. Then lastly we have two other points. Neighborhoods and rural communities the impact that would be mitigated and the last thing, both my boys left, jobs would be protected because they would still be in the area. So again, I urge you to seriously consider the I90 Corridor. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next number thirty-six, Joseph Jensis. After Joseph, we have Demira Pon.

MR. JENSIS: Joe Jensis, J-E-N-S-I-S. to Kinder Morgan, I would like to know how many people they plan to poison today? I live a few hundred feet from the pump station and when I smell your odor, you're poisoning my family and about twenty other households in the immediate neighborhood, some with little children just beginning their lives.

Now, if you invoke eminent domain, will it be for the benefit of Europeans? My best estimate of export with this product is going to be about seventy percent as it stands now. That's not for Americans' benefit and it's not a matter of necessity under eminent domain. Our President wants us to go green for energy. He may not be the smartest guy in the world, but he's smart on this topic. Your project directly violates this policy and energy strategy.

Now, let's talk a little bit about stupidity. Originally last spring people came from Kinder Morgan to get permission to survey on my property. They showed me a professional map that showed the pipeline to run on the south side of the existing pipelines on my property. I already have two. I don't need another monster but being that they were going to put it on the south side, it looked like it was going to be an acceptable situation because the other lines that they put in fifties and the eighties they moved closer and closer to the north. This one, they were going to put on the south. Tolerable if it has to go through.

Two weeks ago, they showed up and moved the whole line to the north. I can't get a reason, I can't get an explanation except something about boring under the Hudson River they can't go on the south side, so they moved it to the north. On the north is a landslide region. They want to put this pipeline through an area of known landslides and I picture maybe a year or two after this pipeline is put in I can take a walk down there and take a look at it. I can see a pipeline hanging in the area because we live in a clay region.

When Mother Nature saturates the clay region, tops of hills end up in the valleys. It's already happened in three major areas down there and one of them is right on the north side of where this line is going to go. I urge you to deny this project.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We have numbers thirty-seven and thirty-eight, Dinera Pon and Andy Kainz.

MS. KAINZ: Yes, we're married. Ladies first. So I'm going to have him actually talk about why we moved here from Albany. By the way, we just moved here last week and we made our offer the end of May and this whole thing happened in between there so we are sort of coming in a little late in the game but I will talk about what I do have background in which is information security.

So I'm faculty in the University of Albany in Digital Forensics and I have been a Senior Research Analyst in New York State Center for Information for Insurance. I do teach actually about risk and about critical infrastructure. So I do have that background.

MR. TOMASI: Can you get a little closer to the mic, please.

MS. KAINZ: When you think about our risk, you think about the cost benefit. There is always benefits and there is always cost. The point is, right, that you want to increase the benefits so that they outweigh the costs. What do you think about when you are doing those sorts of calculations? You think about the assets, right? What's valuable? What's valuable in our communities are the agriculture, the wildlife, the families and the story and the history that we have here and not only what we're going to have now, but what we're going to have in the future.

Who's to say that some of these children who may not have been born because of infertility or something that is because of the pollution that we may not even know about won't even exist, right? When you think of threats, I was actually one of the people who created the New York State Information Classification Policy and what you think about threats are for information security are about health and safety impacts, financial impacts and impacts to the mission, right? Our mission could be considered also.

What's the mission for the government and for the public? What is your mission as a regulatory commission? I want to believe that you have our best interests at heart, I really do. So controls, right? You have things that are supposed to help reduce your risk. You want to reduce it as much as possible. The thing is that you don't want to accept any risk if you have an alternative that's just as good.

So it also turns out that I work with the co-lead for the IEEE Smart Grid Vision for 2030 so he created, it was actually listed as one of the best meetings in 2014 for the Smart Grid. With that technology, it's going to be created for communications of the electric grid and it will allow for micro-generation and with the presence of larger storage devices which will be able to store the energy, we will be able to preserve our electric grid and allow for less brownouts and blackouts because of the difference in fluctuation.

So, I don't believe that we really do need to put our risk into natural gas and that's progress. So, something that I really want to bring attention to is the controls. When we talk about information security, the persons who do the controls are the people who are taking on the risk. But here, we're not. They are not taking any of the risk. They do not have to pay for any of the controls. It's just like if you're cooking, if you're washing the dishes afterward, you are going to be careful. If you're not going to, who cares because someone else is going to be taking care of it.

By the way, surveys by a company, you want to make sure that it's by somebody else. There is less conflict. For base they have to have somebody else.

MR. TOMASI: Time is up. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next, Number thirty-eight.

MR. KAINZ: Good evening. My name is Andy Kainz, K-A-I-N-Z. My wife and I, as you heard, just moved in a few weeks ago. Actually we bought our, closed on July 1. We just moved in a little while ago. It's been a long process. It was exciting and then we saw the signs and we said 'Hey, what are those signs about? Seems like people are really against fracking here. Well we like the environment, that's cool.' We agree.

Both of us came from rural backgrounds. I grew up in Fulton County where there's not a lot other than grass and like farms. The tanning went away when the gloves went away, so that's cool. My wife came from down South and she had cows, I had cows down the street from me when I was growing up. So we came to Rensselaer County because it was quiet. At night you could see stars instead of the dull orange glow of Albany. If you like to see that, just look whatever direction Albany is. It is not that great.

But we came here because we wanted to have a nice, quiet place to live, to at some point in the relatively near future raise children and to just enjoy our lives because we visit our friends in Westerlo which is some other direction. It's very quiet and we wanted to have the same thing for ourselves. So we left Albany, which was loud and hot and you know, just sort of polluted. There is cars rushing by all the time but you don't even seem to think about it.

When we came here, it's just I walk outside and it's quiet absolutely quiet. I don't know what the deci-

bel rating would be but I bet it's a lot below that fifty-five which they say the average level is in the small pamphlet they had at the table and since that's a law of rhythmic scale, that means it's really a lot louder.

Also, going off on a tangent, we both do information security and these data systems that would be in place are, let's just say, laughably insecure because most of them don't really put a lot of effort into securing them properly. Now, maybe Kinder Morgan would do better than their previous record but I have no confidence in that because they've, as I've heard anecdotal evidence, had one of the worst safety records of all energy companies. I could be wrong. The anecdotal evidence that I've been presented could be wrong but I try not to gamble with my safety or the safety of the number of children and fantastic, very nice families that I met when we came to the first meeting this past weekend about this whole project. So thanks for listening. Have a great night. Please make this thing stop.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next we have Michelle Cross number thirty-nine. After Michelle Cross is Mary Theresa Julian.

MS. CROSS: Hello. I'm Michelle Cross, C-R-O-S-S. I live on 115 China Hill Road. I am within a half mile of the zone for the compressor station. I am also, my property is going to be abutted by the pipeline if it runs through.

I stand before you opposing the construction of the NED gas pipeline and the ninety thousand horsepower compressor station currently proposed for Clark's Chapel Road. I understand that a ninety thousand horsepower compressor station is about the equivalent of four locomotives. I used to work for Amtrak so I have a really good idea of how loud that is. My house right now, even with all of the surrounding woods, I can still hear boats, jet skis on Burden Lake. Not bothersome. I can hear the racetrack at Lebanon Valley, not bothersome.

If they bring in this compressor station they are going to cut trees down which is a natural sound buffer, which is going to make that compressor station much louder than Burden Lake or Lebanon Valley. My husband, my two small children and I live on approximately eighty-six acres in the Town of Nassau. We currently raise beef cattle, chickens. We organically grow our own vegetables. We chose this life for what it could provide for our children.

My concerns for the construction that I respectfully request FERC to fully investigate are as follows. The short term and long term impact from the noise pollution from a constantly running ninety thousand horsepower compression station and what it will have on the residents that are identified living within the half-mile zone. The environmental impact of air quality impacts, both short and long term of the emissions of a ninety-thousand horsepower compressor station. This study should include emissions from blow-downs, fugitive emissions as well as accidental emissions.

Even during normal operations, compressor stations have been shown to not emit uniformly. The measurement of tons per year while common in the industry and common in the environmental field where regional air quality is at issue is not an appropriate measure to determine individuals' health risk which increase during episodes of high exposures.

The environmental impact that the proposed gas pipeline will have on the waterways that it will cross, specifically the Valatie Kill Creek. Also the surrounding bodies of water including but not limited to the Burden Lakes, Crystal Lake, Mud Pond, Lyons Lake, Smith Pond, and the Nassau Sportsman's Pond must also be included in the study.

The study must also include the short term and long-term effects on groundwater as the potable water for most if not all the proposed areas originate from wells. A single vein of water can be drilled and feeding multiple homes. Once contaminated, these contaminates will permeate and spread throughout the water table and seep further into the soil making it nearly impossible to eradicate. It is no secret that what goes up must come down. The air pollution will ultimately result in soil and ground water contaminations.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next we have Mary Theresa Julian.

MS. JULIAN: Thank you. I'll reiterate one thing I did say last night and that is after consideration of all possible mitigation measures they are found to be inadequate to protect the natural and human environment, please return a no-action recommendation to the Commission. If you do return a recommendation, please recommend to the commission all possible mitigation measures available to address every identified impact.

New for tonight, I'm on my scribbled notes here. To subject people to these compressor stations is inhumane. Please include in your recommendations to the Commission the maximum mitigation measures. The vented gas needs to be filtered until levels are below acceptable standards and ensure that those standards are set by a mutual party with no vested interest in the natural gas industry. Likewise the noise and the light bulbs need to be mitigated to strict acceptable levels.

Do whatever it takes, please, to make that happen. Not to take these measures I believe would be a disservice to the American People who will not benefit from this project where corporate gain will be significant. If you cannot do this then you are by nature of your mission obligated to return a no-action recommendation because twelve thousand jobs are not enough of a public benefit to out-weight the adverse effects. When determining also another point when determining the value of public and agricultural land, please incorporate into your determinations the monitored values of environment goods and services. I don't know if you're familiar with this process. Okay, if you could please put a dollar amount on the goods and services provided by the environment. Please require from the contractor a definite and adequate plan in perpetuity for the safety and inspection of the pipeline in your recommendations and this cost is to be borne by the project.

Please consider relevant updated information when assessing the overall benefits on the impasse of natural gas and environment. This information should incorporate the significant air and water degradation documentation associated with the extraction process. Also, consider the cost of accidents that have happened over time and extrapolate that future and put that into the cost of this project. When determining the public benefits, whether they outweigh the adverse effects, please account for and take a comprehensive look at the resources inclusive of the extraction process. also please maintain objectivity in human regard by comparing this resource and its making to other resources and their net gain. We have heard a lot about solar.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MS. JULIAN: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up is number forty-three, Mike Marcier. Mike Marcier? Okay, moving on, number forty-four is Kathleen Pop. After Kathleen is number forty-six, Betty Ann Johnson.

MS. POMP: My name is Kathy Pop. I live in east Schodack. I also have a mother and a mother-in-law who live at Riverside Nursing Home in Castleton. Riverside Nursing Home is located within a mile of where the pipeline currently comes ashore. There are eighty people there. It is built in the side of the hill. It is not an easy place to evacuate. I hope you have taken them into consideration when you were planning.

I have a collection of seven other items that I have not heard and so I thought it was necessary to bring them to your attention. Part of the proposed pipeline is scheduled to go through Sacred Heart Cemetery in Castleton. It is not an area currently used so they will not exhume anyone and relocate them, but since pipelines last about fifty years, one can see that section of the cemetery being needed and the opportunity for a backhoe digger, who is digging six feet down to send the dearly departed to Heaven in suddenly quick and unexpected fashion could happen. A backhoe digging a grave next to a pipeline is not a good

scenario.

The FERC handouts say that most pipelines are buried thirty to thirty-six inches deep. Last winter the frost in this area reached an unprecedented five feet. One foot deeper than the local buildings department requires for footings. Many towns, particularly Nassau and lots of cities around here experience serious water main breaks, multiple water main breaks and gas pipeline breaks. Parts of the city of Troy were without gas heat for two weeks. So we know that pipelines that are buried are affected by frost. Please be sure that the Kinder Morgan pipeline is designed to withstand that kind of frost activity because it exists in this area.

I have some concerns about three pipelines running in tandem. The one that was built first dates back to the 1950's. It is bound to have deteriorated at some level. To run three of them together invites small catastrophes to become big catastrophes. Now Kinder Morgan held an informational meeting at the Green Meadow School in Schodack. They brought reference materials that they had prepared and they all referred to laws and statutes for the state of Massachusetts. Hello, this is New York.

They also brought maps to share with us for their proposed sites. There were maps of Albany, there were maps of Nassau. There were no maps of Schodack. So obviously they don't do their homework. Do they extend that to other things? The National Grid maintains these pipelines, the areas where the easements are. They spray herbicide approximately every three years. It kills the vegetation which is the easiest way for neighbors to detect leaks is dead vegetation. It is's already dead, how do you detect leaks?

Finally, there is lots of trespassing on that National Grid property. Snowmobiles, motocross bikes, et cetera, difficult for the police to enforce. Please consider those as well.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up, Betty Ann Johnsen. After Betty Ann Johnsen is number forty-seven, Shelly Geller.

MS. JOHNSEN: Hi. Betty Ann Johnsen, J-O-H-N-S- E-N. I didn't really have anything prepared tonight, just want to reiterate a lot of what my neighbors have said before. I am concerned about our aquifer. We have wonderful water here. I would really, really hate to see anything happen to it. Contamination with benzene and formaldehyde and all the other known and unknown carcinogens that are in fracked gas.

Our air quality is wonderful being up on the Rensselaer Plateau. I would like to keep it that way. The fact that there would be additional green space required for the pipeline in its current designated route as opposed to the previous route, there was no rationale given as to why. Why the change? You said early on tonight we can't just move it from not in my backyard to someone else's backyard but that is exactly what Kinder Morgan has already done.

The size of this pipeline and the increased pressure, I don't believe that it's necessary. If Kinder Morgan was made to clean up the existing leaks and use sufficient strength in the piping and clean up their own inadequate maintenance record that would go a long way to meet the so called need for this additional gas. I don't think eminent domain for private domain, that's not what our forefathers meant by this. Exporting gas to Europe and Asia for a higher price while we're made to fund or we're the only ones who are being asked to take any risk that is just not acceptable.

The compressor station, everyone has talked about the noise and the air quality but what about the constant vibration, the hum that goes along with it. I saw a youtube video of a town in Pennsylvania where people that lived in close proximity dealt with a constant hum. A woman went around numerous times daily just straightening pictures on the walls in her home. That's got to affect your wellbeing and your sanity at some point.

One last point, the Iran negotiations. The treaty that was just announced yesterday that's supposed to be easing sanctions with Iran and bringing them into the international community making all kinds of oil available to the international community and further depressing the price of oil, therefore no need for additional gas. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up is forty-seven, Shelly Geller.

MS. GELLER: That's G-E-L-L-E-R. Tennessee gas is now scheduled to file its formal application in October. The public comment period needs to be changed as well. The new deadline should be September 30th. Not August 31st. Recent studies have been done by such organizations as the AMA and Medical Society of the State of New York which state that the 'support legislation that they require a comprehensive health impact assessment regarding the health risks that may be associated with natural gas pipelines.' Time is needed for such an assessment.

Another in a series of ongoing resolutions issued by town and county governing bodies was just released by Rensselaer County in support of the AMA Resolution that I just alluded to and asking 'The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation to implement an immediate freeze on new air and water quality permits for Kinder Morgan.' Time is needed to examine the implications of the AMA's resolution.

FERC needs to stop, take a breath, step back from the pell-mell rush to grow the fossil fuel infrastructure and evaluate what we really need right now, more capacity, new laterals, loops and roof directions have been added, subtracted and then altered and we still don't know precisely where the thing is going to be until Tennessee Gas issues a concise plan with maps clearly identifying all the land, roads and rivers it intends to bury it's pipe under, there ought to be a delay in the permitting process to give the public a chance to examine the project as it really is, not as it might be.

FERC should require Kinder Morgan to resolve all of the things that have a 'to be determined status'. Once all of the TBDs have been resolved, then and only then should the permitting process be continued. How can you approve or disapprove of what isn't? You can issue contingency orders in the hopes that a company will either comply or be penalized by a regulatory party. But we all know that the regulatory enforcement agencies, like FIBSA is hard-pressed to enforce anything.

Of course, that is not FERC's concern but it is ours. Why don't we admit the truth, that nobody has the time or resources to adequately reflect on what our future energy needs and policies should be when we are rushing ahead, knee-jerking our way to a possibly disastrous future. Let's slow the process down and do the necessary research into the cause and effect and determine what the real trade-offs should and should not be. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next, number forty-eight, Libby Reilly.

MS. REILLY: I'm Libby Reilly and I've already talked pretty extensively yesterday but I just wanted to speak for the residents for Slip Cove Road. It's a road that runs parallel to Clark's Chapel Road and comes to a dead end. It is a dirt road. It's about a single lane and that would have to be the access road for them to get in to lay the pipe. It is also extremely close to the compressor station. If something were to happen at the compressor station and move down pipe, these residents houses are literally fifty feet to two hundred feet from this pipe. They all have children. It would be detrimental. I ask that that be looked into.

If there were something to happen at that compressor station how would these residents that are on top of this pipeline get out safely and effectively when this is a dead end road and it's extremely hard to even get away? I didn't really prepare anything for tonight. I just had some extra stuff I wanted to give you.

I also pulled some stuff off about the honeybees because a lot of us that live/surround the compressor station have them and the EPA tracks the levels of one hundred and seventy-seven air pollutants and they are all listed out here. Dust sticks to bees due to electrostatic charge and are carried back to the hive where they are inadvertently mixed with the pollen in the bee breed. Volatiles accumulate and may even bio-concentrate inside the bodies of bees and may be absorbed by the beeswax as bees ventilate the hive.

It lists all the toxins that come out of this compressor station. I myself have two beehives. I hear China Hill Road has them, Slip Cove Road has them. We all have them. I mean, it's kind of sad that we have

to put our bees ahead of human lives but -- and also if they can do a bat survey in the area. I do know we have quite a few of them because they have dive-bombed me in my house.

Alright, thank you so much for your time and I greatly appreciate it.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up would be number forty-nine, Janet Tobia and then after that is fifty, Tom Tobia.

MS. TOBIA: My name is Janet Tobia, T-O-B-I-A and I live in the town of Schodack on Nassau Lake. My husband and I moved upstate twenty-nine years ago. We swapped the sounds of the elevated trains and the sirens of the city for the honking of geese, the chirping of birds and the croaking of bullfrogs. We have raised our family here and now we live with two young adult children, two rescue dogs and five rescue cats.

I love our home very much and our town and I don't want it ruined by this monstrosity threatening our very lives. We are under attack. That's how I feel and it seems that way very much. A large and rich corporation is planning to destruct our river, our lakes, our streams, our roads and our homes and the quality of our lives. Please don't allow Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Pipeline and gas to slowly poison our air and our water.

Unknown toxic chemicals and methane can leak out of these pipes. The ninety thousand horsepower compressor station planned for Clark's Chapel Road will belch toxins into our air for miles around. If there is an explosion, our volunteer firefighters will be helpless to protect us because they can't now what's burning because of the proprietary rights that Kinder Morgan has on their chemicals.

What about our rights? We're trying to recover from the effects of the nearby Dewey Loeffel dumpsite, which is now a Superfund Site. We don't need this attack also. This project will not benefit us. It will only hurt us. Please help us move out of the dinosaur age and move away from our dependence on fossil fuels. Please help us move into the 21st century where we belong with an emphasis on renewable resources.

We as Americans could be the progressive leader of the rest of the world instead of a slave to a filthy and greedy industry. Please don't help Kinder Morgan slowly poison us.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up, number fifty, Tom Tobia. After Tom Tobia is Margaret Dolen.

MR. TOBIA: Good evening. Tom Tobia, Schodack Resident, T-O-B-I-A. This proposed pipeline will be a mile away from my home and the compressor station will be three miles. Air quality in Rensselaer County New York, on a scale of one to one hundred, one hundred being the best as reported by the EPA is ninety-five. The United States as a whole is ninety-three. This is based on the ozone alert days and the number of pollutants in the area.

Last year, David Carpenter, Director of the Institute of Public Health and the Environment of the University of Albany conducted a study of such compressor stations in five states and found unsafe amounts of human carcinogens that were released into the air. In 1964, Governor Rockefeller first outlined the Pure Waters Program, with the bold proposal that the people of the State of New York spend one billion dollars to clean up lakes, rivers and coastal waters. This approval launched the largest and most comprehensive water pollution program in the world. New York's Pure Water Program laid the groundwork for the Federal Clean Water Act that was adopted in 1972.

For the past fifty years, the residents of Rensselaer County and the State of New York have worked hard to preserve and protect the quality of our air and water resources. As stated during this comment period by many of the residents in our town and county officials, none of us are convinced that this project will serve any value to our community or county that we have fought to protect.

January 1, 1970, the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA is a United States environmental law that established a US national policy promoting the enhancement of our environment. NEPA is one of the most emulated statutes in the world and is often referred to as the modern day environmental Magna Carta.

Based on the current State and Federal environmental laws in place today, the Energy Regulatory Commission FERC, the governing body of oil pipelines must deny the placement of this pipeline and the compressor station.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up, number fifty- one Margaret Dolen. After Margaret Dolen is fifty-two, David Barnard.

MS. DOLEN: My name is Margaret Dolen, D-O-L-E-N and I live on Reno Road in the town of Schodack. Tonight, I am speaking not only as a local resident but as a public school teacher in the State of New York. I would like to read you a small part of the Next Generation's Science Standards. If you are not familiar with current education, NGSS is the equivalent of a common core curriculum for science. It outlines the basic principles that must be taught in school to children in grades kindergarten through twelve.

So I will begin my quote Next Generation Science Standards number ESS3 Section D. 'Human activities, such as the release of greenhouse gases from burning fossil fuels are major factors in the current rise in Earth's mean surface temperature reducing the levels of climate change and reducing human vulnerability to whatever climate changes do occur depend on the understanding of climate sitings, engineering capabilities and other kinds of knowledge, such as understanding of human behavior and applying that knowledge wisely in decisions and activities.'

As a science teacher, I am required to teach that the main cause of global warming is the emission of greenhouse gases. That the main cause of greenhouse gases is burning of fossil fuels and the main solution is the adoption of alternative energy sources. As public school teachers, we strive to teach students the concept and skills needed to produce the scientists and engineers of the near future, the people to whom society depends to develop alternative energy sources.

Why then would a Federal Agency, in this day and age even consider building an infrastructure intended to transport a fossil fuel, particularly when this particular infrastructure and this particular type of fuel has such a potential to cause harm to the very children that we teach? Secondly, why would Kinder Morgan at their open house right here at Green Meadow School in the Town of Schodack, prominently display posters that downplayed and disrespected the use of solar and wind power and promoted the use of natural gas as an energy source?

If there is such a need for energy production in the United States, shouldn't all types of energy production be welcomed? The answer to me is simple. There is no need, there is only corporate greed. Basically, every school-aged child in the United States is being taught in school that this is the wrong thing to do. I cannot suggest any alternative location for this project. There should be no pipeline. That is what my students would say. As a sixth grade teacher, I hope the people who make these decisions are at least as smart as a sixth grader. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next up is number fifty-two David Barnard. After that is fifty-three, James Dolen.

MR. BARNARD: My name is David Barnard and I am from Delmar, New York near Albany and I am here to support all those living in these communities. I am a research scientist now retired and my main field is physics and engineering so I speak from the point of view of energy. I speak directly to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. You need to be concerned about the progress of energy development and energy projects in our nation, absolutely.

These projects require a much deeper analysis of energy solutions and is the technology up to date? These are the questions that you need to answer. What are the serious impacts of greenhouse gas emissions?

How much gas, coal, nuclear, solar or wind? How does it affect our communities?

Your charge is to assure that appropriate technology is applied to the Nation's Energy Transmission System. It appears that the impact of this pipeline on populations near compressor sites is very serious, serious enough to require independent design and planning. There is a basic conflict of interest with profit and impact on populations and environmental issues.

This mandates that this nationwide design plan be independent of business or gas companies. All public stakeholders should have a say before the plans are firmed up by pipeline industries. It would appear in the present plan shown to the public are much too late in the design process. This public hearing process is done in such a way as to limit the effectiveness of the public input into the planning process. That is to say that the industry has already set the technical design and routing priorities, the public must accept the plan without much ability to change.

It would seem that large energy-hungry compressor stations that produce tremendous noise, pollution and leaked gas are outdated technology. It would seem that as we plan for the future we need to require a noise-free, pollution-free technology.

MR. TOMASI: Thirty seconds.

MR. BARNARD: Why can't a nation that can send people to the moon, send a probe to Pluto produce quieter gas infrastructure? Why can't we have a nonpolluting infrastructure? The answer is that we can, we can if agencies in our government like FERC and all stakeholders present prevent short-sighted profit motives from taking technological shortcuts.

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time is up.

MR. BARNARD: we pay taxes to support things like FERC and --

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time is up.

MR. BARNARD: we are concerned citizens that the communities and this Nation require you to make more proactive role in designing our future. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Do you want me to take that, sir? Thank you. Next up is David Dolen -- James Dolen, I apologize. After James Dolen is number fifty-four, Mark Mincher.

MR. DOLEN: I am James Dolen D-O-L-E-N, Reno Road in Schodack. Yesterday you mentioned, I think it was PL99-3 that gave some guidance on the process. I downloaded the three PDFs today and tried to read through them. They're very complicated. I am an experienced environmental engineer and have written Environmental Impact Statements and approved them but those documents are so complex I request that FERC provide the funding to the local anti-pipeline organization to fund environmental studies, independent environmental studies, not governed by FERC but run by the environmental organizations as well as provide legal representation for lawyers qualified and experienced in FERC proceedings. Maybe sixty to one hundred thousand dollars, I'm not sure but the proceedings and the engineering are so complicated, the citizens really are being steamrolled by Kinder Morgan and potentially FERC.

Secondly, the public needs all details of the project, not just that governed by FERC. It needs the details covered by DOT and other involved agencies. Why aren't they here? Where are the DOT hearings? They have the safety standards for this but they are not here.

(Applause)

MR. DOLEN: They need to have hearings as well. Ideally, the proceedings should be joint with FERC with all involved agencies. Lastly, the Commissioners must decide based on the benefits versus the harm and I don't know exactly how it's put in your documents. It's something like that. How do you put a price on the quality of life? How do you put a price on sitting out on your deck at night, or sitting out on the lawn and listening to the peepers and the birds and the crickets and so forth? You know, how do you value that? Most of us value that.

Your book here says requirements are for fifty- five decibels 24-hour average. There could be loud noises, low noises. There should be no noise from this project in the community that it's in. This is not reasonable for the folks that live close to these facilities have to be subject to noise. The pipeline shouldn't be anywhere near those homes. Secondly, vibration, light, emissions. It's not fair to, all those things need to be considered and the visual impact.

The air modeling needs to be done. There's no air-modeling data. Certainly the data from the Albany Airport can't be used since it's so far away. So do ten years of air studies before you even consider this project. Lastly, conduct studies at existing conditions at Kinder Morgan facilities of noise, vibration, light, etc. Give us those studies at their facilities and then we can come back here and you can present that to us. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Number fifty-four Mark Mitcher. Is Mark Mitcher here? No? Next up number fifty-five Thomas Heckman.

MR. HECKMAN: Thomas Heckman, H-E-C-K-M-A-N. I'm living in east Schodack on Route 150. Important to me is the aquifer. Important to New York State is the quality of water. It's one of the basic riches that we have. I'm really worried about the effects on the aquifer. There isn't a price, because there isn't a way to clean and aquifer once it's gone. I mean, a lot of the drinking water that people deal with and the wells are quite a distance. I'm not very confident right now on the track record of the big energy providers and for our regulatory agencies.

People earlier talked about the bifurcation of all of these rules. Well 'it's a Federal responsibility, it's a State, it's a County', you know, who's really providing the safety standards? I'm hoping FERC does and is looking at this. I know that we've had problems with the bomb trains and whoever said we should put them in those kinds of tin cans and have them explode all over the place.

It's not a question of does it do it. It's not a question of whether or not the scientific folks who work for Kinder Morgan or who work for various oil companies don't know about this. It's not that they don't have the ability to do better because certainly they do. So the issue really to me is where's the need? And if the need is overseas why are we dealing with any kind of hardship, any kind of health safety or monetary impact?

I just put in solar and geo in my house. Those technologies exist now. They have payouts. They don't have a big infrastructure. You don't have to buy up lots of land. You don't have to put burdens on other people. You just have to put something on top of your roof and certainly if you walk into a Home Depot or what have you, you are going to get accosted by someone who says 'I'll give you the infrastructure. I'll put it up and I will give you a reduction in your cost.'

So there is no reason why we should have any risks that we have to take on when we have geo, solar, wind. We have all of what we need to meet all of our energy needs. We really should be dealing with distributed distribution of the electric works. We need to be working on future technology not locking ourselves into old and already obsolete technology which we are doing now with this pipeline. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, sir. Next is Elizabeth Croft.

MR. CROFT: My name is Elizabeth Croft. I am from River Road in Schodack. I'm a school nurse, a public health official but I'm here today as a woman of faith. I believe that this area is sacred ground. I don't know if anyone has spoke that to you or not but there are many creatures who live here that can't speak for themselves and I would say exactly what the man who just spoke before me, that my husband and I have had solar power for about ten years. We have been off oil for about ten years for heating our home. We will soon be buying an electric car. We are not on oil. Oil is of the past.

I also wanted to thank our elected officials who spoke at the beginning of these hearings because they spoke for all of us. Please listen to them. Please also make the following assessments. Please study

economic impact analysis. Make an economic impact analysis to quantify what jobs will be created. How much will those jobs make in local economy. How much will that cost of the rural farms, the beekeepers, the maple syrup industry, the strawberries? All of our local agriculture. How much is that going to cost in relation to a dead industry pipeline? Quantify those resource losses. I call upon FERC to do a comprehensive health impact assessment. Study our health now. I know as a school nurse I have many students with asthma. I have many students with anxiety based on allergies, chemical sensitivities. They're already here. I want to know how many are here now so that we know how to better protect them from developing more.

I ask FERC to implement a comprehensive air quality assessment. We know the plateau air, the higher air is good. We also know the valley air is not good. We also have a piece of land up in northern Albany County. We can see when we come back into the valley, we can see the air. So please do that.

We would also like to study the actual impact assessments on the micro on the small light compressor stations and give us those numbers and give us the real numbers on what we could expect out of this behemoth. Also, moving a compressor station from a populated area to a non-populated area will not have an impact on the overall effect of the environment.

It's not a question of what can be done. We know you can do this but is it the right thing to do and I say no.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Thank you very much. That was the last speaker that actually signed up. If there is anyone else who would like to speak I would invite them to come up now. Again, please speak your name to the court reporter if you would like to come up and speak or add to any of your previous comments.

SPEAKER: I just want to say that I really lost it when that yellow light went off and I lost my whole thing of what I wanted to say was also that I have thirty-three solar panels that I bought that are made in the United States. It costs two thousand dollars more to get solar panels made in the USA. I feed the grid with clean energy and clean energy is that thing I passed around from Haas in Albany, that study that was done not by Haas, it was done by someone else, tells that the jobs are in green energy.

They are not in coal, they are not in oil, they are not in fracked gas. Like everyone has said, it's old. The future is green and I hope that you don't do this. I drove through these people's neighborhood the other day. I got lost trying to get to K's Pizza, where you really should go and get the best pizza in the area over on Burden Lake

MR. TOMASI: I wished I'd known that earlier.

SPEAKER: I got lost. You should put it in your GPS and go by this street. It is unbelievable how beautiful. I have lived here all my life. I lived in Schodack for ten years. I have never been on your street. I got lost there. I saw the big sign that said this is where the compressor station is going. I stopped my car and I just wanted to cry because this is wrong. It is wrong to this to these people. It's wrong, it's a sin.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Would anyone else like to speak?

MR. SERIO: Yes, John Serio again. You mentioned that it was important to get comments as early in the process as possible to FERC. My understanding is that there is a deadline for the comment period so I would respectfully request that all comments whether you get them today or you get them on the last day of comment period need to be scrutinized and given equal weight and they need a thorough review by FERC. It can't be that we are getting comments now based on documents that are not complete.

So you might get comments at the very end that need to be looked at, scrutinized and reviewed and evaluated just like any other comment. Whether or not it's because new information was provided, the rule is

you can give comments by a certain date. All those comments need to be looked at. I do appreciate your giving us guidance but I would urge you to emphasize all the comments equally.

MR. TOMASI: I want to go ahead and point out too since I was taking a few questions tonight. I thought I emphasized this a little earlier that we would answer comments regardless of whether they are filed within the formal comment period or not. I mean, even after the application throughout the entire application process, if you file a comment we will address it. However, if you -- the later, there is a practical limit to what we could do when it comes to getting a comment. If we are in the process of printing a document we can't answer comments at that point.

We will have to answer it in for instance the final document or in for instance if we also get comments after the final EIS, we will answer those issues within the order. So we never really stop answering your questions however there is, I would like to say, for large things that require a large amount of study, please get those to us early so that we can do the most of that study that we possibly can, not that we will shrink on it later but we want to make sure we get it earlier so that we can really could see how viable those alternatives, how viable those in terms of addressing to complete. So that's what I mean.

The comment period is again, we always have people that have requested, people have requested tonight for instance, we want a longer comment period. We never stop accepting comments, we never stop responding to comments. So regardless of whether you make it within the formal comment period or not we will address you concerns. For instance, we had two thousand comments before we issued the NOI. We don't just ignore those. We will address those.

So I just want to assure you that we will address those. Now I can't guarantee you will necessarily like exactly the way we responded however we have to address everything. That is a requirement and we will do that. So we wanted to make sure everyone is clear on that particular issue. Any other comments or questions? This gentleman is walking up here so, come on sir.

SPEAKER: I just had a question about the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. The way I understand this, we are going through the scoping meeting, we are bringing issues to you which you want to ask Kinder Morgan to address. There is already data out there on a lot of these things. These compressors exist in different places. There are ninety thousand horsepower compressors that are out there now that are emitting that there is data for this, okay.

We are going to go through this process and do a draft EIS, have more comments and then an EIS and then at that point you decide whether there is a public convenience and necessity. Is that correct?

MR. TOMASI: Well I certainly do not decide that.

SPEAKER: No, I'm just saying that this is the process.

MR. TOMASI: The Commissioner, yes.

SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. TOMASI: Again, we do the environmental document, we do the impacts and then I want to point out too that one of the things, one of the reasons why we hire contractors like Cardno is they have capabilities for instance that if the company doesn't provide us the answer we want, that gives us the capability to independently do those studies internally using both internally at FERC as well as using Cardno. Well, once we go ahead and get those studies done and we have the IES and we finalize the EIS, that is a recommendation to the Commissioners. The Commissioners use the EIS as well as the environmental data in the EIS as well as other criteria to decide whether it's in the Public Convenience and Necessity and whether we should move forward or not.

SPEAKER: So the data, essentially the bulk of the data that's being provided in this is coming from the Applicant?

MR. TOMASI: That is correct, however we review everything that they file. That's why --

SPEAKER: No I understand that.

MR. TOMASI: That's why there are so many interrogatories, and like I said we will if need be, allow you to see some of the information that they have provided us.

SPEAKER: But this data is out there. There is, these pipelines are on the ground in places, these compressor stations are emitting now.

MR. TOMASI: I see your point, I see your point.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it not reasonable that FERC and the DEC and the EPA would go out and sample what is currently out there and come up with the data points without asking Kinder Morgan to do this. This is something that to me should be part of the process, before you ask these folks that are applying for this to come up with their own figures and then when all is said and done we then decide public convenience and necessity, which is supposed to be the balance of the impacts of all these things against the public good and I would like to see that public good quantified and I would like there to be a number since that seems to be what we are asking about here, what is that public good?

Does it count that it goes in Richard Kinder's pocket or is it public good for all the public? The word here is public. This is not Exxon which is a stock-holding company, which my next door neighbor or my grandmother or my great aunt has stock in. This is Kinder and Morgan, this is two gentlemen who own a very large company and are worth multiple billions of dollars a-piece. So I ask you to balance public convenience and necessity against private gain. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Obviously, you did bring up a question which I want to go ahead and discuss briefly that there is data out there along the compressor station so why don't we just go ahead and do it ourselves. One of the most important things for us is we need to know the site-specific impact of these projects. Just to give you, we know that knowing what the manufacturer of these turbines are, we can tell you what the emission rate is going to be.

However, without knowing the topography, the exact configuration of what each of those stacks are going to be, the stack height, the temperature, the elevation, the ambient general average temperature, the meteorological mixing height, all of that very site-specific data, we can't tell you what the actual exposure levels are or going to be. So we need to know what the actual design of the facility is before to do with that sort of data. All of that is site-specific so that's one of the things that we need that design information to figure out.

We don't design this project. The company designs it and gives it to us for review. So we can certainly go back and review some of that. Generally they give data on specific engines or equipment and we will do that. However we need to understand how it's going to be configured on a site-specific way to understand how the impacts are going to be to the environment and to the local citizenry. Okay, questions? We've got several here so. To my right, sir, could you tell it tonight otherwise I can't, it's not going to be on the record.

SPEAKER: Alright. I was trying to get an idea of what the public good out of this is going to come. I have heard that New York State isn't going to get any of the gas. I'm not sure if anybody in the United States is going to get any of the gas and I'm not sure compared to for example all of these people who are doing the alternative energy piece.

It seems to me that if there was an RFP to come up with X amount of energy needed in a county, a state, a region that those people who provide the other potentially less risky types of energy and certainly some economically much more beneficial to this country let alone any of the employees, it seems that there are people out there who would respond to it. So is this just looking at Kinder Morgan by themselves and what exactly is the good that a country or the state is going to get out of doing this?

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: That's not really a question I can answer right now. It's something that the Commission and the Commissioner are going to have to answer. My job is to do the Environmental Impact Statement,

not necessarily to talk about, to approve or disapprove the project.

SPEAKER: Well the application supposedly was saying we are going to provide this need. I am trying to get a clear picture of what considering New York State and the Country, what need did they say they are going to provide for us? Are we looking at any other alternatives? Are we looking at just this project? So I don't know what the answer to what the need is that they are saying that they are going to do that we say we have and who's the we whose going to get it? The extra electricity or the extra energy? Isn't that something that is already known?

MR. TOMASI: Right. Well, as I mentioned before, they've identified a certain amount of delivery amount, not the fully subscribed 2.2-bcf. They will have to identify all of their customers prior for the Commission for the Commission to decide whether it is needed or not. We have another question?

SPEAKER (OFF MIC): When are they required to disclose?

MR. TOMASI: The question is when are they required to disclose that information? They will have to have this in to Commission when they decide on, when they decide on the order. They will have to file it prior to the Commissioner's order. Any other questions? I am willing to take about two or three questions now.

SPEAKER: Very short one. Yes, very simple. When will the next revised resource report be available to the general public?

MR. TOMASI: Kinder Morgan has told us they will file that within the next couple of weeks. Alright, will that be the last iteration of that. That will be the last iteration of the draft resource reports prior to their application. Once they file their application in October they will go ahead and that will be their final set of resource reports that they will file and they should be complete.

However, I want to point out that once we look at the draft resource reports here in July, we have in the past, I can't say that we have in this instance, we have seen draft resource reports even in the second and third iteration where we were not happy with them and we told the company to go back and give us another draft before you file your application.

Now, having said that, the company can pull out a pre-filing any time they wish and simply file their application. Then we have to review it.

SPEAKER: So what is the target percentage of 'to be determined' that will be left in that report that will be accepted?

MR. TOMASI: I can't. I don't know. It has to do with, but I can't give you a specific 'oh, it's seventy-five percent.' We want to make sure that the vast majority of the information is in this draft resource report. If it is full of holes and full of data gaps then that's going to be a problem. We want to make sure, since this is the second iteration that it is a very robust set of resource reports.

We will allow certain things to be TBD, but again, they need to provide us when they are going to get us this information. They could just say 'oh, it's TBD, we will get it to you when we get around to it'. No, we want them to file this. We want them to file the resource reports for anything that is not available yet or anything that we have asked them, you need to let us know when you are going to have this information available because we don't want to be waiting around for six, eight months to get that; because just like people have said earlier, you deserve that information to be in the public domain so you can look at it and review it.

So we will take a look at this and you will see more questions back to the company and many of those questions will in fact be some of the issues that were brought up tonight.

SPEAKER: So will the comment period be extended if that data is not presented in a timely fashion?

MR. TOMASI: I can't really speak to that at this point. At this point we would have to look and see how those resource reports look.

SPEAKER: Alright, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next, why don't you guys just line up and we will get to the last of you.

SPEAKER: I wonder if the sound in this room is fifty-five decibels?

MS. SPEAKER: Ha ha, good question. I have a comment and a question. You mentioned that you have to understand the design of the compressor station in order to evaluate potential exposures.

MR. TOMASI: Yes.

MS. SPEAKER: My comment is, right now there are no potential exposures to the compression station in our town so any potential exposures in addition to what's there now is just not acceptable.

The other thing is the issue about the comments written versus verbal are given equal weight. What I want to know is are the comments individually or in total given really any weight at all in the decision-making process.

MR. TOMASI: Yes. I mean your comments are very important. We respond to every concern that is brought up to us.

MS. SPEAKER: I know you respond, but is there, do the comments have any influence on the decision-making process?

MR. TOMASI: On the Commissioners?

MS. SPEAKER: Yes, on the Commissioners and for FERC.

MR. TOMASI: Well, for the Commissioners our influence would be they get our document. We will address your comments in our document and they, and I've worked with the Commissioner's staff on all of my projects. The Commissioner's staff asks a lot of very pointed questions when they get EISs and EAs. They understand that the public is very concerned about these projects and the impacts that those are going to have on the community. So when they're voting on this, the Commissioners inform their staff that they want to know what the concerns of the people are.

For instance, in my last project, it was an LNG facility in Texas. The Commissioners asked a lot of questions about, how is this community going to be impacted? It's a very small community next to a very large facility. So they asked a lot of very pointed questions about how is business going to be affected? How's traffic going to be affected? How's noise? How's air quality. They are very concerned about that because of the populations in those areas where those facilities are built are a concern. So they see this and they are aware of that because we address those in that document.

As well as the Commission's assistants, they are people just like everyone else. They have families, they have mothers, they have daughters, they are also concerned because they can put themselves in your shoes. They would want to know what these impacts are going to be and they want it to be delineated in these documents so that the public can understand what could happen.

MS. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MS. SPEAKER: I have two questions if I might. I would like to know the status of the two other alternative routes being considered. Are those being considered on equal basis to the one that we have been discussing or are they in other words, will Kinder Morgan be required to provide all the same data for all these three alternatives?

MR. TOMASI: Well, what we do, you might have seen the data request question which I sent to Kinder Morgan regarding some of these alternatives. We've got a large listing of issues that we want to see in this. We will analyze them side-by-side. If at all, once we get to the point where some of the alternatives become truly where we get all the data and we are like 'this is something we need to take a much harder look at'. We come out for additional meetings along those routes because it's not fair for the people living along those routes not to get meetings like you have here.

So if some of those routes, if once we start looking at them a lot harder if it's something that we may end up recommending under the deliberation process of the EIS, we will have to come out for additional scoping meetings along those routes.

SPEAKER: Thank you. Also, I understand that the impact zone has been expanded from half a mile to a

mile along that line.

MR. TOMASI: That term doesn't necessarily. The only thing when it comes to pipelines is something called the 'potential impact radius' that is related to both pressure and the diameter of the pipeline. That is defined in the DOT, again, I should know this off of the top of my head but I don't. I meant to look it up a little earlier so I could tell you but that is what delineates what the potential impact radius is along either side of the pipeline. That is a calculation different for every pipeline because every pipeline has a slated pressure and when I mean pressure, I mean maximum allowable operating pressure or MAOP and diameter.

So that's what it is. It's the distance from either side from there. It varies and that's something will actually have in the document. So we will explain what that is. We will have that distance in there so people can understand anybody within the potential impact radius or not.

MS. SPEAKER: So that will be --

MR. TOMASI: The one mile is, I have never seen a potential impact radius that wide.

MS. SPEAKER: Okay, but when will we know then?

MR. TOMASI: That information will be in the EIS.

MS. SPEAKER: In the EIS, in the draft EIS?

MR. TOMASI: Depending on Kinder Morgan we might actually file that information as part of their resource report.

MS. SPEAKER: But it will be in the draft EIS?

MR. TOMASI: Yes, we will, it will definitely be in the draft EIS, yes.

MS. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: This is going to be the last question of the night.

MS. SPEAKER: I don't have really a question, I have a comment that New York State has had tax on our electric bill since about 1996 is my guess that is supposed to go toward alternative energy. Why are we putting fracked gas through New York State when we are trying to get alternative energy, clean energy, green energy?

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Since that wasn't a question, I'm going to take one more question. There you go.

MS. SPEAKER: You said when the commissioners meet and consider whether to issue a certificate of public need and convenience they consider the evidence or the final EIS statement. But you also make reference to other criteria. Could you tell us what they are?

MR. TOMASI: The criteria varies. I mean, the Commissioners can really, as I mentioned in last night's meeting, they can use multiple criteria. Some of the criteria that they use will be well what are the rates going to be? What is the gas supply like from where the pipeline is coming from? What is the market like to where it is going to? Is it going to decrease or increase the cost of gas to consumers? Is it going to, for instance, is the tariff going to be acceptable?

For instance, is the pipeline going to be built by a company that is technically competent. They can use things like opposition to the pipeline both political and local. They can use pipeline support if people are in favor. They can look at the economic benefits of the pipeline or economic detriments of the pipeline. They can look at any factors that they wish to make their decision and the Environmental Impact Statement is one element of that. As I stated earlier when they will put together what is called their decision-making order, there will be an environmental insert that will address environmental concerns and then will also include an environmental attachment which will have all the environmental conditions that we would recommend in the FEIS. That is only if the Commission approves the project. If they deny it, then they

simply deny it.

MS. SPEAKER: Has the Commission ever denied an application based on an EIS.

MR. TOMASI: There was, it was an LNG facility that was denied because it violated certain safety rules.

MS. SPEAKER: Okay, is that the sole example that you have?

MR. TOMASI: That's the last one I can remember, yes.

MS. SPEAKER: Okay, are there many?

MR. TOMASI: The last three projects the Commission does approve.

MS. SPEAKER: So as I understand this process, all the information that FERC is taking in really goes to mitigation and rarely if ever is used except I guess in the case of this LNG --

MR. TOMASI: Liquefied natural gas facility.

MS. SPEAKER: Where I guess there must be evident clear safety violations? This is all for mitigation.

This is not directed toward the ultimate decision of whether to approve or not to approve. Would you say that generally that's a fair statement?

MR. TOMASI: I can't speak for the Commissioners. They can do -- my job is to do the environmental document.

MS. SPEAKER: No but you're aware of their prior decisions.

MR. TOMASI: I'm aware of their decisions but ultimately my job is to ensure that regardless of their decision, if they do choose to build this project, if they do choose to approve this project that we actually build this in a way that has the least environmental impact that we possibly can. Again, there is no guarantee that the Commission will approve it. They obviously have the option to deny it and one of the things as I mentioned last night and I think tonight as well, the Commission often looks at 'well, is this project going to be overbuilt? Does it have customers? Right now we have to see whether this project is truly viable because they have not provided us all their customers. Obviously, that's not my particular area of expertise, my job is to do the environmental impact statement and that's my job here, that's why I'm here and ultimately the whole role of this is to minimize the impacts as much as possible and look at alternative routes which will minimize the impacts as much as possible for me. I mean, obviously, we encourage you to write letter to us saying we shouldn't go along with this pipeline. We understand that and I'm certainly sympathetic to that, however my job is to do the environmental view.

MS. SPEAKER: Right, but we're here, I mean, we want information also. We want to know what is the meaning of our efforts? What is reasonable to expect of FERC when we share with you our environmental concerns? We need to know, are we sharing this in the hopes that these are very persuasive, persuasive enough that it's likely this project will be denied or are we here knowing that this project is probably going to be approved despite our environmental concerns and that really the reason we are here is to make sure that the inevitable pipeline does the minimal damage.

MR. TOMASI: I can't speak for the Commissioners. All I can say is we look --

MS. SPEAKER: Of course you can't but you are the Commission's representative.

MR. TOMASI: Yes.

MS. SPEAKER: And these are legitimate questions. People here are bearing their hearts and souls, their lives, their lifetimes, their investments and I think we're entitled to be clear about what is likely and what is not. MR. TOMASI: Like I stated earlier, the vast majority of projects, although they may not end up the same way they come in to us, the vast majority of the pipeline projects are approved by the Commission.

MS. SPEAKER: Okay, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: We're going to go ahead and -- ma'am?

MS. SPEAKER: Just a quick question. Shouldn't the customers be in the United States in the forty-eight

contiguous states and not outside?

MR. TOMASI: Your question is shouldn't the customers be in the US contiguous states and not outside the U.S.? Again, that's not something I can really address. Again, that's for the Commissioners to decide. They have to make their decision on what is again in the public convenience and necessity and they're going to have to make their decision. My job is simply to write the Environmental Impact Statement and try to minimize the impacts as much as practical.

So again, I want to thank you for coming out tonight. We are going to close the meeting now and everyone drive home safe.

(Whereupon, at 10:45 p.m., the evening scoping meeting concluded.)

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF: : Project No.
NORTHEAST ENERGY PIPELINE PROJECT : PF14-22-000

VFW Post 6223
386 Main Street
Great Bend, Pennsylvania 18821

Wednesday, July 15, 2015

The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping Meeting, pursuant to notice, at 6:30 p.m., Paul Friedman, the moderator.

P R O C E E D I N G S

(6:30 p.m.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Welcome everyone. I want to go over some basic safety rules. Okay. If in the unlikely event there's an emergency, such as a fire, there's an exit right through this door up here on the left and then on the right, you can walk down the stairs and there's another exit. All right. The most important things you need to know, where the restrooms are. So there's a restroom right through that hallway, and there's another set of restrooms downstairs in the basement near the bar.

All right. That said, we have no microphones today, so I'm going to use my big-boy voice, and if that's ineffective, yell at me and I'll speak louder.

Good evening. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission which we abbreviate as F-E-R-C, FERC, or Commission, I would like to welcome you here tonight to our public scoping meeting to make environmental comments on the Northeast Energy Direct, N-E-D, or NED project, proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, TGP.

It is often referred to as Kinder Morgan because Tennessee Gas is a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan Corporation, and this project is proposed in FERC docket number PF14-22.

My name is Paul Friedman, and I'm a staff member at the FERC based on Washington, D.C. and I'm working on the environmental team for the NED project. Our goal is eventually to produce an environmental impact statement. I'll talk more about that later.

Let me introduce the other team members who are present here tonight. This is Lavinia DiSanto, and over on the sign-up table is Jennifer Ferris and Wayne Kicklighter. They all work for a company called Cardno. Cardno is our environmental contractor for this project and they are going to assist FERC staff in writing the environmental impact statement or EIS.

Let the record show this meeting began at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, July 15th, 2015 at the VFW Building in Great Bend, Pennsylvania.

You may have noticed over here I have Larry. He's a court reporter and he's transcribing this meeting. This is so we can have an accurate record of tonight's comments. Eventually an electronic copy of the transcript of this meeting will be placed into the FERC's e-library system which contains the public record for this proceeding.

FERC has a transcription contract with Ace Federal Reporters, that's who Larry works for. If you wish to obtain a copy of the transcript prior to it's placement in the FERC public files, you must make arrangements directly with Ace, which means you have to talk to Larry when this meeting is over. He'll tell you what to do to get an early copy of the transcript.

The FERC is the lead federal agency for both the authorization of this project under the Natural Gas Act and for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA, N-E-P-A.

Under the NEPA, the FERC team will produce an environmental impact statement or EIS for this project. The FERC was originally known as the Federal Power Commission when it was created by Congress in 1920. We were reorganized and renamed during the Carter administration.

One of the industries we regulate is the interstate transportation of natural gas. FERC also regulates non-federal hydropower, electric rates on interstate lines, and oil rates on interstate lines. However, we do not do anything having to do with siting of power lines or siting of oil pipelines. So, no, the FERC is not involved in the so-called Keystone Excel Pipeline.

The FERC does not regulate the exploration, production, or gathering of natural gas. Those activities are regulated by the states. Therefore, any comments about hydraulic fracturing or fracking which is a method of exploration and production would be out of scope for our EIS because those are activities that the FERC does not regulate. We are only going to do an EIS about activities we have control over.

Our agency is directed by five commissioners who are appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by Congress.

The FERC staff like me, are civil servants. We, the FERC staff, do not make decisions. The five people who sit on the 11th floor of my building, they are the decisionmakers. The staff does make recommendations to the Commissioners and you will be able to read our environmental recommendations at the end chapter of the EIS. So all recommendations are not a secret.

On June 30th, 2015 the FERC issued a notice of intent to produce an EIS for the NED project. That NOI announced these public scoping meetings. The NOI also explained how to file written comments with the Commission. The FERC prefers the electronic filing of comments using our e-comment feature. Go to the FERC's Internet website at www.FERC.gov, click on documents and filing, or you can send your comments in the old fashioned way by writing a letter and mailing it to the Secretary of the Commission at 888 First Street, Northeast, Washington, D.C. 20426.

In all cases, put the docket number which is PF14-22 on your correspondence.

Tonight I'd like to accomplish a couple of things. One, I want to summarize the project very, very briefly. Two, I want to explain the role of the FERC in the review of the project. Three, I want to show how the public may participate in our environmental review process. And lastly, I'd like to allow the public an opportunity to voice your concerns about the project at this forum.

I ask that you reserve all questions until after my presentation. There is a table at the back of the room through this door where Wayne is standing where you can still sign up to be a speaker tonight if you haven't already done so.

Let me emphasize that this is not a hearing on the merits of the proposal. No decisions will be made based on this meeting.

As I said earlier, this meeting provides you, the public, an opportunity to comment on the types of environmental issues that you would like to see covered in our EIS. The more specific your comments are about potential environmental impacts, the more useful it will be for the FERC staff to focus our attention on important issues.

Statements for or against the project are not particularly useful and will not influence the analysis in the EIS.

There are some ground rules about decorum during this meeting. First, treat all speakers with respect whether you agree with them or not.

Two, no booing, cheering, applauding, or yelling out.

Three, if the audience becomes unruly, which I do not think will happen tonight, I do reserve the right to close the meeting. I have been at meetings where they have been very contentious and I have had to threaten to close them if the crowd would not allow speakers to speak.

We will take speakers up until the time that all speakers who have signed up and had their opportunity to

speaking, or if we have a lot of speakers, which I don't think we have tonight, we would continue until the venue has a closing time.

Each speaker will be limited to not more than five minutes. And as a matter of fairness, I will strictly enforce the five-minute time rule using this stop light. At four and a half minutes it turns yellow and at five it turns red, and at that time we would like you to yield the floor to the next speaker.

All comments will be considered whether written or verbal. The FERC gives equal consideration to both written and verbal comments. I would like to clarify that the FERC did not conceive of this project nor are we promoting it. The project was designed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline, which as I said before is a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan. We call them either the company or the applicant. The company came up with the location of their facilities and it is up to the FERC staff to analyze the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of those facilities. The FERC is not an advocate for the project. FERC staff are advocates for the environmental review process.

Let me go over some of the project background. On October 2, 2014, the FERC accepted Tennessee Gas' request to initiate our pre-filing environmental review process for the NED project. During pre-filing the burden is on the company to communicate with stakeholders and identify issues of concern, and to attempt to resolve those issues to perfect its formal application to the FERC.

Tennessee Gas has not yet filed an application with the FERC. They have stated, however, they would like to do so in about October of this year. The purpose of the NED project is to provide about two billion cubic feet per day of natural gas to markets in the northeast. The proposed facilities would consist of -- and here I'm generalizing -- 412 miles of pipeline across portions of Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, nine associated laterals or loops totaling 60 additional miles and nine compressor stations, 14 new metering stations, and one modified existing compressor station. You can read much more details about the project in resource report one, which is the project description already filed by Tennessee Gas in the FERC's e-library system. And, again, there are instructions for how to use e-library in the notice of intent which you can get on the table over there.

During pre-filing Tennessee Gas will file a number of draft resource reports as outlined in our regulations at 18 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 380, so that FERC can review those in advance of an application. The public may also comment on Tennessee Gas' draft environmental resource reports.

Right now in the process we are in the scoping period. The formal comment period will not end until August 31, 2015. However, FERC staff will continue to consider comments up until the time we write the EIS.

Based on comments received to date and our review of the draft resource reports, we have identified the following environmental issues. The public is concerned about impacts on land use including rural characteristics and conservation lands. The public is concerned about impacts on towns and residential areas. The public is concerned about impacts on ground water including aquifers and wells and the public is concerned about impacts on air quality and noise from compressor stations. This is in no way an comprehensive list, it's just a brief summary of what we've seen so far filed in the docket from public comments.

After the application is filed, there are other opportunities for the public to enter into the process and make comments. These opportunities for comments include in response to our notice of application and the response to the notice of the issuance of our draft environmental impact statement. After a company has filed its formal application and the FERC has noticed that application, parties may request intervenor status. Being an intervenor is a legal position. Intervenor status can request rehearing on a Commission decision. They also have the burden of serving all parties. You do not have to be an intervenor to have your environmental comments considered.

However, you cannot intervene during the pre-filing process. You must wait until Tennessee Gas files its formal application.

After the application is filed, the FERC staff will identify data gaps and write environmental information

request. Once the FERC staff is convinced that the application is complete so that we fully understand the potential impacts the project might have on the environment, we will issue a notice of schedule for our EIS.

Based on the application and our own research the FERC staff will produce an EIS in accordance with the regulations written by the Council of Environmental Quality or CEQ at Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 1500 to 1508 to satisfy the requirements of NEPA. That document will offer our independent analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the proposals and alternative. Generally the EIS will discuss the current environment, identify potential project related impacts on specific resources and present proposed measures to avoid, reduce, or mitigate adverse effects.

The FERC will address such resource topics as geology and soils, water and wetlands, vegetation and wildlife, cultural resource, socioeconomics, land use, air quality and noise, and safety.

We will also evaluate reasonable and feasible alternatives.

The next thing in the process will be for the FERC staff to produce a draft EIS that would be circulated for public comment. Copies of the DEIS would be sent to our environmental mailing list which includes elected officials, government agencies, environmental groups, and nongovernmental organizations, Indian tribes, local libraries and newspapers.

We address comments on the draft in a final EIS. The EIS is not a decision document. The Commissioners will consider the environmental impacts disclosed in the EIS together with other non-environmental issues such as markets and rates. The Commission has developed a certificate policy statement that establishes the criteria they use for determining whether or project is in the public need or has a public benefit.

The Commission decision will be issued as a project order. If the Commission decides to authorize the project, they will give Tennessee Gas a certificate of public convenience and necessity. If the Commission decides to authorize the project, the FERC staff will make certain that the environmental conditions appended to the order are satisfied. Those conditions usually include a stipulation that the company obtain all other necessary federal permits like under the Clean Water Act or the Endangered Species Act and authorizations prior to construction. The company must implement all the measures they've committed to in their application and mitigation programs.

FERC staff and our environmental contractors will monitor the project through construction, restoration, and the completion of the mitigation programs.

We will perform on-site inspections to make certain that the project is in compliance with the environmental conditions of the order.

Now I'm done with the summary of the FERC process and now is the time for us to take public comments. I will call up speakers individually in the order in which they have signed up by number.

We don't have a microphone, we're going to have every go to the podium. Speak loudly using your big person voice because we don't have a microphone. Clearly state your name.

When you get to the podium please tell us your name and spell it out for the court reporter. If you represent an organization, tell us the name of your organization without using an acronym. If you are a landowner along the pipeline route, please indicate where your property is located according to the mile marks or cross streets.

The first speaker is number one.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Prior to the speaking, I thought we were just going to be open to where we could question you. You said we couldn't do it until you were done talking.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Right. Let's do the questions after the speakers.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well, this is kind of relevant now.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Then go ahead.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Earlier you spoke that you had nothing to do with the pipeline route.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's correct. Who picks the pipeline route?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well, it doesn't matter. It's upon your approval that they steal our land. So actually you have a great deal to do--

MR. FRIEDMAN: But we don't --

[SIMULTANEOUS CONVERSATION]

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- we don't select the pipeline route. The pipeline route is selected by the company. We review --

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: But you allow them to steal --

[SIMULTANEOUS CONVERSATION]

MR. FRIEDMAN: We don't allow anything until there's an authorization. There has -- this project has not been authorized --

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: We've already been through this. You're the second pipeline going through our property.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Uh-huh.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: We've already been through this once before.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: They've already stolen our land.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. Well, --

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And it was your approval that made it possible.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's correct.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: So the idea that you have nothing to do with the pipeline route is --

MR. FRIEDMAN: We don't select the pipeline.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: -- is so ludicrous --

MR. FRIEDMAN: It's not ludicrous. It's a fact we don't select the pipeline route. What my project team does is evaluate the impacts that route will have on the environment. I don't make a decision.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Not the people? Just the environment.

MR. FRIEDMAN: The environment includes people. We have a socioeconomic section in the EIS that absolutely addresses impacts to people. We talk about things like impacts on property values, impacts on landowners. Absolutely that's in the EIS.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: No, that's not true. The impact on landowners is not even considered.

MR. FRIEDMAN: It will be considered in this EIS.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Right. Didn't in the last one.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, I didn't --

[SIMULTANEOUS CONVERSATION]

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And I'm sorry, your federal agency, I would assume --

MR. FRIEDMAN: And every EIS I've ever written in 25 years at the FERC has addressed landowner issues, every single one.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well, they never talked to us. We're not even contacted.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's why we have public meetings so you can tell us your concerns.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: We did the first time. It didn't help. This is my point. The FERC never contacted us. And to say that you consider --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Did you get a copy of the NOI for this in the mail?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well, of course we did.

MR. FRIEDMAN: We did contact you.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Yeah.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And that's --

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: No, you're right. You're absolutely right.

[SIMULTANEOUS CONVERSATION]

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: -- public needs and necessity --

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's the end document that the Commissioners will issue if they authorize the project.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Is that the same thing as eminent domain?

MR. FRIEDMAN: It is not. Eminent -- it gives -- let me explain this.

Congress in 1947 amended the Natural Gas Act. And what it said is, if FERC gives a certificate of public convenience and necessity, then the pipeline company that receives it does get the right of eminent domain. So you're partially correct.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. And someone like Norman Bay, do you ever speak to him personally?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I have spoken to him once in the elevator.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's the public where they're concerned with the public. He spoke to him in the elevator.

MR. FRIEDMAN: So speaker number one is already at the podium.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I would just like to ask a question also.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'd like to know, how are you federal agency?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. We are authorized by Congress under the National Gas Act. We were created by Congress.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And then who funds you?

MR. FRIEDMAN: We are funded by Congress as a line item in the budget.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And are you funded by anybody else besides Congress?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Nope. There is a misconception going around that we are funded by industry. That's absolutely not correct. We are funded by Congress. If Congress decides they want to do away with us, they can write us out of the budget and we won't exist as an agency. However, we also charge fees to the companies we regulate. Those fees do not go to the Commission. Those fees go directly into the U.S. Treasury.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And have you ever denied a pipeline?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, but very few.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Can you mention one?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Not off the top of my head. Very few. Here's what I will say though. We get lots of applications, thousands of applications. Not every application goes from the starting phase to the ending phase where a decision is made. A lot of them die along the way. We give certificates to companies and the facilities don't get built because the markets have changed. So not everything we authorize gets built, and not every application goes to a certificate.

Yes.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: You mentioned they have that one compressor station and one modified.

MR. FRIEDMAN: There are going to be several compressor stations.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: How many?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I think nine; is that right?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I thought you said one.

MR. FRIEDMAN: No, I believe I -- the number I said was nine.

[SIMULTANEOUS CONVERSATION]

[PAUSE]

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Okay. I misheard then. I misheard, they say it's nine.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yeah, okay.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's what I have.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yeah.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: And do they have the hydration at these stations?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't know. But that's a good question to put into a comment for us and we'll look it up.

All right. So now we get the first speaker going.

So remember to state your name for the court reporter and spell it.

MR. JENNINGS: Okay. My name is Brett Jennings, counselor for Great Bend Borough and chairman of the Halstead/Great Bend Joint Sewer Authority.

There are some issues when you go underneath rivers or interstate highways. Just right up above here, just north of the borough, they drilled underneath the river, people's water -- private water wells were being affected. That was also going into the sewer system from their well down their drain. And if that affects any sewer system along the route, they could start going after the companies that are going and boring underneath affects the treatment process. And I believe that's covered in the 2002 Bioterrorism Act.

Gas going through that pipeline is coming from the Marcellus Region. There's USGS open follow report services 2012-1159 that deals with that, with how high the radon content is, how many picocuries per cubic liter. It will increase above the four which is what EPA says is the standard. There's also a compiled report 81-778 which is geochemistry of trace elements and uranium and devonium shale through the Appalachian base and that will back up why you're getting the radon.

This is the Chesapeake Bay area. We have an MS4 permit or a municipal separate storm sewer system permit in this borough. I have a permit that's waiting on two and a half years since it should have been issued, a permit for discharge at the sewer plant because Pennsylvania has not been meeting its goals in 2014 and 2015. New York state still has issues. And one of the things is they don't have what can happen from development of a shale area which is the induced development caused by a pipeline how much will affect a total nitrogen, total phosphorous, how much will it raise -- how much best management practices will the companies use to delete that. Will they be on record to having to maintain those reductions if they do it offsite at a different location.

Those are very big things because I'd hate to see my sewer plant get sucked down to half our permit limits now or to the limits of technology because people can't stop increasing our development even though there was supposed to be an EIS to solve that.

Also the zip code on page 3 for Great Bend, there might be people running around in Towanda that wasn't correct. The zip code is 18821.

As for -- on page 2, the right of eminent domain. There's no right by any federal government level. It's a power authorized, the right of people to create that company or corporation or government. And when you start sending stuff overseas or sending it to Canada, it starts bringing up issues and they even issue eminent domain. But that's for a jury of the person's peers when they call court against the government or

the person who explicitly gave that power away or gave that power to a company to exercise.

And then for air quality, 28 August 2012, this was for the Constitution Pipeline, but it's relevant. Or, no, this was on the Laser Pipeline. Those hearings for air quality by the DEP, that same night there was hearings as the Susquehanna County Planning Commission to increase the size of that facility although it wasn't reflected in the DEP hearing on the same night, less than two miles away from each other. And with some of these areas you're going to have rattlesnakes. Harmony Township area, where it follows the blue stone. There's areas where there's rattlesnakes. Area where it doesn't follow the Constitution Pipeline, and its route, which is where I have property on and in fact a hunting stand is 30 feet from the markers where the Constitution is going in --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Mr. Jennings, can you now wrap up?

MR. JENNINGS: -- that is -- there's bats and rattlesnake surveys. That area of Harmony Township is full of rattlesnakes. The entire township. The township doesn't maintain paved roads and has wood-planked bridges.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

One thing I wanted to make clear to everybody is when you raise issues, whether it's about rattlesnakes or water quality or property rights, we will address those comments in the EIS. So that's why we hold these meetings. We want to hear the comments. We want to know the issues that concern you.

Thank you for your comments.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I just have a quick question?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No, wait until we're through all of our --

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: -- the width of the pipeline, why is that not indicated in these papers?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Because it's --

[SIMULTANEOUS CONVERSATION]

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- in resource report one.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Is it in here?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Is it in where?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Is it in the paper that you gave us on disk?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't think it is.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: So can you tell us what it is?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I actually don't know what it is.

[SIMULTANEOUS CONVERSATION]

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: 30 inch pipeline, is that what you want? So 30 inches.

[SIMULTANEOUS CONVERSATION]

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It's 30 or 36.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Actually, according to the paperwork we received, it's 42.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I think it changes along the route.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's a -- I think it does change along the route and that's why --

[SIMULTANEOUS CONVERSATION]

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Thirty to 42.

Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Speaker number two.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: [INAUDIBLE] I think that was what, March that was filed?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Which, the resource report one?

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Right.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't remember.

MS. WASNOWIC: My name is Helen Wasnowic, W-a-s-n-o-w-i-c. And the pipeline will go through my property. I am mainly concerned about the deforestation of my property which is they're actually going to take 560 some fee, linear feet, that doesn't include this, you know, whatever hundred feet wide it's going to be that they're going to cut the trees down. And the township of New Milford, that is just under approximately 22,000 feet which is just a little under four miles, they are going to deforest. That's not the whole thing. That is just where they are taking trees down. That's four miles of -- four linear miles of trees they will be taking down. Along with that I currently have a lot of natural springs in the area where they want to come through with the pipeline. Right now these natural springs go down into a wetland that is across from my property. On the other side of the street there is a huge sluice pipe that goes under the road and takes all that water across to the wetlands. What will happen to these natural springs when they put the pipeline in? And what will happen if that water no longer goes over to the wetlands across the road from me?

Those are my main questions. Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Speaker number three.

MS. HOLLERAN: My name is Catherine Holleran, that's Catherine with a C, H-o-l-l-e-r-a-n. We have a 22 -- a little over 22-acre parcel setting in Milford. It's a lake-front property and we've got 200-feet on a private spring-fed lake. We already have Constitution Pipeline cutting through. I'm bringing this up because Northeast Energy Direct Project is running completely parallel, I think on most of its route to the Constitution.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, part is --

MS. HOLLERAN: It is on ours. We're already being cut through by Constitution. I've seen the maps and it's on the east side of the Constitution Line directly through our property. So our property is 22-some acres. I see they're taking 6,761 acres to do the Northeast project and so our little 22-acre parcel, we're losing almost a quarter of it already to Constitution. They're taking a little over four, four and a half -- five acres of our 22-acre parcel.

They are cutting through on a 30-inch pipeline 190 feet quarter they want. It's all our woods in the back of our property. We have a maple syrup business. We tap those maple trees. We were tapping those maple trees. They are going to come through, they've already taken -- we wouldn't sign. We told them we have a lake property, there's wetlands there, there's a natural fed -- spring-fed inlet that goes into the lake which is one of the three major inlets on the lake, it's cutting right through it. It's either going under it, I'm not sure how they're doing it, I guess they're going under it. So this is all right on our lake-front property, all through our fields, we have three fields, we have three early American natural built stone walls from way back when on our property they're going through. It's directly behind the homestead on our property where my sister and her husband live. And it's close to the well, the drilled well which is our sole source of the water supply. It's a little bit up the hill. At the top of the hill there's a stone quarry which is the next neighboring property to our west.

That's our neighbor and he was okay with it. He only has his property for profit for the stone quarry which, okay, there's a stony quarry there, I understand that part. But if you look at the topo map, you'll see that on the other side of his stone quarry there's just open--it's woods and I know it's still more deforestation, but it's up on top of the mountain and no one lives there, uninhabited.

Well, it's not cutting through lake property, it's not cutting right next to our well. It's not taking out all of our forest and all of our trees and all of our maples that we make part of our living off of with our maple syrup business, it's not cutting through stone walls, it's not not taking all our fields, but did they consider

that? No. And we brought it up many times. I have no idea why they did not go with that alternative. So now we've got Constitution who took us by eminent domain, because we never would sign, we're one of seven landowners that refused. We still refuse. We're still in litigation with them and they already call this eminent domain. And now Northeast Direct wants to come right beside it and come closer to our house, take the remainder of whatever trees might still be left.

And I don't understand that with 6,700 acres why my 22-acre parcel has to be cut completely through. It makes a 90-degree turn and goes through our whole acreage. So I think it has environmental impact on the part that's the lake property, that's the stream that goes in, all of our early American stone walls, it's the character and land use of our land that's a recreational property. And we have, you know, our cottage -- we have cottages down there and we have our whole lakefront area. So the disruption of real character and land use, that's a major part of my problem.

Also the fact that we use our woods, not only for the aesthetic value and the fact that they are behind our house in the side of the mountain like another person here has already commented on deforestation of your land and the aesthetic value and the character of the land and it's taking out most of all the woods already. So now you want to come through with a second pipeline to take the rest.

Our answer will be the same. No, we won't sign. So I just -- I can't understand why we can't get this alternative of somebody to move it to the west of us. I know it's too late because you're already --

MR. FRIEDMAN: It's not too late. We're in pre-filing. Let me address that exact issue.

MS. HOLLERAN: Right.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Have you filed a letter with the FERC?

MS. HOLLERAN: Yes.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Suggesting this alternative?

MS. HOLLERAN: Yes.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And you've drawn on a map --

MS. HOLLERAN: I didn't draw a map. I didn't draw a map, but I did --

MR. FRIEDMAN: That would be useful for us to analyze the environment impacts of the --

MS. HOLLERAN: My thing --

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- if we had the alternative route drawn on a USGS quad so we could analyze the route that you suggest.

MS. HOLLERAN: But if here's Constitution and then here's Northeast Direct and Constitution did not move, so how are you going to?

MR. FRIEDMAN: I cannot answer that question. I would analyze the alternative. I don't know what the outcome would be. But how can I analyze an alternative I don't know where it is.

MS. HOLLERAN: Okay. And I have filed all these comments. I filed them e-filed, and I mailed them in a hard copy also. But that's my problem.

MR. FRIEDMAN: So my suggestion is a map --

[SIMULTANEOUS CONVERSATION]

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- a map to go along.

MS. HOLLERAN: That would be excellent. I did show somebody that when we were at your other meeting at Blue Ridge School. But I don't know how it could be moved now because if Constitution isn't going to move, they haven't cut through our trees yet, because they can't, I don't think, until October. But if they can't move, then I don't know how you can move either.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't know the outcome.

MS. HOLLERAN: Okay.

MR. FRIEDMAN: But we would like to analyze all alternatives we're made aware of.

MS. HOLLERAN: Okay. Yeah, I have all my comments filed, but I just wanted to make sure that you heard me again. Thank you very much.

MR. FRIEDMAN: You're welcome. A map would be useful.

MS. HOLLERAN: Okay.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number four.

MR. CORRIGAN: I'm speaking here today not on -- my name is Barry Corrigan, Jr., C-o-r-r-i-g-a-n. And I'm not speaking here on an environmental level. I'm speaking on a strictly property rights business level. I'm the husband of the woman she was speaking about. They're running right through our property. And I want to present to you a scenario about what they're doing to us so that you can understand.

Picture that you have a house with a large section of it that you're not using. And a company comes to you and says, we would like to build a childcare center in your house. And what we're going to do is we're going to pay you for the rugs and the drapes and the electrical and the flooring, and the furniture. Then we're going to use it forever and never give you another dime. Your answer is going to be, no, I won't do that. So what they do is they run off to the government and get them to bring police in and steal your property. Now you have a room full of screaming children and, oh, by the way, if you have children, you can't use that facility because it's not like we're going to have access to the gas. You act like it's an eminent public welfare. It's not. I'm one of the public. I have no access to this gas.

Oh, and by the way, I get to pay insurance and taxes on that property while you make a profit the entire time. Not you, FERC, but the company that's running it through, \$720,000 a day is how much money they're going to lose if we hold them up for one day.

Well, if you're making \$720,000 a day, and for the entire destruction of our property, for the rest of the life of the property, you're offering us the price of a medium pick-up truck that we have to divide among five people. This is not business. If you're going to use the property for an extended period of time while making money, the family and the property owners have to be reasonably compensated on a regular basis, not a one-time, oh, well, we paid for that tree, we paid for that ground once. Twenty years from now they're making \$720,000 a day and the families of the people that own the property get nothing. There's no other business in the world that you can have an access of resources for free for ever. And this is what they're doing. And you're facilitating it by allowing them to steal our land.

They came to us with a business proposition and we said, no. And you have decided that they should be right. It is wrong, it is immoral, and it is anti-American business. The families have to be compensated on a continual level, especially if they said no. Because you're forcing it on them. If somebody says, yep, good idea, I'll go along with it, well, they're idiots and that's okay. But when a family says no and you force them to do it, and you still do not grant them access to what's going through their land, that's pure thievery. And it's thievery on a continual basis. It's not even a one-time thing. It's a continuous thievery of their property and their assets.

I'm done.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. I do want to clarify one thing. The Commission has not made a decision about this project.

MR. CORRIGAN: You did with Constitution. We've already not had our pants pulled down.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's a different project. I'm only here to discuss the Tennessee Gas Project.

MR. CORRIGAN: Well, you're right and I'm sorry, we shall not take your earlier screw ups into account.

MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. Speaker number five.

MR. BARONI: I'm Tony Baroni or Anthony if you want to be formal. I'm a landowner on Sutton Road in New Milford.

I got a letter from Tennessee and then it says, "To minimize the impacts from construction, the proposed pipeline facilities will be collated -- collocated for a majority of the length with the existing utility corridor." Well, that's a false statement. I hope you people realize it. Because what they're doing, they're not minimizing it, they're just taking the impact they already made and making them worse.

Now, I have dealt with Constitution and have come to a conclusion that it's great to have FERC -- a FERC project. The land man will come and tell us, this is federal project so everything is going to be done right to the -- and everything is going to be done right. We're going to get everything squared away because the feds are going to be on it. FERC is on it. Well, I know that doesn't work. It doesn't play that way.

I saw the document with Constitution. The impact statement I've only got 600-some feet they're going across. FERC buys the right-of-way and what's in the impact statement shows it in a different area. Nobody comes and checks. I don't see the FERC people out there. I see surveyors that are working for the company.

I wish that you people would take the citizens into account as much as you do the wetlands and the bats. We are part of the environment also. And I think I'm echoing what some other say, that they don't seem to consider us.

Blue Stone came through my property. I'm a gas-friendly person. I sold them the right-of-way, they came through. But they weren't a federal project. So they bought options, they bought options to buy a path. And when those options didn't link up, they bought an option from me that said, we couldn't make the connections. Some of the people didn't want to link up with us so we'd rather go through in a different direction, and that's what they did.

That is what you should be making these people do. We're in a gas-friendly county here. They don't have to follow the same route that the last guy went through. You see what's happening to us, one after another, you know, three pipelines coming through your property. Pretty soon -- and how many more are going to come along? So they're actually making it worse. They're not negating impact. And I hope you take that into consideration and I hope you take this into consideration. When it's a federal project they come down and say, ah-ha, this is a federal project. So you better sign up with us or we're going to take your land anyway. That's -- they come in heavy-handed, Constitution did. Tennessee doesn't seem, from the first couple letters they got from them to be quite as heavy handed as them. But I think you should understand that, that they use that as leverage because all's we've got to do is draw a line and then make a big complicated impact statement, EIS, that who's going to read when it's 3,700 pages long or whatever it is?

I doubt you'll read the whole thing even though everything comes across your desk, it's probably gets pretty boring. But it has errors. That's where I think you should make them go through the way they do as if it's not a federal project. Because once it's federal, they just draw the straightest line as they can, the easiest line across the map, and then say, well, we'll treat you here, there, whatever we can do to accommodate FERC. And I've talked to the surveyors, when I said, "Why are you going here where we got a wetland? You could go over there up on the hill where there's no wetland." The surveyor gets a blank look on his face like, nah.

He goes, too late now, we're too far downstream, FERC won't let us change at this point and they go. So that's my comments.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment. Again, I'm going to say it, you know, it's not too late, we're in pre-filing, no decision has been made about this project. We have not written one word of the EIS. We're listening to your comments. If you have an alternative route, if you'll inform us about that route, you will need a little map with a line drawn on it, we would analyze that. I can't guarantee what the outcome will be.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I can.

MR. FRIEDMAN: But I can tell you that we could analyze it.

MR. BARONI: The point I tried to make was, they should come up with the alternative routes. If they

did it the way -- if it was not an interstate pipeline the way Blue Stone, BP and Blue Stone did because that wasn't interstate, they couldn't get eminent domain. They had to work with the landowners. They went through the people who were willing to sell their right-of-way. And for sure, there's got to be ways through Susquehanna County where you can minimize the number of people they're aggravating. Because I think over all you'll find this is a very gas-friendly county. I am, but -- All right. They get worn down after a few of us.

MR. FRIEDMAN: We're at speaker number six.

MS. SCROGGINS: Do we give names or no?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes.

MS. SCROGGINS: Vera Scroggins from Citizens for Clean Water.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And please spell your name for the court reporter.

MS. SCROGGINS: The whole thing?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yeah.

MS. SCROGGINS: V like in Victor, e-ra, S-c-r-o-g-g-i-n-s. And I'm in Susquehanna County. And like some of the previous speakers have said, get ready for your next pipeline. We have two on this family's property, number three for, sounds like for the Baronis, so get ready for number three, number four, because it's just going to keep going. And I consider that absolutely an outrage that we have to endure this and for what?

So I want to say that FERC, I don't consider FERC really working in our interests. I don't consider the FERC actually deciding in our interest, but basically working for the industry.

You're going to be cutting through 87 streams and rivers, 53 wetlands, 33 public parks, 33 lands protected by conservation easements. And you will have people -- thousands of people that will be impacted and in a potential blast zone. If there is a leak -- gas leak and if there is an explosion, we're talking about all kinds of people that are in that blast zone. It's a dangerous thing to be next to high pressure, 30-inches to 36-inch pipelines. This is not like suburbia. I'm from suburbia. Twenty-five years ago we did not have such pipelines in our roads in front of our homes like they have now. And there's no minimum setback as far as I have found. That means they could put it within 50 feet of homes, they have it on school properties, it can be next to schools, it can be next to anything, farms, where we grow our food. Consider that also unacceptable and outrage to the American public.

And of course property values are going to be reduced. In this particular write up it says 20 to 30 percent, but I consider it more than that because if I was going to buy property that had three pipelines -- high-pressure, large-size pipelines on their property, I wouldn't consider buying that property unless they were basically giving it away. So we have that situation.

I'd like to be an intervener at some point. I've intervened on several pipelines and as far as I can see, they all get approved. So we can delay it as much as possible. We need to delay these pipelines and cost they millions every single day. And then they possibly may not build it. And then you have to see if it's really necessary to have this pipeline. The demand is not there. The need is not there for this gas. And you're going through, it looks like, at least five states, 412 miles, nine compressor stations. Absolutely outrage. They are going to emit toxic emissions. And like I even asked you, you don't even know if there's dehydration at these compressor stations. We have enough compressor stations already in our county. These are nine along of course the whole route, we're going to get at least one that I know of in the New Milford area where we have two 12 stations. Twelve compressor stations in one -- 12 compressors in one station which to me is like even hard to fathom that they would even do such a thing, and it's near homes and they're emitting every day, plus the noise everyday besides the toxic emissions, and the potential for risk and explosion.

So that's what you're going to add. And, of course, you're going to approve this, unless, of course, we can

show there's no need for it. Or if they decide to opt out of it, they don't have enough money and investors, which that might happen. Because right now gas prices are down. They've plummeted. Oil prices have plummeted. So this whole project may be withdrawn. Anybody in their sane mind who is an investor should not invest in something like this.

And as far as this being a gas-friendly, I would have to disagree with Mr. Baroni. It's an increasingly becoming less of a gas-friendly county. After we see all the things that we're going through that we have to be subjected to including what he's being subjected to, and there will be more down the road, so it will be less and less gas friendly.

And I would like to say that these pipelines are large 30 to 36 inches. And as far as environmental, you can have thousands of pages, what does it mean? It doesn't mean much of anything because I can see if it's in the public convenience and you think there's a demand, you will improve this. No matter what we say here, I've been to a whole group of these hearings. They all have gotten approved at this point unless the company themselves opts out. So it's basically a joke, it's basically a sham, you're here to present as if you're going to help us and take care of us and it's just a nice little series of events for us to go through and to present our material.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

MS. SCROGGINS: And is it five minutes yet?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yep.

MS. SCROGGINS: Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number seven, please?

MR. LOTORTO: Hello, my name is Alex Lotorto, L-o-t-o-r-t-o. Speaking first in my capacity as a landscape contractor and also as an environmentalist. My organization that I work with is Energy Justice Network. Our organization is specifically right now counseling a number of landowners in the number of 75 to 100 along the Atlantic Sunrise Pipeline right-of-way in Susquehanna, Wyoming, and Missouri and Luzerne County. I had spoken at a similar hearing like this, this time last year on the Atlantic Sunrise and I'll repeat some of the things I want to note.

One is landowner rights. There was a decision in the Federal Supreme Court that was called Kilo, it was a decision about a pharmaceutical company in Connecticut that received eminent domain power because of an economically distressed neighborhood. Pennsylvania in response passed very strict laws about the use of eminent domain in our Commonwealth to protect landowners from eminent domain for use by private companies for private profit and in a utility capacity. And we have those laws in place today and they've been most recently reviewed in this county by -- there was a project called a laser pipeline which is now owned by Williams that was subjected to the Public Utility Commission and their permitting process. And they withdrew that permit because we don't know exactly why, but in the opinions of the dissenting commissioners on the PUC, that this did not -- that a gathering line system in Susquehanna County did not meet the utility status and was not a public convenience and necessity according to Pennsylvania's laws.

So after that round of permitting in 2011 and '12 you see a lot more FERC applications coming from these companies, and it's a pattern. They don't want to go through gathering line permitting for the PUC. They don't feel that they can get enough landowners in a line to agree to their easement offers that are pathetic and according to those landowners and they're not willing to fairly negotiate for the fair value of those properties as we heard today.

So I think that FERC needs to consider costs that for the landowners including their own appraisals that have to be bought in your economic review, appraisals for real properties, that include forestry, agricultural uses, quarry rights, mineral rights, alternative uses of those property subdivisions all have to be done by special rural property appraisers in Pennsylvania that are licensed professionally and most of them are out of Clark Summit. And most of those appraisers work for the gas companies on these projects, also the electric utilities. So it's very hard to find someone without a conflict of interest. And these landown-

ers work very hard to do that. And I think that that's not -- it's not fair, obviously to these landowners to have to go up against a mammoth agency and a mammoth company to make the case that their property is worth more than the company's appraisal. And that has to be considered in your economic analysis.

They also have environmental rights in Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania constitution has the right to clean air, pure water, and the rural scenic and aesthetic values of the environment. It's in our Pennsylvania constitution and it's the job of our agencies, not the federal agencies, but our agencies to protect those rights. And I've lobbied very hard, you know, with our landowners and our group to change how FERC is allowed to put these things into place. I think that it's a violation of our rights.

Recently just some environmental issues, the northern Myotis bat is a long-eared bat recently listed on the endangered species list. They found 44 of those, according to the environmental impact statement for the Constitution Pipeline. Those at the time were not federally listed, now they are. And you need to consider that. You're not supposed to cut a tree -- any landowner is not supposed to cut a tree within ten miles of hibernacula which is where they sleep at night -- or sleep in the wintertime.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in New York has been very grateful, Tim Sullivan is a biologist there, to limit the tree-cutting period to February and March to protect bats. And the companies are pushing very hard to keep cutting in off season and things like that. That needs to be considered.

Also, this pipeline starts in the 300 line of the Tennessee Pipeline which is part of a recent D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals decision that Delaware River Keeper Network had filed in relation to the Northeast upgrade project and their 300 line upgrade in 2011 and 2013, which I was very involved in monitoring and we found \$4 million worth of fines -- violations and fines, the Delaware River Keeper Network, in wetlands, with woodchip piles three feet high around the base of rare species of trees. And when they did their replanting they put yellow and red pines at high elevation that weren't native to the forest. They put conifers in wooded areas and deciduous areas. And I felt very -- you know, as a landscape contractor, very just offended by the lack of respect. That was in a Delaware state forest and I haven't even gone onto all the private properties to take a look. But those violations alone in the Delaware state forest in Pinchot Brook wetland which was a core habitat for endangered species were permitted by FERC to happen and now you have fragmity, which is an invasive species, you have multi-flora rose, you have barberry and you have -- what else did we find? Knotweed, Japanese knotweed in the right-of-way that's being very poorly maintained. And all these landowners have to do that themselves because it's after two years, they're released from really significant maintenance of invasives.

The soil was so compacted in the right-of-way, it was more compacted than an earthen dam in Pike County. And that means that runoff from that into the wetlands is disrupting, you know, our sensitive wetlands. And I can't dig in a wetland, you can't dig in a wetland, if you're a private landowner, but these pipeline can dig through, you know, whatever they'd like to do with your permission.

And finally, as a union member I wanted to say, I've noticed among one of their contractor is Micheal Pipeline Construction, there's a common contractor for Kinder Morgan, frequent OSHA violations. You are not allowed to drop a tree within two lengths of that tree's radius if someone is not wearing protective gear. When I was monitoring trees were dropping all around me. We had guys jump starting -- kick starting their chain saws instead of setting it down. They were sent onto the job in the middle of February with sleet on 80-degree grade slopes and they were falling with chain saws with no blade covers on them. You have to look at the compliance history of all their contractors and all their history in this state and I'd like, you know, FERC to take a look in the last two years of their compliance history with other agencies.

And the last thing I want to say is it's a more moderate complaint, but PPL has announced plans to put a high-voltage power line from Towanda with that that new Moxie Panda Energy Plan through what looks like the collocation with the Tennessee Pipeline. It's going to cross Susquehanna County in the southern into Bradford County in the southern part. There is a best practice in the industry that the EPA Natural Gas star program recommends which is to run compressors with electric motors which reduces the exhaust by 100 percent because there's no exhaust. The only emissions then are blow downs and vented tanks.

That can also be reduced. And I don't see any reason now that regulations are being adapted from that natural gas star program that the FERC can't require those best practices. So I encourage you to --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Can you wrap up?

MR. LOTORTO: I encourage you to look at all the best practices recommended by EPA and require them on all your dockets that you're looking at now because they are soon going to be regulations and they may have to retrofit them anyway.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

That's the last of the people who have signed the sheet. However, this is an open forum, so if anyone else would like to speak, please, all you have to do is raise your hand.

No one is raising their hand. All right. If that's that last --

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible).

MR. FRIEDMAN: All right.

MR. GOFF: Ronald Goff from New Milford on Sutton Road. I live within a half mile of the compressor station that's there now. And the new compressor station, which I believe is going to be two compressors in it is going to be within a half mile of that. We've talked about air quality. How is the air quality monitored? And can there be real-time air quality monitoring of that? And then a warning -- a way to allow the homeowners in the area to know when the air quality is getting at critical levels or whatever, you know, that could be harmful to them.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I don't know the answer to that question. I do know that the company would have to get a state permit for air quality. But since you've raised it in the scoping, we'll address the answer after doing some research in the EIS.

MR. GOFF: And who is the regulatory committee for -- I mean, I understand -- does FERC regulate what they do, or who is the actual regulatory commission for --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yeah, we regulate -- we regulate lots of things. We regulate all the environmental impacts. So we'll have -- for a project this size, we'll hire a contractor because I don't have enough FERC staff to go out and monitor construction by inspecting construction as it occurs, 24/7. Okay. So that's one thing we regulate.

Of course, we regulate rates and we regulate tariffs.

MR. GOFF: Okay. I'm only looking at regulation of compliance. The compliance of like the air quality and stuff like that. And --

MR. FRIEDMAN: I believe that air quality is regulated by the state under a delegated permit from the Clean Air Act, but I'm not certain. But since you've raised the issue, we'll do some more research on that.

MR. GOFF: Okay. Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: You're welcome.

MR. CORRIGAN: I have a question.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes.

MR. CORRIGAN: You say you don't regulate [INAUDIBLE] contract it out.

MR. FRIEDMAN: That's correct.

MR. CORRIGAN: Do you somehow feel that would be cheaper than in-house work?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Because we're funded by the U.S. Congress, they actually --

MR. CORRIGAN: They get the money from somewhere.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I'll tell you the answer to your question. I actually don't. Because we're funded by the U.S. Congress, they tell us how many people we can employ. So we can't have more FTEs than Congress give us. So we have to contract a lot of work.

MR. CORRIGAN: [INAUDIBLE].

MR. FRIEDMAN: We have enough money to pay the contractors.

MR. CORRIGAN: Yeah, which means you could do it cheaper in-house, but you're inflating a budget by eliminating --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, what we're doing, we cannot increase staff levels, so we have to find a way of increasing staff levels some other way, and so we we use contractors.

MR. CORRIGAN: Costs more.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Well, typically we ask the companies to pay for that, so that it's not a burden on the taxpayer.

Yes, sir.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Being the air quality came up, I have another question and I have a video here that I couldn't show. Can I show you this after we're closed?

MR. FRIEDMAN: You could. Do we take post-hearing videos in the library?

No, they can't. All right. You can show it to me afterwards.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Well, can I -- it's only 16 seconds long.

MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. You can show it to me afterwards.

All right. So on behalf of the FERC, I would like to thank you all for coming here tonight to help us focus the environmental review process on those issues that are of concern to you.

Let the record show that this meeting concluded at 7:34 p.m.

(Whereupon, at 7:34 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF: : Project No.
NORTHEAST ENERGY PIPELINE PROJECT : PF14-22-000

Towanda Jr/Sr High School
1 High School Drive
Towanda, Pennsylvania 18848

Tuesday, July 14, 2015

The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping Meeting, pursuant to notice, at 7:00 p.m., Paul Friedman, the moderator.

PROCEEDINGS

(7:00 p.m.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: So good evening, ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission which we abbreviate as F-E-R-C or FERC, or Commission, I would like to welcome you here tonight to our public scoping meeting to make environmental comments on the Northeast Energy Direct Project or N-E-D, NED, which is proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company is abbreviated as TGP and it is a subsidiary of Kinder Morgans as some people refer to as Kinder Morgan. And this project is proposed docket number PF14-22.

My name is Paul Friedman, and I'm a staff member for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission based on Washington, D.C. and I'm working as part of our environmental team.

Let me introduce the other members of our team who are present here tonight. From Cardno the FERC's environmental contractor for the NED project next to me is Wayne Kicklighter and Lavinia just left. She was here a second ago. Lavinia DiSanto. And at the sign-up table is Jennifer Ferris.

Let the record show this meeting began at 7 p.m. on Tuesday, July 14th, 2015 at Towanda High School.

You may have noticed that a court reporter is transcribing this meeting. This is so we can have an accurate record of tonight's comments. Eventually an electronic copy of the transcript will be placed in the FERC's e-library system which contains the public record for this proceeding.

FERC has a transcription contract with Ace Federal Reporters. If you wish to obtain a copy of the transcript prior to its placement in our public files, you must make arrangements directly with Ace, so after the meeting you can talk to Larry and he will tell you how to do that.

The FERC is the lead federal agency for both the authorization of this project under the Natural Gas Act and for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA.

Under the NEPA, the FERC team will produce an environmental impact statement or EIS for this project. The FERC was originally known as the Federal Power Commission when it was created in 1920. We were reorganized and renamed during the Carter administration.

One of the industries we regulate is the interstate transportation of natural gas. FERC also regulates non-federal hydropower, electric rates and oil rates, but not the siting of power lines or oil pipelines. So FERC does not regulate Keystone.

The FERC does not regulate the exploration, production, or gathering of natural gas or the local distribution of natural gas. Those activities are regulated by the states. Therefore, comments about hydraulic fracturing or fracturing which is a method of exploration and production would be out of scope for our EIS because the FERC does not regulate that activity.

Our agency is directed by five commissioners who are appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by Congress.

The FERC staff like me, are civil servants. We, the FERC staff, do not make decisions. The five important commissioners, the top of our pyramid, they're the decisionmakers, however, staff does make recommendations to the Commissioners and you can read our environmental recommendations for the NED project in the EIS.

On June 30th, 2015 the FERC issued a notice of intent to produce an EIS for the NED project which announced these public scoping meetings. The NOI also explained how to file written comments with the Commission. The FERC prefers the electronic filing of comments using our e-comment feature. Go to the FERC's Internet website at www.FERC.gov, click on documents and filing, and you can then do an electronic comment, or you can do something the old fashioned way, write a letter to the Secretary of the Commission at 888 First Street, Northeast, Washington, D.C. 20426.

In all cases, please put the docket number on your correspondence and the docket number again is PF14-22.

Tonight I'd like to accomplish the following things. One, I'd like to summarize the project very, very briefly. Two, I'd like to explain the role of the FERC in the review of the project. Three, I'd like to outline how the public participates in our environmental review process. And five, I'd like to allow the public an opportunity to voice your concerns about the project at this forum.

I ask that you reserve all questions until after my presentation. There is a table at the back of the room manned by Cardno, I think Jennifer is sitting there right now -- where you can sign up to be a speaker tonight if you've not already done so.

Let me emphasize that this is not a hearing on the merits of the proposal. No decisions will be made based on this meeting.

As I said before, this meeting provides you, the public, an opportunity to comment on the type of environmental issues that you would like to see covered in our EIS. The more specific your comments are about potential environmental impacts, the more useful it will be us to use and focus our attention on those important issues in the environmental document when we're writing it.

Statements for or against the project are not particularly useful and will not influence the analysis of the EIS.

So here are some ground rules about decorum during this meeting. First, treat all speakers with respect whether you agree with them or not. Please, no booing, no cheering, hold your applause, and no yelling out of turn.

If the audience becomes unruly, which I'm certain will not be the case tonight, I reserve the right to close the meeting. That statement is for other meetings we're holding later in the week.

We will take speakers up until the time our contract for this venue as a closing time. Those not called can still place their comments into the record by filing a letter with the Commission. Again, given the turnout tonight I don't think that's going to be an issue.

Each speaker will be limited to not more than five minutes. At other venues they'll be limited to three, here we've extended the period to five because of the low number of speakers.

As a matter of fairness, we will strictly enforce the five-minute time rule using the stop light we have here. We will talk about the stop light right when we get started with the comments.

And, again, you may send in detailed comments in writing.

All comments will be considered. The FERC gives equal weight to written comments and to verbal comments. I'd like to clarify that the FERC did not conceive this project nor are we promoting it. The project was designed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline, Kinder Morgan. We also call them company or the applicant. The company came up with the location of their facilities and it is up to us, the FERC staff to analyze the environment impacts associated with the construction and operation of those facilities. The FERC is not an advocate for the project. FERC staffs are advocates for the environment review process.

Let's review some project background. On October 2, 2014, the FERC accepted Tennessee Gas' request to initiate our pre-filing environmental review process for the NED project. During pre-filing the company is supposed to communicate with state holders, to identify issues of concern, attempt to resolve those issues and prepare its formal application to the FERC.

Tennessee Gas has stated that they'd like to file their application in October of this year. The purpose of the NED project is to provide about two billion cubic feet per day to markets in the northeast. The proposed facilities consist of 412 miles of pipeline across portions of Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, nine associated laterals or loops totaling 60 additional miles and nine new compressor stations, 14 new metering stations, and one mile of existing compressor station. For a detailed description of the project you can read Tennessee Gas' research report one which has already been filed with the FERC.

During the pre-filing Tennessee Gas will draft these resource reports as outlined in our regulations at 18 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 380, that FERC will review and comment on.

Right now we are in something called the scoping period. The formal comment period will end on August 31, 2015. During scoping the public may also comment on those resource reports which are available online at e-library.

However, even after the close of the scoping period, we will continue to see -- we will continue to consider comments that are filed with the FERC up until the time we write the EIS.

The EIS will assess such resource topics as geology and soils, water and wetlands, vegetation and wildlife, cultural resources, socio-economics, land use, air quality, noise, and safety. It will also evaluate reasonable and feasible alternatives.

Based on comments received to date and our review of the draft resource reports, we have already identified the following environmental issues. People are concerned about impacts on land use including rural characteristics and conservation lands. People are concerned about impacts on towns and residential areas. People are concerned about impacts on ground water including aquifers and wells and people are concerned about impacts on air quality and noise from compressor stations. That's not an exhaustive list, it's just a few of the topics we've seen so far in going over letters that have been filed about this project.

Other opportunities exist for the public to comment after Tennessee Gas files its formal application with the FERC. These opportunities for comments include in response to our notice of application and the response to the issuance of our draft environmental impact statement. After an application is filed with FERC, which has not occurred yet, and may occur in October, parties may request intervenor status in response to our notice of application. Being an intervenor is a legal position. Intervenor status can request re-hearing of a Commission decision. They also have the burden of serving all parties with their filings. You do not have to be an intervenor to have your environmental comments considered.

Also, you cannot intervene during the FERC's pre-filing period. So you cannot request intervenor status at this time. You must wait until after Tennessee Gas files its formal application.

After the application is filed, the FERC staff will identify data gaps and write environmental information requests. Once the FERC staff is convinced that the application is complete so that we fully understand the potential impacts the project might have on the environment, we will issue a notice of schedule for our EIS.

Based on the application and our own research the FERC staff will produce an EIS in accordance with the regulations written by the council of Environmental Quality at Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 1500 to 1508 to satisfy the requirements of NEPA. That document will offer our independent analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the proposals and alternative. Generally the EIS will discuss the current environment, identify potential project impacts on specific resources and present proposed measures to avoid, reduce, or mitigate adverse effects.

The FERC staff would produce a draft EIS that would be circulated for public comment. Copies of the

draft environment impact statement would be sent to our environmental mailing list which includes elected officials, government agencies, environmental groups and non-environmental locations, Indian tribes, local libraries and newspapers.

We address comments on the draft in the final EIS. The EIS is not a decision document. The Commission will consider the environmental impacts disclosed in the EIS together with other non-environmental data such as markets and rates. The Commission has developed a certificate policy statement that establishes the criteria they use to determine whether or not there is a need for a proposed project.

The Commission decision will be issued as a project order. If the Commission decides to authorize the project, they will give Tennessee Gas a certificate of public convenience and necessity. If the Commission decides to authorize the project, the FERC staff will make certain that the environmental conditions appended to the order are satisfied. Those conditions usually include a stipulation that the company obtain all other necessary final permits and authorization prior to construction. The company must implement all the measures they've committed to in their application and mitigation programs. FERC staff and the contractors will monitor the project through construction, restoration, and the completion of the mitigation programs.

We will perform on-site inspections for compliance with the environmental conditions of the order.

Now is the time for public comments. I will call up speakers individually in the order in which they have signed up by number. To move the meeting along in an expeditious manner, I will call up several numbers at a time and those speakers should sit in the front row ready to comment. In this case it's probably not necessary. I would like each speaker to speak clearly into the microphone, state your name and spell it for the record. If you represent an organization, tell us what it is without using an acronym. If you are a landowner along the pipeline route, please indicate where your property is located according to the mile marker or cross streets.

At this time I'd like to call up speaker number one.

MR. HUSTON: Hello, check, check, check? We have no mike.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Wayne is going to fix that.

MR. HUSTON: I got it. I got it.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Wayne is going to fix that for you.

MR. HUSTON: Check, check.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. The other thing I want to go over is our stop light. It will be green for the first four and a half minutes. Orange for 30 seconds, and then when the red light comes on, we'd like you to stop speaking and turn the mike over to the next speaker.

All right. The floor is yours.

MR. HUSTON: Hi, there. My name is William Huston, H-u-s-t-o-n. I just want to start off by saying that I'm going to address these people because these people are here to just fulfill a check mark on a box. They don't listen to what we have to say. And this is coming from studying dozens of FERC dockets. The one I have been most involved with is the Constitution Pipeline and that's been a multi-year battle.

FERC hurts families. FERC hurts families. FERC is a rubber stamping machine for industry. FERC is paid for by the industry that they regulate, not by Congressional appropriation. A lot of people might not know that.

FERC is a rogue agency. FERC is operating outside of the system of laws of our nation. FERC -- the FERC commissioners are committing acts of treason. These are high crimes. They are putting many human lives in jeopardy and they're responsible for destruction of thousands of acres of forest and living things that live in the forests.

These are devastating impacts. I would take argument -- I will address Mr. Paul -- Paul, right?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Uh-huh.

MR. HUSTON: One thing you said earlier is not true. You made one error. What you said was not factual. You said that fracking is out of scope. In reality, this is one of the gross violations that FERC commonly does with the National Environmental Policy Act, we call it NEPA. They don't look at upstream impacts such as fracking. This is required under NEPA.

What he said was, he said that FERC doesn't regulate fracking. That's true. That part is true. FERC does not regulate fracking, but FERC is obligated by law to study upstream impacts of a pipeline which includes fracking. They don't do that. This is a violation of law. They don't study downstream impacts such as radon gas. They don't study all reasonable and foreseeable impacts, so a pipeline that gets put in the ground very commonly a few years later will start getting compressor stations popping up. The impacts of those compressors under NEPA should have been scoped originally, but FERC looks the other way because they're a rubber stamp for industry.

FERC does dozens of violations of NEPA, the environmental law. They also do violations of the Natural Gas Act including failure to examine the character and the safety and compliance record of the applicant. And according to the Natural Gas Act, it says that this is 15 U.S.C. 717(f) paragraph E, "otherwise such application shall be denied." They don't do that. They ignore the law commonly.

There's this thing I was talking with Paul about, we had a little disagreement, but basically it's that there's two kinds -- I'm not going to get into that because it doesn't apply to this case, but FERC commonly --

(Audio disruption.)

MR. HUSTON: Can I have that little section credited?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. HUSTON: So the other thing how FERC violates the Natural Gas Act is by allowing jurisdictional facilities to be built without a certificate of public convenience and necessity. This is a violation -- can we swap mikes, maybe?

(PAUSE)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Wayne, do you want to swap the mike out?

(PAUSE)

MR. HUSTON: That's going to be a lot better. So FERC violates the NEPA, right, the National Environmental Policy Act. FERC also violates the Natural Gas Act which is what created FERC. So FERC is operating outside of their statutory authority. They are a rogue, criminal agency acting on behalf of industry. This is just a fact.

So if you came here thinking that you could tell FERC something and maybe they'll listen to you, I would recommend that you organize in different ways in your community. I would actually suggest that you plan for nonviolent civil disobedience, getting your bodies in the way of construction. That's what it's going to come down to. Because if they decide to put this pipeline in the ground, it's coming and really nothing we can do here is going to stop them.

How am I doing?

MR. FRIEDMAN: You have more time.

MR. HUSTON: Okay. So the other thing is, outside of this whole thing, you know, we have to divert, we have to request from our pension -- to divest. We have to divest our own personal financial portfolios from the oil and gas industry. We have to work on policy that promotes capital investment into renewable energy and not these pipelines that are massively contaminating our area.

Anyway, I have a map I can show you later showing the water contamination in this area and it's quite severe. So I would highly encourage you to organize your community because if we don't stop these pipelines from coming in and they make rapid conversion to renewable energy, this place, this beautiful place, my family has lived here for 150 years, at least, this beautiful place that we've been given to take care of it going to be made inhospitable to life, uninhabitable. It's happening. Many families have already had

water impacts.

So thank you. Let's try to figure out how to stop this stuff and it's not by talking to FERC.

Thank you very much.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Speaker number two.

MS. WARD: My name is Diane Ward, W-a-r-d. I'm a Pennsylvania resident and property owner in Bradford and Wyoming Counties in the Marcellus Shale region. And I oppose the entire scope of the Northeast Direct project from its origin in the gas fields of my home turf to its endpoint in Dracut, Massachusetts.

My opposition is based on the fact that the Northeast Energy Direct Project is not driven by documented U.S. customer or consumer needs. To the contrary, the need for the project is a direct outcome of American greed on the part of the gas industry both at the corporate and individual level.

Any customers or consumers who may be served as a result of this project are tangential to the real economic purpose of this project. The people who oppose this project, among the supply and market impacts in New York, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire are clear that although they may pay some of the highest gas and electric prices in this country, this project is not in their best interest or in the public interest. I support and applaud their efforts to ensure that this project is not approved by FERC and I think you should understand why.

Here in the northern tier of Pennsylvania, the gas corporations were besides themselves in the rush to drill, drill, drill without regard to the short-term need for additional gas supply. They drilled irresponsibly, cutting corners, polluting, lands and water, defiling our culture and ruining many lives. They rushed to ensure long-term, lowest cost to themselves.

The oversupply situation and the current low-gas price problem are of their own own doing. Gas industry, economic health, is the need behind this project, not consumer need. The gas industry desires that this project come to fruition so that it can reap the rewards that it envisioned when it decided to drill with gusto with reckless abandon. They know that the corrupt American systems which support the American economy can be counted on to assist them in counteracting any undesirable results of their request to drill. They count on FERC itself to look the other way when omissions, contradictions, and unsound data fill their application. This project does not end in Dracut, Massachusetts as stated. The chief method by which the gas industry achieves its nefarious results is by phasing. They plan the first phase to be as acceptable as possible. They obtain approval and construct. When phase one results are unacceptable, they bring in phase two, now a dire emergency and necessity, a phase which carries with it the additional negatives that fuel the public's ire.

In this case phase two goes beyond Dracut to Canada and further beyond by means of LNG exports from Canada. Phase two cannot be stated because it would eliminate the possibility of a positive outcome from the basic decision that FERC needs to make that of public convenience and necessity.

Phase two work has already been done, but this work is being ignored by FERC. Paraday Energy has filed a federal application to send domestic natural gas from Massachusetts to Nova Scotia where it would be converted to liquefied natural gas, LNG, and others.

Agreements are in place for sales to Germany. The natural gas would travel through the Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline from Dracut, Massachusetts, Spectra Energy who owns the pipeline has already applied to reverse the direction of the pipeline flow to reach the Maritimes provinces.

The gas industry leaves off these unpalatable details and FERC swallows the story whole. Sometimes FERC is able to believe that Massachusetts will be able to use all this gas regardless of how unreasonable that may seem.

FERC does not an objective decisionmaking agency relative to its role as a naysayer. FERC jobs and funding only directly energy projects. The more projects, the more money and jobs. However objective

you may be on other matters such as choosing between various siting alternatives, FERC is beholden to the interstate energy industry. No project, no job, no nice cars, fine homes, college educations for the kids, no benefits, no retirement. It is the common, human, low level of American greed. It resides in the psyche and it's disguised by generally calling it ambition, and the culture rewards ambition.

So I oppose the entire project and request that it not be approved as a public convenience and necessity.

I do think there are some specific areas that need FERC attention in the current filing and my simple request to you which is very particular, which I think you're looking for, is relative to solid waste. If you go ahead with this or any other pipeline project in the future, please classify waste, thrown as roadside litter by pipeline contractors, subcontractors, suppliers, et cetera, while on or off the job as solid waste associated with the pipeline project. This would mean that the company in charge of the project would have to have a portion of their solid waste plan dealing with these behaviors and with remediating any issues that these workers create.

Since this particular pipeline is so extensive, there will be thousands upon thousands of miles of local, mostly rural roadways littered upon by the workers as they have been littering in and around all of the other projects. There need to be clear expectations, enablers and incentives for workers who eat and drink on the run to dispose of their fast food containers, drink containers and other waste in a proper manner.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Your time has expired.

MS. WARD: Our environment depends on --

MR. FRIEDMAN: Could you wrap up, please?

MS. WARD: -- our doing something about this. Thank you very much.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you. Next is speaker number three.

MR. JOHNSON: Hello. My name is Lavern Johnson, J-o-h-n-s-o-n. I live here in Bradford County, Burlington Township and I am opposed to this project because of the fact the way the pipe was put through my property before where they're going to put another one along side of it.

The first thing they do is take away too much land for the project. They want work space which they don't need. They cut the trees. There's going to be a tremendous amount of water runoff.

We've had huge floods in this area for years. With the hundreds of miles of pipelines going into this state and taking the extra trees and extra space, you're going to let a catastrophe happen. You'll wipe Wilkes-Barre, Scranton, and Harrisburg off the face of the earth. The floods will be huge next time. They're only going to be bigger when these pipelines come in. With the storms we're having now, if you go and look at the pipelines and the well pads, there's water runoff taking roads out in front of them. There's nobody regulating this and it needs to be stopped.

Part of the project someone probably talked about last time I want to comment on. They show you a map that shows you they're going to bore through the wetlands, diversion and this thing. Then when they come to do it, they dig it. I said, "What happened?" They said, "Well, the FERC permits were changed." Well, I wasn't told they were changed. They were just changed. I don't feel that's fair to a landowner. I lost a lot of pasture for my cattle that year that I didn't expect. I ran out of hay. And all they said, "Well, we'll give you money, we'll give you money." Everything is money with these people. It's not the fact that they destroyed my land. They tell you that the land is going to be put back to the original condition. It wasn't. The grade wasn't put back.

First they blast the rock out. They take the rock and put it out there. They put their pipe in, by law they've got to have, I believe, eight inches of dirt around the pipe. They take a shaker bucket, reach over there and put the dirt around the pipe. Where does the dirt come from? It's my dirt. The rock is left over there. Then they mix the dirt and rock back up together and they leave you a mess. I've got rock all over my property.

I went to put the fence line back in, I can't even get a small hole in the ground because it's solid rock

where we used to have fence. And they won't do anything. You can complain and talk to these people and nobody answered. Now they tell me there was probably a FERC inspector there. If there was, I never seen him. Nobody talked to me. Nobody asked me any questions. The verge conditions weren't put back in right. It was simply a mess. They might have come through seeding time, they took and put bales of hay into there, for mulching and they put it in with the plastic and blew plastic all over my property. I complained. Oh, we'll pick it up. No, they didn't.

The birds, the animals, my cows, everything got -- it was a mess. And I don't want this project on my property again. The way they do business is terrible. I'm sure the animals died from the way they did it. They drilled under the Susquehanna River, they pumped into the bottom of the river and they dumped tons of bentonite into the river. Nothing was reported in the paper or anyplace about this. I mean, the project the last time was a disaster and I doubt it will be any different this time. They've already told me not to fight them too far, they'll take me to court under eminent domain and I'll get less than what they offer me. That's the threats you get before this thing is started.

So, you know, I just don't understand where the inspectors were last time. There's no compaction around the pipe, the put dirt around the pipe. And I worked construction all my life. The pipes settle in. Now you got a big dip in your ground. Oh, we'll come back and fill that. Oh, the crews in Jersey. Oh, we can't get the crew there now. Well, why don't you do it? We'll pay you to do it. Everything is they don't want to do anything. And everything is left a mess. I mean, it's sad, there's still a piece of log, and dunnage and plastic, and sticks on my property coming out of the ground.

I helped a neighbor fill a silo last year, we almost flipped its ensilage wagon over because of the hole where the pipeline had settled in. I mean, the whole project was left a disaster. If there was inspectors there, I don't know where they were. From what I've been told now there was supposed to have been a FERC inspector there. I didn't know it. I think the landowners should be told that this is going on and that the inspector should come talk to the landowner so that we know what's going on. Now they tell me I should have called a number. Nobody told me that last time and I was to these meetings before. But I'm just an old construction worker and farmer, so I probably don't know the laws or just about how to do things, but I would certainly hope that somehow they could do this different.

I mean, the top of my ground is covered with shot rock, I call it, because that's what we call it in construction when it's blasted out with dynamite. And it's all over. You know, nothing was put back. The grade isn't back. They've dug up huge rocks, the size of pickup trucks. In my agreement it said they would be removed from the property. Every day I ask them why they didn't move them. When they blasted, I said, why didn't you blast them so that you can get them out of here, because they took two excavators and a dozer to get them out of there, out of the ground. One day they weren't there. Is said, "Where's the rocks at?" "Oh, they're gone." I said, "Where are they?" "They're gone." Finally I said, "Listen, I'm tired of your crap, tell me where they are." "We buried them."

I said, the agreement was not to bury them. And they didn't bury them in their right-of-way, they buried them over on my property. They take way too much space that they didn't use, and my cows were out, they knocked fences down. The whole thing was a disaster. So I oppose this project simply because they won't do the job right and because of the possibility of flooding throughout the state with more pipelines.

Thank you very much.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

That's all the people I have signed up. Is there anyone else who would like to speak tonight?

(No response.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: If not, on behalf of the FERC, I'd like to thank you all for coming here tonight.

(Audience interjections.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: The notice said, when we start -- okay, and I announced that we'll end when people are done speaking. We're done with all the speakers.

So on behalf of the FERC, I would like to thank you for all coming here tonight to help us --

(Audience interjections.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: -- what?

MR. HUSTON: Can the people that have already spoken, before you close the meeting, can we speak one more time?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No. You had your opportunity.

Please send in written comments.

Let the record show that the meeting concluded at 7:35. Thank you for coming tonight.

(Whereupon, at 7:35 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF: : Project No.
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT : PF14-22-000

Tactonic High School
96 Valentine Road
Pittsfield, MA 01201

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping Meeting, pursuant to notice, at 7:00 p.m., John Peconom, the moderator.

PROCEEDINGS
(7:04 p.m.)

MR. PECONOM: Good evening everybody. Good evening. My name is John Peconom and on behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission I would like to thank all of you for coming tonight.

Can everybody in the back hear me? Okay. The fans are blowing so I just wanted to make sure, thank you. So the purpose of tonight's scoping meeting or public comment meeting is to gather issues or offer analysis of the Environmental Impact Statement, to identify new environmental issues, to explain the review -- the FERC review process, to provide opportunity for public input.

Tonight is a comment meeting. Myself, Jim Martin who is my supervisor and also Eric Tomasi's supervisor who is the Environmental Project Manager, are here from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. We are joined by other staff here at the table and in the back. The folks in the back are happy to answer your questions to the best of their abilities.

Our job here tonight is to gain information from you, to tell you a little bit about the FERC review process, all this associated with the proposed NED pipeline. Public input is an important part of the FERC review process. I like to tell folks, when we come out to these meetings from Washington, D.C. is that -- in fact we are from Washington -- I'm not going to sit up here and tell you that I know everything about this area.

We depend on your input, your comments to help us learn about this area, help us understand the issues unique to this area. Our job is to conduct an environmental review. I am a biologist, Jim is a biologist, Jenny is an environmental protection specialist. They send us here to understand your environmental issues, to better understand them and to take that information back to Washington so we can better do our review.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm having trouble hearing you sir.

MR. PECONOM: Oh my apologies. Is this better? Okay. So as I said the public input is an important part of our review process. We are not from this area, we need your help to make our review the best review it could be. I am not going to sit up here and tell you that I know everything about this area or that Jim knows or that any of us know anything about this area.

Your input is crucial for our review. You live here, you spent many years here, we need your help to make sure our review is as complete as possible. This is just but one of many ways to give us your comments about this project. This scoping meeting, this public comment meeting is a chance for you to tell us your comments in person.

You can also send us written comments. You can go to the FERC internet website www.ferc.gov and send us comments. I believe many of you have done that already. We accept comments now through the close of the scoping period and really throughout the entire review process.

Many folks have expressed concerns to me that this is the only time they have to comment and that is not the case. We encourage you to comment in the review period so that we can get started on our review as

quickly as possible however, we accept comments all the way through until the end.

We have a lot of people who have expressed an interest in speaking tonight. By my count it is near 80 folks so that is going to be a few hours. If you want to speak or you don't get a chance to speak because it is going to take so long, you can submit us written comments. Written comments are given the same weight as verbal comments.

I can tell by talking to some folks earlier today and looking at the crowd right now, this is a very passionate crowd with strong feelings. And I understand that the folks here in Pittsfield and in surrounding communities are used to very lively discussions about the issues facing the community.

I have to say I was very impressed when people were signing up earlier in how they conducted themselves and were very civil in doing that and I hope that that continues throughout this meeting. I am not going to go through these points that are above my head because I think everyone here knows how to act at a meeting.

I will do my best to give everyone a little lead way understanding how passionate folks are. If I feel like it's a little much I will just ask you to tone it down a little bit.

So a little bit about the NED Pipeline Project -- as you can see here Tennessee Gas proposes to construct and operate 418 miles of new pipeline in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut. 9 new compressor stations, 13 new meter stations, 1 modified existing compressor station, 8 pipeline segments, laterals, loops, delivery lines et cetera.

All of this would be in order to deliver 1.3 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day. A lot of you have been tracking this project from the beginning. A lot of you expressed concern to me about the information filed on Friday, the revised resource reports. It's a lot of information to process. I haven't read it myself, it is going to take everyone here and us as the Commission a long time to process that information.

I know people want as much information as possible to provide the most comprehensive and detailed comments as possible. We understand your concerns. Tonight's job is not for -- the purpose of tonight's meeting is not to get those detailed comments at this time. It is going to take a while to go through that information.

I think all of you have had a chance to review the basic outline of the project. If you understand what your concerns are we want to hear those tonight. There will be plenty of time in the weeks and months coming ahead to provide those detailed comments.

Again as I said earlier written comments are considered same as verbal comments. Just a quick project map of the eastern portion of the project and then the western portion of the project -- we were here several months back for the company's open houses.

At that meeting through the comments we have received at the Commission to date we have already identified public concerns. There is a list of them right here, some of the main ones that we have heard quite a few times. References to develop alternative energy, I see some signs out there tonight expressing that concern.

Concerns regarding the export of this gas, disruption of the character and the environment here, development through high residential areas, cumulative impacts and fracking, private well and aquifer damage, compression station noise and air emissions -- those comments expressed to us are on our radar. Our job is to then make sure that we review these areas, conduct analysis, ask questions, do research and prepare that information for our public review.

I expect that we will learn some more tonight about these issues and other issues. People ask me what happens with these comments that you give us. You know what is the point here? And these comments are very important and I know when you write a letter you want to get a letter back. You want to know that you are heard and how we express that is when we turn that information around we ask the company questions.

You may have seen the comments that we have issued on their draft resource reports. We are going to is-

sue more comments and we are going to ask agencies that we work with about these issues. I wish we had time to write everybody a letter but these projects you know, get in the hundreds of thousands of letters. It is just impossible to do.

But the way we use that information is during our review which is a nice lead in to the FERC process. Right now we are in the FERC pre-filing process. There is no application, there is no official project. The purpose of the pre-filing process is what I like to call to shake the bushes, to find out what people's concerns are, to identify issues.

A lot of times these projects are designed on a drawing board in some far-away place. We read about them in Washington. We would like to come up here, see the area for ourselves, talk to people who might be affected by these projects. This is the pre-filing process. It is designed to get you to give us information as quickly as possible so that we can use that in our review of these projects.

The company expects to file its application in October of 2015. That application should address all of the concerns raised tonight as well as previously and should provide all of the information or response to the information that people have expressed concern with.

Once that application is filed the Commission staff will review that information for accuracy and completeness. If necessary we will issue requests for additional information before we even begin preparing our Environmental Impact Statement.

The Environmental Impact Statement is a summary of our analysis of the potential impacts resulting from construction operation of this projection. The Commission is responsible to conduct an environmental review. We are able to do that based on the information provided in the application, the information that we gained from you, from our consultations with state and federal agencies and local governments.

Once we have done all of that work and prepared an analysis we will put that into a Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement will be issued for public review. You will get a chance to read what we have done and decide whether we have done it right or not. We will come back somewhere in this area, perhaps here, and hold comment meetings to allow you the opportunity to inform us whether we got it right or not.

Our job is to advise the Commission and tell them what the impacts would likely be if this construction, if this Project were approved and the construction and operation occurred.

Any comments that we received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement would then be incorporated into a Final Environmental Impact Statement. As I said before the Commission would use that document as well as other information regarding the cost of the pipeline, some legal aspects, the purpose and need and decide whether or not to approve the project.

The Commission's review is not the only review that occurs. There are several other federal and state statutes that the company must adhere to, one of them being the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act. The project is subject to NEPA review. NEPA is administered by the Secretary of the executive office of Energy and Environmental Affairs and they expect documents to be filed in that process this fall.

Other reviews that will need to be conducted by the Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and other state and local agencies. Before I continue I neglected to point out that there is a stenographer in the corner here who is recording tonight's meeting. It is important to have this information on the public record so that the public can hold us accountable for the things that we say and to make sure that all of your comments given here tonight are recorded accurately into our record.

I talked a little bit about the EIS and I am just going to talk a little bit more about it here. The EIS is our independent analysis of the likely impacts that result from construction and operating the project. As it says here the EIS will take a hard look at the environmental impacts of the project and we will look at alternatives to avoid, minimize or mitigate those impacts.

I'm a biologist, Jim's a biologist and I have said this before. You know we will look at the information provided we will assess what the impact could be. We will also look at how that impact could be avoided

or minimized. If necessary, we will recommend measures to further avoid and minimize those impacts. All of that information will be included in the Environmental Impact Statement.

We are now coming to the important part of the meeting where we get to hear from you. As I said earlier we have close to 80 speakers tonight. I have elected to allow the elected representatives to go first, seeing that they attend a lot of meetings and represent a lot of folks here in the area.

They will be given five minutes each to speak. After that we will then start calling numbers. I believe we have close to 70 numbers. Given that we have so many people we are going to limit your comments to three minutes. By my count we are close to 4 hours right there. We have a timer set up here. At two and a half minutes the yellow light will go on and at three minutes the red light will go on.

I will allow you to finish your sentence and if you can hurry up and finish that would be great. I will give you a little flexibility but not much just in order that I want everyone to have the opportunity to speak tonight. So just up above me is a quick reminder. It is important that when you come up to please say your name and spell it for the court reporter so we can attribute your comments accordingly.

Speak clearly, the fans are blowing and the microphone obviously I am having trouble with. We want everyone here to be able to hear your comments. And I think that's about it. It's a passionate crowd, give us your comments, tell us what you think. So with that I will go ahead and call the first speaker State Representative Paul Mark.

MR. MARK: Thank you very much and thank you for having these hearings in Pittsfield and in Greenfield. My name is Paul Mark, P-a-u-l M-a-r-k. I am the State Representative for the 2nd Berkshire District which includes the towns of Dalton, Windsor, Hinsdale, Peru and Northfield.

Windsor and Northfield would be home to two of the compressor stations and I am here to read a statement on behalf of each of the state legislators that would be impacted directly, that represent one of the towns that the pipeline in this area of the state would be going through.

"We are all unable to attend this hearing tonight due to legislative sessions in Boston, but we all wish to comment on the matter before FERC due to the critical importance of this regulatory process in evaluating the environmental impact of this proposed project on the communities that we represent.

First and foremost we believe that FERC should suspend the current environmental scoping process and withdraw the Notice of Intent that was issued on June 30, 2015. It was only days ago -- it was only days ago on Friday, July 24, 2015 that the latest resource reports for this Northeast Energy Direct Project were filed for public comment and review as part of this process.

These documents are massive, with thousands of pages of highly technical and important environmental information about this project. Despite the lateness of the filing of these reports, they are incomplete and omit critical information that is necessary for a thorough and accurate review of the impacts of this proposed project in our communities.

In this short amount of time, it is simply impossible for citizens, organizations and experts to properly analyze and comment on the environmental and economic impacts of this project. In order to have a credible and respected regulatory process, we believe that it is incumbent upon FERC to postpone this scoping process.

We believe that it should be restarted with the issuance of a new Notice of Intent extending the public comment period for at least 60 days in light of the July 24th resource reports. A new schedule of scoping hearings should be issued to allow for meaningful public comment during this period.

Without a restarting of this process, we believe that our constituents who would be affected by this project will be unable to offer full and meaningful testimony and comments on a project which threatens both the environmental health and quality of life in our region.

We respectfully ask that you approve this request before proceeding further." Signed Senate President Stan Rosenberg, Senator Benjamin Downing, Berkshire Franklin Hampshire Hampden District, Representative Gailanne Cariddi, 1st Berkshire, Representative Paul Mark, 2nd Berkshire, Representative Steven

Kulik, 1st Franklin and Representative Susannah Whipps Lee, 2nd Franklin District, thank you very much.
MS. CARIDDI: Good evening. My name is Gail Cariddi and I am the Representative from the 1st Berkshire District as well as being a signer to the document that Representative Mark wrote I have a few comments for you.

3 of the 9 communities I represent are along the proposed northeast direct pipeline route as it enters the Commonwealth from New York State Hancock, Lanesborough and Cheshire. In reviewing your maps I find that my constituents are among the route that is about half of the segment G marked path in Berkshire County.

As the State Representative I have received over 1,000 contacts on the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project through personal meetings, letters, emails and phone calls from my constituents. From these contacts, all but one are opposed to the construction, operation and maintenance of the proposed pipeline facilities along or through near their communities.

I have also received information that communities of Hancock, Lanesborough, Cheshire, North Adams and Williamstown in the 1st Berkshire District have voted in their town, or city council meetings to oppose the construction of the proposed Northeast Direct Pipeline Project.

The comments I have received cite health, environmental and safety concerns in reasons for their opposition. While the route is proposed to follow an existing right-of-way this does not alter the fact that the proposed pipeline construction and the building of temporary and permanent access roads will cause considerable destruction and permanently alter our nature habitat, vegetation and wildlife.

Much of our local economy is dependent on the beauty of our surroundings that feature hundreds of acres of publically accessible conservation land, spectacular views and home to many rare and endangered plants. The route is proposed in an area that will affect local water resources and wetlands.

Of particular concern in the community of Waynesboro is that the proposed route will go through the town's water aquifer. In Cheshire the proposed route also shows the pipeline going through Cheshire Reservoir, another important water and recreational resource in the region.

I believe a reasonable alternative would be to have the proponent's pump the same amount of money and investment into the investigation of enclosing of all gas leaks. Such a project would employ more local workers over many more years than a few years of the construction of the proposed new larger line.

The impacts and the fact that it will eradicate existing leaks and problems on our roads, streets and connections to our existing users would be more beneficial. I also believe that this will provide greater socio-economic activity and will have a longer lasting positive effect on our local economy in the 1st Berkshire District and in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In conclusion I ask that you take your highest regard to the people's wishes of Massachusetts when we voted on Article 97 the Commonwealth's Constitution. In part it reads, "That people should have the right to clean air and water, freedom from excessive and unnecessary noise and the natural scenic, historic and aesthetic qualities of their environment and the protection of the people to their right to the conservation, development and utilization, agricultural, mineral, forest, water, air and other natural resources."

This is hereby declared to be a public purpose in Massachusetts, thank you so much.

MR. PECONOM: Before I call the next speaker I want to make sure that everyone can hear in the back. Do I need to turn a fan off? Yes? Okay. Turn on the lights too? Okay, it is going to make it hotter. Do we have -- so give me one second please. I appreciate everyone's patience for just adjusting the volume to make sure everyone can hear, or trying to anyways. What's that? Oh a vote on the fan. All right, give us a minute and we will see what we can do here, I apologize.

And you may have to yell if you are going to give comments so that may be the answer here. I'm trying to and I'm working on the lights too. We have consulted about 25 people and the answer is you are going to have to speak louder to the microphone. If you turn up the volume there's going to be feedback issues and the house lights are the only lights that are available to us at this time.

The side lights might be able to come on but I'm not sure that's going to help anybody so I apologize and we will just do the best we can tonight. The next speaker is Miss Mary Cherry. I appreciate everyone's patience and understanding.

MS. CHERRY: Good evening, my name is Mary Cherry. M-a-r-y C-h-e-r-r-y and I am the Vice-Chair of the Dalton Select Board. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you. I would like to highlight votes taken in Dalton concerning Kinder Morgan's proposed pipeline.

At a special town meeting on June 30, 2014 the voters in the town of Dalton voted overwhelmingly to endorse a Resolution banning new high-capacity, high-pressure pipelines and to champion sustainable energy. Subsequently at its special Select Board meeting July 8, 2014 the Dalton Select Board voted to rescind permission to survey town land previously granted to Kinder Morgan.

Additionally the Select Board drafted a letter of opposition to the pipeline sent to FERC highlighting four major areas of concern: possible watershed contamination, use of eminent domain for a private company, clear-cutting of vegetation and forest areas through town and encroachment upon state, federal and protected lands.

At the request of the Select Board the town manager formed a group focusing on statement preparation to FERC. This group is comprised of town departments and boards, health department, highway, police, fire and Conservation Commission to name a few. Their work will result in our official written comments to be submitted to you by the August 31st deadline.

Further, at its March 9th, 2015 meeting the Select Board denied an additional request by Kinder Morgan to survey different plots of town land once the route had changed. I stand before you tonight on behalf of the town of Dalton to reiterate and emphasize the overwhelming opposition to the construction of this pipeline.

Our concerns which will be delineated in our letter to you focus on eight major areas potentially impacted by this pipeline: drinking water, ecological and agricultural, air quality, public safety, road and traffic, recreational and aesthetic, historical structure and economic.

I will speak briefly on some of the ecological concerns we have. Construction and operational impacts on environmentally sensitive lands including the Housatonic River, farms and forest is of substantial concern. Virtually all of the project area is within Massachusetts Bio Map 2 core habitat which is designed to guide strategic bio diversity conservation in Massachusetts over the next decade by focusing land protection and stewardship on the areas that are most critical for insuring the long-term persistence of rare and other native species and their habitats, exemplary natural communities and a diversity of eco systems.

Bio Map 2 is also designed to include the habitats and species of conservation concern identified in the State Wildlife Action Plan. It is land that is key to conserving our state's bio diversity. Also a substantial portion of the project area is located within Bio Map 2 critical natural landscape.

Further the project area runs through natural heritage and endangered species program priority and estimated habitats. Additionally a portion of the project area also runs through the upper Housatonic Valley natural heritage area, a federal designation which exists in partnership with the National Park Service to illuminate the diverse rich identity of the upper Housatonic River Valley region and to preserve and promote its historical, cultural and natural resources.

The proposed route crosses streams that flow into the Housatonic River. Soil in these areas may contain hazardous chemicals from no operation dating back as many as 200 years. A complete Environmental Impact Study must be done by a third party in order to assess the existing environmental species and habitats and document the impact of the pipeline installment on those ecological areas, including its long-term presence.

While time does not permit me to go into detail here, the scope of our eight concerns and numerous questions and requests outline in our letter to you, I implore you to take these into consideration and to ask that Kinder Morgan address and mitigate where necessary, each and every one of them, thank you for your

time.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Miss Cherry. Mr. John Bartels?

MR. BARTELS: Good evening. My name is John Bartels, J-o-h-n B-a-r-t-e-l-s. I am the Chair of the Dalton Select Board and I thank you for the opportunity to speak with you tonight. As you have heard and will hear from other speakers our town has a number of concerns and issues with regard to the construction of the Northeast Energy Direct Gas Pipeline Project.

I intend to direct my comments on the impacts of the construction with our watershed and thus our drinking water however this is not just our drinking water but that of the City of Pittsfield, parts of Lanesborough, Lenox and Richmond. This issue impacts nearly 50,000 people.

Miles of the proposed pipeline were run directly through watershed property in the towns of Dalton, Hinsdale, Peru and Windsor which serve the drinking water supply for the aforementioned towns. It also runs extremely close to the Cleveland, Windsor and Egypt reservoirs as well as a public water supply well. The construction along the route will be through areas of dramatic elevation change, varying soils, streams and swamps.

This being the case questions arise -- how will Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas, during and after the construction of the pipeline, control the soil erosion running into our watershed properties and eventually into our reservoirs? How will Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas monitor and insure that water flow into the reservoir remains consistent prior to and after construction?

How will Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas insure that water tables will not be affected by the pipeline construction through these areas? How will Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas prevent or mitigate the potential of construction vehicle fluids, blasting chemical residues or other miscellaneous compounds from infiltrating into our watershed and thus contaminating our water supplies?

Does Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas have a plan in place in the event of water contamination and thus the shutting down of current water supplies? The town of Dalton's formal written letter to the FERC of concerns and issues details this matter of watershed and water contamination to a much greater extent.

The Dalton Fire and Water District drafted a route change to deal with the aforementioned issue, the town of Dalton agrees with the following recommendation as well, and I state.

"As previously stated due to the substantial concerns we have for the safety of our drinking water and surrounding watershed, as well as issues related to the pipeline, we recommend an alternative route through Dalton which will negate a majority of these concerns." It is as follows:

At coordinates 42-30, 45.94 north by 73.09, 14.61 west the pipeline will turn northeast for 3.1 miles to coordinates 42-32, 19.48 north by 73.06, 17.93 west. At this point again the pipeline will turn east for 3.1 miles to coordinates 42-32, 16.00 north by 73.02, 36.36 west and turn again heading southeast for 3.32 miles to coordinates 42-29, 52.17 north by 73.00, 24.04 west. This will bring the alternate route back to a proposed route without the need to cross any watershed or Route 9.

Again this alternative route avoids our watershed, reservoirs, public water supply well, it also avoids populated areas of town and a major road crossing, not to mention Massachusetts Bio Map 2, critical natural landscape, natural heritage and endangered species program priority and estimated habitats, the Housatonic River, farmland and privately owned timber lots.

I hope you will consider the concerns I have expressed and the alternate route which our town and fire district endorsed. You will not only ensure the safety of our watershed and drinking water for the town of Dalton, but as I said also for the City of Pittsfield, towns of Richmond, Lenox, Lanesborough and Richmond.

The town of Dalton's complete and formal written statement of issues and concerns with the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Gas Pipeline Project will be submitted to the FERC prior to the August 31st, 2015 deadline. Thank you for your time.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Bartels. Miss Deborah Brunelle?

MS. BRUNELLE: Good evening my name is Deborah Brunelle. D-e-b-o-r-a-h Brunelle B-r-u-n-e-l-l-e. I am here on behalf of the Dalton Fire District Board of Water Commissioners. The Dalton Fire District owns land in Dalton, Hinsdale, Peru and Windsor that is being affected by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline. To this date the Dalton Fire District is not aware of any surveys for environmental, biological sensitive habitat, or cultural resources completed or even begun. We would request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission require a full Environmental Impact Study be performed for Dalton Fire District land quality, our wildlife, the flow of water to our rivers and reservoirs in the entire Dalton watershed and finally our water quality.

We are the only Zone A surface watershed impacted in the State of Massachusetts. Last year Kinder Morgan was given an alternate route to avoid our watershed, our populated areas of town, two major road crossings and interim well head protection area. Massachusetts Bio Map 2, Critical Natural Landscape, Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program priority and estimated habitats the Wahconah Falls Brook, farmland and privately owned timber lots.

Furthermore, out of the 7.2 miles proposed for Dalton's pipeline layout at least 4.2 miles will have a direct impact on our watershed, all of which could be avoided with the alternate route proposed. The current pipeline runs through our watershed and next to a public water supply well. There are three watersheds, Egypt and Anthony and Dalton, and the Windsor Cleveland which extends from Dalton into Hinsdale, Peru and Windsor.

The Cleveland, Windsor and Egypt reservoirs along with the Anthony Brook and Cady Brook head walls are the primary and emergency backup drinking water supplies respectively for Dalton.

The Cleveland reservoir and Cady Brook head wall also serve the City of Pittsfield and three other towns, Waynesboro, Lenox and Richmond. If these drinking water sources were contaminated in any way this could affect tens of thousands of residents and industries.

We have compiled a detailed list of questions and we have stated our concerns in a letter to the FERC regarding the potential for unreasonable risk posed to human and environmental health. We respectfully ask FERC to have the Tennessee Gas Pipeline provide us with specific answers to our questions and concerns. We need to feel comfortable with the unknown to protect the water supply for our town, the towns of Waynesboro, Lenox, Richmond and the City of Pittsfield and our watershed, wildlife and vegetation and I thank you for your time.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Miss Brunelle. Mr. Nathaniel Karns?

MR. KARNS: Good evening. I am Nathaniel Karns, N-a-t-h-a-n-i-e-l K-a-r-n-s and I am the Executive Director of the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission. On behalf of the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission I want to thank FERC for holding a scoping meeting for the EIS for Tennessee Gas as proposed Northeast Direct Project in Berkshire County.

This is the largest proposed project in the county since either the Massachusetts Turnpike or the original 200 line were built in the early 1950's. The Berkshire Regional Planning Commission is the regional planning agency for the 32 cities and towns in Berkshire County, Massachusetts.

Shortly after NED was proposed, BRPC began working with our directly affected municipalities, two fire and water districts, Rensselaer County, New York and the three affected towns there. Those include the towns of Waynesboro, Cheshire, Dalton, Hinsdale, Windsor, Stephentown, Nassau, Schodack, City of Pittsfield and the Dalton and Lanesborough village fire and water districts, Rensselaer County and three of the towns that were on the originally preferred route from Tennessee Gas.

And that working group has stayed together for over a year discussing and trying to develop comments. Collectively and individually we will be submitting extensive written comments to FERC regarding issues of importance to our communities and counties which we believe the Environmental Impact Statement must address.

The level of impacts that such a project will create on our communities is profound. We will provide specific detailed information and requests in the following issue areas: protection of drinking water, infrastructure, highways, roads and recreational trails, public safety, private property owner impacts, compressor station impacts and Windsor and Nassau pipe yards and contractor yards, water resources, wetlands and water crossings in particular, areas of special interest and social, economic and physical issues.

We are confident that FERC will find the detailed information we provide beneficial and will presume that you will understand why these issue areas are of such concern to us. We can also confidentially state -- confidently state that the alternative's analysis which calls for in depth consideration of a pipeline in the existing 200 line corridor, along the Massachusetts Turnpike, will also receive considerable attention in the Berkshire's as you get into those issues.

And again we thank you for being here and we look forward to submitting comments by August 31st, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Karns. Mr. Channing Gibson?

MR. GIBSON: My name is Channing Gibson, C-h-a-n-n-i-n-g G-i-b-s-o-n. Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to address you tonight on behalf of the town of Lenox as one of its Select Men. I am here tonight because Lenox is directly impacted by the Massachusetts alternative route described in Resource Report 10 in the Tennessee Gas Pipeline company's filings with FERC.

I am also here because our concerns for our town extended the other towns and conservation lands in both the alternative and preferred routes. The Massachusetts alternative would result in grave impacts to the town of Lenox, most critically to the town's watershed lands on Lenox Mountain, which along with its main feeder stream lie directly in the pipeline's path.

The Lenox watershed is small by watershed standards yet it delivers to the town safe, high-quality drinking water. The cost of treating even relatively pure water is enormous and Lenox has invested and must continue to invest millions of dollars to maintain this vital utility which is our town's sole source of drinking water.

The large-scale deforestation, excavation and likely blasting required for the NED pipeline to reverse this small watershed and its main feeder stream pose serious risks to the Lenox water supply. Any contamination by a toxic substance, either during construction from even minute amounts of spilled fuel oil or hydraulic fluid for instance, due to the pipeline's leaking or failure would be catastrophic.

I want to highlight here that last November in special town meeting the people of Lenox voted to place Article 97 protection on the town's watershed lands precisely because the NED pipeline's profound threat to their water supply and while our watershed is our primary concern it isn't the only one.

The federally mandated rest of river clean up proposed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency is a massive undertaking that calls for the excavation of miles of the Housatonic River in order to mitigate the river's PCB contamination caused by General Electric.

This multi-dedicated operation intersects in Lenox with the alternative route of the NED pipeline. Though we have raised the issue repeatedly we have heard nothing, absolutely nothing about how this intersection of two large scale excavation and construction projects in areas of environmental and critical environmental concern would be addressed.

Additionally the Massachusetts alternative route would drive right through the heart of a Lenox town jewel, Kennedy Park, utilizing the town's main access trail and destroying that trail's natural forested surroundings and canopy, thereby destroying a large part of Kennedy Park's appeal which is presently enjoyed by residents and tourists alike.

And those tourists I just mentioned are another vitally important resource imperiled by the environmental impacts of the NED pipeline. Since the demise of the mills and factories and GE, the economy of the Berkshires has become based almost entirely on tourism.

Towns here are in many cases hanging on by their fingertips financially. We depend for our existence on

the tourists and second homeowners who are drawn here by the spectacular natural beauty of the Berkshires. Any threat, even a remote threat to the scenic and serene escape into the country that we offer, is a threat to the financial security of our towns in our county.

One might say, “yeah the pipeline is a temporary inconvenience,” but then the 100 foot swath of deforestation is allowed to grow back to a 50 foot swath of grass and no one will even think about what’s underground unless there’s a problem or unless you live near a compressor.

In a very, very competitive regional market for tourist revenue not only can we not afford even a small drop of visitors or a reduction in second homeowner interest in the area, if a problem were to occur the Berkshires would be economically destroyed. And for what? It is true that in dire circumstances with no alternatives we all have to share risks, but the present circumstances aren’t dire.

Assuming there is actually a need for additional natural gas capacity, the good news is there are less risky, more effect, more sensible alternatives to the NED Project. Alternatives such as Access Northeast and the PNGTS and trans-Canada Project, both of which unlike NED are scalable, and would minimize impacts to the environment by utilizing existing gas pipeline footprints, both of which would also better target the need we hear so much about from our utilities, primarily the need to help contain the cost for the production of electricity about which the power companies warned us, we and our children should be having unrelenting nightmares.

In closing I want to address something that has greatly troubled the Lenox Board of Selectmen. In voting to do everything possible to prevent the NED Pipeline from coming through our town, we knew that if we prevailed and the route was changed it would mean that other towns and other conservation lands would then be in the line of fire. We didn’t like how that felt, however, so great was the threat to our watershed that we had to put that discomfort aside and act as we did.

And in fact the preferred route did change and now the Lenox BOS wants to express publically its empathy for those towns presently in the pipeline’s path -- towns whose great concerns mirror ours. We stand with our neighbors in condemning NED as a natural gas transmission alternative that is bad for everyone, we ask you to recognize the wholly unacceptable environmental and economic threats to Berkshire County posed by the NED Project and therefore to reject it entirely, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Gibson. Mr. Bob Bishop?

MR. BISHOP: Thank you my name is Bob Bishop. B-o-b B-i-s-h-o-p.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can’t here you.

MR. BISHOP: Okay is that better? Okay. I am a member of the Dalton Select Board and Chairman of the Dalton Conservation Commission. I am here to speak on our conservation issues -- I’m here to speak on our conservation issues as we see it from the Conservation Commission. First of all the route is going through a lot of our wetlands and we are concerned about the impacts of short term and long term.

MR. PECONOM: I think he’s doing the best he can.

MR. BISHOP: Okay.

MR. PECONOM: The feedback would be a problem, that’s what we were told.

MR. BISHOP: Okay I will try to speak up louder. We are very concerned about the drinking water supplies. We are concerned about using explosives near these water resources how they can change the underground channels and possibly cut off water supplies to our wetlands and our drinking water supplies.

We are concerned about the vernal pools along this route. We are concerned about the proposed stream crossings and the impacts they have on our streams. This route will also disturb a lot of our habitats for rare species that are on this route and this route will also be built in flood plains and the Commission is going to require compensatory storage for anything that is taken up on these areas.

The town of Dalton also adopted a Scenic Mountain Act in 2006 which will require a separate Notice of Intent filed by Kinder Morgan and this Act was put in to keep our mountains pristine for our area. Let’s

see -- because of our concerns the Commission is going to require a full impact study including field data sheets, rare species and wildlife habitat, et cetera.

We also require -- we are going to ask Kinder Morgan to hire a consultant at their expense so we can review these under Mass. Law 53G and the Commission would like to remind FERC and Kinder Morgan that the pipeline will have to file a Notice of Intent with the Storm Waters Commission in town also, okay, thank you very much for your time.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Bishop. Mr. John Garcia?

MR. GARCIA: My name is John Garcia, J-o-h-n G-a-r-c-i-a, the town of Windsor and I would like to say that the town of Windsor is a beautiful, clean, quiet town and it has been for the last 44 years since I have lived there. Now with this compressor station they want to build -- first it was 80,000 horsepower and now it's 40,000 horsepower, but anyhow no matter how many horsepower I would just like to address -- first of all the 6 families that live right in the vicinity of this proposed station, their land will be worthless. They won't be able to live, the noise will be horrendous, the light, the pollution so I have a few things that I would like FERC to do and Kinder Morgan. First of all I would like them to study the potential risk for health problems to people and wildlife.

When a compressor station is totally engulfed in thick heavy fog and blizzards so the blow-off of chemicals which has 15 carcinogens in it can't draw up their stacks into the sky so they stay low to the ground for days on end, because we have fog for days on end -- thick fog.

And this is typical weather for Windsor, Mass. The second thing I would like researched is I would like you to please research the effect on drinking water from all the surrounding reservoirs, Cleveland which supplies Pittsfield with their water and Pittsfield really thinks they are getting out of this but when they find out that their water is effected, Wahconah, Ashmere and all the private wells in Windsor from the 15 or more harmful chemicals that will be emitted from the compressor station exhaust stacks especially associated with thick fog, blizzards and rain and I would like you to please research and measure how much chemical pollution from a compressor station accumulates in all the different layers of snow because we -- you think Boston got snow, Windsor tops Boston every year.

And all the different layers of the snow of the high volumes, before the melt off which would all go into the Dalton watershed when it does melt and to everybody else's wells.

And I would like you to study the effect that chemicals from a compressor station will have on farm produce, livestock, individual gardens and will they be safe to eat anymore? Thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Garcia. Miss Anne O'Connor?

MS. O'CONNOR: Hello my name is Anne O'Connor, A-n-n-e O'C-o-n-n-o-r. So I am a member of the Williamstown Board of Select Men. Williamstown is not directly affected by the pipeline nonetheless a Resolution opposing the proposed Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline was passed unanimously at our town meeting on May 19th, 2015 and also endorsed unanimously by the Select Board.

I ask FERC to consider a number of general concerns that we addressed in that resolution. I would like you to study the environmental impacts of the installation and the operation of the pipeline with respect to the health of residents in the directly affected communities as well as nearby communities such as Williamstown.

Please examine whether fumes from blow-down valves or the compressor station could be carried by the wind as far as Williamstown or in certain weather patterns, settled in large quantities in the Hancock and Williamstown valley floor. Please also consider whether health risks and property value losses associated with the pipeline will impact our regional tourism economy which is reliant on attractions such as Jiminy Peak, Ramblewild, Ashuwillticook Rail Trail, Mount Greylock and Notchview, all of these are in directly affected communities.

And we rely on these to bring tourists and second home dwellers to our area. Please thoroughly study how the pipeline will impact the quality of the water, air and soil for local farms including the organic CSA's

such as Caretaker Farm in Williamstown, Mighty Food Farms in Lanesborough and Lakeview Orchards, all of which are significant suppliers to our local food economy and food resiliency.

Please examine how the Williamstown economy would be impacted by a decline in health quality as well as property values in our neighboring communities whose residents work and own business in our town. Please consider the impact on our regional school district if children from Hancock and Lanesborough move away, are sickened or die due to the effects of the pipeline.

Please consider the cost to the town of Williamstown if our emergency responders are called upon for disaster response and mitigation due to a pipeline incident. Please also clarify whether we as rate payers will be required to pay for the construction of the pipeline via a utility tariff

The need for the pipeline is still not clear and FERC should suspend the scoping process until the state attorney general has finished participating in Mass. DPU dockets 1537 and 1548 regarding gas capacity needs and Berkshire Gas's proposed contract with Tennessee Gas.

Please also examine whether the increase gas dependency resulting from the pipeline would damage the state's solar power industry and prevent Massachusetts from meeting its statutory obligations under the Global Warming Solutions Act.

Finally with respect to all of the comments made this evening we ask you to consider the potential benefit of not building the pipeline. Particularly, in the fact of the extreme challenges presented by the climate crisis, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Miss O'Connor. Miss Joan Wattman?

MS. WATTMAN: Good evening, Joan Wattman, J-o-a-n W-a-t-t-m-a-n the town of Plainfield. I serve on the Zoning Board of Appeals. I am an abutter. The half mile stretch of my property is part of the right-of-way of the power lines and the pipeline would be constructed along that.

The town of Plainfield has voted overwhelmingly to oppose the construction of the pipeline. Many of the speakers have addressed points that I would like to address. I am going to be writing individually and also the zoning board is going to be writing before the August 31st deadline.

We have several questions that we have been drafting. My main concern is the need and I feel like that has not been addressed adequately by the proposal. I would ask that the need be considered in light of the leaks that have not been corrected and also the overall improvements that could be made to our infrastructure by efficiency and conservation measures.

I believe that a gas pipeline that serves a fossil fuel industry that has got a finite resource and will not have a long life should not be allowed to destroy our environment. I would like to see more attention paid to alternative energy as well as the huge savings in efficiency, insulation and weatherization, thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Miss Wattman. Mr. David Wasielewski? Mr. David Wasielewski?

MR. WASIELEWSKI: My name is David Wasielewski D-a-v-i-d W-a-s-i-e-l-e-w-s-k-I and I represent the town of Dalton and the green town green committee. The Green Dalton Committee's mission is to identify, investigate and recommend to the Select Board various initiatives which protect a community's natural resources and enhance environmental health and the sustainability in Dalton.

On careful consideration of this project we stand opposed to proposing the NED Pipeline. A comprehensive evaluation of this pipeline project indicates that the cost and that the risk and cost will far outweigh any benefits to our community. Dalton is expected to assume substantial risks of its water resources as the proposed pipeline runs in close proximity to our public reservoirs and Housatonic River.

Planned and unplanned gas releases will inevitably foul the air we breathe. Construction and clearing out the pipeline rights-of-way will disrupt the ecology and damage a community infrastructure ill designed to support the anticipated heavy construction.

Property values will decline and the mountain this community values will be permanently scarred. These

real costs are easily externalized by Kinder Morgan but must be borne by our community. The real potential ecological damage associated with this pipeline are real, long-term and virtually impossible to undo while the costs of the projects are clear the benefits of the pipeline to this community have remained vague and unsubstantiated.

Kinder Morgan remains unaccountable for its claims to lower energy cost or to promise the gas will only be used to benefit local community even as it seeks permits and builds terminals to accommodate its export.

Are the irreplaceable, non-financial components of our community should be disregarded as Kinder Morgan and others go their profits. Incorporating the fact that Kinder Morgan has externalized and creates a community balance sheet for Dalton that does not support the construction of this pipeline.

With this in mind we specifically call for a more intensive Environmental Impact Statement as the pipeline and its construction activity to our sensitive wetlands, rivers and essential regional water supplies. The chemical composition of the gas and other materials that the pipeline will carry remains unclear and almost impossible to assess at this time.

We request that an emergency plan be put in place that would address the potential loss of water supply to our town and the surrounding communities including creating paper mills, our town's primary employer. We call for a delay or extension of the scoping process as the current proposal contains over 10,000 TBD's which at this time are unacceptable or impossible to respond to.

For example we were only very recently made aware even of the presence of a metering station to be located within our town. Thank you for the opportunity to address this community.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Wasielewski. Mr. Timothy Crane?

MR. CRANE: I am Tim Crane. T-i-m C-r-a-n-e. Can you hear me? My intent is to express community concerns, to assist FERC in the determination -- in determining the scope of issues to be included in the EIS despite the inadequacy of information available to date.

Our hope is that FERC will extend the comment period and my remarks are a prologue to our comprehensive written submission that will be filed as late as possible within whatever extensions FERC provides. Why as late as possible? Because NED is a moving target.

Initially filings depict the project entry into our town of Windsor from the west with 4 and miles of pipe co-located with electrical utility right-of-ways with no above ground facilities. A major re-route brings the project to our town from the north, placing a 60 megawatt compressor station somewhere along the route in Windsor.

We learned that co-location means that the project expands upon the altered landscape of a utility corridor rather than lives within it. Then filings disclose the location of Windsor's compressor station just hours before FERC announces the beginning of the comment period. Most recently the developer announces that the pipe is now 17% less in cross section and that the compressor station will be 50% of its original proposed power output.

While confusing in its relative scale, it sounds like relative good news until you read the full press release I quote, "Kinder Morgan will scale compression stations along the route to match firm subscription levels and will seek authorization to install the compression on an as-needed basis."

We don't know if that means the compressor station's 20 acre site with 10 acre operational footprint has been shrunk to 10 and 5 acres. We don't know if the noise levels will be half, if the light pollution will be half, if the structures will be half the size, if emissions into the air will be half or if toxic condensate volumes will be half.

Or Windsor's compressor station will be scaled for contingent capacity, sized for additional turbine engines and even greater output than 60 megawatts for future subscription levels.

If a smaller pipe lets you have the flexibility to scale through put to future subscription levels, there is only

one way for that to happen -- higher pressure, more compression.

Should FERC accommodate the developer's objectives for flexible capacity leaving a town uncertain as to scope and impact? And should FERC choose to impose on the town not just the compressor station but the prolonged apprehension of its potential expansion? The town of Windsor expects a flexible form of remediation.

Toward that end we have two explicit requests. First, the pipeline will be within the cleared utility right-of-way. Second, the compressor station will be underground as with Bear Swamp and Northfield Mountain generating facilities each about 50 miles from here, at an order of magnitude more powerful than any compressor station these facilities are invisible and silent.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Crane. Mr. Douglas McNally?

MR. MCNALLY: Good evening, thank you for accommodating our comments. My name is Douglas McNally, D-o-u-g-l-a-s M-c-N-a-l-l-y. I am a member of the Windsor Select Board and I have been a resident of the town of Windsor for 36 years.

The nature of our community and its residents required diligent consideration before you permit the placement of a compressor station and pipeline in our town. We question the placement of a large industrial complex in a community where the next largest business is a general store with one gas pump.

Windsor is a small rural community and the natural landscape of the town is its most defining characteristic. This greatly contributes to its quality of life and economy. In 2003 the Westfield River Watershed Open Space and Recreation Plan recommended goals for Windsor.

This template for our future focused on developing our rural, agricultural and conservation-based environment and economy. This included preserving the landscape, promoting agriculture on Chapter 61 tax programs, developing strategies for maintaining and promoting open spaces and protecting our wetlands and watersheds.

Windsor is the home of the trustees of reservations in Notchview through which the pipeline will pass, Windsor State Forest, the Eugene Moran Wildlife Management Area and Tamarack Hollow. We have an Agricultural Commission and we are a right-to-farm community. At our annual town meeting we approved a Green Community Initiative and a 1.3 million dollar bond for broadband internet access to include increased capacity for residents to have access to the internet.

In the past 30 years Windsor's population has increased by 50%. It is a population which shares immense pride in the pristine beauty of our community. Our sustainable community is a people friendly place and a safe and health space that allows residents to reduce their ecological footprint. We are a community with high social capital, strong social ties and networks, citizen proactivity and volunteerism.

These values and the bucolic open space bring people here. Many residents are farmers, potters, poets, musicians, artists, bee-keepers and nationalists. Residents are willing to trade paved roads and commercial infrastructure for fresh, high-quality air and low noise levels. They endure rough winters in exchange for starry summer skies, home-grown organic vegetables and clean water.

All this being said we want to submit a document requesting further detail based on facts so that if this thing happens we can assure people will not see any change in our community nor experience any change in our values. But we are unable to do this with a lack of timely information that has been provided.

We are concerned that we just received a resource report with so much information missing, thousands of "to be determines" including how our wild scenic river will be impacted, how our town will be impacted. We are asking for more time and another scoping session.

Absent clarification on the actual scope of the project and complete details, it is difficult if not impossible for us to assess the total impact of the project on the health, safety of our residents, on the environment, on our economy and on the rural nature of our community.

What we are able to discern is that Windsor's development to date and its future will be severely compro-

mitted by the cumulative effect of this project. Absent significant noise, light emission and toxic containment mitigation Windsor simply won't be Windsor anymore, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. McNally. Lee Hauge?

MR. HAUGE: Thank you my name is Lee Hauge, L-e-e H-a-u-g-e. I am the Chair of the Board of Water Commissions for the Lanesborough Water District. The Water District has 3 concerns about the impact of the pipeline on our operations. It is a danger to our water source, a danger to our infrastructure and impact on our finances.

As far as the water source is concerned, we currently have 2 wells and they both draw water from the town brook aquifer. And the current path of the pipeline goes right through the middle of the zone 2 of those two wells and right through that aquifer.

Contamination of this aquifer will leave us with no alternatives for water for our customers. We have looked for alternate sources to the north, south, east and west and have found any suitable aquifer has been contaminated by the abandoned town dump, the PCB site, superfund site, and a sewage treatment plant so there really is no other place for us to get water with exception of a deep underground aquifer which runs underneath the town brook aquifer.

Now pumping tests of our 2 wells have indicated that there is interchange during that pumping process between this deep underground aquifer and our shallow aquifer. So if you contaminate the shallow aquifer it is likely that it would also contaminate this deep underground aquifer and that is going to have implications far beyond the Lanesborough Water District because who knows where that goes and what other aquifers it feeds.

Our concern is both for construction phase, installation of the pipeline and operation of the pipeline. During operation there will be liquids in the pipe that would be released in case of a break and who knows what the constituents of those liquids are and of course during the construction phase all the things that are being done during the construction phase are things that are prohibited in the overlay zoning district that we have established to protect this precious water resource.

Our other concern -- one of our other concerns is infrastructure. Again the two wells -- we need both wells operational to supply our customers. If one of them is down -- if the larger capacity one is down the other one doesn't have capacity to serve the district. If the smaller one were down then we can't shut the big one down for maintenance so we need both wells.

If either one gets contaminated we are kind of dead in the water. We have a new water tank. We just invested 1.2 million dollars in a \$750,000 water tank that is on Prospect Hill. It is very close to the path of the pipeline. We are concerned about blasting during and heavy equipment and so on during the installation of the pipeline traversing very close to that brand new water tank.

We are concerned about impact on our finances. Again, because -- okay I forgot, so we have water mains, some of them over 60 years old that were installed back when the District was first formed back in 1938. These things were installed with technologies that are nothing like today's and they are very fragile and heavy equipment driving over the roads, over these water mains is likely to cause chaos to them.

We are concerned about our finances. All this endanger to our infrastructure is probably going to require us if the pipeline goes where it is planned to plan ahead, upgrade and do a lot of replacement when things break as I am sure they will.

So in summary we would be very happy if this pipeline went away or were put somewhere else as far as our water is concerned and if it does go where it is planned, a lot of work has to be done to take the precautions that we need to protect our water resource and our infrastructure, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Hauge. Mr. Paul Sieloff?

MR. SIELOFF: Yes hello my name is Paul Sieloff. P-a-u-l S-i-e-l-o-f-f. I'm the Town Administrator of the Town of Lanesborough which is the municipality just north here of the city of Pittsfield. Lanesborough is a small town of 3,000. It is semi-suburban semi-rural. We have fairly limited financial resources which is

kind of the emphasis that I would like to put on my presentation.

The proposed pipeline would bisect the town from east to west. The Board of Selectmen who are the elected representatives of the town asked me to attend tonight and bring to your attention the following practical concerns and ask FERC to as much as possible during the deliberations consider the concerns of the town of Lanesborough because the town would have a very difficult time responding to substantial negative effects of the pipeline project.

One of the concerns that the Selectmen wanted me to mention was the concern about damage to our roads, bridges and infrastructure. As we understand the project heavy trucks and equipment very unlike vehicles and equipment that we have nowadays using our roads will be used during the construction activities.

We are very concerned about that. The town of Lanesborough has a very limited infrastructure budget. Any damage to our roads would be very problematic. As an example it took over 2 years to finish one road, it was a very long road and because of our financial limitations we needed a 2 year cycle to do it.

This year we did 2 small roads and we should be trying to do upwards of 5 of 10 roads a year but once again because of our limited finances we are limited and once again if there were substantial negatives from this project on our infrastructure, I'm not really sure where we would turn so as much -- so if FERC can do as much as possible to protect towns such as Lanesborough and there are a number of us out here in the Berkshires like that.

I won't repeat what Commissioner Lee Hauge said but the water aquifer is in Lanesborough and although the Water District is technically separated from the town obviously we are very closely related and we work very cooperatively. And I know from working with them they also do not have financial wherewithal to deal with substantial problems of the construction project if it were to affect the aquifer and the water system.

The Selectmen also wanted me to talk to you tonight about our fire safety and our police services. We are a very small town, in fact we have a small volunteer fire department, our budget is only \$76,000 a year, they are very active volunteers, very highly trained, but clearly the scope of this project is way beyond anything they would have handled before and I hope FERC was able to take that into consideration when considering either training or the types of support for smaller towns and their public safety offices.

Our police department as an example, we usually only have 2 officers on at any time and sometimes we only have one officer on. So in case there was a problem with this pipeline, we would have somewhat limited resources to deal with it.

And I want to note two other small recent events that I think somewhat relate to the pipeline which is the town working with the water department is putting in a water line to deal with some pollution issues we have near our landfill. And what surprised me as we have been working on it for the last couple of months is the amount of blasting that we have had to do because of the underground rock formations, much more than expected.

So there is a concern that this whole project may have a problem like that too because you know we assumed we were going to shoot through this project and there were a large amount of rock formations that we had to deal with with heavy equipment.

And somewhat also related is I have seen concerns mentioned about how deep the pipeline is going to be and I will say that personally Lanesborough had a number of problems this year with an extremely deep frost. The frost went as deep as 8 feet which is way deeper than most people expect and we had a number of problems with both water lines and sewer lines and that is something that I think also should be considered when looking at the scope of this project and perhaps the engineering design of the project.

The town will submit more detailed information in the next month or so and I wanted to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you tonight.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Sieloff. In a minute we will move to the numbered speakers tonight but before we do I would like to thank all of the various representatives that spoke this evening. I think you

did your constituents a service and I can't think of a finer example of public speaking tonight.

I say that partly because those of us or those who are going to speak next are not elected officials or representatives and perhaps may not be polished speakers and so I ask for your patience and your understanding for those that come up and speak if they don't share your opinion you should them the respect that they deserve because it is courageous, it is an act of courage to come up here and speak in front of a public crowd, I think it's one of the most feared things there is out there.

So that said we are going to start with the numbered speakers here. As a reminder we are limiting them to 3 minutes. Somebody asked about hand-written comments so if you are called and you have some hand-written comments please go ahead and provide them to Jennifer here on the end. And remember to speak clearly into the microphone, it is adjustable so you can push it up and down as you need to. I think the acoustics in here again are a little bit better. So we will go ahead and begin with number 1 and just for the benefit of our court reporter we are going to take a break at 9 o'clock.

Sure, we can do that so if number 2, 3 and 4 want to get ready and be on deck and just as your number, a couple of numbers in front of you be ready to come on up so we can move it along, so number 1 please, and go ahead and state your name for the court reporter.

MR. LUPINO: My name is Adam Lupino. L-u-p-i-n-o. I want to thank FERC for being here tonight. I'm Adam Lupino, the Director of Policy for the Laborer's International Union of North America New England Region. I am here tonight to support the project.

Our organization is in full support and the 65,000 members and 52 local unions that we represent is in full support of the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project and the benefits of additional natural gas capacity into New England. Our support for this project is centered on 5 themes: the tax income that would be generated for local cities and towns in Massachusetts and other states along the route.

The job creation -- the estimated creation of 3,000 local construction-related jobs; the economic stimulus to the surrounding community for businesses during and after construction; energy reliability -- providing a long-term energy reliability that we sorely need to New England and a business community that has been loud about the fact that rising energy costs are a contributing factor to whether they want to invest in the businesses long-term.

And we also support the future economic growth that this project provides and the extra capacity that we will need to meet future customer demand. As construction laborers, this project represents the promise of good family-supporting jobs to the region.

As consumers it ensures a cheaper, cleaner and reliable energy source. This isn't a make work project for our laborers, this is a signature project and a long construction career. They work with their hands every day and they deserve to be respected for the work that they do building our roads, bridges, schools and essentially building America.

Laborers build pipelines across America safely and efficiently. We have access to top-notch training in our site in Hopkins, Massachusetts to ensure these projects are built on time and on budget and I invite all interested parties to come take a tour of our site to see the training that is going on right now to prepare our laborers for this project.

And we are also recruiting members from the community and working with local veterans' organizations to make sure that this project is staffed by local members of the community, through our Helmets to Hard Hats Program.

We also support the fact that we build the energy efficiency and renewable energy aspects of our economy as well. In fact our members right now are building the first off-shore wind farm in the United States on Block Island Sound.

Kinder Morgan and specifically Tennessee Gas has always been a responsible neighbor as a pipeline owner in this community for decades. Most importantly it is no secret --

MR. PECONOM: Mr. Lupino your time is -- can you wrap up?

MR. LUPINO: This project -- we are facing an energy crisis, we need an expansion project now and we support this project so we can bring much needed energy source to market as soon as possible, I thank you for your time.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir. Number 2?

MR. AMES: Good evening, my name is Tad Ames T-a-d A-m-e-s. I am the President of the Berkshire Natural Resources Council which is an effected landowner if this pipeline goes through. I am also representing a coalition of other land conservation organizations across the state called Northeast Energy Solutions which are also affected landowners.

As a conservation group we have worked with landowners and donors and state agencies for nearly 50 years to protect land and its natural beauty and its ecological function and we share and totally endorse many of the concerns that have been raised tonight about the environmental impacts of the proposed pipeline.

But I would also like to address some of the process that has been happening with this pipeline. Tennessee Gas Pipeline continually fails to meet its publically and formally stated deadlines. But notwithstanding this the Berkshire Gas Company has formally represented during this proceeding that its' September 1st deadline is mandated and mandatory.

And nothing could be further from the truth. In fact representatives of Tennessee have stated that the deadlines they have put forth during this proceeding won't be meet, specifically in a marketwatch.com publication on July 16th, 2015 it is reported that Kinder Morgan East Region's Pipeline's President Kimberly Watson said that "Tennessee intends to file the certificate application for the project in October, 2015."

So apparently the September 1st application deadline has been moved to October at the earliest and there are no requirements that an applicant such as Tennessee file its' application with the FERC within a certain time after beginning the pre-filing process, so there is no rush. Tennessee is free to delay the filing of the application and the FERC is free to extend all deadlines.

Moreover, Tennessee has just issued its' updated resource report with the FERC just last Friday, July 24th, 2015 and on or about July 22nd a Kinder Morgan spokesman, Richard Wheatley said that he "does not have any idea what is included in the new resource report" and just like the Kinder Morgan spokesman, we have not had sufficient time to investigate the most recent draft of the resources report.

We do know that the prior resource report was flawed with factual inaccuracies, aged data and inherent defects and we must presume the same of the latest round.

Finally, I would like the scoping hearing to also address the availability of lateral lines and the relative lack of gas that is being attributed to electrical generation despite all representations to the contrary. Thank you very much for coming to the Berkshires and for the opportunity to speak.

MR. PECONOMOM: Thank you sir. Number 3?

MR. PHILBRICK: Steve Philbrick P-h-i-l-b-r-i-c-k, Minister of the West Cummington Congregational Church. Before my scoping request I would like to say that these hearings have lost relevance and lost our respect because you allow them to continue mere days after Kinder Morgan has filed a 6,000 page resource report.

Studying the facts to make a wise decision takes time. FERC doesn't appear interested in doing this yourself and you are denying us the opportunity to do so. One of your responsibilities is to oversee environmental matters related to the natural gas project so before anyone is allowed to put a shovel in the soil of Windsor would you please analyze the geology all along the proposed route, with particular focus on blasting in the future by quarries or for future road construction?

Any miscalculation of the charge based on ignorance of the local rock formations can result in ground shaking pipe-warping damage. Study frost heaves and steel quality, particularly for the lightest gauge, which is what we will receive in Windsor since our lives and environment are apparently worth less to you

than those in larger communities which is frankly an obscenity.

Please study rust. Ionization by the high-tension line, vulnerability to vandalism, vulnerability to terrorism, since we are so far from any watchful eye, even the Kinder Morgan screens in Houston. In addition I call upon you to fulfill your charge to study the siting of the pipeline in regard to the health and well-being of New Englanders of every species.

Another of your charges is to monitor and investigate energy markets, so you should know by now that this pipeline is not necessary for a single thing in this world but Kinder Morgan's profits.

FERC, as a group you are not keeping faith with us. You are breaking hearts, you are not a fair broker between corporations and the people and you are not living up to us, your job or yourselves. You are better than this, thank you for listening.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you. Number 4?

MS. EISEMAN: Kathryn Eiseman, K-a-t-h-r-y-n E-i-s-e-m-a-n and I'm President of the Pipeline Awareness Network for the Northeast and speaking on behalf of the organization. As a preliminary matter, we too ask that FERC issue a new Notice of Intent in light of TGP's Friday afternoon document dump. As noted, the new resource reports still indicate over 10,000 missing data points or TBD's.

While Kinder Morgan tries to rush this project through, they are also pressing for approval of their Connecticut Expansion Project. It is critical that the Commission prevent improper segmentation and evaluate NED and the Connecticut Expansion as a single Northeast expansion project, especially in light of the overlapping customers.

Tonight though, I am commenting primarily on the need for a full study of socio-economic costs. The EIS must include a thorough analysis of the impacts from the project that would continue after construction. The impacts of a new industrial corridor here must be evaluated in terms of the community-wide effects.

Cumulative impacts on communities must be considered with respect to not only the immediate project but the infrastructure and disruption that is proposed and expected to follow as a result of the project, including pipeline expansions and upgrades, additional compressor stations and gas-fired power plants.

The employment impacts of non-pipeline alternatives versus pipeline alternatives should be studied in terms of not just the number of jobs created, but the duration and percentage of jobs provided to local residents. From a public benefit perspective an economic analysis is meaningless without an equally thorough economic analysis of the alternatives.

The EIS must include a comprehensive eco-system's services analysis to evaluate from a socio-economic perspective water quality, air quality, biological and other costs and benefits of the project and of the alternatives set forth in the EIS including the no-action alternative in order to determine which alternative is in the public interest.

Lastly, but importantly, before any of the analyses I have mentioned are undertaken, the Commission must squarely address the fundamental question of the purpose of the project and whether it serves a public need or merely the interest of Kinder Morgan and its affiliates and customer stockholders, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma'am, number 6?

MR. NUFFER: My name is Fred Nuffer N-u-f-f-e-r. I live at 171 Radley Road, Avril Park, New York which is in the town of Nassau, your neighbors to the west. While I appreciate the opportunity to make comments here to FERC tonight I am quite upset that FERC seems to be wed to an arbitrarily artificial comment deadline date of August 31st when it seems to bend over backwards to allow Kinder Morgan to willy-nilly submit information on its own schedules.

A request -- I pointedly request that FERC re-start the scoping process to allow Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts and New Hampshire citizens the opportunity to review the most recent environmental resources report that was submitted by Kinder Morgan just 3 days ago.

It is inexcusable that we are expected to make intelligent and full comment on these critical things when

the 6,000 -- 6,500 page report comes out a few days ago. I also wanted to come here to let FERC know and the audience tonight, to better understand what their neighbors to the west are doing with regard to the NED project.

Rensselaer County which is the county immediately west of Berkshire County and all 3 towns within Rensselaer County where the pipeline is crossing, have passed resolutions unanimously in opposition to the NED Pipeline. Both Albany and Schoharie County, the two counties further west again have also passed resolutions in opposition to the NED Pipeline.

Rensselaer County and Schoharie County have passed resolution calling on the Governor to place a moratorium on all permits related to this project until the State Commissioner of Health has completed a health study of the impact of compressor stations on immediately surrounding populations. Both the AMA and the New York State Medical Society came out with a report that was damning on what the impacts are to human health around both pipelines and compressor stations. I would like to see FERC look at that in its EIS statement as well.

Also there have been other resolutions considered and laws that are being considered in Rensselaer County that will require an independent inspection of the pipeline.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir. Number 7? I lost count, what number -- 6 thank you.

MS. BRADLEY: Jan Bradley J-a-n B-r-a-d-l-e-y. Welcome to the Berkshires, the lungs of Massachusetts. My scoping request concerns compressor station emissions. I live in Windsor and I would be 3 miles from the proposed compressor. David Carpenter is the Director of the Institute for Health and the Environment at the University of Albany.

He has said that compressor stations are as equally polluting and harmful to the environment as fracking wells themselves. Last year the Madison County, New York Board of Health conducted a study of compressor station emissions in Pennsylvania and Texas. They consistently measured high levels of benzene, tylenol and over 20 more volatile organic compounds.

These toxic, cancer-causing chemicals are in the gas because of fracking. They are released into the air during plant emissions, fugitive emissions, blow-downs and accidents. One study reported 2,126 fugitive emission points from a set of compressors. Another confidently estimated 37.9 tons of VOC's vented annually from a compressor in Pennsylvania.

Radioactive elements such as radon 222 are also found in the Marcellus gas and released into the air. Radon precipitates out as radioactive polonium and lead. Anyone living in the vicinity of 3 miles from a compressor is at high risk of nosebleeds, rashes, headaches, dizziness, nausea, irregular heartbeats. These symptoms have been detected even further away if downwind.

The mere fact that this is common knowledge and allowed in America is FERC's crime against humanity. These studies were done on compressor stations of 12,000 to 18,800 horsepower. I can't even find data regarding a 41,000 horsepower compressor. It would be one of the largest in the country.

Meanwhile we are a very humid climate -- 8 inches of rain this last June and an average of over 50 inches per year, air pollution comes down to the ground with precipitation. So this is what we ask you to scope. An assessment of our air quality before construction and a list of the chemicals and toxins that will be carried to this compressor, this must be made public information based on the Freedom of Information Act.

Our observations say that any run-off would go right into a nearby river designated wild and scenic where trout spawn naturally. Of course the pollutants would be in the air and all bodies of water, but trout are an indicator species, like canaries in a coal mine. If not killed immediately there would be obvious lesions on the body and spawning issues that would lead to a rapid decline so we ask your scope to involve trout assessment.

Finally we demand the enforcement of new technology and zero emissions from these stations. Zero. If Kinder Morgan thinks it can go up from 18,000 horsepower to 41,000, the new technology must be required. We demand that compressor stations be a completely closed system that all gas released, planned

or fugitive must be captured and then re-entered into the pipeline, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, number 7?

MR. EVANS: Good evening my name is Richard Evans, E-v-a-n-s. I live in Great Barrington, not along the path of the pipeline but close enough. I would like to speak with you tonight about legacy mine and yours. When I told several friends where I was going tonight they said to me, "be realistic they are not going to be listening to you, FERC will just pass the pipeline." And I said, "I don't believe you. I believe the people of FERC are going to honor their mandate and that our voices do matter and that they will act in the public interest and take seriously the many concerns and questions that we have about this pipeline." And foremost is the question do we need this huge pipeline? Has the case been made to spend billions of dollars to move billions of cubic feet of fracked gas from the shale fields of Pennsylvania to Atlantic ports in Canada? As we know Canada is already engaged in tactical pullback on the size of the pipeline but the problem is the same, 30 inches or 36 inches.

If the case had been made for this pipeline, why would our State Attorney General, Secretary of Energy and several well-informed citizen groups be calling for further study? Why would there be such honest disagreement about whether in fact we have experienced a real or a manipulated winter shortage of natural gas?

And even if there were to be some energy shortage, there are certainly alternatives and the pipeline would carry much more than we need and would move fracked gas to Atlantic ports for overseas sales. And who would benefit from that? Not the people of our states, we will simply bear the costs and the risks.

And given the un-enviable safety record of KM in its other operations across this country, well documented when you investigate, the risks are considerable. So the cost benefit analysis becomes clear if the pipeline is built, the corporation benefits and we bear the cost and risk and by we I mean all of us. For all who have missed an opportunity here to avoid yet another in a series of mistakes we have made in regard to our future.

That future must not lie in new pipelines that will simply perpetuate the use of planet-warming fossil fuels. We simply cannot do that to our grandchildren and that is why I said I want to speak tonight about legacy, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, number 8?

MR. PASCO: My name is Walter Pasco, I live in Lanesborough, 900 feet south of the power right-of-way on a dirt road that is impassable, barely passable in the spring during the thaw, it is a one-way road.

My experience has been that I am a retired engineer with a PhD in mechanical engineering. I worked on electrical systems and high-pressure guns for the Army by doing an advanced development project. My concerns are basically related to stress failure of the pipeline from thermal expansion and also from stress corrosion.

Where I live the terrain is very irregular with hundreds of feet of changes in elevation over sharp ledges. A mile of pipe under normal changes in weather, temperature, over the season can stretch and shrink 3 feet. If not allowed to stretch, the stresses that can develop within the pipe at zero pressure can approach the safe level of operation.

So because we have this irregular terrain, the pipe is constrained to not move and the stresses internally can be damaging and lead to premature failure.

My other concern is the external corrosion failure. Normally cathodic protection is used to control erosion. Unfortunately nobody talked about geo-magnetic currents which are created by the solar winds interacting with the rotation of the earth to produce thousands of amps in power lines and I worked on power transformers so I have direct access to that information.

So along a long cross-country conductor, thousands of amps can flow at different times depending on what the solar activity is. Those currents are coming in from the ground to the pipe and can absolutely nullify

any cathodic protection that is produced by putting some metal next to the pipe.

Another factor is that voltage is produced by high-voltage transmission lines can induce voltages in the soil below so someone has to look at what those levels are, I don't know what they are but I do know you can have thousands of amps flowing from the soil into your pipe, totally nullifying any cathodic action that would be produced by an ordinary passive process.

MR. PECONOM: Sir your time is up, can I get you to finish up really quickly?

MR. PASCO: Well okay, then there's noise problems. I understand we are having a metering station put in the town and you have to be -- I dealt with transformer sound for years, you have to treat it very carefully as the street tones and random tones and they have to be properly measured.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir. Number 9?

MS. JOSELL: My name is Selma Josell, S-e-l-m-a J-o-s-e-l-l. I live in Lanesborough and I have to say that at a previous meeting with KM representatives present they are masterful at evading questions and not give answers. So I would like to ask FERC to give specific answers to some of my following questions.

We talked about the Lanesborough water aquifer. Can Kinder Morgan guarantee that during construction and after the pipeline is laid that our water will still be clean and that there would be no leakage of gas into the water and that our water will be clean and useable?

I have just heard yesterday that there is a meter station proposed for Lanesborough. I am not sure what it is, I read a little bit about it. It seems to me it is kind of like a compressor station, so I would like to know how much noise in decibels this station is going to generate? How far away are we going to be able to hear this noise?

I assume there are going to have to be lights. How visible will those lights be and again for what distance?

Those meter stations also have blow-downs, what toxins and gasses and items are going to be blown into the air during these blow-downs? And what is the radius of the impacted area around this meter station?

Kinder Morgan states that there is gas shortage in the Northeast. What percentage of this pipeline gas is going to go to New England and what percentage is going to actually be exported?

Is the amount of gas going to New England going to eliminate the shortage and what areas of New England are going to receive the gas?

Perhaps the pipeline really is not necessary. Kinder Morgan has already downsized it for lack of customers. We need to look into renewable energy which is clean, provides lots many more long-term jobs than a short-term construction pipeline does and will not destroy our planet.

FERC, please stand up for the property owners, our future generations, our businesses, all who are being placed in jeopardy by an unnecessary gas pipeline. This proposed pipeline places communities in Berkshire County and all across the state in danger of undermining our property values, quality of life, health, natural habitats, air, soil and water quality, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma'am. It is 9 o'clock so I am going to stop -- it's 9 o'clock right now so I am going to stop for a 10 minute break for our court reporter, then we will pick up. Feel free to catch any of us here down stage and we will reconvene in 10 minutes thank you.

(Whereupon the meeting recessed reconvene in 10 minutes.)

MR. PECONOM: Once again I would like to get the meeting started again so if folks would please grab their seats. Before I call number 10 I just wanted to remind everybody because I have been approached several times during the break you know you have a very high number, you may submit written comments at any time and as I said earlier on the side here written comments are considered the same as verbal comments.

I understand that you may not be able to make it another hour so please keep in mind you may submit comments. You can also submit comments after you have had the chance to read all the information filed on Friday, the various thousands of pages of information there, so please keep that in mind.

Tonight was never intended to be your only opportunity to provide comments so please get those written comments in. I would like to thank everybody for the manner in which they are conducting themselves this evening and the manner of keeping things going and being ready when your number is next, it is making this meeting a pleasure.

One thing just to remind everyone of is that the timer here is set for 3 minutes so just keep an eye out for it, green, yellow and red. One quick announcement the Massachusetts Energy Facility Siting Board will be conducting meetings on August 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th and Dracut, Pittsfield, Greenfield and Lunenburg. The announcement -- the gentlemen who is with the Siting Board is number 40 or 50 so he is going to be a little bit but he wanted me to go ahead and make the announcements of the meetings. That information is available on your website, yes, so just quick announcement there for additional meetings about the project, with that number 10 please, thank you.

MS. ROSE: Hello I'm Cheryl Rose from Dalton. C-h-e-r-y-l R-o-s-e -- on the FERC website the Commission describes as paramount in its guiding principles that all proceedings be open and fair to all participants. Given new resource reports from Kinder Morgan began available just a few days ago and in them many variables are to be determined.

It is not fair to ask us to respond to over 6500 pages of incomplete information in just a few days. I request that FERC repeat the scoping hearings and comment period when more complete information is available.

As a resident of Dalton I am concerned about the effects of construction and operation of the proposed NED Project on my drinking water quality, air quality and safety. The proposed route is perilously close to the drinking water supply which serves my town. I asked the FERC to require Kinder Morgan to provide plans for baseline tests and monitoring and mitigation of impacts to Cleveland and Egypt reservoirs and the guarantee of safe drinking water flowing through the faucets of our homes if construction or operation of the pipeline or pipeline accident contaminates or harms either of these reservoirs irreparably in any way.

Kinder Morgan should also provide plans for baseline testing and continued monitoring of air quality, both near the compressor station in Windsor and the main line valve planned for Dalton and plans for response to and remediation of any contamination from the toxic chemicals transported through the pipe.

Finally, the FERC's own mission statement is to assist consumers in obtaining reliable, efficient and sustainable energy services at a reasonable cost. I call on you to be true to your mission. The financial health and environmental costs of this project which will ultimately be borne by the consumers to which you refer warrant a comprehensive study of our energy needs and the ultimate ways they may be met.

Our Attorney General Maura Healey has engaged such a study and I ask the FERC to include the results of this study in their determination of our need for this project. The data on the negative effects of burning and transporting fracked methane and the limited amount of methane available from Marcellus shale continue to grow.

In contrast, abundant clean energy resources are available and the projects to deliver them are ready to be built at a faster rate than our government is supporting under the pressure from the fossil fuel industry.

The FERC has the power to impact our state energy policy for many years to come. Given what we know about energy, the environment and human health, I believe asking us to invest in this pipeline is wrong. The people of Massachusetts want to protect our health and the health of our environment and we need our dollars to invest in true renewable and sustainable and ultimately cheaper energy that will provide us long-term energy security.

I call on the FERC Commissioners to accept their responsibility with respect to the impacts of the decision on climate change. This is not just about the immediate impacts of burying a pipe in the ground. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, number 11?

MR. ROSE: Henry Rose, I'm a resident of Dalton and a local physician. H-e-n-r-y R-o-s-e. I have many health and safety concerns that I would like FERC to address. First I need to reiterate that this scoping meeting is premature. These meetings should be held again and located at least some of the time in communities slated for compressor stations.

Some 20% of existing gas is estimated to be lost from pipeline leaks. Improving efficiency of energy use in homes and businesses has a long way to go and green renewable projects like solar and wind are certainly safer and more sustainable. The impact of these measures must be studied before moving further with a 3 and billion dollar project that will be paid for by rate payers, obligate the use of even more fossil fuel for years to come and subvert the work to be done in green energy.

I request that the Environmental Impact Statement not just assess the impact of construction, the gas and the TG pipeline is obtained by fracking which employs numerous chemicals that are suspected or known carcinogens and endocrine disrupters. Pipelines are known to leak over time and the effects of these chemicals need to be looked at thorough, including the potential long-term impact of ingesting or inhaling small amounts over many years and especially the impact on children and pregnant women.

The pipeline is planned to go near the Cleveland reservoir which supplies Dalton's and Pittsfield's drinking water, the potential impact on this reservoir and all other affected reservoirs need to be studied. In addition when a pipeline is constructed, water is used to test its integrity -- I would like to know where this water comes from and where it is discharged.

I also have concerns about compressor stations and pigging operations that release methane and toxic fracking chemicals into the air as part of normal operations, the potential local and regional effects on air quality should also be determined. Safety concerns about the potential explosions and massive fires have not been sufficiently addressed. Such catastrophes have occurred and I request that FERC detail how a large fire or explosion would be dealt with in the Berkshires.

FERC has a mission to look at costs, I request that these costs include the health, safety and economic costs of degrading the environment. Much of the gas supplied by the pipeline is likely planned for export, the price of gas will reflect global market price and gas prices will rise in the U.S. FERC's obligation is to this country.

Finally I would like to say to my fellow citizens whose work is to repair and construct pipelines, I want you to have good paying union jobs with good benefits. Repairing our leaking infrastructure, stopping the waste we already pay for with our gas bills or reducing greenhouse emissions. I work for a hospital that is constantly upgrading new technology. They are not investing in electric typewriters or x-ray equipment from the 1970's.

We have the ability to move forward with cleaner and more sustainable technology and I hope you fellows will join us.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, number 12?

MS. GITLITZ: Good evening my name is Jenny Gitlitz G-i-t-l-i-t-z and I'm from Dalton. I'll focus on 2 issues tonight -- drinking water and noise and light pollution from the compressor station. The pipeline will traverse watersheds that Dalton and Pittsfield and other towns depend on for drinking water. Please ask Kinder Morgan to disclose a full list of chemicals in pipeline gas including common names by CAS number and alternate names, concentrations in the gas at expected pressures, let us know what plans exist to detect leaks that might enter drinking water.

In the event of contamination what plans exist to provide residents with alternate drinking water? Finally how will soils and water sources be restored? How does Kinder Morgan plan to maintain pipeline integrity when they only plan to bury it 3 feet underground and how we have heard this evening that frost can in our region can go from 5 to 8 feet deep?

On the issue of noise and light pollution, the noise and light pollution from compressor stations are likely to be highly disruptive to both people and wildlife. Locally the Notchview Reservation and the Moran

Wildlife Management Area provide over 5,000 acres of wildlife habitat and recreational areas to tens of thousands of visitors annually.

In terms of noise pollution, please ask Kinder Morgan to provide or identify exactly where the Windsor compression station will be located, the exact levels of sound generated there through the day, when maximum sound levels will occur and for how long, a detailed map of sound travel in meters and levels and decibels.

What types of wildlife will have to flee to less desirable habitats due to noise and what other impact will noise have on wildlife? What economic impacts will loud noise have on the Notchview Reservation? How many of the 10 to 15,000 annual visitors will be dissuaded from coming to ski or hike due to noise and the loss of peace and quiet that they value.

Windsor and the surrounding areas are one of the few truly dark skies left in Massachusetts. Dark skies are valued not only by astronomers but by anyone who likes to look up at the night sky. They are also important to nocturnal animals. In terms of light pollution please ask Kinder Morgan to identify what size area will be illuminated by the compressor station, the light levels and lumens, a map showing the light levels at various radii up to 20 miles, what types of wildlife will be forced to flee because of intrusive light pollution and what other ecological and economic impacts will light pollution have on western Massachusetts?

In closing due to the large amount of missing information in the research reports, over 10,000 TBD's at last count, please do not close the scoping comment period until 60 days after Kinder Morgan files new, complete research reports. I would also ask the FERC to allow the development of alternative sources of renewable energy such as wind and solar built at residential, commercial and industrial scales to be studied before making a decision about the NED Pipeline, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, number 13?

MS. RYAN: Hi my name is Polly Ryan, P-o-l-l-y R-y-a-n. First I would like to say that I also feel these scoping hearings are being conducted prematurely in light of Kinder Morgan's having only just released their second resource report. My experience today as an impacted landowner, is that I have been continually misinformed and under-informed by Kinder Morgan of the project's details making it very hard to comment effectively on the scope of this environmental impact study.

Please know that I have attended 5 of Kinder Morgan's open houses, 2 of their presentations and I have read their first resource report and I still don't have answers to questions that concern me. In terms of the scope of this EIS I would like you to please conduct an objective study using established reproducible, scientific methods to determine the cumulative methane emissions that the entire U.S. gas industry will produce over the next 10 years and determine the impact of these emissions on global warming.

To evaluate this you will need to determine the amount of natural gas available for extraction in the shale regions and then figure out how much of it will be drilled out over this period. Clearly one can assume that the extracted gas's inevitable destination will be in our atmosphere regardless of whether these emissions occur in Europe.

I am requesting this research because scientists have determined that methane is 84 times more potent a greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide over a 20 year span. And according to the Union of Concerned Scientists who published the Climate Deception Dossiers, there has been a coordinated campaign underwritten by the world's major fossil fuel companies to spread climate misinformation and block climate action.

I expect this study to be peer reviewed and then published so we can see the data. And until it is available to us I suggest a moratorium on all new gas infrastructure permits. I also suggest that the gas industry does repairs to existing infrastructure while the moratorium is in effect.

MR. PECONOM: Ma'am your time can you wrap up, thank you.

MS. RYAN: According to the Environmental Defense Fund, enough natural gas is lost each year to fuel 6 million homes. I would say it is time for the facts and science to be revealed on this subject before we are

all FERC'n fracked.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, number 14?

MR. PECK: Nicholas Peck, N-i-c-h-o-l-a-s P-e-c-k and I'm merely now wishing to make the point to instruct the Commissioners, the members of the FERC Commission, to remind them of their role as regulating the public good and I believe that if they take that job seriously of regulating the public good and consequently not spending too much time trying to regulate Kinder Morgan, if they want to regulate the public good they are going to take the position that we have too much carbon in the atmosphere now and that based on the efforts that governments around the world are doing that FERC should come into an alliance with the good nations of the world and say to the other nations yes, we are going to start to cut carbon now in the United States.

The United States currently and for years has been producing triple or quadruple the carbon of the people of the world, triple the Chinese people. I mean it's time for the United States to get its house in order. We created this system of gluttony and carbon and it is time for us to go back and therefore I say FERC can easily, for moral reasons, for scientific reasons, with all the practical solutions offered tonight, FERC can simply not approve this project.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, number 15.

MS. WINN: Hi my name is Jane Winn, J-a-n-e W-i-n-n and thank you for the opportunity to speak. Kinder Morgan just released the new resource reports, thousands of pages long and these reports still are missing huge amounts of information. Without this information we, the public are at a major disadvantage trying to come up with comments on the scope of what we would like to see in your Environmental Impact Statement.

These scoping meetings are being conducted before Kinder Morgan has provided enough information on exact locations and sizes of facilities that would allow us to provide comments that would truly benefit the NEPA process. It is unfair that no scoping meetings are being conducted in Windsor or Northfield, Mass., communities whose character and environment will be heavily impacted by the compressor stations.

That said tonight I would like to take my 3 minutes to focus on jobs. We strongly support the union jobs. Unions in the past have helped to shrink income and inequality and helped to counter corporate control of our democracy. We would like to join with the unions in asking local distribution companies, in our case, Berkshire Gas to start using well-trained union labor for fixing their most-likely-to-explode gas leaks.

Right now Berkshire Gas is required by law thanks to many of us to fix their most dangerous gas leaks over the next 5 years. We would like to know those jobs are going to highly trained union labor. Right now they are not. We will be pushing for all gas leaks and distribution lines to be fixed. Consumers are paying for all that gas even though, at least in the Boston area, 2.7% of that gas is leaking into the atmosphere, wasting consumer's money and contributing to climate change.

Fixing these leaks could provide years of local well-paying jobs. We also feel this proposed pipeline threatens jobs, clean energy jobs, one of our fastest growing sectors in Massachusetts. At the end of 2014 clean energy employed 88,372 people according to the 2014 Massachusetts Clean Energy Industry Report. This is as many people who are working in the insurance industry here.

The clean energy industry employs 2.4 percent of all Massachusetts workers. At the end of 2014 there were 5,985 clean energy businesses in our state. Clean energy jobs account for 2.5% of the Massachusetts gross state product and these numbers are growing fast. The number of jobs in the industry grew by 10.5% from 2013 to 2014, the third year in a row of double digit growth resulting in a 47% increase over the past 4 years and projections are for that double digit growth to continue.

We need the no-action alternative for this proposed pipeline and put our union friends to work immediately fixing the gas leaks in our state, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, number 16?

MS. WILLIAMS: Good evening, my name is Jean Atwater-Williams and I live in Sandisfield, Massachu-

setts and my comments tonight will focus on the illegal segmentation between the NED and the Connecticut Expansion Projects by Kinder Morgan.

In the Delaware River Keeper Network versus FERC ruling in June, 2014 the D.C. Circuit Court explained that an agency impermissibly segments NEPA review when it divides connected, cumulative or similar federal actions into separate projects and thereby fails to address the true scope and impact of the activities that should be under consideration.

The court further explains that connected actions include actions that are interdependent parts of a larger action. To determine whether actions are interdependent the Court looked at the physical, functional and temporal connection between segments. Although Tennessee Gas insists that the Connecticut expansion and the NED Projects are not physically connected, the evidence demonstrates otherwise. Tennessee Gas's overbuild of Connecticut Expansion Project will serve several of the same customers as the NED Project.

In addition, Tennessee Gas prematurely filed its application for the Connecticut Expansion without the customary pre-filing so that it can deny a temporal overlap between the projects. Fast forward to the Northeast Energy Direct Project -- there are 3 potential routes identified by Kinder Morgan as alternatives. One, the now preferred route affecting Hancock, Lanesborough, Cheshire, Dalton, Hinsdale, Peru and Windsor.

Number two, further enlargement of the existing 200 line which would affect Richmond, Stockbridge, Lee, Tyringham, Monterey, Opus, and Sandisfield and amass turnpike alternative which seems really silly.

Option number two happens to be the exact same corridor and right-of-way impacted by the proposed Connecticut Expansion. This is clear evidence that these two projects are indeed related and are being improperly and illegally segmented. It is therefore FERC's duty under federal law to immediately deny the Connecticut Expansion application and then require Kinder Morgan to withdraw this NED pre-filing until such time as they can prepare a pre-filing that legally and appropriately address the project in its entirety, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma'am, number 17?

MS. EDDY: Hi, my name is Judith Eddy, J-u-d-i-t-h E-d-d-y. Thanks for coming out tonight. I am outraged that FERC is allowing Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company to continue with its application for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline. I protest the fact that we are even having this scoping hearing tonight given all the conditions with the resource reports that have been mentioned numerous times. I also agree with the previous speakers in that I believe that these applications are being segmented and I ask that you don't consider them as separate but that they are obviously part of one large project aimed at getting fracked gas from Pennsylvania and elsewhere to the East Coast where it can be exported for higher prices, also the fact that Kinder Morgan has fallen far short of providing the necessary and required information. I have called and written to my legislative representatives in both the Massachusetts State House and in Congress to demand that FERC halt the scoping process and rewind this application to require a new Notice of Intent and a new scoping meeting schedule.

I am appalled and insulted actually that the citizens of Massachusetts and of the United States are being treated this way. How dare Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company provide such incomplete and inaccurate resource reports to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, an agency that should be respected and that is our only protection against the sloppy way this company does business and the dangerous way that they do business, putting our environment and our cherished natural areas and the wildlife that depend upon them at risk of permanent degradation and annihilation and the citizens of Massachusetts at risk of bankruptcy, diminished health and possibly death.

I know that sounds dramatic but it is true. I will not honor those 6,500 pages of resource reports with specific recommendations until I have more time and even then I don't know that I could read and understand them, but we have people in the room who can thank goodness.

And the fact that we were only given a few days to do that, so I ask that you please do your job and work for the citizens of the United States to protect us from corporate arrogance and abuse. We have not and will not stand by as Kinder Morgan uses Massachusetts as a conduit for its corporate greed. We lead the nation in energy efficiency and renewable energy has provided over 88,000 jobs in our Commonwealth.

I support the union workers in seeking sustainable decent paying jobs, I just wish the jobs to be in clean energy, jobs that will last far into the future. A number of people I know who oppose this pipeline and in fact all fracked gas operations and infrastructure are not here tonight because they have lost faith in this process.

They believe this process is hopeless but we are all here tonight because we obviously still believe in the process and we really hope that our voices are heard. And it sure is obvious tonight that the majority of people in the room do not want this pipeline -- I know it's red, I just want to say I want the EIS to consider which is impossible, but I hope they can consider the billions of invertebrates and reptiles and fish and flowers and plants and trees and mammals that don't have any say here tonight unless we speak for them and it breaks my heart to think of the degradation that is going to happen and the destruction if this pipeline is built, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma'am, number 18.

MR. MELVO: Good evening, my name is Eugene P. Melvo, Jr. I grew up in the town of Cheshire and my family still lives there. I have worked in the construction industry for 40 years. The Northeast needs this pipeline to act as an incubator for employment opportunities and to expand our economy and to revitalize the region.

I worked on the Altresco Line that came into the General Electric. I worked across the country on gas production from Wyoming all the way back to Cheshire, Mass. I lived less than 1,000 feet from a Tennessee Gas transmission line growing up. I worked on my first pipeline when I was 16 years old on West Mountain Road in Cheshire.

The right-of-ways become recreational areas for biking, snowmobiling, hiking, horseback riding, et cetera. The excavation of this line traveled 1 mile along the east side of the lake, never contaminating the lake. It further ran up passed the water supply for the town that was never contaminated through this construction either.

Just the construction of this pipeline will create a thousand jobs. This affordable alternative energy will attract businesses to relocate in Massachusetts and the Northeast which will create even more jobs for working families. Providing affordable energy will give homeowners and business more revenue to invest in the area for even more employment opportunities.

The pipeline will produce an alternate source of energy that is produced in the United States and it will relieve the burden here in the Northeast by us residents being victims of circumstances beyond our control. For our families -- we can control their own financial destiny by acquiring this affordable energy.

We all know natural gas is alternative energy, it is viable and will prevent further pollutions by coals, fuels and nuke plants. One important component is transmission lines are safer than alternative energies that are transported over the roads or by rail. More potential danger will be reduced by reducing ground transport.

Right out through Dan Fox Drive, Tamarack Road, over through Homes Road, upper William Street just in this city, Crane Ave, out through Coalsville, the upkeep and maintenance of the gas right-of-way are impeccable. There is no environmental concern that are completely restored to their original conditions.

One thing that is undisputed here tonight and I am a neighbor, that Tennessee Gas is good neighbors. In 40 years in construction in putting in gas lines we haven't had one catastrophic event on an area in this pipeline. We need the Northeast Direct Pipeline, it will be installed by trained, certified, skilled, licensed trades people, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, number 18? That was 18 -- 19 thank you.

MS. BLOMBERG: Hello, my name is Sandra Blomberg. S-a-n-d-r-a

MR. PECONOM: Could you speak up just a little bit thank you.

MS. BLOMBERG: S-a-n-d-r-a B-l-o-m-b-e-r-g. I live in Pittsfield. The terrible situation that we are having is much larger than this pipeline. Our government is failing to protect us from many health and safety issues by the continued support of the fossil fuel industry through subsidies, deregulation and by the releasing of protected federal land to detrimental corporate exploitation.

Our government must now move towards more environmentally responsible energy sources that will provide many more good and permanent jobs while at the same time protecting the environment for us all and for future generations, thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma'am, number 19? 20?

MR. CLARK: Good evening my name is Will Clark, W-i-l-l C-l-a-r-k. I'm from Hancock, the prettiest town here in our area. Okay anyway here's the deal folks -- I live in this great town, we don't have a big watershed that has got water going you know from one place to everybody, no we have 450 individual wells on 450 different pieces of property.

So I don't want an EIS that tells me, "Oh in one fell swoop Hancock is all covered under this EIS" I want 450 separate studies. I want a study for every single well. I want it monitored before, during and after and every year after forever. I want an EIS for every piece of property that grows a different kind of crop and guess what, in Hancock that's a hell of a lot of them. I want to know that Kinder Morgan doesn't think so little of me and my neighbors and our children that they could actually bother to use the same thickness of steel in the walls of their pipeline that they do in towns because we live in a rural place where they won't.

I want us to think about it this way. We have on one hand a greedy company that wants to make more money. And on the other hand, you have got the vast majority of your citizens in front of you telling you, "hell no, we do not want this pipeline". So please do me a favor and try listening to your citizens.

Lastly, we cannot absolutely cannot allow the bodies of water, the streams, the beauty that is our rural community here to be destroyed by this pipeline. I am going to ask you and I don't expect you to answer, how many of you have actually seen the destruction that occurs when one of these pipelines goes up? I have. I lived 15 miles from San Bruno, California when it blew up and killed a dozen people and burned four houses -- I'm sorry, four blocks worth of houses to the ground. It's horrific.

I appreciate that you are here and want to take a look around at our pretty area. Do yourself a favor, also go to where it has been destroyed because there are plenty of places here in the U.S. that it has already occurred, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, number 21?

MR. WINN: Good evening, my name is Bruce Winn. B-r-u-c-e W-i-n-n and I'm with Berkshire Environmental Action Team. First of all thank you for coming out tonight and giving so many of us a chance to speak.

Part of the scoping process is to consider alternatives to the proposed pipeline project which includes the no-action option, or not building the pipeline at all. I would like to encourage you to consider this no-action option and all of its benefits seriously in your decision-making process. In determining whether or not to allow this project to go forward, you will be deciding according to your website whether the project is required by the public convenience and necessity.

Well the public is here and we want to tell you that we don't find this project to be a necessity. And we certainly don't find it to be convenient. We are right here and we are the public. In the 13 years that Berkshire Environmental Action Team has been in existence we have never seen a grassroots movement grow as quickly as this one.

For the past year and a half we have been amazed at the number of people turning out to voice their opposition to this project. All across the state people have been finding their own way of saying that they don't believe this project is necessary and they don't find it convenient. So far 54 towns and cities in Massachusetts have passed resolutions against this pipeline.

Recently Kinder Morgan decided to move the pipeline route north into New Hampshire for much of its length, no doubt in an attempt to get it away from the increasingly effective grassroots movement, the public.

Well already 14 towns in New Hampshire have passed resolutions against the pipeline and New Hampshire hasn't had much time to organize. This is the public in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, in the same way that those in nearby New York states have, speaking through their own town and city governments to tell you that we don't find this project necessary and we don't find it convenient.

Across the state we have been getting the strong support of our state representatives and senators, you have heard from some of them tonight. They joined us very early by the way. They are voicing their own concerns about the pipeline and those of their constituents as our both of our U.S. senators and a U.S. congressman. Again, in weighing whether this project is required by the public convenience and necessity the public has been speaking loudly and clearly, we are right here tonight and we want to tell the FERC that the public finds this project neither necessary nor convenient, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, number 22?

MR. WRIGHT: My name is Tim Wright, W-r-i-g-h-t, I'm from Pittsfield and I'm speaking in opposition to the proposed pipeline. The amount of gas that this pipeline is much higher than the state of Massachusetts can use and much of it is going to be exported as it is said.

Kinder Morgan and Berkshire Gas also known as Iberdrola, are large corporations and only have a mandate to maximize profits for their shareholders and we'll end up by paying for most of the bill with few benefits to show for it. I do not believe that this pipeline is in our national public interest.

We have fought wars over our access to energy supplies. We have 6 fleet parked in Bahrain as well as many military bases that secure it as well. Too many soldiers have come back with post-traumatic stress disorder, missing limbs, homelessness and flag-draped coffins in exchange for lower energy prices. This new pipeline will enable this policy to continue to treat our soldiers as cannon fodder for energy consumption.

Just a little bit of history about our actions. We overthrew Prime Minister Mossadegh, this is in 1950 in Iran who was democratically elected and we did this on behalf of the Anglo-Iranian oil company which is now BP. This led to a set of dominoes in the Middle East that allowed the Shah to come back, the Shah to be deposed and the Ayatollah to be there and then we helped Iraq and it's all connected, all the energy -- it's connected to all of these wars and it is at its center.

I ask if you do say yes to this pipeline then do not grant export licenses for this energy. It is unpatriotic, un-American, un-ethical and a disservice to those who fight for our country, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, number 23?

MR. KIPEN: I'm from Ashfield, Massachusetts, another community that has passed a unanimous resolution to oppose the pipeline that would come through our town. I have come here tonight specifically to protest FERC's all too obvious advocacy of the Kinder Morgan Pipeline Project.

At the Natural Gas Roundtable luncheon in Washington, D.C. on July 21st, just a week ago, FERC Chairman Norman Bay announced his agency would soon issue a "best practices manual" to help the gas industry win permits for fracked gas infrastructure projects. It is all too obvious that FERC is standing with the industry, that FERC operates de facto as an arm of the fracked gas industry comes as no surprise to many communities that have contended with FERC approved projects.

For example, FERC holds free three-day interactive seminars where it teaches the industry to "successfully navigate the FERC process". It goes so far as to invite the industry to sponsor snack times and evening social gatherings, "pre-conferences" where FERC staff ask do you have a conflict in your pipeline work -- maybe with a property owner and offer to "strategize for dealing with difficult behavior".

It is obvious FERC looks at communities, at people who are adversely affected by these projects as "problems". Little known to those who attended Tuesday's luncheon, 3 organizers with a group called Beyond

Extreme Energy were not allowed to attend despite having registered for the event.

Although the luncheon was held at the University Club, it was monitored by FERC's internal security personnel. One member of Beyond Extreme Energy was asked to leave by FERC's security because the lunch was "over capacity". The other two members were escorted out because their clothes did not meet the club standards. Once removed, the building doors were locked and 5 security officers were stationed at the entrance.

Federal watchdogs looked closely at FERC pipeline reviews to make sure the public has a sufficient say, including around possible environmental impacts. Fracking infrastructure exacerbates climate change, but it also leads to air and water pollution and a slew of localized health impacts that leave communities on the front line suffering -- headaches, respiratory issues and even cancer are the dangers of living near fracking infrastructure, not to mention the dangers of explosion.

The latter emphasizes the importance of public input, especially in light of the fact that FERC authorized construction allows for private land to be taken through eminent domain. On your list of identified public concerns, the first list that was put up on the screen there is no mention of pipeline leaks, a prime concern in all the towns along the proposed route based upon Kinder Morgan's very poor record in this regard.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, number 24? Sir, he didn't get your name for the record.

MR. KIPEN: My name is Ken Kipen, last name is K-i-p-e-n.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you again.

MS. DEVOE: My name is Joan Devoe, J-o-a-n D-e-v-o-e, Lanesborough, Massachusetts. Since I am a homeowner in Lanesborough, Massachusetts, a retired school teacher and a cancer survivor who wants to live in a safe and healthy environment in a home that will maintain its value, you can imagine how horrified I was to learn that my house is located near the designated incineration zone, or blast area of the proposed Kinder Morgan Natural Gas Pipeline.

Also this pipeline is slated to pass through our aquifer, conservation land, pass under the Cheshire Reservoir, thus threatening our health. Therefore I request that FERC assign an independent third party to conduct a scientific no-action alternative assessment to determine the impact of building the pipeline.

This study should also assess the following areas of concern: The current infrastructure, property values, public health, wildlife habitat, watersheds, vernal pools, aquifers, private wells and the quality of the air, water and soil, all along the pipeline from Hancock to Drake as well as in the areas where the compressor and meter stations are composed. This will establish a baseline so that individual property owners, businesses and towns will be able to receive adequate and fair compensation for any accidents, pollution, health consequences or damages that may occur if the pipeline is eventually built.

However, if the pipeline is build there needs to be an ongoing scientific assessment by an independent third party that can monitor any changes in the infrastructure and all the areas of concern that I just mentioned. Also detailed written emergency plan needs to be made available to every community in Massachusetts that is situated near this pipeline plus there needs to be a plan for the annual training of all medical and emergency personnel the details of how to respond to a pipeline explosion or any other pipeline-related health hazards that could occur.

This includes an evacuation plan that provides detailed information on how residents will be supplied with water, food, shelter, medical care and other basic necessities. There also needs to be a detailed legal documentation that specifies how communities, businesses and residences will receive fair and adequate compensation for any negative impacts in all the areas of concern that I mentioned during the building of the pipeline and after the pipeline goes online.

It is important that there be shut-off valves every 2 miles, not every 10 to 20 miles and that the pipe have a thicker lining than the one being proposed. It is also important that the pipeline be buried well below the frost line. However, since this proposed pipeline places communities in Berkshire County and all across the state in danger of undermining our property values, quality of life, health, safety, natural wildlife

habitat, and the quality of our air, soil and water, it is clear to me that no option is the best option therefore I request that FERC not grant Kinder Morgan permission to build this pipeline in Massachusetts, but to instead look into the development of projects that expand clean, renewable energy, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma'am. Number 25?

MR. MOORS: Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you tonight. My name is Lyndon Moors, that's L-y-n-d-o-n M-o-o-r-s. I live on South Main Street in Lanesborough, just a half mile from where the proposed pipeline will raise to cross Route 7. Incidentally I am also a local union President. Lanesborough, Massachusetts is celebrating our 250th anniversary this year. We celebrate our small town, pre-colonial era heritage, our clean air and water, our natural resources, our green spaces and our forests.

The state champion elm sits outside my front door. Our town flag depicts the constitution oak, named for the legendary spot from which the signing of our constitution was announced to Lanesborough residents in 1787. We value our recreational and agricultural lands, we set down our own roots buying land, building homes and educating our children.

I encourage you to fully consider the negative impacts this proposed pipeline will have on what we hold to be important.

Number one -- what is the risk to our aquifer you have heard so much about tonight -- our town's source of clean water under which this pipeline would be run?

Number two -- what destruction would be brought upon Constitution Hill, perhaps our most historic location, but awaiting Kinder Morgan's bulldozers?

Number three -- what impact will this project have on our private property values in insurability and will its completion make our homes more difficult to sell?

Number four -- is there a less-destructive path for this pipeline? Even though many analysis now claim that the project is excessive and unnecessary in its proposed scope.

I would also ask you to schedule additional opportunities such as this one tonight so that we may provide relevant testimony as Kinder Morgan's plans continue to evolve. We know precious little today about their plans for metering stations and compression stations for instance and their potential impacts should also be considered in our deliberations, thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, number 26?

MR. SPATZ: I am Larry Spatz, L-a-r-r-y S-p-a-t-z I live in Lanesborough. This is the wrong project at the wrong time by the wrong company. It's the wrong project at the wrong time because they have to realize that we have to stop extracting carbon from the earth. There's no question about it, if we don't we are going to fry the planet.

And if we are not extracting carbon anymore then we don't need pipelines to transmit it either. I say that Kinder Morgan is the wrong company because of its abysmal record in safety and in the environment. This record is so bad that in Deerfield, MASS they held a public hearing over a year ago. They read into the record all of Kinder Morgan's infractions these include pipeline leaks, bribery, pollution, fraud, scams, theft, deaths, felonies, environmental disasters, labor violations, unsafe working conditions and influence buying.

At the public hearing Kinder Morgan was invited to respond, they did not show up. They were given 15 days after that to write -- to submit written rebuttal, they did not do that. 2 days after the period was up they sent a letter saying that they would not listen to anyone except FERC, they didn't care what the Board of Health thought.

So at that point the Deerfield Board of Health voted under its power to protect the life and safety and health of its townspeople to disallow Kinder Morgan from any further activities in the town with respect to the pipeline.

And the Lanesborough Board of Health recently took the same action on June 8th of this year and the

week in May of 2015, the Selectmen voted not to allow Kinder Morgan to conduct surveys on any of the town properties and in addition to that at the town meeting in June there was overwhelming support for people saying that they did not want the pipeline to happen.

There's no question that this is a project that should not happen, thank you.

MR. PECONUM: Thank you sir, number 27? 27? 28? 29?

MS. FEATHERS: No? Does that work? Well, Marjorie Feathers, M-a-r-j-o-r-i-e F-e-a-t-h-e-r-s and can I be heard. The narrow lengthy town of Hancock with a population of 751 is by any definition rural, which in pipeline lingo means that it is classified as an area of low consequence. With this classification a pipeline through town can be constructed of thinner gauge than would be allowed in an urban area.

Although the proposed pipeline would be maintaining the same volume and pressure throughout its route, rural areas would, because of diminished safety requirements, be less protected from explosions and the amount of gas burned in a rupture.

A close look at concentration of settlement in Hancock, using the U.S. Geological Survey Map, reveals that within one-half mile of the current power lines along which the proposed 1 and 1/2 miles of pipeline would be buried, lies the whole village of Hancock, 72 dwellings, the town library and the town's only church.

Buildings within close proximity to one another that could burn on moss. Some are just feet or yards from the corridor. With no town water source, all of these dwellings are served by their own individual wells or springs. It is known that minor leaks in gas pipelines are allowed to remain. Certainly those living nearby would be concerned about their precious water supply.

Perhaps in Montana, Wyoming, Nevada and many western states, there are lengthy regions where pipeline eruption would be of low consequence to the surrounding area. This is not true in Massachusetts. It appears that the lives and homes of people who live in our rural areas are considered as in consequential as in open land.

In America when we set up safety regulations and empower businesses to construct for what some call the greater good of the nation and population, do we categorize the value of people's lives? Are 100 lives in rural areas less valuable and of less consequence than 1,000 urban lives?

Rural towns in the Northeast contain people, not vast stretches of open land. These people need the same safety protection as do people in cities. If this proposed pipeline is as greatly needed as Kinder Morgan National Grid and Berkshire Gas proclaim, and if it really would solve economic problems, why are so many New York and Massachusetts, state and federal senators and congressman who have studied it, opposing its construction? They know it is wrong for these states and this region.

And okay, out of 600 miles of current pipeline in Massachusetts, Kinder Morgan brags that they employ 46 people in 2013.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma'am, 30 or is it 31, 30 okay.

MS. ZANTAY: Karen Zantay. K-a-r-e-n Z-a-n-t-a-y. Here are comments from over-wrought residents of Third Burden Lake, the largest lake in Rensselaer County where inner city children and veterans come for a summer experience. It has hundreds of residents and thousands of visitors each summer.

It is the home of a 50 year old thriving restaurant that claims customers from many different states and many miles away and it will have the highest impact from the compressor station. The comments ask you to include in your EIS these negative socio-economic, health, environmental and cultural impacts. Kinder Morgan's atrocious safety record including deaths that have happened in more than 36 significant accidents, they are skimping on pipes which are proven to leak, not could leak, but will leak.

Their failure to maintain, test, inspect and monitor the pipe's corrosion levels. They want you to give us a full blown meteorological air quality impact study to research the leakage of methane nitrous oxide and other toxins that they do not have to disclose to us, the same toxins that come from fracking also come

from compressor stations.

They cause pre-natal problems, lower sperm count and fertility problems in women. There are documented cases of people living near compressor stations developing respiratory illnesses and other health problems in their kidney, liver and brain. The blow downs and constant hum and vibrations and the health risks they incur, no emergency services to handle an accident, mining in the same area as the pipeline.

Benefits are little to non-existent for residents and very large for foreign markets. Lights and constant humming will harm wildlife including bald eagles, blue herons, painted turtles, bears, many types of fish, alpacas, Black Angus beef farm and many others. Explain why the safety standards are different between cities and rural places, why rural lives are expendable.

Study what happens when their mortgages and home owners insurance are called in and nullified due to harmful toxins on or near their property. Will Kinder Morgan be able to replace these? Will Kinder Morgan make up the difference of decreasing property values? Will they pay for testing our water before and after the compressor station is built, and continually monitor our water?

How will the fireworks and snowmobiling and quading in the area be affected? Missing from my pile here are all the comments from the people that don't even know about this or don't understand the harmful and even fatal impact it can have on our community and our world. Please include ways to notify all the residents in the towns affected.

Maybe the U.S. mail could be used, then it might not appear like the gas companies and the federal government, are trying to hide what you are doing to us.

Lastly, I am just asking you to think as you lay down your heads on your pillows about what you are doing to people's lives, their health, their financial position, their children, their animals, their mental state, et cetera. What will your decision do to your mental states knowing that you helped harm people by not denying this application?

Is money worth people's lives? Please just go home and think about this as if it was in your back yard, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma'am, 31?

MR. SMITH: My name is Sam Smith S-m-i-t-h from Williamstown. The overwhelming evidence before all who have eyes to see is that the struggle to protect the planet from climate change is a failure. And the promotion of the KM NED Project tragically witnesses to the perpetuation of failure. Even though little time is left to amend through our global human failures, two expert sources challenge us to restore faith in a future with us in it.

Until very recently the goal of nation's was to limit warming to below 2 degrees Centigrade but now according to a study published in the journal Nature Climate Action it is critical that warming be kept below 1.5 degrees. The 1.5 degree goals leaves no space to further postpone global mitigation action and emissions reductions.

The second source is an interview with Dale Jamison, author of Reason in a Dark Time Why the Struggle to Stop Climate Change Failed and What It Means for Our Future. In the interview published in the New York Times opinion pages, Jamison says the way forward is a bottom up rather than a top down process, that our primary hope lie -- to address climate change, is grounded in actions and organizing at the local and regional level.

In Jamison's words, international agreements matter but their importance is exaggerated. At the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, most of the representatives of the global community thought the solution to climate change would be an international agreement that would bind countries and force them to behave, but we don't live in a world in which such authority exists, either external to nations or in their super egos.

Most action on climate change will take place within regions, within countries, within communities and in the hearts and minds of individuals. Once there has been enough change at these levels, then effective agreements can be made in a way the point is simple. When it comes to fundamental change, law tends to

follow politics and morality rather than leading them.

These words underscore the importance of “We The People” in rejecting the pipeline, participating in actions on behalf of emissions reductions, building a clean power economy and determining our future, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, number 32?

MS. KAYE-MOSES: Sam is a hard act to follow. Linda Kaye-Moses, L-i-n-d-a K-a-y-e hyphen M-o-s-e-s. Kinder Morgan should be required to prove the need for the proposed pipeline by providing studies verifying that need and supplying information as to who conducted those studies and how much was paid for them.

Kinder Morgan should be required to provide specific unambiguous answers to all questions without resorting to the phrase “to be decided”, since that phrase appears over and over again in the report submitted just a few days before the scoping period and allows for seemingly deliberate omission of information that FERC and the public need.

Kinder Morgan must assure FERC and the public with specific facts and details that public health and public safety will be the paramount priority and thoroughly protected before, during and after construction of any pipeline and compressor station.

Kinder Morgan should be required to supply all environmental studies, the names of the entity or entities who made the studies and the amounts paid for the studies. In addition, Kinder Morgan should provide specific information re: environmental protection within the scope of all the elements of the pipeline construction and as affected by that construction for all living things and within our entire eco-system, the water, the soil, and the bio-diversity in our forest, our mountains, our aquifers, lakes, ponds and streams.

Kinder Morgan should be required to prevent ecological and property damage that can result from the construction of the pipeline and compressor stations and should such damage occur, which it does, Kinder Morgan should provide a plan and assume responsibility for that prior to beginning construction and to effect complete and sufficient remediation and mitigation of any such damage.

Kinder Morgan excuse me, should describe in detail the temporary, part-time, full-time or permanent jobs connected to the construction and/or the maintenance of the pipeline. Can we, the citizens of Massachusetts and Berkshire County in particular, depend on FERC to protect our interests, including our health, and the health of our environment from any degradation by Kinder Morgan’s pipeline and its contents?

The most effective way to protect our health, our land, our environment, our watersheds, is to not construct the Kinder Morgan Pipeline.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma’am, 33? 34? 35? 36?

MR. BURCROFF: My name is Eric Burcroff, E-r-i-k B-u-r-c-r-o-f-f. I first met NED when a guy drove up to my barn -- I said I first met NED when a guy drove up to my barn in an unmarked truck, he had no business card, a blurry map and a letter.

The letter said 2 Houston billionaires wanted to gouge the pipeline through my backyard. I started to look into these guys. They came from ENRON, remember ENRON? Screw grandma, they were high in the echelon of that corporation. Ken Lay taught them how to scavenge energy companies, buy them on the cheap, create shell companies, drill, blast, gouge, trench, misinform, lie, obscure, pay workers the least amount possible, diminish maintenance schedules that are industry standards, take companies on and off the stock market repeatedly. These are bad guys.

Then I started to read about what fracking means to human health, the environment, the stuff that is coming from the Marcellus shales which is among the most radioactive in the world, to be transported to the coast of Massachusetts primarily for export.

So I began to weigh the costs and the benefits beyond my backyard to what President Eisenhower warned us of when he left office -- the triumvirate -- Washington, Wall Street and Houston. This is what we are

dealing with. These are nasty people, they may want to take care of their grandchildren. I take that back, they are not nasty people I'm sorry, they are driven by their priorities, I am driven by mine.

I care about the environment, I care about community, I care about renewable energy, weatherization, and community building. For that I am grateful. I have woken up enough to join committees, walk the pipeline, meet my neighbors and educate myself more about these kinds of projects. This one is a very bad project, I urge you to continue doing your jobs. I am grateful for you allowing us to speak tonight, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, 37? 38?

MR. DAUNAIS: Good evening my name is James Daunais, J-a-m-e-s D (as in David) a (as in apple) u (as in unicorn) n (as in Nancy) a (as in apple) i (as in icicle) s (as in Sam). I cut my comments and questions down a little bit, a lot of them have been addressed already.

One question I have -- I don't know why I am going to lead off with this one, but here goes. Are any of the FERC biologists actually going to do any on the ground investigations of the proposed routes any time before you start your EIS process? You don't have to answer that now, I hope you are. I know perhaps your staffing and budgeting levels have been reduced to the point where maybe you can't even do too much of that.

Secondly last year we had an information meeting, I believe it was at the Lee High School, the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline people, and others. I informed the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline officials at that meeting of an unsafe and getting more unsafe every day conditions of their existing gas pipeline near the Outlook Avenue, Cheshire, Massachusetts property our family owns. And this is the existing pipeline that I guess they are going to propose running a new pipeline over part of it through Cheshire and even into Adams where I do live.

I told them that there was a neighbor that bought a 3 acre lot from my mother before she passed away, built a house there and shortly after asked if she would mind if he went over on their property a little bit and cut down some very large trees that he felt might come down in a storm and wreck his new house.

My mom said well go ahead, that's okay. Little did they know that what he was doing was taking out hundreds of trees, making himself a nice, great big dirt bike loop track through not only his property, but over onto our property as well and coming down the hill on the right-hand side of the property, the track bounding over mound and then coming down, slamming down onto the pipeline with their dirt bikes, which he has removed at least a minimum of one foot of soil covering that pipeline if not 2 feet or more and then running down the pipeline, gunning it and digging their rear tire in as they are gunning it down the straight stretch and up the hill on the other side of the loop.

And he even took his little bulldozer and pushed a stone wall at the bottom of the property over enough to give himself a little more lead way room to go down that hill, bottom down to the pipeline and up the other side of the track. I am going to go up there tomorrow, I haven't looked at it since I told these people about it. I wonder if they would require him to replant the trees on the section of the two uphill slopes above the pipeline, to cut down and re-seed the grass in there, to cut down on the erosion of that very minimal earth covering that was existing over that pipeline, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, number 39?

MR. YOUNG: Thank you, my name is Lawrence Young, L-a-w-r-e-n-c-e Y-o-u-n-g and first of all I would like to thank you for your time and your attention and your service in this critically important function.

I am an abutter to a proposed pipeline route in Plainfield, MASS. It's a little town of about 600. I would ask among other things that you determine the impact of the proposed pipeline on our wildlife. We have salamanders, bats, monarch butterflies, prometheus and Lunar moths, we have deer, bear and snakes and so forth and on an issue that had been brought up -- it is my understanding that much, if not most of the gas that would be transported is for export.

If this is true I would say this is primarily for a private purpose and gain and not primarily for a public pur-

pose, for a public interest. And to add insult to injury I suppose there is a proposed tariff to pay for it from the taxpayers to further help the Kinder Morgan and so forth and the whole concept of this project I would suggest runs counter to the -- President Obama's stated commitment to reducing greenhouse gases and counter to proposed treaties with other nations and also by further encouraging dependence on fossil fuels. I would ask that the Commission look into how much gas would be made available from these wells that are being fracked. I would suggest that it may well be that by the time this project is up and running, advances in renewable energies may render the entire project anachronistic.

Also my understanding, and I have heard this said tonight as well that Tennessee Gas intends to use a thinner gauge pipe in rural areas, including right near my house, again border -- or abut the power line and I have also heard that you have heard reported that they can expect to make billions of dollars even in the first year of the project operation, surely they can afford to use the safest pipeline possible.

I would also again mention the likelihood and inevitability of frosties and again it's a little town I ask you to protect me and protect my loved ones, and protect my town and protect us all thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, number 39? I'm sorry, 40?

MR. BESMOFF: My name is Stuart Besmoff S-t-u-a-r-t B-e-s-m-o-f-f. I live at a zero net energy home in Windsor, Massachusetts where I operate a solar business and buy organic food from farms in this town. The likely contamination of our food supply is one of the reasons the voters of Windsor passed a Resolution against this type of project.

The Environmental Impact Statement should study the impact on conventional and organic farms as well as family gardens in all the towns with a proposed compressor station and along the entire route of the proposed pipeline. Exhaust from a compressor station is a major concern in a town which now has very good air quality.

The EIS should identify a soil, air, and water testing program to be conducted before any construction begins to establish a quality baseline. The water testing should include public and private wells, plus surface and sub-surface water. Alternatives to providing the energy to operate the compressor stations should be considered in the EIS.

Burning gas containing fracking contaminants is not good for the environment. The alternative for using renewable energy to operate all of the compressors should be studied. It is expected that a zero net energy facility, using solar energy to operate all of the compressors will have the least impact on the environment. Employment is important for my western Massachusetts neighbors, skilled in various trades. Since there is now a shortage of people to install and maintain solar hot-water equipment I will be glad to help anyone here or if you know somebody who left and you can get the word to them, get started in a career which will help not harm our planet.

You can see me after this meeting or look up Alpine Solar in Windsor. Resource reports provided by the developer have been incomplete or late. These scoping meetings should be repeated when more project information is available, allowing at least 90 days to examine the completed report. Also, a scoping meeting should be conducted in each town designated for a proposed compressor station with the objective to avoid or lessen environmental impacts, it is clear that the alternatives which should be studied most extensively are conservation, efficiency and renewable energy instead of damaging the environment with new fossil fuel infrastructure.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, 41?

MS. JACOBS: Hello my name is Susan Jacobs and I live in a portion of Windsor, Massachusetts known as East Windsor which is also the location for the proposed compressor station. We've lived there for 25 years and for 7 of those years we opened our home as a bed and breakfast, welcoming guests from around the United States as well as Europe citing the quiet peaceful surroundings, fresh air, and ability to see the stars on clear nights.

Many came back repeatedly. This project with a proposed compressor station barely 2 miles due west of

our home will change all of that. My concerns are many but tonight I will focus briefly on air and water quality. The Sierra Club sites many concerns with the national gas industry including the numerous loopholes the industry exploits in order to ignore basic, environmental and health protection.

The Sierra Club goes on to list some of the many problems associated with inadequate safeguards in natural gas development, including harmful air emissions that pollute communities surrounding drilling operations, compressor stations and pipelines. And lack of environmental assessments, monitoring and regulatory enforcement to gauge damages to landscapes and wildlife.

I respectfully request that you determine the realistic amount of pollution that would be released from the compressor stations and take steps to reduce the dangerous gases and chemicals in it to zero through the use of scrubbers and any other technology that could be used to protect our clean air.

Like everyone else in Windsor and many of the surrounding rural communities, our home has a well. Much of our area of town also has wet, boggy areas, and is adjacent to brooks and streams feeding into the West Field River. The VOC's and the other contaminants contained in the emissions of the compressor station and other installations along the pipeline will not only be present in the air we breathe, but will fall to the ground to pollute our gardens, streams and ultimately our drinking water unless Kinder Morgan is forced to take all necessary steps to protect our resources.

During the construction process where will Kinder Morgan access the large quantities of water they will need for hydrostatic testing? Will there be guarantees that these sources of water will not compromise our local wells? Please study how our pure water can be protected, not just mitigated when later studies show our wells, streams and rivers have become polluted.

Also I respectfully request that the resource report submitted by Kinder Morgan be rejected until such time as they can provide complete information. Do not accept their submission if it contains even one "to be determined". Your job is to protect and represent the public. I ask that you do your job and make the best decision for the public and deny Kinder Morgan a permit for this project, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma'am, number 42? Good evening my name is Lee Flournoy, L-e-e F (as in Frank) - l-o-u-r-n-o-y. I'm a resident of West Windsor, thank you very much for coming. If I realized what this would be like I would have brought coffee. I want to just focus on a couple of the ways in which this project seems to me to be so massive because Windsor is getting a compressor station that we have to travel as far as Pennsylvania to see something three-quarters of the size of the one we will get and because it is in such a precious area.

The nature conservancy actually designated the Berkshire Tactonic landscape as one of America's last great places, referring to it as more than 155,000 acres containing one of the most spectacular, healthiest and most diverse blocks of intact forest in southern New England.

We have an incredible variety of wildlife, a great number of endangered and threatened state species. We probably have the long eared bat in the area of the compressor station. Both the challenge of the importance of this natural span of land and the scope of the project brings us to a dilemma -- Kinder Morgan has not been responsive to the very good questions you all have asked them, told to specify and delineate and justify the impact that the compressor station, the access roads, the contractor yards, have had on -- would have on water, ground water and wetland resources, they have said "we'll tell you about that later" or "we will use best practices and we will attempt to the extent practicable to avoid wetlands". I would suggest to you that's not good enough, given what the size of what they are proposing and the delicate landscape they are working in.

Windsor has bedrock which underlies the entire landscape in a fashion like this and they note on their tables that the average bedroom starts at 38 inches and they intend to go down 6 feet for the pipeline. That means blasting, that means blasting near people's wells because unfortunately the bedrock isn't in one location, it is scattered throughout the length of the pipeline.

If you had a way to say to them we are staying this proceeding until you give us adequate answers to the

questions we asked you about safety patrols, about road crossings, about emergency access if you are going to block a road, about effects on water, I think people would have confidence because we are tiny towns. We have 800 people, you have heard from towns of 600 and 700, we can't hire experts to do what Kinder Morgan hasn't done and if there is a way to work around the problem of lack of landowner access with objective experts, I think there would be much better data available for you to make good decisions, thank you so much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma'am. Just a quick note at 11 o'clock we will take a short break for the benefit of our stenographer, he is working hard to record all of your comments tonight, 15 minutes, so number 43?

MR. MARKHAM: Hi, I'm Jim Markham, that's M-a-r-k-h-a-m, the town of Plainfield. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. I would also like to state my objection to the fact that these hearings are continuing given that so many other people have referred to Kinder Morgan's late and incomplete release of almost 7,000 pages of technical documents on Friday.

Unconscionable right now gentlemen and ladies, that we are even continuing with this right now, unconscionable, please think about that and process that. Now it took me all a day or two of research to realize the staggering scale of this project. It took me a day or two to come up with over 50 substantial points of concern that I will certainly pass on to you.

I am only going to highlight three of these right now, but the fact that it took Kinder Morgan 6,000 plus pages to assure us that they have got everything under control is a huge red flag right there. 6,000 plus pages to assure us that they have got it taken care of, there's some major, major problems here in running this pipeline through this part of the country.

I should go a little bit further and say that I don't think it should run through any part of the country, largely because of its impact on global warming and the carbon that it is going to create for the environment. But let me focus on public health and safety impacts, just three of them.

Please research response time of first responders, firefighters in event of a problem, especially in remote rural areas on difficult terrain. Please evaluate the susceptibility of the region's forest and grasslands to catastrophic fire in the event of a pipeline explosion or fire, especially during dry times a year when the region has high fire damage.

And third, please address issues related to aging of the pipeline and infrastructure. Explore the means by which safety will be maintained as the pipeline ages. Now you folks apparently are from Washington, while you are here I hope you get a chance to get out and see the area, it is not like Washington and there are some things you should know about, okay?

In the winter there's lots of snow. In the winter there are times when the roads are impassable. What happens if there is a major emergency then when the roads are impassable? We have a season in the spring we call mud season, many roads are impassable. I mean you cannot drive a vehicle on them. What happens at that time if there is a need for emergency response?

There's an explosion or some sort of fire, how are they getting people in there? Please explore that, okay? There's also two times of the year spring and fall when things tend to really dry out and get windy. At those times there is very high fire danger. If there happens to be a fire with all the tinder, dry leaves, twigs on the ground, we had an ice storm several years ago, there's tons and tons of dry fuel.

We have got wind, we have a gas fire, you have a major conflagration on your hands, how are we going to take care of that problem if we can't even get there to respond to it.

Lastly I would like to close because I know my time is up and according to FERC you are saying public benefits must exceed cost to society. If anybody is paying attention tonight we know where that balance lies, please think carefully, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, 43? Sorry, 44?

MS. WERGLAND: My name, can you hear me? Can you hear me now? My name is Glendyne Wergland,

that's G-l-e-n-d-y-n-e W-e-r-g-l-a-n-d. Two of my concerns about the proposed pipeline involve safety. First, the herbicides used to kill woody plants on right-of-ways are known to cause birth defects. Increasing the width of the right-of-way to co-locate a new pipeline will increase the amount of herbicide applied. That will also increase birth defects in exposed human and wildlife populations. If Tennessee Gas would cut brush instead of spraying that would reduce our exposure to toxic chemicals and reduce birth defects which show up most conspicuously in the amphibian populations that live along the right-of-way who develop with missing limbs, incomplete skulls and eyes that never separate, their eyelids don't separate. In addition to benefitting the amphibian populations, cutting instead of spraying would also benefit the workers and nearby landowners.

A second safety problem is that a 30 inch diameter high pressure gas transmission pipeline has a blast impact radius of more than 700 feet. How then can a new gas transmission pipeline be built only 50 feet from existing dwellings? DOT regulations allow this but they should be changed. The pipeline setback needs to be increased to reflect the huge impact radius of today's larger diameter, high-pressure pipeline leaks and explosions.

And given Kinder Morgan's subsidiaries' poor safety record, we had better be prepared for just such occurrences. In closing, I would like to thank FERC for the 43 pages you compiled of discrepancies in emissions in the Kinder Morgan Draft Environmental Impact Survey. But we have to wonder if this pipeline company is so sloppy in their work that they leave all these "to be determined" blanks in their report, how are we going to ever feel good or safe if they build a pipeline in our backyards? Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma'am, 45? 46?

MR. BERTHIAUME: Good evening and thank you for hanging in there and for this opportunity. My name is Kenneth Berthiaume. K-e-n-n-e-t-h B-e-r-t-h-i-a-u-m-e. The following comments are focused primarily on reasonable alternatives that when in full consideration of impact now and certainly in near term future years will render the need for a Greenfield pipeline unnecessary.

The New England region is host to a wide variety of viable alternative renewable energy resources including but not limited to, on shore and off shore wind, solar, domestic hydro and imported hydro, hydro-kinetic energy and others. As stated in resource report 10, alternatives, energy conservation the energy efficient technologies are not expected to eliminate the steadily increasing demand for energy or natural gas.

But yet ISO New England, our grid operator has recently stated that the 2014 energy consumption numbers are 2% lower than 2013 and the winter peak for those years is also lower by 4.2% by the way and further indicate that EE and solar are having an impact and I quote, "when the EE savings are factored into the region's load forecast, energy usage is expected to remain flat with an average annual growth rate of 0.0% rather than the 1.0% projected in the baseline mode forecast."

Why then are these two entities on absolute opposite sides of the spectrum? This warrants a comprehensive analysis as Massachusetts has been ranked number 1 in energy efficiency for the last 4 years in a row, and according to the U.S. Environmental Energy Protection Agency, improving the energy efficiency is one of the most constructive and cost-effective ways to address the changes of high energy prices, energy security and independence, air pollution and global climate change.

As state in resource report 10, wind power is not an option. And then they close by stating that should these projects be developed, the 2800 megawatts proposed by GLIA could reduce pressure from the New England gas supply and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Why has TGP upfront dismissed this free, read that as zero fuel costs, source of energy?

ISO New England references 4,000 megawatts of wind power in the 2015 cube. The above discrepancies must be accurately assessed and also combined with energy storage viability as addressed within the next section.

The solar power -- as stated in resource report 10 and I quote, "these systems generally are not well suited for use as large scale generation in the proposed project area". Why is solar so promptly dismissed when

in fact worldwide, nationally and regionally solar is increasing exponentially yet TGP has chosen to state that it is not a viable energy source despite the fact that the cost of this energy source, also known as fuel is zero.

From the Solar Energy Industries Association I quote, “solar provided roughly one-third of all electric generating capacity in the U.S. in 2014”. I’m sorry -- one other thing I would like to say is battery technology is not addressed at all, yet is currently available by a number of companies, one which offers its clients a 20 year insured warranty for grid-scale batteries.

Both solar and energy storage capability require accurate and full consideration. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, number 47?

MS. WHITE: Peggy White, P-e-g-g-y W-h-i-t-e. I’m from Peru and just in terms of letting you know a little bit about our area. Peru borders Windsor on the south. We are a town also of 860 people. We voted unanimously at this year’s annual town meeting opposed to this project and just in terms of many of the issues and I’m going to try to summarize what I said. I also have concerns about the first responders.

We have a volunteer fire department and many of the roads as people have said that connect us from Peru to Windsor are dirt roads and are very difficult to pass in the winter so if we are to be called to respond to any kind of incident in Windsor it would be difficult for our first responders to get there and I do ask that you determine the anticipated training, services and equipment that would be necessary for the first responders to answer the call.

And then someone mentioned one of my other issues, the northern long eared bat has been determined under the endangered species act to be threatened and Section 4D of the act provides measures necessary for the conservation of the long eared bat and limits destruction of its habitat.

Berkshire County is one of the many counties that have infected bats with the white nose syndrome which is so devastating and when forest habitat is destroyed this is another threat or further threat to their existence so I would ask that you please determine the environmental impact of all the logging, the clearing that would be required in construction of the access roads and the pipeline in terms of the compromised habitat of the long eared bat and then on another topic -- people have mentioned tourism and how this is such an important part of Berkshire County.

I want to add a caveat to that as well, in terms of recruiting and retaining professional people in this county, the natural beauty is also very important. People choose to work here because it is a place that is quiet, that’s beautiful and so it is very important for us as -- and I’m a healthcare professional, as health care professionals that we continue to offer a place where people want to come and provide their services, so I would ask that you please determine the impact of the NED Pipeline on tourism, on our home values and on the economy and well-being of Berkshire County.

I also had issues as other people said about frost lines. We all know that so well. And then also that so many of our homes rely on wells in Berkshire County and in my town Peru, we have no water source, we are all on individual wells as well so thank you very much for your time.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma’am. It’s now 11 o’clock so I would like to take a quick 10 minute break. I appreciate everyone hanging in there. I have been told meetings in this part of the country can go all hours of the night so we are still here. We will reconvene in 10 minutes, thank you.

(Whereupon the meeting was recessed, to reconvene in 10 minutes.)

MR. PECONOM: All right. Thank you for your patience, number 47? 48?

MR. KELSO: Hi my name is Mark Kelso, I’m from Richmond, Massachusetts and our land abuts the existing 3 pipelines that enter from New York State into Massachusetts. We are temporarily not on the currently slated route but we have been one of the alternate routes that has been suggested over time.

I would like to speak mainly today to the integrity of Kinder Morgan since they took over Tennessee Gas Pipeline. We have been actually lied to on a number of occasions when confronted -- when I confronted

the company they claimed legal rights that they did not have to survey our land. We specifically gave them a statement of non-permission to survey our land and they trespassed upon our land and staked and when they were confronted, they said “we have the right to do this” and when we showed them the deed they said, “oh I guess we don’t, okay”, but their practice as a business, as the guy said about the Deerfield Board of Health, they have very poor business practices.

And another point at a Richmond town meeting when we were looking at the possible expansion of the TGP line through Richmond they said “there is nothing but natural gas going through these lines”, but we had been told earlier in a meeting a month before with another Kinder Morgan representative that it is basically a petro-chemical superhighway that they can use to transport anything that has been licensed. They can take airline fuel through there, they can take anything that they are allowed to in addition to natural gas and there were a number of other points that they just would say one thing and they would say another thing and they weren’t being consistent, so I would like you to look as Commissioners, I’m asking the FERC to hold them accountable for just sound business practices, okay.

It’s just not good business, I run a business, I try to tell the truth as best I can to my people. The other thing is that we who live on the pipeline right now they have not been out to maintain that pipeline in the last four years. There are trees standing about 14 -15 feet tall which have root zones that must be down into that 3 feet, 4 feet level by now and they haven’t even come out to look at them even though we have told them about them. Thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, 49? 50?

MR. TREMBLAY: Good evening, John Tremblay J-o-h-n T-r-e-m-b-l-a-y. I’m from Cheshire, Massachusetts proudly. I’ve lived in the Berkshires my entire life, welcome to the beautiful Berkshires. You know I didn’t really prepare much for my statements but what I did do was I decided that I didn’t know much about FERC so I went to your website and I went to the page that says what is FERC and I’m going to read to you what I found.

It says “the purpose of the Commission is to protect the public and energy customers insuring that regulated energy companies are acting within the law.” I kind of like the sounds of that. It’s a lot of responsibility but it is an important role and we appreciate you being here and letting us make our comments.

So I thought about that and I said to myself, who are the other entities in play here and I thought about ISO New England and so I went to their website and I know they are kind of a stepchild of yours but -- so it says, “what we do, so operate the power system, administer wholesale electricity markets, power system planning,” huh -- I don’t hear anything about the public there.

So I said to myself okay who is the other entity in play -- Kinder Morgan. I started to read some nice things about Richard Kinder, 2005 CEO of the year, he receives a salary of \$1.00 a year, no bonuses, no option grants. Kinder Morgan claims that it does not spend money on corporate jets, first class thoroughfares, sports tickets or other expensive pre-requisites. Wow, that sounded really good. However, Forbes Magazine estimates Richard Kinders’ net worth at more than 11.8 billion huh. So what does Richard Kinder care about? Probably what the shareholders think.

So when I look at the 3 entities that I see in play, I see you guys as our only hope and again I feel like that’s a lot of responsibility but I am sure you can handle it. So John in your opening comments you mentioned you have somewhat limited knowledge of the Berkshires. I’m offering to take you to 3 different locations, a community supported agriculture farm, the Ashuwillticook Rail Trail and the Cheshire Reservoir that are going to be affected by the pipeline.

The pipeline is going to go right through all 3 of those in the way that it is presented today. I would be glad if you want to stay in the Berkshires to take you to each one of those, and I’m sure there are other people here in green shirts that would love to show you the Berkshires and what it means to us and why it is so special.

So what I am asking you to do is consider the following: fully independent peer review, vetting of the de-

mand claims, reviewing leak repair alternatives, considering the use of eminent domain considering about 60% of this project of the gas could go out of the country, the effects on the tourism economy and the environment of the Berkshires, the new report that just came out that's over 6,000 pages, to issue a new Notice of Intent and comment period and reschedule the scoping sessions, thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, 51? 52?

MR. DERBY-KILFOYLE: My name is Christopher Derby-Kilfoyle, C-h-r-i-s-t-o-p-h-e-r D-e-r-b-y hyphen K-i-l-f-o-y-l-e. I'm a business man from Adams. I have one of the oldest businesses offering solar electric systems in the United States. It's our 32nd year in business. That's a tribute to the people that came here tonight. It's not me, it's the sentiment of the Berkshires to want to do the right thing about energy and I'm very concerned about energy.

Many people have touched on important aspects tonight. I want to ask FERC to look at a couple of details. It is common knowledge that pipeline operators vent their pipeline as part of maintenance and to relieve pressure. This pipeline will have excess pressure in the summer time when demand is low, that's when they will be venting it.

I want FERC in its Environmental Impact Statement requirements to Kinder Morgan in Tennessee to specifically address whether they are going to vent the pipeline and flair that gas, whether they are going to vent the pipeline and direct the gas directly into the atmosphere, or whether they will contain it.

And then I want the FERC EIS to specifically call forth the volumes of gas that they are allowed to vent like that and I want FERC because it has regulatory ability to offer punitive penalties to pipeline operators to then levy serious, significant fines against Tennessee Gas Pipeline and Kinder Morgan for venting their pipeline without sufficient public notification. They know when they are going to do these deliberate ventings, they should be publically notifying our communities and when those fines are collected give that money back to the community where that gas was vented.

In our day and age of technical progress it is quite possible for each town to have several real time data monitoring stations, picking up emissions of these volatile organic compounds, methane and the adulterants. We should be able to go right on the web and see how the pipeline is doing on any day of the year and of course we would be relying on the operators to be on their honor to tell us when they are venting, but with monitors that are in real time data, third party verification, the public can see them, we would have a way to know if they were venting and not telling us. So those are simple detailed requirements we will be looking for in your environmental impact statement and the resulting efforts of your scoping through the next two years we hope more, and we will be bringing this up to the Energy Facility Siting Board, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir. 53? 54?

MS. BLANK: Hello, my name is Lorraine Blank, L-o-r-r-a-i-n-e B-l-a-n-k and first of all I want to thank the stenographer for doing such a hard, wonderful job and being patient. And I also want to say given the incomplete nature of Kinder Morgan's resource reports and changes to the scope of the project, these scoping meetings are being conducted prematurely and failing to provide information that would benefit the NEPA process.

And in your new scoping meetings please conduct them in the communities that will be most impacted and bear the brunt of impacts from compressor stations, several of which could be among the largest ever built in the U.S.

What I wanted to say was there are 4 different points at which fracked gas is vented all the way along the pipeline. It is vented at the metering stations, it is vented at the valve stations, it is vented at the pigging stations and it is vented at the compressor stations. I would like to know how much methane gas and how much of the carcinogenic chemicals are vented at each of the four stations along the entire route of the pipeline.

I would like to know how far apart each of these stations are from each other, along the whole route of

the pipeline. I would like to know how many metering stations there are along the whole route of the pipeline, how many valve stations there are along the whole route of the pipeline and how many pigging stations there are along the whole route of the pipeline and also how many compressor stations there are along the whole route of the pipeline.

I would like to know how the combination of the metering stations, the venting stations, the pigging stations and the compressor stations and all of their combined emissions affect the environment in terms of how much methane gas and carcinogenic chemicals will be spewed out into the air as a whole and fall upon all of our soils and go into all of our waterways.

How will this affect our environment, our wildlife, our ability to grow healthy food in health soil, our ability to obtain clean drinking water and our ability to breathe the clean air? How is it going to affect all of our living conditions and our ability to attract tourism to this area in the Berkshires which is so well known for the beauty of its parks, its lakes, its forest, and for its recreational facilities to enjoy nature?

How is it going to affect all of the farmers who earn their livings from growing and selling fresh Berkshire produce? Can we afford to have our quality of life destroyed and have all of what we have along the whole route of the pipeline turned into a fracked gas waste dump where no one will want to live, where no one can actually live because the environment will be so poisoned for centuries?

Please say no to unnatural gas, embrace green energy, debase fossil fuels. And I just wanted to say as a resident that lives on Cheshire Lake, it is getting increasingly difficult in this world to find a place of safe haven. To me the Berkshires is a place of safe haven where I could look up at the stars at night and at the moon, where I can sit on my dock and see the two little handsome turtles popping out of the lake, where I can see the cranes and the eagles flying overhead.

Please dear FERC help all of us in the Berkshires to keep our safe haven safe.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

MS. BLANK: You're welcome. Thank you for your services.

MR. PECONOM: 55? 56? 57? 58? Oh I'm sorry, okay 58? 59? 60? Oh you're 59? Got it.

MR. AUGUST: Good evening my name is Steve August and I am a lawyer with the Massachusetts Energy Facility Siting Board. With me tonight is Enid Cuman, who is an analyst with the Siting Board as well. I would just like to take a moment to explain what the Siting Board in Massachusetts does and its role in this proceeding.

The Siting Board is an administrative agency of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. One of our principal functions is to review proposals for the construction of new energy facilities in Massachusetts including large electric power plants, electric transmission lines, natural gas pipelines and natural gas pipelines that lie entirely within the Commonwealth.

The Siting Board does not however, have the authority to approve or reject interstate natural gas pipeline facilities such as the one being proposed by Tennessee in this case. Instead such authority rests with FERC in Washington, D.C. The Siting Board is not a part of FERC. FERC is an agency of the federal government and the Siting Board is a state agency. The Siting Board will be holding a public comment hearing here in this auditorium next Tuesday, August 4th on the same subject as we are meeting on tonight and the proposed NED Pipeline which will begin at 7 o'clock and we will also be holding meetings next week in Greenfield and in Lunenburg and in where else -- Greenfield, Lunenburg, Dracut, thank you very good.

After the conclusion of the Siting Board's public hearings and an additional public comment period, the Siting Board will be filing written comments with FERC regarding the proposed NED Project. The Siting Board's comments are intended to identify difficulties and problems with the project associated with environmental issues and impacts.

In addition the Siting Board may be advocating for the imposition of certain conditions on Tennessee in order to mitigate the environmental impacts that the pipeline would impose on abutters and the local

communities. The Siting Board's comments to FERC will be based in part upon a review of the pre-filing documents that Tennessee submitted to FERC and upon the public comments that local residents make at the public comment hearings including this one tonight. We hope that you will come out next week and comment to us as well as we look forward to seeing you next week, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir, number 60? 61?

MR. CRANE: Hi I'm Dicken Crane, it's D-i-c-k-e-n C-r-a-n-e. I'm an organic farmer in Dalton, MASS and like all farmers I pay attention to which way the wind blows and I'm pretty sure everyone here senses which way the wind is blowing in Berkshire County but the question is can a stiff breeze in Berkshire County even blow out a candle in Washington, D.C. and we know that Kinder Morgan is a lot more than a candle.

Where this morning I found out from the report that one of my best hay fields and my compost site which is probably dollar wise the biggest part of the income from my farm has been designated as a pipe yard and it is also an APR farm that has an agricultural preservation restriction development rights that belong to the Department of Agricultural Resources so this is protected Article 97 land but it shows up on the map in the recently released report as a pipe yard, the whole thing.

So this is kind of distressing. The pipeline will also cross our land which has a conservation restriction on it where it comes off of MASS fish and wildlife land which used to belong to us that was donated to the Berkshire Natural Resources Council with a conservation restriction on it and now belongs to Fish and Wildlife and is part of a designated forest reserve.

So all these protections which as in our case we were the donor of the land that was -- we donated the protection it was the presumption that it would really be protected and if the pipeline goes through it is going through literally miles of land that had the belief that the land was protected from development and so it is not just one source of protection, there's layers of protection all of which are at risk of being torn apart so that this pipeline could go through.

And the booby prize on top of this is that some of my best agricultural land becomes a pipe yard so I think it is important to recognize that the levels of protection that people have faith in need to be recognized because if that faith is lost there's a lot more lost than just that land. If there's the incentive for anyone to bother to protect land when they know this can happen anyway, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, number 62?

MR. BRENNER: My name is Mory Brenner, M-o-r-y B-r-e-n-n-e-r. I was a practicing attorney for many years and I live directly on Cheshire Lake, probably the closest person to where the pipeline is going to cross, almost a quarter mile underwater.

My home rests in a position similar to many along the route. My house lies close enough to the pipeline that its mere existence will degrade our property values and the worst case our lives will end in an inferno. From the end of my driveway where I know see blue herrings and Cheshire Lake I will someday have nothing but a memory that you used to like it exactly where that hideous pipeline is.

Yet we live far enough away from the pipeline that we will receive no compensation. I urge you to take any and all action under your control to stop construction of this pipeline before any damage to lives or the environment can take place.

Let's begin by examining if this project goes well, expansion of the existing Spectra pipeline would render this Kinder Morgan pipeline as unnecessary. There's a projected supply of gas serving as a source of the Kinder Morgan pipeline, it has reached depletion levels in only 10 or 20 years with permanently scarring our area. No matter what our personal usage of gas from this pipeline will remain at zero, zero!

It's interesting that we live in a spot that will never, ever, be offered natural gas or cable. And many of the people who have spoken tonight, you may not realize are in the same position yet people are trying to force an unwanted pipeline down our throats. If the pipeline experiences failures as it surely will, things go from bad to worse.

Let's look at the history of these pipelines, there will absolutely be problems. When and where and the severity of a breakdown may remain the issue, but the changes of a perfect record given the past experiences stand near nil. Proponents of the pipeline tell me it's unlikely I'll be incinerated as the most recent technology will open valves and release gas to avoid a major explosion.

Even using the shortest distances envisioned between the safety points and the smaller diameter recently being discussed that still means the release into our air of over a million cubic feet of gas, every time the system senses a problem. I will be happy if I can avoid incineration but I certainly do not want a million cubic feet of chemically infused fracked gas released into the air that I breathe on a regular basis.

Now let's explore a real disaster. The cleanup faced by British Petroleum in the Gulf of Mexico may cost over 50 billion dollars. Based on a quick look at the Kinder Morgan balance sheet such an event would bankrupt them and I have seen no evidence of any insurance or that insurance could cover a claim of this magnitude. We would be left with nothing.

One thing that stands out clearly when reviewing the disaster history involves a very long list of Kinder Morgan pipeline failures, deaths and criminal convictions. In fact Kinder Morgan stands convicted of criminally negligent homicide on multiple occasions.

This proposed pipeline rates as analogous to the government issuing a machine gun to a serial killer and forcing us to accept them as a permanent guest in our home at our own expense. As I stand here facing an early death at the instance of my government, let's consider that even the military draft lies as a thing of the past. Yet in this case not only did they propose to put my life at risk but to do so for a cause that our community and our neighbors have voted almost unanimously against. The 5th Amendment of the United States Constitution guarantees me the right to life, liberty and property yet the government proposed to certainly take my property and potentially take my life.

Further constitutional language states property cannot be taken for public use without just compensation and yet that looks exactly what they plan to do. I find this pipeline unnecessary, repugnant, unconscionable and unconstitutional. I sincerely hope that you will do everything in your power to end this project before it destroys our property, way or life, natural resources and human lives, thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir. 63?

MR. PFEIFER: Joseph Pfeifer P-f-e-i-f-e-r. I'm a resident of Windsor and my house is going to be 3 miles directly north in a straight line of this either 80,000 horsepower, 55,000 horsepower, who knows how many horsepower compressor.

The reason we are here is because the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts have been gutted. Energy companies are exempted from the regulations that we thought we had won back in the '70's and '80's. This is not a gas pipeline. This is a sewer of toxic waste mixed with natural gas.

The issue that affects FERC's domain is that the rules that apply to simply natural gas cannot apply here. The proportions have to be greater and Kinder Morgan's behavior as a company of the large pipeline companies, they spend the lowest per mile on safety and maintenance and it shows in their record.

Really more severe precautions are going to be needed to be taken with this proposed project and we see no evidence that it will be. The venting of gas will not just be the venting of gas, it will be the venting of carcinogens and other petrol chemicals into the environment. This project is scheduled to be drilled under the Westfield River. There are 3 wild and scenic rivers in the state of Massachusetts and the Westfield is the only one in western Massachusetts, naturally reproducing populations of brook and brown trout.

How will Kinder Morgan assess the safety of what they are doing in regards to this river, a precious resource for everyone in this community? How will they assess sediments, spawning? How will they assess invertebrate life? How will they assess the health of the fish after this proposed pipeline is put in?

How will we know that toxins haven't got into the adipose tissue of the trout? How will this project impact the migration of moose which we have increasing numbers of in western Massachusetts? They walk through my back yard on a regular basis. How will they contain the cleaning of these pipes? If you have

ever seen videos of the cleaning of these pipes there's a robotic hog that goes through them, gets spewed out at one end along with a spray of toxic chemicals, those chemicals go straight into the ground, how will they protect the environment from that?

My 7 year old daughter asked me dad, are you going out to vote against the pipeline? I said yeah and then I realized I can't vote against anything. I have to appeal to my government to do the right thing for us. Nobody wants this, no one. No one who lives here wants this, no one needs it and it doesn't belong here.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, number 64? 65?

MR. OLIVIERI: Thank you very much for being here to listen to the voice of the people and acting upon their will. I really thing this should go to a referendum so that people's written votes can be heard. My name is Luke Olivieri L-u-k-e O-l-i-v-i-e-e-r-i. We are privileged to speak one's mind and now even more so when the concern is a huge public health, safety and well-being issue with non-polluting technology such as solar, tidal, wind, wave energy, bio-mass and geo-thermal power at our disposal it is unconscionable that any corporation, state planning board or federal agency would consider actually expanding fossil fuel use now that the hard effects of global warming caused by industrial release of carbon into the atmosphere are clearly seen and has brought us all to the point of climate crisis.

The process of fracking for natural gas is irretrievably destructible to animals, the environment and to public health. In farms and residential areas bordering fracked wells in Pennsylvania, methane has backed up into people's water wells and plumbing systems to such an extent that their sink faucets can literally be set on fire -- creme brulee anyone at the sink?

Toluene, benzene and other deadly chemicals are leaking into drinking water, hmmm how many of these substances can you feed your toddler? When corporations crack massive layers of bedrock, blast water and astonishing pressures, strip mine for coal by tearing off whole mountaintops, clear cut massive acres for timber, they have a word that the use to try to ignore the devastation to people, animals and the environment that they leave in their wake, that word is externalities.

They literally seek to block out any thought of the destruction and pollution that their activities lead to so that the focus can be on their bottom line profits. Here's some more externalities that those blinded by profit may not have considered. On Pennsylvania farms adjacent to fracked wells, calves have been born with no pupils or iris's in their eyes -- that's right just solid white marbles for eyes.

Homes in Oklahoma near fracked wells have so much methane backed up into their plumbing and basements that people brace for an errant spark to set off a massive explosion in their own house. People cannot move away because their houses are now unsellable.

Pipelines as these can explode and anyone who balks at that idea simply has to remember the massive explosion in Edison, New Jersey a few years back when eye witness accounts reported that people thought a nuclear bomb had been detonated. The sky was lit up in orange and white so greatly, fire crews became disoriented because the explosion ripped through multiple weak points along a 2 mile stretch of pipe, firemen had no idea where to respond first.

Please use common sense to protect our children, our grandchildren and ourselves. Vote no action on this issue, do not build any pipeline. We do not need it, thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir. 64? 65? 66? I think -- do you know -- is there anybody left that hasn't spoken? Okay. Would anybody else like to speak before we wrap up the meeting? Thank you for having us, it was a pleasure. We appreciate all of your comments, thank you very much, I conclude the meeting. (Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 11:46 p.m.)

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF: : Project No.
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT : PF14-22-000

Nashua Radisson
11 Tara Boulevard
Nashua, New Hampshire 03062

Wednesday, July 29, 2015

The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping Meeting, pursuant to notice, at 6:35 p.m., Eric Tomasi, the moderator.

PROCEEDINGS
(6:35 p.m.)

MR. TOMASI: Okay everybody we are going to go ahead and get started, if everyone wants to take their seats we will go ahead and start. Good evening everyone I want to thank everybody for coming out tonight on behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. I want to introduce myself first. My name is Eric Tomasi, I'm the Project Manager for FERC for this project which is the Northeast Energy Direct Project that is proposed by Tennessee Gas.

The docket number for this Project is PF14-22 and as well as being the project manager for this project I am also the lead technical lead for air quality pipeline safety and noise for the Office of Energy Projects which I work in. I have several people here who are pretty much integral to the set up and running of our meeting tonight as well as helping prepare the environmental impact statements and that's our contractor Cardno and they assist us in preparation of the document.

With me tonight at the table I have Wayne Kicklighter. Out at the table you have been -- you have all seen Lavinia Desanto, Jonathan Hess, Bruce Hart, Steven Brand and Peter Marsi and I want to thank them again for helping tonight. I also want to thank staff here for doing a great setup here tonight.

And a couple of things the bathrooms which you probably have seen are out there, there is some water out there as well if you need water it is getting a little warm in here so make sure if you do want some water go and grab some and we -- this is going to be a very long night. I apologize in advance, we are probably going to go to at least midnight and we will take at least one break so to let people have bathroom breaks and that sort of thing.

Now also I want to point out that there is a court reporter here tonight and the court reporter is transcribing this entire meeting. Now this is so that we can have an accurate record of tonight's comments and that record is going to be placed into our e-library system at FERC and that will contain the entire public record both for this particular meeting as well as to hold the docket as a whole.

Now the court reporter we have here tonight is with Ace Federal Reporters and if you wish to get a copy of that transcript prior to its placement in the public files, you have to make arrangements directly with Ace. Next slide -- I want to talk a little bit about why we are here tonight.

Obviously a lot of people were extremely interested in this project and a lot of people were very concerned about this project but tonight I want to accomplish a few things. One, I want to go ahead and summarize the project for those of you who may not be totally cognizant of everything, especially the changes that have happened over the last week or so, so I want to summarize the project, I want to explain the role that we play, that FERC plays in the review of this project.

I want to outline how you the public can participate in the process, not just here at this meeting tonight but there are other ways that you can participate as well and lastly, and perhaps most importantly this meeting allows you to voice your concerns about the project in this particular forum.

I do ask that you reserve all questions until later. There is a table out front manned by Cardno. If you haven't signed up for a speaker already -- to be a speaker tonight, you can sign up out there, you will have gotten a ticket. Now I hope to get through everyone on the tickets but in general we get to around 15 - 18 people per hour when we get to comments, and the last time I looked we were about 85 people signed up and we have about 19 elected officials who wish to speak as well.

So as I said it is going to be a late night and there's a chance for those of you people who have high numbers may not be able to get a chance to speak here tonight. We are going to go late, but I know people may not want to be here until 2 in the morning so I wanted to let you know that right off the bat.

Now again, if you can see up there some of the purposes, not just the things that I want to summarize that I want to do but one of the big things that we want to do -- why we come out here is we want to get issues, find new issues out that we may not know about that you know so that's sort of one of the main reasons that we come out. Because I'm never going to know as much about the area around here as you will and so that's why we come out here so we can hear from the -- you know local citizens about environmental safety and other concerns that you have that are in your backyard.

I also want to go ahead and identify issues like I said and those are identified by you the public as well as you know, your elected officials and also the agencies as well. And I am going to go and explain a little bit about how the process works where we are in the process as well as -- and then finally give you the opportunity for speaking tonight.

Now I say this again and again when I come out to meetings like this is your input is very critical to our analysis as I said. We rely on all kind of surveys from the company, the agencies from New Hampshire and our own expertise as well, both our expertise internally as well as the expertise of our contractors.

But like I said just a few moments ago I am never going to know this area as well as you because you live here. Next slide, now obviously people can speak here tonight be again if they give me a number there's 200 people signed up to speak we are never going to be able to get through that many people here tonight, so I want to tell you about some other ways that you can go ahead and participate in the process and that's you know both written and verbal and you know obviously the scoping meetings, I apologize, that obviously you can go ahead and file through our E-library system if you go to ferc.gov under E-comment, E-library you can go ahead and submit written comments to us through our electronic system and as well as what's called our quick comment system also on E-library.

You can also just send me a letter, old-fashioned but you can just send me a letter stating your concerns and that will get on the docket and of course you know one thing that is very important is that we do have the comment letters on the table. If you want to take one you can write it out tonight, if you want to come to Milford tomorrow you can give it to me at Milford or you can mail it to me.

So there are multiple venues, multiple ways that you can provide input to our process. And again, the last thing is that whether you give me a written comment or a verbal comment tonight it counts exactly the same, so there you go. Written comments are given the same weight as verbal comments. And I want to reiterate that because a lot of people here I mean I know they are going to be concerned, they only have 3 minutes and there's not a lot you can say in 3 minutes but you can summarize some of your concerns.

So we are going to be at 3 minutes for every speaker but I want to make sure that you are able to get all of your comments into the record and so that's why I want to see your written comments, even if you have them written down here tonight and you read off of them, if you are not able to get through those, please give me those comments so that I can take them back to D.C. and put them on the record.

Next slide please -- now again that leads me to the next thing which is meeting decorum. Now I know this is a big tradition of having town meetings and hearings going on, now this is not a hearing. And one thing that I cannot do is I can't really discuss the merits of the project because we are still gathering that information.

We have -- right now we have gotten a good amount of information from the company but we still have

a lot of information yet to get. That's why we start this process really early so that we can go ahead and start gathering that information in this early process before they actually come in with a formal application.

So that's something that I really want to stress is there is a lot of things that you know you are going to want answers to and I don't have the answer to those yet so just understand that. Obviously you know, there is a lot of people in the room tonight, please if you could turn off the phones.

Now everyone is going to have numbers that is going to speak except for the elected officials, when I call your name and your number come up to the podium and you can give your comment, you know, as I mentioned if you have a written -- some written comments out, try to summarize them as succinctly as you can so that you can get those on the record on those 3 minutes.

Also, there are some people here which are both pro and against the pipeline project. If you do not agree with the speaker they have the right to speak, everyone has the 3 minutes please let them speak, that's very important. Everyone here remember is a citizen, a member of the public, they should be able to get the 3 minutes to speak whether you agree with them or not so that's very important.

Any disruption like it says it's only going to disrupt the next person's ability to speak because we have a lot of people to get through and I want to be able to get through and here all of your comments as I possibly can and if there is jeering or even cheering we are not going to be able to get through that.

And I know people are going to be, the emotions are high and everyone is going to want to cheer and clap and that's fine but know that the longer that you cheer and clap that's going to cut more and more time out of the end of the night so I understand there is concerns and you know there's emotion but try to keep your applause to a minimum so that we can get to the next speaker.

Now next slide please -- I am going to talk about the project information but I want to talk a little bit about who FERC is. You know so many of you do not know what FERC does but we are an independent agency and what I mean by independent agency is that we -- our decisions are not reviewed by either Congress or the President.

You have to go through the Court system, that's why we are independent. Now we actually regulate interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas and oil and we only do siting for natural gas facilities. Also we do siting for hydro-electric, for non-federal hydro-electric facilities as well.

Now as a federal licensed agency we are actually -- the whole reason I'm here is because something called the National Environmental Policy Act. Because we essentially license and -- well LNG or natural gas facilities, we work hard to disclose the impacts, both to the public and to the decision makers which in this case are the 5 Commissioners that we have.

Now our EIS which we will talk about a little later, will have all the environmental impacts that we determine that we can find by the project and also alternatives. We will also recommend mitigation measures and those will be included in our EIS.

And now one of the things I also want to point out is that there are things that FERC does not do. We do not regulate oil pipelines, we do not regulate electric -- the building or siting of electric lines and we do not regulate the expiration, production or gathering of natural gas. That means drilling, both conventional or unconventional fracking, so we do not regulate that. We regulate the intermediate portion which is the transmission of natural gas from point A to point B that is what we regulate.

Now I mentioned our Commissioners. We have 5 Commissioners that are appointed by the President and approved by the U.S. Congress and they are the final decision makers on this project. I do not make a decision one way or the other whether the project will go forward or not.

My job is to write the Environmental Impact Statement, solely write the Environmental Impact Statement and so I want you to understand that your concerns will be in the record. My job is do the environmental review, it is the Commissioners, it is their job to vote yes or no on this project to determine whether the project is in the public convenience and necessity.

So I wanted to lay -- make sure you understand that. And I am going to talk about how I do the mitigation and how we are going to go ahead and write the EIS later. The next slide -- well actually keep this slide, we'll talk about the project information real quick.

Now as many of you know, we just got this next set of -- the last set of draft research reports on Friday. It's a very voluminous -- very large amount of information to take in and you know my team is basically going through that and we will be analyzing that over the next month or so and we will be -- over the next month or so we will be sending the company additional questions to try to get more answers out of the company to understand why there are so many holes in this document and how we can fill those holes so we can really disclose all the impacts to the public and the Commissioners.

Now as you can see you know the pipeline did change in length by a little tiny bit, it is now 418 miles of pipeline in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut. There are still the same amount of compressor stations, they went to one meter station as well and there are still several pipeline laterals, loops and delivery lines in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire. There are also some loops in Pennsylvania as well but they are part of the beginning of the project.

Now one of the biggest issues that just happened is Tennessee just indicated that the line is going from Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts. It's actually going to be lower in volume. Previously they have identified 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas per day that would be flowing through there, now they have reduced that to 1.3 billion cubic feet per day.

Now also they actually reduced the size of the pipeline as well from 36 inches to 30 inches on that route. Also, and this is important to many of you in the community here because I know there is the market path mid station which they reduced the size of those stations by right around 90,000 horsepower to right around 40,000, a little over 40,000 at this point.

So that's pretty important to the people who might be affected by the compressor station so I want to lay that out and make sure you understood how some of the changes have recently happened.

Now next slide please -- now this is the project map. I mean obviously I will leave this up for just a second so you can see generally how the project runs on the east portion here. I obviously runs through this community. Then of course there's a west side -- next slide please -- which you know goes through Pennsylvania and New York.

Now all of these maps and everything like that have just been updated by the company. You can find all of those on our E-library system. There tend to be -- the more detailed maps, alignment sheets, are going to be a lot more detailed and they are going to be very big to download so that's something you should be aware of, next slide.

Now, I said that part of the reason for us coming out here tonight is to get comments from you. Well we have already had a lot, lot, lot of comments on the record. At last count you know there was substantially over 3,000 comments on the record on this project. This project might actually set a record for the most amount of comments we have ever received on a project.

And obviously there are a lot of specific concerns that people have identified and these are just a list of some of the concerns that people have obviously and to many of you in this room I see some of the signs here, there is a big preference to develop alternative energy as opposed to natural gas.

There are very many concerns regarding export and of course there are a large amount of concerns across, not just in this community but across the project about disruption of the rural character or the nature of the community by which the project would be going through.

These are basically we went through all the comments that we had and these are our top comments. And obviously developed to higher density residential areas, those are comments that we actually got from -- most of those comments actually did come from here and just south of here in Massachusetts as well.

And of course human impacts, fracking is a big concern, you know looking at the impacts overall from the adapter gas industry. And there has been a lot of concerns especially to the various conservation areas,

both here and in Massachusetts about well and aquifer damage. So there has been a lot of concerns about that and you know all of these things are included and because there is a compressor station nearby we have gotten a lot of concerns about emission from the compressor stations as well as noise from the compressor stations.

So all of these things and these are things that we have to address in our Environmental Impact Statement and we will address those. Now some of these will also be addressed more completely perhaps in the Commission's Order. The things will probably more completely addressed by the Commission itself will be things regarding export and specifically regarding developing alternative energy as well as need issues.

So next slide please -- now I am going to talk a little bit about the FERC process but I know there have been a lot of concerns and I know the local community has been concerned about easements and eminent domain. If the Commission, if the 5 Commissioners do decide to approve any project, not just this project but any project, that conveys with it eminent domain for the project and I know there's a lot of concern about that, so I just wanted to make sure that you understand that yes this project would if approved by the Commission would allow the company to go through eminent domain.

So one of the things that I always point out to people even if you do not approve this project a couple of things one -- we do encourage you to 1, allow the survey crews on your property. And why is that? Why is that. That is so that I can understand what is on your property. If I don't know about it I can't try to avoid it and that's one of the things that really helps you know if the survey crews go down your property then I will actually know about what is on your property and what things have to be avoided.

If you don't allow the survey crew on that I will not know about that issues and I might think that everything is fine, so that's why I encourage you because also there is sort of a perhaps maybe myth is not the right term, but there is an attitude that well if I don't let them on my property, well if everyone does that the Commission cannot approve the project.

Well there is no lower bound by which the Commission considering survey access would approve a project. So even if you were an extremely low percentage of survey access, the Commission may approve a project. We will do our best to identify the impacts based on other types of surveys like aerial surveys, light surveys as well as information from the states and local governments but at the end of the day the Commission may decide to approve it regardless of having survey access or not.

Now of course we will eventually have to have survey access to allow anything to go across any individual property. What that means is that for some reason you did not allow survey access and the Commission were to approve it and it were to go across your property, we would require them before construction to do those surveys so that we could then find out about it.

But at that point that's the tail end. You have a lot more control over what happens on your property if you deal with it now.

Now about easements. For those of you who may be negotiating with the company about easements, I do encourage everybody to be -- obviously I'm not an attorney, I encourage you to obtain an attorney if you can, but at the end of the day the easement is something that you should read extremely carefully because that should identify all the things that can and cannot be done on your property so it is a very important document and it should be looked over very, very closely, so that's what I wanted to say briefly about that.

Now I am going to talk a little bit about the FERC process. Now obviously we started our review about 9 months ago, well more than 9 months ago now, back in September of 2014 when the company was accepted in our pre-filing process. And originally the route as you definitely would probably be aware of went through Massachusetts and shortly thereafter they filed their initial research reports 1 and 10 they moved the route to go through what's called the New Hampshire Pipeline, New Hampshire Electric Line Alternative and then thus went up into New Hampshire and basically its current route as identified today.

They also in March they filed the first full set of draft research reports which we submitted comments to them and this last Friday they submitted new draft research reports which again are not fully complete and

that's sort of the purpose of pre-filing.

And the purpose of pre-filing is to get out there early to identify the issues early so that the pipeline can be moved, can have modifications to it, just to do the best we can to avoid the things that the community are concerned about so that's really what the important thing is about the pre-filing process is it allows us to move very early before the company gets out there and does many, many surveys.

Now there is -- the company does plan to file their application at this point in October of 2015. As I mentioned we will have additional data request to the company to fill in the gaps. Even after they come with their application we are still going to be filling in all these gaps and we might still see alternatives that we want vetted.

If we do actually find truly viable alternatives we will have to do more of these meetings and notify the people in those communities because just like you got notice, we can't put a pipeline through someone's community unless they get the opportunity to know about it and have the opportunity to speak and give us comments on the record.

Obviously there will be a draft -- the point of this is to prepare the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and again after the Draft Environmental Impact Statement I will be back here to do another round of meetings, to hear from you about what you think about our Draft EIS. At that point we will have a lot of information on the record so you know, obviously there is going to be a lot of comments, but I can answer some of your questions a little more fully we are going to have more information at that point.

And then of course after the comment period is over for the Draft EIS we will issue our final EIS and that will be a recommendation to the Commission in a public disclosure document. The Commission will use that as well as other things to make their decision and well what other things will they use, how does the Commission make its decision? Well not only does the Commission look at the Environmental Impact of the project but they look at the economic impacts, they look at the public convenience and necessity, is this needed?

You know what effect is this going to have economically on the region? All of those things go into the Commission's decision-making and then they are the ones who make the decision and their decision is in what's called our Certificate of Order. There will be a discussion about the environmental impacts and in fact all of the recommendations that we have to mitigate impacts in the final EIS will be included as a condition of the Order so that's important to understand.

The FEIS does not decide anything, it is the Commission's Order which decides everything. Now next slide, now I'll talk a little bit about the EIS and what it is going to contain a little bit. We not only get comments from you but we talked to a lot of other agencies, we talked to state governments, we talked to local governments, we had a couple of meetings this week with local governments. I have a meeting tomorrow with the state agencies as well to try to get their input and their concerns on this project.

We also go ahead -- I am going to be out here again to look at the route as well as look at alternatives to see whether other routes, and perhaps some of those routes might take you completely out of New Hampshire entirely, it might be better than the one that is currently proposed. We will be looking at those, because one of the things that we have to do on not just alternatives but for the entire process is we have to do what is called -- we have to take a hard look at the environmental impacts which means if somebody identified a concern, we have to make sure we fully analyze that concern and that's what I mean by hard look and again we will address every single comment that we get in our EIS.

Now we address it a little differently between the draft and the final. The comments in it right now, we will address in the EIS but we will address them generically. We will not have you know, John or Jane Q Public gave us this comment, this is how we respond to it. We will look at all the issues, synthesize them down and look at every single thing and address each individual comment.

Now after the Draft EIS comes out we will address those comments a little differently. In the final EIS, if you comment on the draft you will in fact see your comment letter and right next to it will be our response

to every single point that you actually had, that's the difference between comments now and comments after the Draft EIS.

Now we also have gotten a lot of questions about well do we need to make sure we get our comments in by August 30th we don't have enough time, well here's the thing about the formal comment period that we are in right now. The formal comment period what that does is the company is required to respond to everything filed in the formal comment period.

But we have to respond to every comment, whether you file your comment in the formal comment period or not we are going to respond to it, regardless before the application, after the application it does not matter, we will still respond to that.

Lastly we also get information not just from the agencies as well but we also get information from the elected officials. Like I said I was out there today and yesterday talking to elected officials. I also wanted to go ahead and thank you know the offices of Senator Shaheen and Congressman's Kuster's offices they have been really, really aggressive -- maybe aggressive is not the right word but they have been giving us a lot of really good information about your concerns.

And I have talked with them on a regular basis about the concerns of the communities up here so I think you are well represented there and they have been giving me a lot of input on how best to you know, address some of your concerns and make sure that we get the proper outreach to the communities.

Next slide please -- and finally before we talk a little bit about procedural and decorum issues here the EIS actually will be sent out now. Who is it going to be sent out to? If you received our notice you are going to get a copy of the EIS. Now right now we send out CD's. If you do not want a CD copy you have to send us back the back page of the notice that says I want a hard copy or let us know tonight.

Now if you are not on the mailing list yet, please sign up out front, make sure that you get on the mailing list. One thing we will be doing and we have done is for anyone who submits a comment, we look for that comment to see whether there is an address and we put you on our mailing list automatically.

So whether you want it or not if you submit a comment and we have your address you are on our mailing list. Now if you don't want to get the EIS just tell us we don't want the EIS and we won't send it to you. So lastly, I want to talk a little bit about decorum for tonight.

As I said we are going to have a couple of things here. I am going to ask you to come up to the microphone and speak. I am going to do elected officials first, we have several elected officials like we said they are going to speak first and then we are going to do the general citizenry. I would ask you to speak clearly, sometimes I don't but please do yourself. Next, spell your name for the court reporter and I am going to have to enforce a time limit. It is going to be 3 minutes but again if you have written comments please after you are done, drop them off here or at the front table.

Now we also have a way for you to know how late your time is going. We have this little light here and this podium is going to go away, we are going to move this so you will be able to see it. We have a little stoplight which is green, yellow, red it is pretty self-explanatory. When the light turns yellow you have 30 seconds left and when it is red your time is going to be up so that will help you as you are speaking to identify how long you have.

Okay and lastly please do not interrupt the speaker. Even if you don't agree with them please let them finish and if for some reason the speaker goes over or won't stop you know we will take care of that but ultimately I would encourage you to please stop at your 3 minute time period because everyone has 3 minutes and that is how we are going to move forward on this.

So we are going to go ahead and we are going to set back up and then I am going to go ahead and call the elected officials up, okay, one second.

Okay first I would like to go ahead and call up Majority Leader Jack Flanagan.

MR. FLANAGAN: Thank you Eric and thank for coming to New Hampshire to visit with us. Before I speak I would like to say that there's a lot of things going on in Concord so before you sign any easements

or issues of eminent domain please follow what's going on up there. We have had this discussion, Eric and I think you know where I'm coming from.

F-l-a-n-a-g-a-n and I'll be very brief because I know there are a lot of people here. This pipeline is a solution looking for a problem. The Governors of New England said that we need more natural gas for electric production. This does not provide any electric production.

So if you want to minimize the energy impact vote the thing down so there won't be any environmental impact because we have a pipeline coming down from Portland and we have another one from Spectra which is through Massachusetts and Connecticut so I encourage FERC to approve those and vote this one down and the Environmental Impact Study would be very, very brief.

And with that I'll leave it to the rest of the folks here. I would also like to say that the Majority Whip is here from Merrimack and he has also stated that the towns of Merrimack feel the same way so with that I will answer any questions you may have.

MR. TOMASI: No I have no questions sir.

MR. FLANAGAN: Thank you, and that will be it. Thank you Eric I may see you tomorrow.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you the next elected official is Representative Susan Emerson.

MS. EMERSON: Thank you Eric. For the record my name is Susan Emerson and I represent Rindge and Fitzwilliam which is the District 11 in Cheshire County. Over the past several months I have followed this issue very closely and I am here to give voice to the grounds swell of opposition that has risen up into Fitzwilliam and Rindge and then the other 16 communities directly affected by the Northeast Energy.

I am outraged that these FERC scoping sessions are being held only days after Kinder Morgan submitted their 6,571 page draft environmental report making it impossible to address these issues. Let's see, I am cutting my speech. While the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission entire budget is written by the energy industry, it is tasked with regulating that in no way means that FERC's stated mission is to rubber stamp every poorly conceived large scale commercial energy project that comes before it.

That brings us to the Northeast Energy District. My understanding is that the new preferred route through New Hampshire which nearly avoids several wealthy communities in Massachusetts is preferably because it is for the most part, co-located along an existing energy corridor. Apparently FERC likes co-locations. Well if this is co-location then the FERC and Kinder Morgan have redefined the words.

I will speak honestly about the social-economic impact of these kinds of co-location along the path of overhead electrical transmission lines. Every single landowner along this route has already had to deal with the impact of the current power line corridor including lowered property values and the visual power line infrastructure.

Let's see, the ability to use in a meaningful way, significant portions of the land they own and pay taxes on. If the NED Pipeline proposal becomes a reality every bit of these landowners are going to bear the burden again. The pipeline which will be located adjacent to, but not in the existing power line right-of-way will further reduce each landowner's property value, it will result in the deforestation of even more of their land. It will make even more of the land unusable which they pay taxes on.

Kinder Morgan is asking the specific groups of people who have already been negatively impacted to be the same group of people that will need to bear the brunt of the impact of the second infusion of their property and their lives. This is not the easy decision to lay a new pipeline adjacent to an existing pipeline. This is no co-location in any traditional meaning of the word.

Kinder Morgan plans to come and take another bite out of this group of landowners that have already been bitten is simply unethical. Separate from the issue of landowner impact is the overbuilt nature of this pipeline from New England Natural Gas is a bridge fuel, a short-term solution to a problem.

For much of the infrastructure is to put in place to address the dubious short and long-term which weighs against the short-term and long-term environmental impacts that arrive part and parcel with the NED Pipe-

line is plain and simple. I understand that the FERC is not concerned with market forces like demand. I understand that Kinder Morgan conveniently positioned as a mid-stream supplier is not concerned with the sources nor the destination of the product passing through the infrastructure.

I understand that the owners of the natural gas being transmitted are unconcerned with any outside of the wall of the pipeline itself, other than the cost being charged to them for the pipeline capacity that they use so the scope of these concerns never ultimately look at the overall impact of the project.

The scope by design is short-sighted and near-sighted and the route of this project itself is extremely poor sighted. New Hampshire is the other -- New Hampshire is as others have already said, New England's OPEC of electricity, energy production and delivery, how strange that New Hampshire's reward for producing and exporting most of Massachusetts' electricity they consume is to be handed a pipeline that has to go out of its way to climb north into the western New Hampshire only to cross back over New Hampshire's southern borders some 71 miles to the east in order to terminate in Dracut.

Ultimately the decision to build in New England is increasingly number of gas power plants in the fact of the known limits of New England's existing pipelines which brings to Anthony Buxton. Mr. Buxton, an industry lobbyist came up with the idea of financing the pipeline by charging the New England electrical rate payers, Tom Welsh, a Maine member of the NESCOE got on board and ultimately we have the scheme in place where NED Pipeline, and natural gas pipeline is to be financed by the electrical rate payer which apparently no assurance that the pipeline will ever carry any significant amount of natural gas for New Hampshire.

MR. TOMASI: Representative, can you hurry up please, I've given you about 7 minutes, can you please wrap it up?

MS. EMERSON: Yes, I'm going to leave the last couple of pages off. Majority Whip Richard Hench, Dick Hench is in the audience and he agrees with what I say and he's from Merrimack and he's a wonderful Majority Whip and he just came from work so he didn't have time to change clothes, but I am going to give you my 7 pages of testimony.

MR. TOMASI: Please do thank you.

MS. EMERSON: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next Representative Jim McConnell.

MR. MCCONNELL: Thank you, James W. McConnell M-c-C-o-n-n-e-l-l and I represent Cheshire 12, the towns of Richmond and Swansea. I have got 3 points I want to make and I will make them brief because I know a lot of people want to speak.

First of all the portion of the state that this is going through is going to number 155 wetlands in the Monadnock area along, 116 bodies of water, 18 rivers, 8 miles of state forest and parks are heavily dependent in the southwest part of the state and perhaps through the entire southern part of the state on wells and aquifers.

And my concern here is not only there is a reason they call this the Granite State, but the blasting that is required disrupt the wells enormously, but in the event that we do have a problem at some point that there will be a serious problem with the aquifers. That is a serious problem because this is an Environmental Impact Statement I would specifically request that you address that point.

I have got 2 other points that I want to raise. First of all this discussion about the fact that this is obviously an export pipeline -- back on May 8, 2014, 22 senators signed a letter to the White House, in that they went through -- they discussed the approval of a 6th export facility -- now bear in mind this was not quite a year and a half ago.

The comment that they made that is applicable here is "that the total approved exports combined with existing improved export pipelines now exceeds the total amount of gas that is currently used in every single American home and commercial business. This kind of export will lead to the "high export scenario" referenced by the Department of Energy study in 2012 that indicated prices would increase by up to 54%."

More than half of our electricity in New England is generated by natural gas. This pipeline could be a disaster from our standpoint. It's an export pipeline that is going to increase the cost of electricity here in New England absent additional supply.

Echoing this comment the Industrial Energy Consumers of American attempted to stop the Department of Energy from filing or from permitting export permits to be issued with respect to this pipeline. I want to second those comments. Their concern is that they would lose what competitive advantage they have and frankly I can't see that they are in any way wrong in that respect. That's clearly going to be a problem.

Finally I want to discuss the fact that Kinder Morgan just delivered a new 6,000-some page proposal. In my letters to FERC back on April 2nd and also on May 15th, I commented on the fact that Kinder Morgan has basically conducted a campaign to attempt to create an illusion that they are moving along and they are doing an efficient job. The bottom line is that from where I am sitting Kinder Morgan moves this thing around to the point where nobody can get a fix on what they are doing and adequately address the criticisms that we have and would have were we able to fully study these things.

The bottom line is I find that it is distressing that we are having these scoping hearings at this juncture at all. It seems to me clear that until they get some of those TBD's "to be determines" out of those proposals and come up with a hard proposal as to what they want to do which would only be slightly modified thereafter unless significant problems develop in some area that you address, it seems to be that we shouldn't be having these scoping meetings at all at this point.

It seems to me we ought to put these off for 60, 90 or six months, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next is Marty Jack.

MR. JACK: Thank you my name is Marty M-a-r-t-y Jack J-a-c-k, I represent District 36 which is Nashua Ward 9. I want to re-emphasize something that Leader Flanagan said. This pipeline does not do a thing for New Hampshire. The time that we are natural gas constrained is in the middle of winter when the electricity generation plants want to use it and when people want to heat their homes with it.

We know now that the electricity generation people are doing pipeline projects to bring the supply that they need into the state along rights-of-way that they already own, so it seems to me that this pipeline isn't needed and we know that the best environmental impact is no-build.

The second point I want to make is there is a sea of people here today. Almost all of them have some sort of signage that is opposing the pipeline and I hope the Commission will pay close attention to what they have to say and will vote not to approve the pipeline, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. First on our list Chairman of the Town Council Nancy Harrington?

MS. HARRINGTON: They are not going to speak they are just going to stand. Good evening my name is Nancy Harrington, H-a-r-r-i-n-g-t-o-n. I am the Chair of the Merrimack Town Council and I am here on behalf of the entire Council for these proceedings.

The Town of Merrimack is engaged in this examination process early on in order to insure protection for our resources and community. As a result we have provided multiple documents for consideration. Although I will provide written testimony I would like to highlight 3 issues of concern during this verbal testimony.

Number 1 -- FERC's rushing to the scoping meetings when the KM resource report are about to be filed has made the process less transparent and disadvantaged interested parties like Merrimack. This next round of resource reports was filed on July 24th and included thousands of pages of new information regarding the proposed and ultimate route and associated impacts.

It is appalling to the town of Merrimack that we have not been afforded sufficient time to review these filings in order to comment on them at these scoping meetings. Holding these scoping meetings less than a week after such a significant filing is a gross denial of due process. We request that the Commission hold an additional round of scoping meetings once interested parties like Merrimack have had 90 days to review this latest round of resource reports.

Number 2 -- there's no information on the record documenting why this project is necessary as compared to other projects that address the energy issue. As is required by the Commission's jurisdictional authority we ask the Commission to look carefully at the many existing non NED projects and their alternatives such as Northern Pass Project, Portland Natural Gas and Spectra.

There is much evidence supporting the conclusion that these projects are sufficient to meet New England's energy needs on their own and that they are far ahead of the NED Project and construction timelines. These other energy projects will avoid the devastating environmental effects of the NED Pipeline as they truly co-locate with other existing pipelines.

Finally the limited information we had and the old resource reports make clear that the proposed route has dramatic effects on Merrimack. We are not aware that any of these issues have been addressed to date in any reports filed by the applicant. Of course, given that less than a week has passed since the filing of the major modifications it may be that some of these issues are addressed which gives rise to the second tier of issues which Merrimack has yet to focus upon.

The proposed route and the Ambrose alternative have significant impacts to Merrimack resources and we look forward to a process in which these issues may be addressed in a more complete and transparent way. And one final note in response to what you made a comment about the survey agreements. Merrimack has been negotiating with Kinder Morgan since March. We want to see a better survey agreement. They are saying we are not allowed. They don't want town personnel to be present when the survey is done. That's the sticking point. So perhaps you can give them a little nudge and if they allow, not allow, we want them to be present -- they refuse to sign the permit that agreement because they don't want to have our people there, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. One real quick point and I'm glad you brought this up and I forgot to mention it unfortunately during my initial speeches. I want to make clear that we right now -- we will have another meeting in New Hampshire in Cheshire County. We will -- I guarantee that we will have one, we are looking at a couple of locations, we were just not able to nail one down at this point. So for those of you who you know, know people who are from Cheshire County or know people who live in Cheshire County, I will guarantee you tonight that we will have another meeting in Cheshire County.

Right now we are looking at the middle to the end of August, we will definitely have one so I want that to be pointed out very clear because I know right now the Milford venue is a little smaller than this one and I want people who might be on the bubble about going or not, we will definitely have another meeting, guarantee you in Cheshire County, okay.

The next person on the list, the next elected official is Lon S. Woods.

MR. WOODS: Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to address you. I'm in opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project as it passes through the town of Merrimack. My specific concern is the impact on the water supply for the town of Merrimack. The proposed route crosses through the center of one of the principal aquifers from which the MVD, the producer of water for the town draws water.

There are two production wells in the area of the crossing. Protection of this aquifer is provided by the towns aquifer protection overlay district. The contributing zone for the two wells is a registered well head protection area for the State of New Hampshire.

I must state my strongest opposition to the construction of the proposed pipeline in this area. To lose such a critical resource would have dire consequences on the capabilities to provide water to the residents and businesses in the town of Merrimack. Another aquifer to the southwest, the Witches Brook Aquifer, is also interjected by the proposed pipeline.

Together these aquifers contain 83% of the MVD capacity and based on numerous searches it would be very unlikely that protection wells of equal yield could be found in the involved service area, 83%.

Also of concern are construction activities, blasting, excavations, storage for such products necessarily for an undertaking as proposed, invite contamination. They also create the opportunity to storm water run-off

changes and impact on the surface and ground water quality.

Further although infrequent catastrophic pipeline failures are most always accompanied by structural damage and personal injury. A reasonable person, a municipal entity or dare I say a regulatory commission could not place even such a small risk in such a sensitive area.

Finally, the cost of replacing production wells if it were possible to do so would be prohibitive, an estimated 2 to 3 million dollars for each of the wells. As a resident of the town of Merrimack, a rate payer in the Merrimack Village District I most strongly urge the Commission, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to find the project not of public convenience and necessity, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up Charles Moser.

MR. MOSER: I'm Charlie Moser, Select Man for the Town of Mason, New Hampshire and I am also here speaking on behalf of the New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition which is a group of 14 towns united in their opposition to this project, 14 -- 12 directly affected towns, one town that abuts the compressor station, the town of Temple.

I want to make 2 points at this presentation. First co-location -- it's a myth. The power line easement that goes through southern New Hampshire that this was supposedly be co-located with is simply an easement. Eversource Energy does not own that property so even if the pipeline was directly under the power lines which I understand it can't be, the developer Tennessee and Kinder Morgan are going to have to either purchase or take by eminent domain every inch of property on the pipeline. Eversource does not have the right to grant another energy provider an easement under its easement, I think it has to get permission but they are going to also take the land from the land owners because Eversource does not own the right to say to another energy provider you can put your pipeline here.

So co-location is a total myth. It's taken 4 negotiations with the underlying landowners all the way. I think the term co-location needs to be redefined in your regulations.

The second point I want to make is there's something I don't understand. I will be perfectly honest with you, that is that Kinder Morgan and Tennessee have come to FERC. Their ultimate goal is to get something called a Certificate of Necessity and Convenience.

Why do we have to go through this extremely painful lengthy environmental process involving 14 towns in New Hampshire and I don't know how many in other states when it hasn't even been decided if this project is necessary?

The way this is done is completely backwards, I agree with the other speakers that have said that we have been short-changed by the release of 6,000 plus pages of resource reports on the eve of this meeting and from what I can see that is a denial of due process of the law like other speakers have said, substantive due process and procedural due process.

And I also think that because the pipeline was moved to New Hampshire and other states, people in other states have had more opportunity to challenge it than we have or to express their concerns. It's a denial of equal protection under the law also.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next Louise Lavoie.

MS. LAVOIE: Hi my name is Louise Lavoie. L-a-v-o-i-e and I'm a Selectman in the town of Mason and like other speakers the first point I would like to make tonight is I would like it entered into the record that the New Hampshire towns and affected land owners were not afforded sufficient time to review and fully understand the Kinder Morgan resource reports posted on the FERC web page on Wednesday, July 24th. Please note these documents contain several thousand pages and that FERC's website traffic has been overloaded resulting in limited access to the documents and most importantly 3 business days in inadequate to comprehensively review the documents, underscore the changes, local and digest the many, many unknown and TBD details that still exist with this project.

I strongly urge FERC to slow down this process and allow due process to all those impacted by this project.

Secondly I am requesting that a public safety be studied with the intent of providing the towns a clear line of sight on emergency planning, preparedness and cost. To be things in context, Mason is a small town with a limited tax base. Our total operating expense budget is only 1.6 million dollars. The annual budget for our volunteer fire department is a mere \$65,000.

The town of Mason and surrounding towns are great with volunteer fire departments and we rely on availability of volunteers and mutual aid from nearby towns. The majority of our small towns run on volunteer efforts with limited budget.

In Mason for example there is also limited access to water. There are no pressurized hydrants and tanker shuttles are required to provide water supply to active scenes. There is limited accessibility to the proposed pipeline loops, especially back country land-locked areas.

So the town of Mason is requesting a public safety plan for all the New Hampshire towns along the proposed route. The safety plan must address, but not be limited to key points of concern such as what is the emergency notification process for municipalities and the public?

What is KM and its affiliates plan to respond to emergency situations? Is it minutes, hours, days? What are the evacuation plans for elderly, disabled children as well as land owners potentially blocked in on dead-end roads, cul-de-sacs, et cetera in the event of a pipeline emergency?

Who is responsible for providing resources, training and equipment to deal with pipeline emergencies? In the event of a pipeline emergency where does KM and its affiliates responsibilities begin and end? Where does the town of Mason and other small towns responsibility pick up?

In the event of a pipeline emergency who shoulders the cost of services incurred by the towns? Are Kinder Morgan and its affiliates responsible? What is the plan to access landmark back wood areas and who -- how do we insure the confidence of the public that there will be adequate planning and consideration given to public safety?

The issues I raised deserve a thorough thoughtful study and consideration. Small towns simply cannot afford to take on the burden and responsibility of this project. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up is Bernie O'Grady.

MR. O'GRADY: I'm Bernie O'Grady, also representing the town of Mason, Board of Selectmen. That's O'Grady O-G-r-a-d-y. First of all I just want to say that I agree with just about every statement that has been made here tonight and I would like to go on the record as such.

We are told by Kinder Morgan that they are re-locating the proposed pipeline to New Hampshire to co-locate it with existing utility rights-of-way by reducing the impact on landowners by way of eminent domain. They are proposing -- I would like to speak particularly about the Fitchburg lateral line. They are proposing a Fitchburg lateral line which will not be co-located with anything and will cross more than 40 properties in the town of Mason, several town roads, wetlands, town aquifers and these properties will have to be taken by eminent domain.

It's clear by the number of denials that have been sent to FERC by the owners of this land that the great majority of these properties will have to be taken by eminent domain. By simply looking at a map of the area it is obvious that there are much less impact alternatives and it really makes you wonder why someone would not take a look at this kind of stuff.

One in specific would be a state highway that runs through the town of Mason, we call it Fitchburg Road, it's Route 31. It goes almost exactly the same place that this lateral line is projected to end up and it's baffling to me that someone would not have at least looked on a map and saw how ridiculous the placement of this lateral line is and how there is several others I'm sure and there are obviously easier alternatives.

So on behalf of the town of Mason I am requesting that the FERC require an independent study be done to explore alternative routes, thereby lessening the impact of the town of Mason's roads future infrastructure development and the unnecessary taking of private properties by eminent domain, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next up Shannon Barnes, Shannon Barnes? After Shannon Barnes is Susan Silverman.

MS. BARNES: Thank you my name is Shannon Barnes, I am the Vice Chair of the Merrimack School Board and speaking on the school board's behalf. Joining me is Cindy Guagliumi who is a member of the Board. Our Board has sent you on July 14, 2015 a letter declaring the Merrimack School Board's position on this pipeline. The Merrimack School Board is unanimously opposed to any route that will place the pipeline within 100 feet of any school facility.

In this letter you will notice that one of the proposed pipelines today will go within 500 feet of Thornton's Ferry Elementary School. It's a K through 4 facility that houses 500 students plus 85 staff. They will be in the incineration zone. Our school district's concerns lie greatly in the fact that there are regular additional proposed routes.

The Merrimack School District has facilities throughout town that can stand impacts from both current and yet to be proposed re-designs offered up from the other impacted communities in addition to Northeast Energy Direct. The Merrimack School Board is committed to following this project and taking further positions on this pipeline as information is becoming public.

Consistent with our charges in our elected positions we ask that you not consider any pipeline that would impact the safety of Merrimack school children, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Next is Susan Silverman, after Susan Silverman is Terry Silverman.

MS. SILVERMAN: Hello my name is Susan Silverman S-i-l-v-e-r-m-a-n and I am from Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire. I am speaking today on behalf of the New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition of 15 towns. I have been a Selectman in my town for 20 years and Fitzwilliam has been a member of the Coalition since May of 2015.

Today I want to talk about my concern about the issues of water resources, plant and animal life, watersheds and the basic need for clean water that we all need to survive. Water is an equally important resource as fuel and is integral to communities. Once contaminated, it can have devastating consequences for all individuals, communities, businesses and tourism, a major New Hampshire industry.

The NED Pipeline will intersect the following water resources across the Coalition territory, the Souhegan River which will cross 6 times in the proposal, brooks and streams 22 at least 22 in 15 towns, 13 aquifers, one very large. Ponds and lakes -- 11, the largest of which Scott Pond in Fitzwilliam is 134 acres, wetlands -- over 27 and numerous vernal pools.

Municipal water systems serving over 500 people including the Temple Elementary School, private wells serving in excess of 600 people, numerous watersheds including the headwaters of Tully Brook, East Ashwillit, Miller River and Middle Connecticut.

My questions are these will individual wells and municipal water systems be tested prior and post construction? How will contaminated well water be remediated? How will contaminated ground water be addressed? Will the delicate ecosystems of headwaters be impacted? How many and how severely? How will rivers, ponds, aquifers, brooks and streams be affected by horizontal drilling?

Have these impacts been studied and quantified? Rivers, brooks, streams, banks and riparian zones, often contain wetlands that can be severely impacted by a disturbance. How will this disturbance be minimized or mitigated? These banks need to be restored to pre-constructed conditions.

Specialists -- I would request that specialists be used for this work, not general contractors using the most current and site specific methods. How would the release of natural gas or product affect water ecosystems including wetlands and ground water? How big of an area would be affected and how many people would be effected?

How would you compensate or mitigate for an accidental release? Wetlands -- the construction activities can impact wetland functions, especially through disturbances to vegetation and soils, what will be done to mitigate these effects? Wildlife are dependent upon wetlands and can also be negatively impacted through

loss of habitats. What will be done to mitigate this impact?

Permanent loss of wetlands will result when those lands are replaced with fill, what will be done to alleviate this impact? And the aquifers, how would the aquifers along the route be protected by construction? Have the impacts been studied and quantified? How would these impacts be minimized or mitigated?

And my conclusion is given the nature of the land in southern New Hampshire where this NED Project is located, the amount of water resources, rivers, wetlands, aquifers, wells, it is apparent that the proposed route is arbitrary and does not take into account the rural character and the eco-structures involved.

The appropriateness of this proposal is economically unviable for both Kinder Morgan and the effected communities. The affected waters are a sustaining force for each community and the disruption of the proposed pipeline will forever change the character, quality and environmental integrity of the region. We are geographically quite small and the intimate nature of our region further exacerbates the threat this project poses.

We respectfully request that this project be denied. If it is not denied then we request that extensive, complete, comprehensive environmental impact studies be done by the applicant on the impacts to all of our water resources. You don't miss your water until your well runs dry, it's a famous song, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Terry Silverman? After Terry Silverman is Roberta Oesar.

MR. SILVERMAN: I'm Terry Silverman S-i-l-v-e-r-m-a-n. I'm a resident of Fitzwilliam as well being that my wife allowed me to move in. I am a Planning Board Chairman for the Town of Fitzwilliam, a 30 year member of that Board and an active member of the New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition.

The NED proposed project and its effects on the town of Fitzwilliam and the 17 affected town on the proposed route of the energy pipeline of course goes through many wetlands. Planning board member New Hampshire RSA 67417 endows the planning boards the right to monitor ground water quality and quantity, surface water quality and quantity, storm water runoff quality and quantity, flood control, erosion and sediment control while flora and fauna and recreational aesthetics.

The following should be considered. Will the project result in the conversion of wetlands from one type to another and how can this be mitigated? How much wetlands will be permanently lost and can this be litigated? Even if the temporary disturbance is mitigated or minimized, how will the soil compaction from the construction affect wetlands function?

And how will the PH change in soil due to the rotation of removed and replaced earth and how will this change affect wetlands and water quality? How will the destruction of vernal pools be avoided since many of these are important for the health of the watershed and the wetlands are not mapped and how will the petitioning of the wetland and surface water affect the effectiveness of wetland function and wildlife?

What are the detrimental effects on wildlife during and post-construction due to the loss of native vegetation and plant diversity? Wetland and water bed construction and procedures for FERC only require 80% native vegetation and 50% plant diversity differential from pre-construction levels, that's the 1994 procedures.

The study done by Robert G. Bailey of the U.S. Forest Service for FERC studied 960 sites and suggested a problem with wetlands greater than 20% surface rock or open waters, shall bedrock soils and those determined by annual plant seasons, had a loss or mitigation rate is 35% from pre-construction levels.

The Adirondack in New England mixed forest eco-region along with the proliferation of granite that defines New Hampshire and makes these wetlands common. The success of mitigation is not high. How would this be more successful and mitigated and what will the effects of the additional non-permeable surfaces in construction sites and additional work areas and access roads, temporary and permanent, how will this be mitigated?

I urge you to follow the statement of policy issued 915, 1999 in which the Commission goal is to consider the enhancement of the competitive transportation alternatives, the possibility of over-building infrastructures and the avoidance of unnecessary disruption of the environment and the unneeded exercise of emi-

nent domain.

I have discussed only concerns of wetlands, it seems clear that the continuation of the NED pipeline does not reflect these goals and I urge this project be rejected, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Sir did you want to give me your -- next up is Roberta Oesar. Oesar, I apologize for the pronunciation. After Roberta is Maryann Harper.

MS. OESAR: My name is Roberta Oesar, you'd never get it, it's spelled O-e-s (as in Sam) - a-r. I am a Selectman from the town of Rindge. I am speaking on behalf of the New Hampshire Pipeline Coalition.

My mission was to address the eminent domain of public lands. Allen Fore, and Mark Aptifar from Kinder Morgan have repeatedly said that they do not like taking land by eminent domain. However, they haven't bothered look at our state law. The towns in the pipeline, the proposed route, there are over 2 dozen town held properties, all of which will have to be taken by eminent domain.

The towns do not have the right to grant easements or sell without a town vote. It would be nice if they had a little respect for the town or the state and done some research before they drew this line across the state that is now going to look like Sherman's march to the sea.

So I would ask that you request that Kinder Morgan do some research and respect our state law and our towns, thanks you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. After Maryann Harper is Tad Putney.

MS. HARPER: Good evening I am Maryann Harper, M-a-r-y-a-n-n H-a-r-p-e-r. I'm speaking tonight on behalf of the town of Rindge. Rindge, New Hampshire which is approaching its 250th anniversary is home to the Cathedral of the Pines an inspirational all phased outdoor place of worship as well as Franklin Pierce University which bears the name of our only New Hampshire President. It is home to over 6,000 residents and over 1,000 university students.

Rindge is also the location of the highest number of wetlands and water bodies in all of Cheshire County. Several large wildlife corridors and two large parcels permanently protected by the Monadnock Conservancy. All of these are in the path of the proposed NED Pipeline.

New England lags the rest of the country in economic recovery. Rindge like many of the rural towns along the proposed route would not be characterized as wealthy. This could be the final blow to many fragile existences. I am asking FERC to hire an independent third party consultant to study this entire project in a socio-economic context as I believe this is also your charge.

The creation of a new industrial corridor will remove the buffer of trees between many homes and the current utility corridor. What this project is co-locating with is many, many neighborhoods. This will have an immediate effect on the marketability of the properties and in fact already has. This represents a financial catastrophe to aging homeowners trying to downsize, retire, or move to health care facilities.

I am asking FERC to study and report on the cumulative effect this project has on those who would like to sell their properties in the next five years. In addition to the effect on property value, please include the health impacts, both physical and psychological that accompany the stress of having your well-planned future derailed.

Additional I am requesting that FERC include this information as part of a report on the no-pipeline alternative as required under NEPA. The greatest predictor of future actions is past performance. Today Kinder Morgan, operating as Tennessee Gas has shown us great disrespect.

They push for open houses during the worst part of our winter even though you FERC asked them not to. They have sent surveyors into our towns where nearly everyone has denied access, yet we come home from work to our properties that are legally posted no trespassing to find survey markers and ribbons on our land.

Kinder Morgan has identified 73 properties in Rindge as effected, yet we count nearly double that number. I do not believe this is unique to Rindge. I am requesting that FERC look into this matter along the entire

proposed route. The Constitution of the United States begins with three powerful words, We the People, a principle our country was founded upon yet We the People have no true voice in this decision.

All that has been offered so far is lip service from a company that is using the Natural Gas Act as a license to steal our land and has an insider relationship with the only New Hampshire utility signed up for a contract on NED. We the People say no. We the People say we have had enough. We the People say do not take New Hampshire's citizens for granted, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: The next speaker is Tad Putney, after Tad is Albert LaFebrre.

MR. PUTNEY: My name is Tad Putney. I am a member of the 15 town New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition, the Town Administrator in Brookline and I wish to comment on the 3 topic areas. The first involves roadways. The proposed pipeline would cross a variety of types of roadways including unmaintained Class 6 roads.

While Class 6 roads in New Hampshire are not maintained it is critical that they not be viewed as not used. Any roadways in New Hampshire, including those classified as Class 6 can be and in some cases are regularly used by fully loaded logging trucks which are of substantial weight. The 15 towns of the New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition request FERC require that Kinder Morgan use construction techniques across all roadways in New Hampshire including any and all unmaintained Class 6 roads that will account for the heavy loads presented by logging trucks.

We ask that at a minimum this includes pipe under all roadways consistent with that required of a state road.

My second comment relates to trees along the project area. Trees that are cut within temporary or permanent easement areas may be of value to the individual landowner. Many New Hampshire residents use wood as an alternative source to heat their homes for example.

The 15 towns of the New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition request FERC require that Kinder Morgan provide all landowners with the right of first refusal for any cut trees on their property in excess of 3 inches in diameter. A signed waiver of this right must be required before Kinder Morgan or any of its sub-contractors may remove any such trees from private or public property, even in the case of eminent domain.

If a landowner wants the trees, we request that Kinder Morgan be required to coordinate the location for piling the trees for the landowner prior to the cutting of the trees.

Third and finally I would just mention Mr. Tomasi in your earlier comments of the things that you had heard from the public thus far one of the things that I didn't see but I am certainly hearing tonight is and I would implore the Commission to look at the alternative pipelines that are on the table that to my mind have really no environmental impact compared to this kind of proposal that would look at destroying up to 8,000 acres of pristine woodlands or neighborhoods, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MR. LEFEBVRE: My name is Albert Lefebvre L-e-f-e-b-v-r-e. I live in Rindge, New Hampshire where over 70% of the voters expressed their opposition to the pipeline in the last election. I am a member of the Rindge Conservation Commission. In Rindge we have an aquifer with our conservation land that is along or adjacent to the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline route.

This land with this aquifer purchased by the town for conservation purposes was with the intent to protect it in perpetuity as a future water supply as well as for recreation for its citizens. The donors of this land and other conservation areas, donated their property with the understanding it would be forever protected in the hands of conservation commissions and the state and not become the property of a private corporation such as Kinder Morgan.

The process, the process of taking such lands endangers donation efforts in the future. The State of New Hampshire and the federal government should be at the forefront of protecting these lands and donations from future encroachment and defilement such as the pipeline.

As the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission knows, aquifers are very sensitive areas and must be carefully protected. The aquifer is fed by underground and run-off streams from nearby lands, hills and mountains. One does not always know how and where underground streams run and thus we are very protective of nearby areas.

We must protect our water resources for now and the future. We do not want to become another California with all of its water shortage issues. The route of the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline endangers this aquifer by the blasting required by the granite, by staging areas used during construction and by leakage from the pipeline itself.

There will be little protection for the area of the aquifer after construction ends and pipes age. It will be too late to react because knowledge of leaks become known only after something very damaging has occurred. As a Commission member I request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission conduct an analysis by a third party not by Kinder Morgan or its associate entities into the depth of these aquifers and to determine its sources, the effects of blasting on these sources and the effects of construction on the environment during the construction process. Thank you for your attention to this matter and I look forward to a response, I will give you the paper after I give you a better version.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next is Dave Hennessey. After Dave Hennessey is Jason Hoch.

MR. HENNESSEY: My name is Dave Hennessey H-e-n-n-e-s-s-e-y. I'm the Chairman of the National Regional Planning Commission. I want to thank you Mr. Tomasi for coming here today. I'm sorry I couldn't have been there but as you learned today we are 13 constituent communities many of whom are represented here and you will see some more tomorrow night in Milford.

We act as a clearing house among other things as well as providing specialized technical expertise for our communities which obviously is an importance as you evaluated this application. We, several months ago we created a committee to look at the Kinder Pipeline. They spent months coming up with a very detailed, organized analysis of the Kinder Pipeline as it affected our communities.

They prepared a preliminary report which was accepted by us the directors and executive committee for NRPC and we have been getting that ready to submit to you. Unfortunately it got blown out of the water last week with the data dump from Kinder and now we really do have to go back and look at that report, re-analyze what we have already looked at, so we are respectfully requesting and we will have that in writing to you tomorrow, we are respectfully requesting an extension to at least the end of September for the public portion of the comment period, thank you, sorry about that.

The way our organization works we have professional staff, we have an executive council but our directors who are coming in from 13 communities, only meet once a quarter. The next meeting is going to be in September and we really need to accept that the new report that we are re-doing in order to give you I think the data that you need and among other things, we are comparing each town's experience in getting ready their individual reports as you have heard tonight and comparing what each town has looked at.

So we are asking for an extension of the public comment period. We are asking most definitely for more of these hearings after we have had a chance to digest -- we the local communities as well as National Regional Planning Commission, to look at that data dump from last week so we are asking for at least 3 to 4 more of these kinds of scoping meetings some time before the end of the public comment period, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next Jason Hoch, after Jason Hoch is Jennifer Dollar.

MR. HOCH: Jason Hoch last name is H-o-c-h, no worries. I am the Town Administrator of the town of Litchfield. I am here tonight representing our Board of Selectmen who earlier this year voted unanimously to oppose this project.

The current route passes through a residential neighborhood in Litchfield with cul-de-sacs at each end leaving a single point of access and egress in case of any hazard during the construction or operation and am requesting additional information about mitigation and public safety service provision during the time

periods so that we can adequately protect those homes.

In addition this residential neighborhood has properties that are about an acre each that are already bisected by the Eversource right-of-way. We are concerned about the proximity of this pipeline corridor to these houses and their septic systems. I would request that the level of scrutiny apply to situations where the construction area is within 25 feet of the structure be applied to all densely located residential parcels such as these even if it makes the 25 feet.

We are concerned about the impact on septic systems in this neighborhood and request feasibility of replacing all adjacent septic systems with a community system to serve all of those impacted houses in that neighborhood.

Lastly I am concerned about removal of trees that currently screen the power lines along this co-location corridor. This will impact the quality of life for residents as well as their potential property values. Given the proximity to so many residential properties we are also requesting additional information and consideration about the length, duration, impact area and decibel range of construction noise that threatens the reasonable enjoyment of property owners in the vicinity of the project.

This project threatens to be a major disruption across southern New Hampshire. It is disappointing that this part of FERC's review basically accepts the pipeline need reported by Kinder Morgan as a given, it is somewhat of a cart before the horse type of analysis.

I would encourage the socio-economic portion of the EIS to closely evaluate the measureable energy benefits including provision of natural gas service and actual real documented commitments for power generation that would genuinely lower electric costs after provisions for paying this pipeline are factored in. That the document goes on a town-by-town basis to support the environmental destruction imposed by the Springfield project. Further I would request the socio-economic analysis gets clarified again on an impacted town, by impacted town basis.

The actual likely number of local jobs to be created during construction and operation -- each year I stand in front of my community at town meeting and ask for their support for projects and budgets. I know they would never support something with such steep a cost and such poorly described benefits, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is Jennifer Dollar, after that is Richard Husband.

MS. DOLLAR: I'm Jennifer Dollar, I'm a member of the Temple Ad Hoc Pipeline Advisory Committee. Temple is not directly on the route but the compressor station in Whipswitch will be within a half mile of the Temple Elementary School and other residential areas in our town.

So the following questions need to be answered before this project goes forward. How will fugitive emissions be mitigated and how will they be reported when they occur? How often will there be blow downs of the compressor station? When and how will the public be informed of the date and time of the blow downs? What percentage of the matter emitted by the blow downs will be radioactive?

According to the Southwest Pennsylvania Environmental Project, studies show that the current protocols for assessing compliance with ambient air standards do not adequately determine the intensity, frequency or duration of actual human exposure to toxins. How will Kinder Morgan address this?

Also, reference standards are based on discreet emissions, not on the cumulative impact of many toxins together. Kinder Morgan needs to provide unbiased studies proving that there are no adverse health effects from this type of exposure.

Will Kinder Morgan and FERC accept liability for the increased cost to the community in terms of health care needs caused by exposure to toxic chemicals released by the compressor station? Will Kinder Morgan and FERC accept liability for adverse health effects on pregnant women and their children due to the exposure of these toxins?

We request that Kinder Morgan provide the town of Temple with a longitudinal study on the health effects to children ages 5 to 12 exposed to compressor stations of at least 40,000 horsepower located within a 2

mile radius of the school, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Next Mr. Richard Husband is next, after Richard Husband there is Hay Lynch, Lynde sorry.

MR. HUSBAND: Hello my name is Richard Husband R-i-c-h-a-r-d H-u-s-b-a-n-d and I am a resident of Westfield and a member of its Conservation Commission. And the various submissions of municipalities affected by the proposed pipeline and in the comments tonight it is clear that numerous town drinking water aquifers are in its projected path and therefore may be seriously negatively impacted by the construction and the related activities involved in installation and maintenance of the pipeline.

Such impacts would be bad enough if they only affected one aquifer but due to the connectivity between the water resources in the area an impact on one may have a domino effect on others downstream. One of the aquifers that will be impacted by the NED Project is the Deer Pond aquifer in Litchfield. The Deer Pond aquifer is used for the drinking water of both Litchfield and the town of Hudson and sections of Londonderry and I believe also part of Pelham.

As much as 's of a million gallons of water are currently drawn each day from 2 wells in the aquifer for distribution by Pantech Waterworks and consumption by these towns. Additionally many private wells of Litchfield residents are located in the aquifer. In total more than 20,000 citizens rely on the Deer Pond aquifer for their drinking water.

Moreover, Deer Pond, a great pond entitled to protection and preservation under New Hampshire state statutory case law and the location of Litchfield's town, beach and park lies within the Deer Pond aquifer with a hydraulic connection to the aquifer such that the ponds level may be seriously diminished by a lowering impact on the aquifer's water channel.

Although the Deer Pond aquifer is in the aquifer protection district, protected under Litchfield's zoning ordinances, the NED Pipeline is projected to run through the northern portion of it. It is well established and discussed tonight that blasting, digging and other construction activities associated with installation and maintenance of such pipelines may introduce contaminants in to aquifers that will affect water quality or reduce the amount of available water by impacting the water table.

Again not only to the affected aquifer but also those of the connectivity downstream -- moreover clear cutting, such as the 100 to 135 foot clear cutting path projected to make way for and maintain the pipeline, may lower surrounding aquifer levels as trees intercept and catch the storm water run-off and recharge underlying aquifers accordingly.

Perhaps I have missed the discussion of the protected measures to be employed relative to the clear cutting and construction and insulation of maintenance activities proposed for the Deer Pond aquifer and other aquifers affected by the NED Project, but the "NED Environmental Construction Plan - New Hampshire" which is appendix M to the recently released 6,000 plus voluminous but vague Draft Environmental Report for the project does not even include by a word search the word aquifer.

I had hoped that there is a plan somewhere in this project to protect and preserve the affected aquifers and the quality of their waters and those bodies of water including Deer Pond also potentially negatively impacted by any fall-out from the project. But if that plan fails what then, and what burden would be on the affected towns to prove such a failure?

If the NED Project is allowed to move forward then make no mistake about it I do not believe that it should be allowed to move forward, one of the requirements of the project should be an 8 figure fund to be established by its investors and replenished at a reasonable minimum trigger level for a reasonable number of years, enough to determine the damage ultimately caused by the pipeline to enable studies, land purchases and well development by Litchfield, Hudson and other affected communities in southern New Hampshire already struggling with water issues.

For the purpose of supplementing current drinking water resources, insuring continued drinking water quality and to address negative impacts to other public waters all mitigation of the damage caused by the

pipeline. So make no mistake about it this pipeline will not go through without serious consequences to our drinking and other public waters.

Particularly as the investors in the project will make an awful lot of money by using southern New Hampshire as a conduit to send the bulk of their gas to who knows where outside of New Hampshire, such a fund is only fair and reasonable.

A related concern is the herbicides to be applied for maintenance purposes post-installation to pipeline areas above drinking water aquifers. What effect will these herbicides have on drinking waters? Are they truly safe? Would reliable studies have been performed to insure the health and well-being of the citizens potentially affected by these herbicides?

What would be the testing and monitoring procedures? These questions require answers. And finally I would like to say that the only good thing that has come out of this project is the people in this room. The unity and brotherhood and sisterhood shared by the affected towns is amazing and probably hasn't been seen since the Revolution. This is a Revolution! This is a Revolution, peaceful and positive but make no mistake Kinder Morgan, Liberty Utilities, Tennessee, Algonquin and you FERC, we are going to fight this to the end and we are going to win, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up is Hal Lynde.

MR LYNDE: Good evening and thank you. My name is Hal Lynde, I pronounce it Lynde L-y-n-d-e. I am Chairman of the Pelham Board of Selectman. I think my comments can be summarized pretty much as this. This project the Northeast Energy Direct Project is going to have a major impact on southern New Hampshire for no apparent good and for a capacity that is projected in my view is not needed.

I would note that our current capacity that we have, existing supplies meet most of our needs currently although we saw a big spike in the winter. You have other projects that are before you or before FERC that will add supply, one is Spectra which is deliberately coming in here to address the issue of power generation in New England.

Additionally New England has made successful efforts and ongoing efforts to diversify its energy supply and to switch from non-renewables to renewables and they have done a great job. Further I would like you to take into account the potential capacity that can be deemed by addressing the leaks in existing pipelines. You should be able to quantify that and then I would think the cost of doing that would be less and less impact.

The impacts of course are significant and you have pristine areas to the west of Nashua here that are solely impacted. There's conservation land, forest land, wetlands, you have heard it all, in my town of Pelham which by the way has two pipelines running through it now and the compressor station, we don't need any more and there's a major aquifer there that we are also concerned of.

So I ask you to take all of that into account and I know that you are tasked to do that, I'm sure you will do that so I urge you to do that. One of my concerns is that I ask you to take a very critical look at Kinder Morgan's suppliers the people that they are going to have committed to supplies. One which I am aware of is going to be utilities have to post a certain amount and the state PUC said they could not justify that, so I want you to look critically please at those things because although the PUC Commissioners which are appointed may have said yeah we will do it but I think there was no justification based upon the staff analysis for that.

Finally, I would point out that the Pelham Board of Select Men, through public hearings and individual members attending several hearings came to the conclusion that we could not support the line because it could not be justified. So I ask FERC to find the Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct Product neither necessary nor convenient. Not necessary for New Hampshire and not convenient for the people and citizens of southern New Hampshire, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Okay we have finished up with all of the elected officials so we are going to go ahead and start calling individual citizens who have signed up. We are going to try to do this in a little bit

of a different way here. You know I would like the people with the first four numbers if you want to come up and start speaking so the first person to speak is Richard Fressilli and if the next four people, numbers 2 through 5 wanted to come up and sit here it would be a little quicker for people to come up. There are some seats in the front that are reserved for the people who are the next few numbers, go ahead.

MR. FRESSILLI: My name is Richard Fressilli, I live in the town of Temple, my property is 404 Fish Road. F (as in Fred) - r (as in Richard) - e (as in eminent) double s (shortstop) i (as in idiot) double ll (as in little league) and i (as in ignorant) and sometimes Y and W I think, something like that.

I wanted to shift focus a little bit away from the environmental issues. I work those in at some point in this brief discussion that I have been forming for the last 3 or 4 weeks and the good thing about this if there is a good thing like the former gentlemen said is that it makes you think about things that you might have forgotten about and I want to talk about you know this FERC idea where this FERC comes from, why does -- you mention some of the enabling processes that came about but I think the power may emanate from one of the power in the Constitution, you know, the Constitution of the United States Article 1 Section 1 states that all legislative powers are in the branch in Congress of the United States which shall consist of the House of Representatives.

There's a Doctrine of American Administrative Law with the idea that Congress is able to delegate its enumerated legislative powers to agencies but only when the clearly defined policy standards have been prescribed to guide agency and policy decisions.

Concerns arise in interesting context imposing conflicts in the separation of the power of congressional executive branches of government as a result of all of this. This implicates the substance of Article 1 and Article 2 and the appointment clause, the President's power, the 6th Amendment, procedure and due process, powers, substantive and procedural and the non-delegable nature of this power is reaffirmed in a 2015 Supreme Court case, Department of Transportation versus the Association of the American Railroads.

And the case involved Am-Track and you know a lot about Am-Track --

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MR. FRESSILLI: Especially if you view it as some of the stuff that happened during the storm but that is viewed as a governmental agency and for the purposes of constitutional analysis it was an improper delegation of power. EPA versus City of Palmer Generation 2014 case talked about environmental standards that have to be --

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time is up if you want to give me your letter I will be happy to put it in the record for you.

MR. FRESSILLI: Okay can I make just one more statement?

MR. TOMASI: Sir your time is up.

MR. FRESSILLI: Certain environmental standards have to be enforced in the operation of projects and I guess I'll just give you this paper.

MR. TOMASI: Yes I'll make sure it gets on the record.

MR. FRESSILLI: Thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Thanks, next is Alice Berry.

MS. BERRY: Hi my name is Alice Berry and I live in Amherst, New Hampshire. As you are aware we are probably here tonight because our neighbors to the south Massachusetts who had originally expressed interest in having this pipeline changed their mind. They cited environmental concerns, hired lawyers and the next thing we know Kindle Martin has the pipeline going across the whole southern tier of New Hampshire.

We had very little time to digest this in comparison to the time that our neighbors to the south had. We also have environmental concerns and I would like to bring up just the one that's both environmental and safety. New Hampshire has a long history of earthquakes that probably isn't talked about much. Our New

Hampshire environmental services says that we have had 260 earthquakes that have been between the 4.6 and 6.0 magnitude.

They also state that it is now documented and proven that a 6.5 magnitude earthquake would rupture storage tanks and gas lines. My question is has there been any talk from FERC or Kinder Morgan about building a pipeline that would sustain a mid-size earthquake that would rupture a gas line, because no one can predict when, where or the magnitude of the next earthquake but we would all be in danger if one occurred.

Kinder Morgan further is planning the use of the thinner pipeline material. Except for a few instances where they feel they have to use a higher grade. My question to FERC and to Kinder Morgan is why not take a lead from other states, the famous one being California where not as much as a small single dwelling is built unless it meets safety earthquake standards. Perhaps this has already been done but I have searched and looked and I cannot find any information on that, so I would appreciate if you could get back to me on that particular thing.

In addition the pipeline area in New Hampshire isn't just on open land going next to power lines, it is going through sub-divisions including my own back yard. My street is a cul-de-sac and not only is it a cul-de-sac but we have this school that will be opening in another year on this cul-de-sac.

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds ma'am.

MS. BERRY: Okay I am asking -- we asked Kinder Morgan there's a school and there's a cul-de-sac and they said "oh we will look into that, we'll get back to you shortly." Not a word from Kinder Morgan. Maybe you can get Kinder Morgan to respond because they certainly don't respond to the people of New Hampshire, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you ma'am. Hold on just one second. Okay, don't set it yet, just wait until he starts, okay go ahead.

MR. OVERLOCK: I'll make it short. My name is Lewis Overlock L-e-w-i-s O-v-e-r-l-o-c-k and I'm here in support of Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Direct Pipeline.

MR. TOMASI: Hey, hey, hey I said let people speak.

MR. OVERLOCK: As a construction labor for 17 years this project represents the promise of good family supporting jobs for this region. As a consumer it assures a cheaper, cleaner and a more reliable fuel source. This project will create jobs, it will create economic stimulus, energy reliability and future energy growth just to mention a few.

I urge FERC to approve this project so that we can bring a much needed reliable energy source, and good-paying construction jobs to this region, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where do you live?

MR. TOMASI: Let him -- it's an open meeting, anyone can come, next person is number 4.

MR. TUCKER: My name is Chris Tucker and I live in Maine but I will tell you this Maine is in dire need of this corridor to be built. We are starving for gas in Maine. It's being built, we just put 63 miles of 10 inch in there in the ground, the customers are turning over, it's another source of energy that isn't often. Mills are closing, businesses they are shutting down, we need cheaper energy.

We need it and we need it now. I support this project in full. I'm proud to live in Maine, I own 110 acres by the way, the corridor that runs through from Sable Island, Canada that is feeding New England now is drying up. I live -- my 110 acres is abut to a power line with a 36 inch line. I have hunted it and I have snowmobiled it for years and I have never seen a problem with it, I support this project and I urge FERC to find the balance to help the striving infrastructure energy needs in New England, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next is John Hudson.

MR. HUDSON: It's John Hudson, H-u-d-s-o-n. I sometimes wonder -- I was talking to a policeman earlier and he said you know we forget where we come from. We forget that these lights here came through

a pipeline with natural gas so that we can have lights. We forget that the water we drink out here comes through pipelines.

Each and every one of us when we go home tonight I'll bet you will cross over at least 100 pipelines out there that you didn't even know was there and has never caused any kind of problem at all.

We became energy independent because of the Marcellus shale. Gas has dropped to an all-time low, but what good does it do us if we can't get it to the consumers and the customers like we had. It will be just like this gentlemen said, people getting laid off, other things where cheap natural gas just does an abundance of things for our economy.

The jobs that this thing will create, there will be millions and millions and millions of dollars in jobs and the associated things that come with the pipeline, buying from all of the local people when they come through here. The motels will be full, the hardware stores, everything else will get all of this extra money. With that I am for this project I think it's a good thing, I think that the end result it is going to help millions of people.

We always think something is good as long as it doesn't cross me. Do the pipeline where you can get gas and electricity and cheap rates for all the people in Boston just don't put it on my property. We just all have to ban together and sacrifice a little bit for the good of the whole, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next is we are on number 6 now it's Ken Bury, the next numbers 7, 8, 9 -- 7, 9, 11, and 12 ought to come up that's fine, go ahead sir. Wait until he gets the thing set up, we can start.

MR. BURY: My name is Kenneth Bury it's B-u-r-y. I live on Patricia Lane in Amherst, New Hampshire and I'm an affected landowner. The pipeline is planned to be routed through the back of my property. I won't go through comments here which I have heard other people make relative to really the need for this and where it should be going and some of the impact in our neighborhood.

But I will make it a little more personal. The current plan routing of the pipeline that will cause negative environmental impacts to New Hampshire residents, including me and my family. One of the main reasons for purchasing our property was because there was and there is a full line of fully developed trees from 30 to 40 foot blocking our view of the power line towers and lines.

We now will lose this natural barrier and will continually be reminded of the fact that we not only bought a power line but a 30 inch diameter natural gas line. We regularly use our yards for cookouts and have fires in the back yard fireplace. Will we have to stop doing this for fear that there may be a leak of odorless, colorless gas being blown into our area ready to be ignited?

While we have experienced over the years the electrical power lines, they hum and generate static electricity, we are significantly safe from harm, there's no doubt that we will not be able to live in our current house with as we say, as has been said the low probability but high impact that a leak and a fire can generate enough radiant heat that would destroy any of the remaining trees on our property as well as ours and neighbors houses.

It could even kill us or badly burn our kids, grandkids, and our neighbors. The stress caused by this situation has ruined and will continue to ruin the rest of my remaining retirement years. While I am not officially considered an endangered species, I feel like one.

Little consideration is being given to my safety and security, physically and emotionally. I didn't want to move but for my peace of mind most likely I will have to. I will try to sell my -- if I try to sell my house I won't be able to do it for maybe 5 or 8 years, even more than that I will more than likely have to sell it at a lower price --

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MR. BURY: And if there is a pipeline. As many have seen my house is not only a shelter but my financial security. When I lose the financial security and at my age have no chance of recovering. As a representative I ask you FERC members to stop or re-direct this project in a way to minimize the impact on us human residents, thank you for your time.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next, number 7, number 7 Devon Mayo?

MR. MAYO: Hi my name is Devon Mayo M-a-y-o and I represent hundreds of hard-working union laborers in New Hampshire.

MR. TOMASI: Again I want to tell you, let him speak, it is only going to interrupt everyone else's time if I have to keep telling you to be quiet so. I understand -- this is an open meeting, people are here from Massachusetts as well as -- it's an open meeting anyone can come here and speak, so go ahead, I will add more time.

MR. MAYO: So again I represent hundreds of hard-working men and women in the Laborer's Union in the state of New Hampshire. I'm from Maine, I'm from Rumford, Maine. The hard-working men in our great union, the laborers, build pipelines across the country safely and effectively every day of the week.

We have access to first-class training safety certification programs at our training facility in Harrington, Massachusetts specifically designed for the construction of transmission and distribution pipelines. This project will be built safe, it will be built on time and on budget with respect to the environment and I urge FERC to approve and support this project.

The time to address the New England energy crisis is now, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Next is number 9, Patrick Leary.

MR. LEARY: Good evening my name is Patrick Leary L-e-a-r-y. So the New England Governors asked for gas to generate electricity. Number one there is nothing in the Draft Environmental Report Resource Report 10 from Tennessee Gas Pipeline that allows the conclusion that the environment of northern Massachusetts is more sensitive than the environment of southern New Hampshire.

Further the prime table in that report is unquantified and therefore not understandable. I request the FERC quantify that table. The great New England energy crisis goes to the generation use of electricity. Natural gas is a way to generate electricity.

Massachusetts has been shutting down coal and oil-fired electricity generating plants without replacement for many years now. At the beginning of the shut-down cycle and around the year 2000 Massachusetts generated close to enough electricity to meet its needs. Today that number is closer to 50% and Massachusetts imports electricity from anywhere that it can find it including New Hampshire, Connecticut and Canada.

If it weren't for these three entities Massachusetts would go dark. Massachusetts uses about 10 times the amount of natural gas that New Hampshire uses. So the environmental differences between north Massachusetts, southern New Hampshire are pretty equal.

New Hampshire uses 10 times less gas than Massachusetts and as a good neighbor New Hampshire exports fully half and more than half of the electricity that it produces. For these reasons it is unconscionable to even consider putting this pipeline in New Hampshire when it really and truly belongs in Massachusetts where it is needed. That's the FERC necessity clause, put it there. For process on the do nothing part of the environmental report electricity projects absolutely must be included. They have an energy equivalence all their own. There are several on the docket.

I will provide information to the FERC on these issues prior to August 31st. Speaking of Northern Pass, all the electricity coming through Northern Pass will flow directly to Boston, Massachusetts. ISO New England has issued the permits --

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MR. LEARY: And the build out has already begun. Politicians, I'll skip that. To stop the outlandish bills that are coming our way in 2017 and beyond, do not allow the coal-fired Braden Point Power Plant in Massachusetts to close. Install a second district gas LNG terminal in Everett, MASS that is just for the Mystic Power Station. Sincerely, thank you for your time.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next number 11, John Lewicke.

MR. LEWICKE: John Lewicke. J-o-h-n L-e-w-i-c-k-e. Good evening ladies and gentlemen, I prefer to address you because I do not trust these people. Until the winter of 2013-14 there had never been any shortage of energy in New England in the winter. Some winters are worse than others but we are ready for the worst and flexible about how we deal with it.

The Natural Gas Act which is FERC's charter, prevents manipulation of gas markets and provides penalties for manipulators. The longer version of this documents how independent systems operate in New England with complicity from FERC manipulated energy markets in 2013-14.

So why did things come so close to disaster in 2013-14? The biggest different was that ISO New England decided we needed a Winter Reliability Program. They implemented a centrally controlled solution to a non-existent problem. In doing so they broke the market mechanisms that had been working for so many decades and created the kind of shortages and problems they were claiming to solve.

The Winter Reliability Program involved ISO New England contracting for demand electricity for no more than 200 oil fired and dual fuel generators. They refused to contract the winter energy with gas only generated using LNG. That meant that natural gas only generated was very likely to be idle some part of the coming winter.

ISO New England spent 66 million dollars of rate payers money to pay the oil for these generators. Your system benefits charge at work -- why would electrical generators turn down free oil when the alternative would be buying natural gas with their own money, especially when ISO New England would refuse to buy electricity generated using natural gas from LNG.

In 2013-14 LNG imports were around a third of a typical winter. Looking at the facts it would appear that the Winter Reliability Program really was a winter unreliability program. In September, 2013, FERC approves the Winter Reliability Program without LNG accepting ISO New England's false assertion that there wasn't time to include LNG in the program.

ISO said that they wanted to minimize market distortions. As we all know in 2013-14 markets suffered from natural gas to electricity to wood pellets were distorted far beyond what has ever occurred before or since. It is no surprise that moving a large part of a natural gas supply which before incentives provided New England in the form of LNG would likely result in energy market distortions.

The assertion that there wasn't time is bellied by comments from LNG suppliers and conservation law foundation proposing a workable inclusion of LNG in the next 2013-14.

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds sir.

MR. LEWICKE: That proposal was poo pooped by FERC. ISO New England said their goal was to minimize market distortions. How would anybody expect the market not to be distorted by their market manipulation and the lack of LNG expect the market not to be distorted -- they also say compensating natural gas resources would be sending the wrong signal and a natural gas solution would propose a risk of unintended consequences. What was the right signal they want to send.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up sir. That's fine, but you can come back later on your other point.

MR. LEWICKE: Okay don't take my word for anything, this is all ISO New England.

MR. TOMASI: You can give me your letter if you want to speak during his time. Next we are at number 12 Tim Tenhave. If the numbers 13, 17, 18 and 19 wanted to come up and sit they would be more than welcome.

MR. TENHAVE: Good evening my name is Tim Tenhave, it is spelled T-e-n-h-a-v-e and I am the Chairman of the Town of Merrimack's Conservation Convention. A number of points have already been made and I will leave those alone and give you my written comments.

But what I would like to do is touch on a few items that haven't been spoken to yet. So our conservation properties and open spaces properties, both private and public have ponds, streams, brooks, rivers, jurisdictional wetlands and numerous vernal pools.

The most elusive of these are the vernal pools because vernal pools by nature come and go and they change throughout the year. They are a very important aspect of our wetland systems. They provide life to some of the smallest creatures, which then provide life to even larger creatures and provide enjoyment to us as other inhabitants of the wetlands and the areas. I think it is very important that when it comes to wetlands that when this project be taken care of that FERC stipulates that TGP follows the New Hampshire method for mapping of wetlands and all applicable state laws when mapping all kinds of wetlands and make that information fully available to the landowners so they therefore can confirm or refute the findings that are found using that wetland system mapping process.

When wetlands are impacted on a permanent basis, New Hampshire state law requires that compensatory mitigation be done. There are different ways to do that but the preferred way to do that is to insure that that mitigation is done locally at the same town that occurs that permanent wetland impact.

There is another way or method that TGP could use and that is to use the ARM fund and make a payment to the ARM fund. That ARM fund money though does not stay within the community impacted potentially.

We the Conservation Commission request that you stipulate TGP must act in good faith and make every reasonable effort to provide physical compensatory mitigation to each community where impacts are made and the use of a payment should only be a last resort and determined solely by the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services.

Merrimack's open space and conservation areas impacted by this pipeline are teeming with life and all types of plant, insect, amphibian, reptile, rodent, mammal and humans. We have professionally documented New Hampshire rare and threatened species on our open spaces that are directly impacted by these properties.

I will not go through a list of those items today because I fear I would lose those species. It's important to understand that while these species are not federally endangered they are New Hampshire endangered and they are very important. In fact one of these species is only known to exist in some of our open spaces.

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MR. TENHAVE: Given these occurrences in the vicinity of the pipeline we request that you require TGP to do thorough mapping on the ground of all these areas. Lastly, this process has come along very quickly and you might say well maybe it's not it's pretty typical but for us we found out about the New Hampshire alternative in December. We ask that you give us 60 more days in order to provide comments to you, thank you.

MR. MILLER: Nick Miller, M-i-l-l-e-r. On March 13th of this year Kinder Morgan released the first draft of its resource reports for the NED Project. These early draft reports were very incomplete and contained more than 21,000 uses of TBD, to be determined.

These TBD's indicated where necessary data was missing from the reports. Because these draft reports were so incomplete, they were all but unusable for serious analysis of the NED environmental impacts. Kinder Morgan promised to release updated resource reports in June.

FERC went ahead and scheduled the initial scoping meetings to start on July 14th. This scheduling was very tight for those needing time to examine the updated reports ahead of the scoping meetings. Worried about this tight schedule and about the possibility that Kinder Morgan might not deliver the revised reports as promised in June, dozens of individuals, towns, environmental organizations and elected officials filed comments asking that FERC please not let scoping meetings proceed until after Kinder Morgan had released the updated resource reports and the public had had time to read and annualize them.

It is worth noting here just how massive the set of documents, these updated reports are. There are 13 resource reports, 16 appendices and 4 companion documents. These total nearly 7,000 pages -- this is not light reading. What was FERC's response to the many requests they had received to delay the scheduling of the scoping meetings until a useable set of resource reports was available? Absolutely nothing, they

simply ignored these many requests and refused to delay the scheduled scoping meetings.

And what was FERC's response when Kinder Morgan did in fact miss the promised June release date and the updated reports did not become available until last Friday, July 24th? Again, absolutely nothing -- FERC simply went ahead with its scoping meetings as scheduled. The Pennsylvania and New York scoping meetings took place before the updated resource reports were made available and FERC's schedule provides very little preparation in time for the attendees of this week's five scoping meetings in Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

Simply stated, FERC has failed the public. Participants at the earlier scoping meetings had only the unusable draft resource reports and even those attending later scoping meetings will be afforded precious little time to read, analyze and prepare comment based upon the dated reports.

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MR. MILLER: I had my voice to the many others calling upon FERC to restart the scoping process for this pipeline proposal. FERC must provide those who would be so seriously impacted by this pipeline with the necessary time to read and digest these crucial reports.

Surely FERC must want to receive the most complete and accurate scoping feedback that properly informs public and supply and a re-start of scoping would allow that, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up number 17 Michelle Scott. MS. SCOTT: Michelle Scott, S-c-o-t-t for Scott. Many of the things I had originally been planning to talk about have been covered which is wonderful except that the aquifers that are mentioned include Mason and both the large pipeline and the smaller lateral will also go right over our main aquifer which the town somewhat depends on. We all have wells but many of them are related directly to these aquifers.

So my question for Kinder Morgan when I asked them about how the blasting might affect it they said "well they would consider the wells that were within 50 feet of the pipeline". But as you know if you shake granite and it is all connected it is going to go a lot farther than 50 feet.

There are house lots in Mason which remain unbuilt on because they are sitting on so much ledge that someone sold them a bill of goods, there's no house on it even though it's been sold several times.

My other concern is the brooks and streams which are part of the natural river watershed and I question how they are going to maintain the flow. We have a small stream that is in the direct route of the lateral and it is my backyard and I see fish in that stream. I'm not good at telling what kind of fish they are but they are good size and when I ask Kinder Morgan what about the streams they would only deal with the river, they will tunnel under the river but basically the streams they will kind of go through I suppose.

And these streams feed the river so it seems like not an appropriate thing to do. And I have a question about the air pollution and that's been -- some people have brought that up as well but I would like to know if they are going to measure the air pollution as it affects the towns right now, we have some air pollution, what are they going to do before and what will they do after if these pollutants are increased.

And finally in terms of deforestation if you look at an aerial google map of this area since Mason and the 17 other towns are heavily forested I am wondering how Kinder Morgan is going to mitigate the air pollution that will increase as a result of removing 150 foot swath of trees 70 miles worth through southern New Hampshire.

I figure it's about 55 million square feet of forest --

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MS. SCOTT: And 18 million average size trees, so we are known as the tail pipe of the nation because of the pollution from the west and if we remove part of our protection in the terms of trees that wouldn't be a good thing. This is New Hampshire, we don't want to look or smell like New Jersey and tourism, tourism is actually our second largest industry and it is very important to southern New Hampshire, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next 18, Josiah Barthelmiss.

MR. BARTHELMESS: Josiah Barthelmess, B-a-r-t-h-e-l-m-e-s-s. I am 11 years old. I live directly across the street from the proposed compressor station in New Ipswich. You have heard this is not a good thing for New Hampshire -- the danger of explosions and questions regarding Kinder Morgan's safety record. What we haven't heard from you is how much this will hurt our environment and those that live in New Hampshire.

Kinder Morgan is concerned about the health of 10 endangered ponies who will live 1 mile away from the station. What about the hundreds of kids who live within the half mile mark? Do our lives count too? Or the Temple Elementary School only a few steps away? What about our health?

This nation does provide clean water to third world countries, how do you intend to protect my water? The same water I use to grow a vegetable garden in my backyard, or even bigger the Greenville Reservoir seconds away. My generation will be the generation who will pay greatly in this whole project. You think only on the now and have forgotten the consequences this has in the future. Let me paint a picture for you.

I am but an 11 year old boy now but one day I will be a man -- a man belonging to a generation who will have to clean up the destruction, devastation that this pipeline will leave in its wake. We know what toxins come out of your compressor station and what leaks from your pipes into the ground. We know you don't test emissions daily.

Our protective lands, our wetlands and their health will be affected much beyond repair. Those younger than me have no idea what you have already decided for them. I am old enough to understand what this pipeline brings with it. I will not be na ve. I am educated and I am standing up now to protect my future. Take a good look at me, I am just one of the faces of the next generation.

I represent the Kids of the Pipeline Resistance. I promise you will see me again and our voices will be heard, thank you for your time.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up number 19 Patricia Canaday.

MS. CANADAY: My name is Patricia Canaday C-a-n-a-d-a-y and I cannot be prouder at calling you my neighbor and my friend Josiah. I live in New Ipswich, New Hampshire. Given the incomplete nature of Kinder Morgan's resource reports and recent changes to the scope of the project, these scoping meetings are being conducted prematurely and therefore failing to provide information that would benefit the NEPA process.

New Ipswich has no public drinking water. We are all on private wells. The pipeline will segment an unknown number of the bedrock aquifers. The New Hampshire DES Water Resources Primer, Chapter 4 entitled Ground Water states that "ground water is the water beneath the surface of the land. In New Hampshire ground water resides within bedrock fractures and between particles of soil, sediment and loose rock that lie on top of bedrock. The upper boundary of an underground area that is completely filled with water is called the water table. The depth to the water table varies based on geology, elevation, precipitation trends and the season but it is typically 10 to 20 feet below the land surface in New Hampshire.

Ground water quality is influenced by the bedrock and overburden materials it moves through. It also can be greatly influenced by land use. The nature of New Hampshire aquifers differs significantly from many other parts of the country where aquifers are more uniform and much deeper.

Unlike these places, the amount of water that can be stored in New Hampshire as ground water is limited naturally by the state's climate and geology. Land use change also alters the occurrence of ground water in the state."

Radon and arsenic in particular are naturally occurring and concentrations can increase due to the disturbance caused by pipeline construction. The quality of pipe used in this project should be evaluated due to potential leaks contaminating our aquifers.

Please do a hydro geological study to identify the bedrock aquifers impacted by this project. Please identify all wells that draw water from these bedrock draped aquifers. Those wells should be tested prior to the construction and quarterly after construction for flow and impacts.

Asking us to identify what needs to be avoided, mitigated, minimized or compensated without the adequate resources or time to do so can only assure that the town of New Ipswich will suffer irreparable harm from this project, thank you.

MR. TOMASKI: Thank you very much. Next number 20 is James Giddings and the next 4 numbers 21, 22, 23, 25 wanted to come up they can come sit.

MR. GIDDINGS: James G-i-d-d-i-n-g-s from Greenville and I wanted to ask FERC to demand that Kinder Morgan supply maps to the public in a form that can be quickly used to replicate the maps that they have produced in their DEP reports. In other words we need vector maps, we need something that gives the latitude and longitude at every inflection point in the pipeline and of the corners of the lots that will be using for compressor stations and other facilities.

This is very important to us because if we are going to analyze the effect of change that they have made first we have to know what that change is and it is not clear from the written reports exactly what the changes are. You look at the map and you can't tell what was the old one like, where do I find that, you can't do that very easily but if you have vector maps you can make an instant comparison.

Also vector maps are mathematical entities and you can use them to produce statistics about how close certain important things are to a pipeline, to a compressor station and we are more or less guessing or judging based on what it looks like now and we could do a lot better job as the public of analyzing and coming up with counter proposals, objections, corrections to what Kinder Morgan has produced.

A second point I wanted to make is that New Hampshire had a particular form of conservation that's called current use. Landowners are given a tax break for preserving land in farming or either of two categories of forest. I know the land that I live on has a lot of current use and most of the people in the rural parts of Greenville, New Ipswich and Mason also make sure of that.

This is a form of conservation land that is not obvious, it is not owned by a conservation organization, it is not town conservation land, but it is very important and to take that land out of conservation i.e. by putting in an industrial installation, would cause the landowner to pay what is called triple dooamage, three times as much as they have saved in taxes over the years.

MR. TOMASI: You still have some time sir you still have 30 seconds.

MR. GIDDINGS: Oh I see, well I don't need to talk -- .

MR. TOMASI: Okay thank you sir. Next up is Kathy Gauvin, 21.

MS. GAUVIN: My last name is spelled G-a-u-v-i-n. Hi my name is Kathleen Gauvin and I live in New Ipswich, New Hampshire. Given the incomplete nature of Kinder Morgan's resource reports and recent changes to the scope of the project, these scoping meetings are being conducted prematurely and therefore failing to provide information that would benefit the NEPA process.

New Ipswich has no public water supply. We all have private wells, many of our wells are dug wells. What effect will blasting and drilling have on these private wells? How can pipeline blasts and contaminants in well water be detected? How close to private wells -- how close do private wells need to be in order to be impacted?

This is the concern that needs to be studied before the project is approved. We urge FERC to study best practices for the alteration of terrain in order to avoid a change in water flow. We urge FERC to follow New Hampshire, RSA 485-A Water Management and Protection including water pollution and waste disposal as it relates to protecting our water quality and water monitoring processes.

We urge FERC to investigate the best practices dictated by New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services because it is less expensive and more protective of public health to prevent contamination first, than it is to treat water to meet health standards.

We also demand that our wells be tested quarterly for contaminants if this project is approved. There are numerous dug wells that are in close proximity to the planned compressor station and its emissions. What

will the effect be on these wells when toxins are released in the air, fall to the ground and seep into the wells? This is a concern that needs to be addressed prior to initiating this project.

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MS. GAUVIN: Who will monitor Kinder Morgan, Tennessee Gas to make sure that the best management practices are used to protect the water quality of our town's private wells? This is our concern and it needs to be addressed. Asking us to identify what needs to be avoided, mitigated, minimized and compensated without the adequate resources or time to do so can only assure that the town of New Ipswich will suffer irreparable harm from this project. We are demanding --

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up ma'am, thank you. Next is 22, David Plaza.

MR. PLAZA: Hi, my name is David Plaza, P-l-a-z-a. I'm a land owner in Lanesborough, Massachusetts and I live 2 miles from this end of the pipe in Londonderry. My question to FERC is if they do put this pipeline through and request to take my land by eminent domain to please provide a detailed analysis of where this gas is going, internally to New Hampshire and Massachusetts and if any of it is going to external markets.

Secondly, in terms of conservation of energy, there has been comments about the shortage of you know spikes in natural gas prices, you know there is a way of saving 10 to 15% of the electric bill, we can spend 70 million dollars and buy a half of million households in New Hampshire, 20 LED light bulbs at 7 bucks a piece and that will save 80 to 90% of a light bulb's electricity. Very simple, impact to the environment -- except if people throw the stuff on the side of the road, something very simple and easy to deal with.

Now a couple details about my land. I had some survey tags put on it. My land is posted. Can FERC find out from Kinder Morgan if they were the ones that put those tags on my land. If so, please tell me.

Secondly, frost lines in Lanesborough, Massachusetts go down to about 5 feet this past winter, how is that going to effect a pipeline which has a -- where the top of the pipe is 3 foot below grade? Will that cause issues with the pipes? Also, in the area of Lanesborough there were numerous caves in that area where the pipeline is going through. I own two and there are bats in them so it is an environmental issue. They should be looked at.

Ten years ago there was about 1,000 - 2,000 bats per cave according to a person I recently met. We are in the process of going back in them this fall to find out what we have. Hopefully there are some endangered ones.

If you do take our land by eminent domain we should be compensated appropriately, includes future loss of earnings et cetera, you know, as people said it's a retirement fund, it is for me.

Finally that's it thanks.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next number 23 Julie Steed-Mawson.

MS. STEED-MAWSON: Can you see me over the podium?

MR. TOMASI: I can.

MS. STEED-MAWSON: Oh good I'm only 5 feet tall, that's an important consideration. My name is Julia Steed Mawson and that's spelled M-a-w-s-o-n. I'm a biologist and extension educator emeritus with the University of New Hampshire. I live in Pelham and I oppose this pipeline.

Research produced through the community profiles program facilitated by U&H for Pelham and over 100 towns in New Hampshire carry statements in a variety of forms but they all point to the same statement which is that New Hampshire residents want to maintain the rural character of New Hampshire. This is echoed in Pelham's master plan and in the recent report developed by the National Regional Planning Commission.

The question becomes how do we maintain our natural resources and the vital critical rural character that we love as well as the beautiful rural treasures to the west of us? How do we not become another industrialized region like the middle of New Jersey?

In 1973 as a student, now you know how old I am, worrying on an NSF grant to study the Lowell canals as a community resource I had to be fully immunized to work on the Merrimack River. Millions of dollars and hours of people's time later the water is now suitable for recreation.

While the mills were built over 100 years ago, no one considered these unintended consequences. Understandable in some ways since our science was not developed. In the 2015 report, Beaverbrook Flood Study for Pelham produced by VHB on the flooding events that now challenge Pelham it stated that due to rapid growth and changes in climate events, modifications to the flood plain have had unintended consequences and that's a quote.

Not so excusable since the science of hard surfaces and its relationships to run off and flooding have been known for over 30 years. Now we are faced with building a high pressure pipeline of great scope and magnitude that can have long term and potentially devastating impacts on our natural, social and cultural resources of New Hampshire activities that can impact the "orderly development of the region".

Not thoroughly studying the unintended consequences of this project concerning maintaining the vital resources and way of life that we have in southern New Hampshire would be inexcusable given that there are at least 17 other New England energy projects currently proposed.

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds, continue.

MS. STEED-MAWSON: Thank you, thousands of leaking gas capture incidents that need to be mitigated and great financial pressure to make the Marcellus shale field profitable. I ask therefore that you study the long term, 75 to 150 year impacts of this project by developing a research strategy that incorporates the evaluation of multiple stressors on the inter-related human, energy and eco-system surfaces of the southern New Hampshire, northern Massachusetts region through integrated laboratory, field and social science approaches.

Further, given the growing understanding --

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am your time is up. You can bring that up I will put that in the record. Next number 25, Dennis Gauvin.

MR. GAUVAN: Good evening my name is Dennis Gauvin and I live in New Ipswich. Given the incomplete nature of Kinder Morgan's resource reports and recent changes to the scope of the project these scoping meetings have been conducted prematurely and therefore failing to provide the information that would benefit the National Environmental Policy Act process.

New Ipswich has no public drinking water supply. We are all on private wells. The pipeline will segment 3 stratified drift aquifers and an unknown number of bedrock aquifers. The New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services report of 2010 titled Rock Blasting and Water Quality Measures That Can be Taken to Protect Water Supply and Mitigate Impacts states: "Ensuring safe and adequate drinking water supplies requires maintaining the quality and availability of present and future water supply resources. Because in the long run it is less expensive and more protective of public health to prevent the contamination than it is to treat water to meet health standards and it is less expensive to use existing sources than it is to develop new ones.

Municipalities and water supplies have crucial roles in managing activities that affect water quality and availability. Effective protection relies on the combined efforts of state water supplies, municipalities, business institutions and individuals whose activities have the potential to effect source water quality and availability.

Blasting of crystalline bedrock can contaminate water resources, there are two primary methods by which the quality of ground water could be changed due to blasting. Contamination resulting from the release of regulated or unregulated substances to the ground water and agitation of the sub-surface may cause turbidity in ground water to increase."

Blasting should be avoided until this can be studied more properly. Consideration should be addressed to alternatives such as drilling or cutting. The proposed pipeline will pass a short distance behind a piece of

land where a good many years ago a pig farm existed.

This farm was found to be polluting a great many wells in town. Our house was one of them and it's about a mile from this piece of land. The farm was ordered cleaned up by officials and subsequently went out of business. There were I don't know how many wells but a lot. I live in the center of Ipswich -- it was a whole downtown area, in fact I think the town offered anyone who was concerned to just have the well tested at their expense.

We would expect the blasting in this area would --

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MR. GAUVIN: During construction will cause additional issues with our drinking water. Population in this area that we talked about where the pig farm was and the pipeline will be has grown tremendously in the last 25 years. Should this project move forward we will be forced to test our wells on a regular basis, at our own expense to monitor for contaminates. Then what is the process to determine the cost? This needs to be studied.

Asking us to identify --

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MR. GAUVIN: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is number 26 Homer Shannon. Is Homer Shannon here? Oh I'm sorry he's back there next up is going to be 27, 28 and 29.

MR. SHANNON: Homer Shannon, H-o-m-e-r S-h-a-n-n-o-n. I built my home in 1983 and I've lived in it ever since. When I purchased the land for my home it came with a power line easement. The easement occupies about 30% of my total land. For the most part the power line has been a very good neighbor. It has never had any barking dogs, there have never been any shouting residents and best of all I know that it could not be re-zoned for a 24 hour gas station.

Imagine my surprise when in January of this year I learned that Kinder Morgan was plotting to take about 20% of my non-easement land for a natural gas pipeline and its associated right-of-way. I was informed that this would be in the best interest of all citizens as the route would use existing power corridor.

I'm not certain what a power corridor is. No one has ever used this term in reference to the power lines that go across my property before. My land is not zoned as a power corridor. I do not consider my property to be a power corridor. It is simply my land. What would the impacts of this project be to me and my property?

The strip of land in question is on the west side of my usable land. The strip is heavily forested with mature oak, maple and pipe trees, 50 to 80 feet in height. This strip of forest buffers my house and landscape and landscape yard from the power line. This is more than an aesthetic feature. In the winter the trees protect my property from the cold winds that blow out of the northwest.

In the summer it provides shade that cools my home and adjacent yard from the long hot summer afternoons. The Kinder Morgan proposal as presently drawn in the alignment sheets would require that most, or all of this tree buffer would be cleared. There is not sufficient room between the new easement and my home to grow a new buffer even if I had 30 years to wait for it to grow.

This pipeline will devalue my property in a number of ways. The placement of a second easement of any sort on my property will devalue it. The loss of usable land will devalue my property. The presence of a 30 inch, potentially explosive pipeline on my land will devalue my property. The loss of the power line tree buffer will devalue my property.

How much will Kinder Morgan pay me for these losses? I do not know. You will be paid in full for your land and paid for any additional damages is what Kinder Morgan tells me. What these are and how much I am to be paid is not discussed. I ask you -- please indicate in your Environmental Impact Statement --

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MR. SHANNON: Impact Statement -- how right-of-way owners will be compensated and what payment guidelines are and outline the negotiation and eminent domain processes so that we may understand how we are going to be compensated

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next number 27 Gina Rosati.

MS. ROSATI: Hi, welcome to New Hampshire thank you for coming. New Hampshire is known for clean water, fresh air, green forests, white mountains and more granite than you can imagine. New Hampshire is also home to 41 endangered or threatened wildlife species including the small footed bat and the northern long eared bat and 288 plant species that are listed as endangered or threatened under the Native Plant Protection Act. 60% of New Hampshire residents depend on ground water for the drinking water supplies only 1 in 5 New Hampshire homes currently use natural gas.

Kinder Morgan/Tennessee currently has 1 New Hampshire anchor shipped, Liberty Utilities signed up to buy its gas from Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline. Why would the FERC approve of plundering 71 miles of New Hampshire land, rivers, ground water, animals and plants when there are other approved pipelines that will use existing infrastructure and could easily provide gas to Liberty Utilities.

Why would FERC gamble with our environment for something that is not needed by our state? Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next up 28 Diane Hewitt.

MS. HEWITT: Good evening, my name is Diane Hewitt spelled H-e-w-i-t-t. I'm a resident of Groton, Massachusetts. My property is included in NED's original pipeline route within 20 feet of our home. My son and his wife recently moved to a home in New Ipswich, New Hampshire less than 2 miles from the proposed compressor station.

I'm a member of several non-pipeline or against the pipeline organizations as you can imagine. As many others have already mentioned let me say again how disappointed our family is that these scoping meetings are even proceeding. FERC has steadfastly refused to heed the urgent request of our legislature, our congressional delegation, our state-wide environmental groups, our municipalities and thousands of citizens to postpone these comment sessions for at least 60 days after the release of the amended resource report, it is a travesty and these should be null and void proceedings.

But since we are here I would like to ask FERC how it intends to conduct a thorough analysis of the air quality impacts and the greenhouse gas emissions related to both the construction and the operation of the pipeline. We know that the Kinder Morgan proposal will have significant and negative impacts on air quality and a complete and comprehensive assessment of the cumulative impacts on air quality including all the related facilities such as compressor stations, metering and venting stations is absolutely required.

Specifically I am requesting that you study and document the following information: 1. Research the local, state and federal air quality standards that must be compiled and the monitoring requirements and ongoing testing protocols to determine compliance during both the construction and operation of the pipeline.

Provide a detailed description of the air quality modeling that will be conducted and provide maps of the areas that will be impacted from the emissions from the pipeline, compressor stations, metering and venting stations. This should include both pre and post pipeline studies which are conducted under different meteorological conditions.

Please review and incorporate into your work the great study by the southwest Pennsylvania Environmental Health Project on the health impacts of compressor stations dated 2/24/15. Identify all the hazardous pollutants that will be emitted and the air quality monitoring and testing that is proposed to be completed on a daily, weekly or more frequent basis at the compressor venting and meter stations.

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MS. HEWITT: During the operation of the facility to protect our health and safety. Study and devise a reporting structure and a rapid response system on these emissions so that local, state and federal officials

are not only aware but can respond appropriately to unhealthy and dangerous conditions.

Finally conduct an analysis of the greenhouse gas emissions expected to be generated by the construction and operation, quantify the impacts on the project to the state's climate state initiatives and greenhouse gases, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up 29, Christie Bradshaw? Christie Bradshaw 29? Okay moving on, number 30 Louise Delehanty and you are going to be the last speaker and we are going to take a 10 minute break and come back so go ahead.

MS. DELEHANTY: So my name is Louise L-o-u-i-s-e Delehanty D-e-l-e-h-a-n-t-y and I would just like to talk about some details or the lack of details I found in the new resource report. First of all the areal map showing my residence the map was at least 6 years old and I live in a 55+ community of seniors, active adults and people work, some people retired, some people moved here but anyways this is an old map I had seen it before but now it had temporary work stations and additional temporary work stations and anything that would be needed to construct a pipeline.

However, this map doesn't even show my home as being built yet. This is a map at least 6 or 7 years old and it's a 24 unit, 55+ community and it doesn't show maybe half of the units having been built yet on this land and the name on the map, Winterberry Road is not even correct, they have us as Brady Lane, there's another Brady Lane. I don't know if I mentioned I come from Pelham, New Hampshire, as a side I'm on the Conservation Commission but this is more personal.

This is not attention to details. If they can't get the name of the street right, if they can't have an up-to-date map, this is supposed to be an aerial map, this past January and February it doesn't even show snow. It should have showed, it should be white all over, with 6 or 7 feet of snow.

Now my other thing is there is no detail, forget the devils is in the details with that. My next point real quick is people are talking about hazardous materials. Skimming all over the new resource reports I was reading about asbestos cleanup. Asbestos is a by-product of some of the tools and working materials used to install the pipeline and this is how Kinder Morgan and Tennessee plan to protect you from hazardous materials.

They are going to be put in barrels. Non-corrosive hazardous materials will be in plastic barrels. Corrosive materials will be in metal barrels. The corrosive ones will have a pallet beneath them to catch anything that drips. These are Kinder Morgan's own words in the resource report.

A minimum of a 3 inch wide paper will say hazardous materials, danger. A minimum of 3 inches okay. And also they are going to treat and post, check your wells but if the wells are found to be contaminated from this hazardous material in some way they are going to give you potable water. Now I would like to see them go all over Pelham or all over any of the other communities and bring in water, potable water, like what are they going to get, bottles in Palm Springs, something like that?

Last of all like the gentleman said my husband and I, this is our retirement home and that means that not in my backyard, this isn't our backyard. When he says people don't want it in their backyard it is because it is our retirement home, when they deforest around us like the other gentleman said, we won't be alive to see it grow back so we won't have the joy of having our retirement home and being in this environment that we love right now, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Okay thank you very much.

MS. DELEHANTY: Oh real quick, I don't want to forget this but endangered species in Pelham nobody has brought them up, but actually these sightings have been reported to the New Hampshire Fish and Game. We have blanding's turtles, we have northern black racers and we have the northeast cottontail and these have been spotted and documented so tell FERC about them.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, thank you we are going to take a real quick 10 minute break, please be back by 9:40 so we can start again.

(Whereupon the meeting recessed to reconvene in 10 minutes.)

MR. TOMASI: Okay if everyone wants to come in and take a seat we are going to go ahead and get started. We are going to get started here. Right now we are on number 31, Debra Huffman.

MS. HUFFMAN: Good evening I'm Debra Huffman H-u-f-f-m-a-n and I'm speaking on behalf of the 60 members of the Friends of Horse Hill Nature Preserve. My written comments address many of the environmental concerns and alternative solutions you have already heard but there are several concerns that are unique to Merrimack and to Horse Hill that I would like to bring to your attention.

Merrimack is identified as the site of the proposed metering station and we are concerned about leaks. In a written response to questions from the town of Merrimack, Kinder Morgan said and I quote "if a leak is detected that does not represent a safety concern and is classified as a non-hazardous leak, an appropriate repair plan would be developed. Example of a non-hazardous leak that would not require a system shut down would be a valve packing that can be tightened to stop the leak."

We are requesting that the air and water surrounding the proposed metering station be evaluated before, during and after construction and operation for a minimum of 1,000 feet around the station site. The metering stations proposed location is next to the Merrimack River and this is a source of particular concern to be addressed in detail in the EIS.

As for Horse Hill, the proposed route crosses our trail system in several locations and that raises many concerns. For example we use tractors to maintain the trails and we are told that this will be a problem. We allow hunting on Horse Hill and we wonder if that will be a problem. We are concerned about monitoring for use of chemical defoliants and corrective action that will be taken if agreements with property owners are not adhered to regarding chemical defoliants.

Please insure that the EIS addresses all of these issues in detail. We are concerned about impacts of erosion on the protective soil above the pipeline. Use of the trails by hikers, bikers, horses and ATV's causes severe erosion in certain areas, particularly in the power line corridor. Please insure that the EIS includes specific details describing monitoring, policing, and specific corrective action that will be taken to address erosion issues.

Erosion is a concern for several reasons one of which is the impact of temperature on the pipeline. Please insure that the EIS includes detailed information specific to New Hampshire such as extremes of temperature, expected maximum depths of frost, impact of frost heaves on the pipeline.

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MS. HUFFMAN: Finally we are concerned about impacts on public support for conservation land donations and purchases. The taxpayers of Merrimack voted to spend over 4 million dollars of their hard earned money to purchase Horse Hill Lake to preserve in 2002 and they continue to contribute to its ongoing maintenance. If the federal government can grant the right for a corporation to cut through the middle of a nature preserve, digging a trench through such a delicate eco system, will votes be as inclined to fund future purchases in the name of conservation? This is a concern that reaches far beyond New Hampshire, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next up we have number 32 Joe McGuire.

MR. MCGUIRE: Hi Joe McGuire, M-c-G-u-i-r-e, I'm from the town of Mason and I'm a stakeholder, I'm opposed to the pipeline. The NED Pipeline is planned to cut over 55 million square feet of forest as it traverses through our farmland, there are many individual examples of acer saccharum, also known as sugar maples as well as sugar bushes that will be effected by this project.

A sugar bush is any group of sugar maples that are planted in close proximity to each other for the purpose of harvesting maple sap, the raw ingredient used in the manufacture of maple syrup and related products. Maple syrup is a primary agricultural product in the state of New Hampshire.

As FERC develops the Environmental Impact Statement for the NED Pipeline please identify how you will consider the following attributes associated with the removal of either an entire sugar bush or a portion of the sugar bush for the entire pipeline route.

Since the economic vitality of any sugar bush is based on the closest of trees to each other, in order to facilitate economically more feasible sap harvesting, the continuity of operations, please be sure to personally examine on foot the impact to each and every sugar bush on the NED Pipeline route.

Removing the middle of the sugar bush for example can more than double the operational costs of running the remaining two isolated pieces of the sugar bush as the harvesting process will need to be duplicated for each section. In many cases it will not be feasible for these costs to be borne by the operator and chances are that the entire sugar bush will cease production.

Please be sure to conduct these studies with the landowner and sugaring operator present as well as a state employed forester and representative of the New Hampshire Maple Sugar Producers Association. Please also identify the process by which Kinder Morgan will replant the sugar maples for each and every instance where sugar maples will be cut in order to have the most successful replanting young trees must be harvested and transplanted from the same sugar bush that they are going to be replanted in.

The transplanting process takes a full year or the transplanting process will be a failure. Please also identify how the economic impacts for every sugar maple cut will be handled to provide just compensation for the sugar bush operator. Any trees replanted will not yield marketable crop for at least 40 years. After that the sugar maple trees have a lifespan of up to an additional 360 years providing agricultural products for many generations to come.

Additionally the species is moving north due to climate change. In addition please identify how Kinder Morgan will maintain the easements without the use of chemical herbicides, which potentially will render entire crops unusable by humans. In addition please identify for the entire pipeline route how you will prevent either non-native species of trees, or non-sugar maples from replacing the sugar maples that are cut.

In addition tourism, especially during the fall foliage season is a much needed and valuable industry in our state. The sugar maple which is a representative species in New England is known for its bright fall colors. Removing large swaths of these trees will detrimentally affect any tourist related business in operation now or planned for the future that relies on the spectacular fall beauty.

Please identify each and every example through personal, physical inspection and review of any instance where the removal of sugar maples has a negative impact to related tourist or potential tourist business, thank you.

See I have more time. So there was a gentleman who spoke ahead of us who said he wanted to have all the gas identified that was coming through the NED Pipeline, to have it specifically you know, identified where each unit of gas was destined for and I would also like to see that expanded to include the AIM and Spectra Pipelines in Massachusetts because it has been kind of a shell game going on where we say oh no, the gas on this pipeline is not going to be exported, the gas on the other two pipelines is for Massachusetts so between all 3 pipelines I think we want to see that accountability for all of the gas on all 3 pipelines is going, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next we have number 33, Maria I'm not going to try to pronounce that I apologize.

MS. SZMAUZ: Hi, I'm Maria Szmauz S-z-m-a-u-z. I live in New Ipswich, New Hampshire. Kinder Morgan's previous resource reports 20,000 or more TBD's or incomplete. Working 9 to 5 to pay for our land that Kinder Morgan wants to take by eminent domain to most likely export LNG leave us no time to comprehend the 6500 pages released 5 days ago. I would respectfully suggest that these scoping meetings are premature and are failing to ensure the NEPA process.

In New Hampshire we take the beauty, health and conservation of our land seriously. We preserve land. We have a huge tourism industry. NED is probably the most substantial infrastructure project in southern New Hampshire in decades. Co-location with power lines should be called co-locations with homes and farms and businesses because electro-magnetic interference dictates the taking of an additional 150 feet or more of each abutters Greenfield land.

Much of this is conservation land. New Hampshire conservancy documents show NED goes through 44,270 feet or 8.38 miles of it which is about 10% of the route however these do not include -- these maps -- the nearly half mile of private conservation land with deeded conservation and restrictions on it in my town.

Land with over 150 acres of heavy forest with a huge range of wildlife, much wetland and homes where primary deeds mandate no commercial or industrial use of this land whatsoever and heavy restrictions including no clear cutting, no permanent structures and on and on and on.

What mitigation are we to have as Kinder Morgan violates our primary homeowner deeds? You cannot mitigate by preserving land elsewhere instead this land is where our homes are. Who will want to provide a conservation easement in the future if it is so easily violated? This goes against our town's master plan and will jeopardize future donations of conservation land across the state. How can you mitigate that?

It also jeopardizes our own future use of our own land. Heat will keep snow melted for skiers, pesticides will keep it open. Previously we were allowed to farm this land. It will restrict hunting for which it is greatly used now but mostly my greatest concern is that it will jeopardize both our water and our safety.

Water as the route will require blasting throughout and bedrock granite contains arsenic, there's a lot of arsenic in our town and in our area. And this land is mostly forest, it connects with hundreds of acres of preserved forest nearby. In a fire --

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MS. SZMAUZ: Thousands of acres will burn and our EMS will not stand a chance of fighting it. Homes and animals and industry would be lost. Kinder Morgan has an atrocious safety record, both including accidents and best management construction practices. PHMSA admits that each inspector is responsible for enough pipe to circle the globe and a 2 million dollar penalty doesn't really hurt a multi-billion dollar company. How can you guarantee the safety of our forest and homes and how can you mitigate our sleepless nights.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up ma'am, thank you. Next is number 34, Jay Cimken, number 37 Stephanie Scherr, sorry.

MS. SCHERR: Good evening Stephanie Scherr, Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire. Those of us opposing the Kinder Morgan NED Pipeline want you to halt the scoping hearings and restart the process giving landowners the full 60 days they are allowed. The thousands of To Be Determined labels in Kinder Morgan's latest report is unacceptable. Routes have been changed leaving no time for landowners to understand what is happening to them as Kinder Morgan's people swoop in on them like vultures trying to negotiate deals.

These calculated moves on the part of Kinder Morgan do not go unnoticed nor without response. When Kinder Morgan uploaded their latest draft of the environmental report on Friday afternoon leaving just days to sort through the enormous document for scoping, landowners called FERC. Their calls were met with incredibly rude, disrespectful, condescending responses. This re-enforces that you support pipeline projects at any and all costs with no regard to those who will be impacted and whether they want or need your services.

The following comments were made by FERC employee Sara McKinley and Marcia Lorensky at the Land Owner help line. Sara told one caller compressor stations are just big chemical plants, there is no pollution I don't know what you are worried about. I have worked on gas pipelines for FERC for over 30 years and never heard the term blow down. You have been sold a bill of goods, you need to get off You-Tube. Then she hung up. This was the second person at FERC to tell her blow downs don't exist.

Sara told another caller "You and your folks can take as long as you want to process and digest this information. You do not need a FERC scoping your FERC comments sent in to us are the same as testifying. Kinder Morgan pushed your buttons and there is no need for your buttons to be pushed."

A caller who spoke to Marcia stated, "Not one of my questions have been answered, she's beating around

the bush. She wouldn't stop talking until I told her it was my turn to talk now. She tried to tell me that there would be no tariffs on our electric bill, that the noise wouldn't be that interruptive and that any information that I may get from protest groups is biased. Is your information biased? Marcia told another called that she talked to Kinder Morgan on the phone, they are wonderful people. They don't want to hurt anyone. She said that she would be working until 7 o'clock tonight donating her time to FERC, talking to people to make them feel better. She was told that she shouldn't be so upset."

Believe me this kind of response doesn't make anyone feel better. The FERC game is rigged to promote old, outdated, filthy energy technology. Seal the leaks in existing pipelines and send Kinder Morgan back to Texas. We value clean air, clean water, wildlife, scenic vistas, outdoor recreation, state parks, conservation lands, historic ponds and small town culture. The injustice of shoving this pipeline through rural communities does not sit well with us, rural lives matter.

We have clean energy solutions already in use exploding in popularity. The energy field waiver source already possesses the skills to transition to safer, healthier, clean energy jobs with great futures. I call upon Governor Hassan and all of our state representatives to have the vision to boldly move New Hampshire forward, promoting choices that will proudly put New Hampshire in the lead, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: I want to respond really quickly here. If anyone has any problems with any staff that they speak with at FERC, be they in another division, another office entirely, please contact me. Let them know that you want to speak to the project manager, Eric Tomasi. I will be able to give you answers, I will not condescend, I will be straight with you because that is really what my job is.

Whether you may like the answers or not, I will tell you what I know at that time.

MS. SCHERR: But those are the numbers that are available and that is the response that people are receiving. It is intimidating, it's bullying and unacceptable.

MR. TOMASI: And again I apologize for anything that you might be offended and again if you don't get the answers you get from the Landowner Help Line or you don't get it from anyone else at FERC please contact me directly. You can call the external affairs office and they will transfer you to me it's not a problem. Many of you have my phone number, it's not a problem anyways, okay.

Oh yes, the last speaker was Stephanie Scherr, S-c-h-e-r-r is that correct?

MS. SCHERR: Correct.

MR. TOMASI: You can just call FERC and they will give it to you. I mean many people have it, it is not that big of a deal, but as it is just calm down, wait, wait, wait.

MS. SCHERR: Your phone number sir.

MR. TOMASI: Yes sure.

MS. SCHERR: I would like to pass it on to people that spoke to Sara and Marcia.

MR. TOMASI: Absolutely. Well actually why don't you just wait until we are done and I will give it to you then.

MS. SCHERR: I don't want to wait until you are done, I'm tired. Thank you so much.

MR. TOMASI: Again like I said I want to apologize if people aren't getting the answers from any other FERC employee please let them know you want to speak with me, the Project Manager, Eric Tomasi and I will work with you directly. So anyways the next commenter is number 40, Thomas Hope? Is Thomas here? Next, I'm not going to spend a lot of time calling each person. Number 42, Doug Wittback?

Okay is anyone here, 42, 43, 44, or 45? 42 is not here, okay 43.

MS. BAILEY: Hello my name is Jordan Bailey I live at 6 Skyline Drive, in Brookline, New Hampshire. I'm a volunteer on the Brookline Conservation Commission and I also represent them on the Brookline Pipeline Task Force.

In Brookline a total of 15 parcels will be impacted by pipeline including 6 parcels that have been pur-

chased by the town's Conservation Commission at a cost of over \$571,000 and totally over 163 acres. The Town of Brookline has engaged qualified experts to assess the potential impacts of the pipeline project.

We ask that the record reflect if such resources have been retained. As the results of these studies are finalized we reserve the right to utilize them and request to Kinder Morgan, its affiliates as well as FERC, NHSUC and other agencies.

Secondly I wish to advise FERC that at Brookline's annual town meeting on March 11, 2015 voters overwhelmingly passed several warrant articles related to the proposed pipeline. The following were passed: Number 1, should the town of Brookline vote to oppose approval of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal is inconsistent with the town's goal of protecting and preserving aquifers, drinking water, including community and private wells, wetlands, streams and other bodies of water.

In addition the proposal to extract water to use in drilling or other operations whether from a body of water or well is inconsistent with the town's goal to protect such waters.

Number 2, shall the town of Brookline vote to oppose approval of the Northeast Energy Direct Project because the proposal is inconsistent with the basic tenant of individual property rights whereas if approved Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, LLC shall have the power to force private property owners to give up rights under eminent domain proceedings in order to create a new corridor for the installation of the pipeline project.

Number 3, shall we impose a moratorium on any interstate pipeline projects within the town of Brookline? The moratorium became effective immediately upon the vote and include, but was not limited to, land acquisition, surveying, tree removal or any physical alteration of any land within the town of Brookline intended for pipeline construction or development.

A fourth article appropriated funds to assist the town in opposing the pipeline project. Again all 4 articles passed overwhelmingly, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. 44? Is 44 here, 44 Christine St. George?

MS. ST. GEORGE: My name is Christine St. George, S-t. G-e-o-r-g-e. I live at 13 Lordon Lane in Brookline. Considerable blasting is expected for the construction of the pipeline. In May, 2014 prior to the announcement of the proposed route, Brookline passed a blasting ordinance. We request the ordinance be followed by Kinder Morgan and its affiliates, including the pre and post blasting surveying of all structures within 500 feet of any blasting.

My second request is specifically for Section J of the alignment sheets in Brookline, New Hampshire. Given the crossing of Route 13 with a traffic count approaching 10,000 vehicles per day, the nearly 20 buildings intended for human occupancy and numerous building lots actively on the market within the potential impact circle, I would request FERC study whether the area between Station 783 plus 62 and 820 plus 00 could be reasonable designated as a high consequence area as allowable under the applicable area of Title 49 of the Code of the Federal Regulation Section 192 and thus included in the applicant's Integrity Management Plan if the project is approved.

My third request involves road crossing. The proposed pipeline would cross 3 different types of roads in Brookline, one is a state road, a second is a paved town road and the third is an unmaintained Class 6 road. Each of these roads will experience heavy logging trucks. As a result I request that FERC require construction techniques that will ensure the ability to handle heavy logging trucks on all road crossings in Brookline including any Class 6 roads.

Also on June 10th Kinder Morgan had an open house in Brookline, New Hampshire. The representatives there said that this pipeline was just a bridge -- a fuel bridge for that -- within 10 to 15 years of renewable energy coming into, you know, using it for electricity and what not.

So what my problem is, is if it just a "bridge" of 10 to 15 years, why would we go through the expense of putting in a pipeline, destroying all of this property and all the natural resources just for 10 to 15 years, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Next number 45 Melanie?

MS. LEVESQUE: Yes, good evening. My name is Melanie Levesque. I am a member of the Brookline Pipeline Committee.

MR. TOMASI: Could you spell your name please?

MS. LEVESQUE: Oh sorry, L-e-v-e-s-q-u-e. I should be used to that. So I am a member of the Brookline Pipeline Committee and also a former State Representative for Brookline, Mason and Hollis, New Hampshire. I live at 2 McDaniel's Drive in Brookline, New Hampshire. We are concerned about the impact of the pipeline on property values for our community members that are co-located with the planned pipeline, you may refer to them as pipeline abutters.

First, we request that Kinder Morgan be required to provide tangible, substantiated data regarding the impact of similarly sized gas pipelines on local property values. An assessment of the potential impact on property values in each town along the pipeline should be clearly detailed.

My second comment involves electricity rates. One of the alleged benefits of NED is reduced electricity rates. We have trouble understanding how a pipeline that does not serve existing power generation plants will aid in reducing electricity rates. In other words, we clearly understand that the gas from the pipelines will be used for heat, not electricity.

To assist in quantifying the benefits of NED, we request that Kinder Morgan and its partners be required to provide the results of a study that evaluates the cost benefit analysis of the specifically proposed pipeline for electricity prices in New Hampshire, similar to what was done in a study in Maine.

The study should also consider the potential cost impact of the project on tax on rate payers. In addition provide quantifiable figures on the predicted reduction in electricity prices as a result of the pipeline and over what period of time. Such an analysis can then be weighed against the significant personal and environmental impact of this project.

In addition and in closing as a former State Legislature and a member of the Science Technology and Energy Committee, I am deeply concerned about the role of the Federal Energy Regulation Commission. It seems that an agency titled as such should not only be to approve pipelines, but to heavily consider the impact on our environment, our communities, our conservation land, our energy needs and promoting a responsible 21st Century energy strategy, one that promotes renewable, sustainable, efficient and necessary energy projects, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Number 46, Sebastian?

MR. BARTHELMESS: Yes, Sebastian Barthelmeß, B-a-r-t-h-e-l-m-e-s-s.

MR. TOMASI: All right let's get the timer started.

MR. BARTHELMESS: Okay, I got mine going too. I live in New Ipswich, New Hampshire, only feet away from the proposed compressor station. With my 3 minutes here, for the few that are left could everyone stand up and raise their hand if they are too tired to at this point.

MR. TOMASI: Please speak into the mic.

MR. BARTHELMESS: Could everyone stand up that is in opposition to the pipeline at this point or raise your hand. Excellent, okay you can sit down now, thank you I really appreciate your support here. And those opposed that are still here could you raise your hand? I'm sorry that are in favor of the pipeline.

I think that speaks for itself. I have only two questions for you in my limited time. First of all Eric, I actually called you twice when I was in D.C. two weeks ago and I visited the FERC Office at 8 o'clock in the morning. I have a cell phone number and I have no response yet and it's --

MR. TOMASI: I was actually out of the country for two weeks, there's nothing I could do about that.

MR. BARTHELMESS: All right but any kind of response would have been much appreciated even --

MR. TOMASI: I was completely incommunicado for those two weeks.

MR. BARTHELMESS: Okay I would like to point your attention to for the record the Notice of Intent to prepare and Environmental Impact Statement that you handed out as we entered the building.

On page 6 on the second paragraph it says right at the end, during scoping we are specifically soliciting comments on the range of alternatives for the project. I have been here the whole evening and I have heard very little for alternatives. Now you mentioned that FERC regulates gas, oil and utilities, electric I'm guess, okay. So would solar I'm guessing, I'm proposing on the record that you would look into what it would take to displace the same amount of energy for solar, hydro, in your Environmental Impact Study, is that too much to ask?

It looks like you are going to be soliciting these comments on the full range.

MR. TOMASI: That's correct.

MR. BARTHELMESS: So you will investigate things outside of natural gas?

MR. TOMASI: Just complete your comment.

MR. BARTHELMESS: Okay that's actually my comment and my question. So you will research those things outside?

MR. TOMASI: We are going to be looking at a range of alternative analysis including you know, basically we have already asked the company to look into other aspects of it, including no action alternatives, system alternatives and other things. We are going to be looking at the range of them, if you want a more expanded analysis like you said again putting it on the record like you have just done is the thing you need to do.

MR. BARTHELMESS: Okay that's it, I'll give you back the 30 seconds.

MR. TOMASI: Next number 47 Carol Lang?

MS. LANG: Hello, my name is Carol Lang, L-a-n-g, I live in Merrimack, New Hampshire. I have a number of concerns regarding this proposed pipeline. Unfortunately when this meeting was announced it wasn't clear whether we were going to be allowed to address all of our FERC concerns or restrict ourselves to strictly environmental concerns, so it made it a little difficult to prepare for this. So in the future some guidance in advance would be helpful.

Given the other proposed increases in sources of natural gas for the Northeast, for instance the Spectra Northeast Utilities Pipeline, there isn't even enough demand that I can see to justify this additional pipeline. In addition we have seen this past winter energy use was regulated much better than the prior winter to that and I think a lot of this was because of the prior experience, the resources were allocated better and supplies of LNG were stockpiled as a buffer against the few extremely cold days when the peak demand would be.

So there's a lot of things that can be done to mitigate the current situation. I have a number of concerns but the safety record of these pipelines and Kinder Morgan specifically, and I have concerns that these are all relatively small towns. Our emergency response teams are not equipped to deal with a major disaster which more than likely could certainly happen, it happened before in other areas.

I'm really questioning -- to me I think this whole thing has put the cart before the horse. Before everybody was all wound up, worrying about this and trying to you know, come up with the justifications for positions, the need would have been much, much more adequately analyzed to see if this is even necessary, I seriously doubt that it is.

I have lived in Merrimack for several decades I chose to live here because of the quality of life of this area. I feel the project would seriously degrade that quality of live, the rural character would be irreversibly altered, property values would decline, our environment would be negatively impacted.

If this pipeline were truly critically necessary maybe I would accept those changes but since New Hampshire exports approximately half of its natural gas to other states --

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MS. LANG: I have a hard time justifying this proposal. I will leave the rest of my remarks in the written comments I gave you prior to the start of the meeting, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: You have more time if you wish, you have some more time, thank you. Next number 48 Gary Elsworth.

MR. ELSWORTH: Good evening, my last name is E-l-s-w-o-r-t-h. If the Spectra Pipeline can expand in its current footprint, why in the world would you ever permit Kinder Morgan to build another pipeline? Why cause all the damage to New Hampshire?

Another question I have is how often are the gas lines in the country tested? Who does the testing of the gas lines? To cause less environmental impact to New Hampshire, don't build the pipeline, we don't need it. If you must have this gas line for the purported need, why don't you have it in another state, in MASS Pike, right through Dracut? Why go through all of New Hampshire which is not going to use the gas, we don't need the gas and we export the electricity, send it down to MASS Pike, there's no schools, no homes, to worry about.

And one last thing is why should any pipeline in the country be left in the ground when it is finished being used? Why aren't they pulled out? Why aren't the lands reclaimed? Leaving this hazardous pipeline in the ground for 20, 30, 40 years it breaks down, how is that good for the environment, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next 50, Patricia Martin, Patricia? 51, Stephen Spaulding?

MR. SPAULDING: Stephen Spaulding, S-t-e-p-h-e-n S-p-a-u-l-d-i-n-g. My comments are in the form of a list of question that FERC and our elected officials and everyone around has a moral duty to ask and answer. I'm going to read real quickly.

Do you support implementation of policies designed to promote development and use of clean, sustainable energy technologies? Do you support implementation of policies designed to promote conservation and a greater efficiency in energy usage? Do you believe that policy should favor non-polluting and renewable energy technologies over fossil fuel-based technologies?

Do you consider natural gas a sustainable energy source given that the supply is finite? Do you consider natural gas a clean energy source after taking into account its full environmental impact at all stages from extraction to combustion?

Do you accept the near unanimous judgment of the scientific community that climate change is occurring, is caused by human activities and is an eminent serious threat to the well-being of human beings and other species?

Do you agree with the scientific consensus that moving away from reliance on fossil fuels is essential if we are to avoid the worst impacts of climate change?

Many proponents state that the NED Project is needed to lower energy prices in New England whereas many opponents state that, many opponents believe that New England consumers would see little benefit.

Do you believe that a guarantee of reduced electric rates for energy consumers in New England should be a pre-requisite for approval of the NED Project? If the NED Pipeline were to fulfill the stated objective of lowered energy prices, do you believe this outcome would impede development of clean, sustainable energy technologies and encourage increased consumption of natural gas?

Even if the NED Project is approved and completed without delay, it will bring no gas to New England until late 2018. In many parts of the United States and the world, energy from renewable sources is already cost competitive with natural gas. Do you believe that advances in other technologies during the interim might make natural gas relatively less advantageous from a cost standpoint?

If the price of fossil fuels reflected the true costs of the environmental damage they cause, do you believe such fuels would remain economically competitive? Are you confident that the economic benefits promised by the project's advocates outweigh the environmental, social and opportunity costs of completing it?

Support for expanding the gas infrastructure strongly implies support for increased fracking. Studies

suggest that near fracking sites water and soil are contaminated, seismic activity increases, and residents suffer elevated rates of cancer and other diseases. Do you believe that fracking poses a threat to public health?

Given the scale of the NED Project, its environmental and aesthetic impact and the need to grab powers of eminent domain, do you feel the project should be allowed to proceed only if it is clearly demonstrated to be the best way to address the region's energy needs?

Do you believe that the NED Project has been clearly demonstrated to be the best way to address the region's energy needs? I know my answers, I know the answers of everyone else in the room, which the possible exception of the FERC representatives, thank you, my full text has been given too.

MR. TOMASI: Next, Jim Ogonowski?

MR. OGONOWSKI: Hi, I'm Jim Ogonowski of Dracut, Massachusetts. O-g-o-n-o-w-s-k-i. I am a 30 veteran of the United States Air Force and the New Hampshire Air National Guard. I'm also a farmer. My family has been farming for over 112 years in Dracut. Based on what I can surmise from the latest routing, our farm is the single most impacted parcel of land on the entire 418 mile route.

I am here to tell you our farm is not for sale and it is not free for the taking. We have a proud tradition of farm and we have a proud tradition of preserving open space. Two parcels of our other farm lands have already been preserved as open space. One with the assistance of Senator Ted Kennedy, in memory of my late brother John who himself, a veteran, a farmer, was the pilot of American Airlines Flight 11 that was murdered on September 11, 2001.

Additionally my late brother's 100 acre farm is preserved as open space. The one parcel we have never saved is the one parcel my dad purchased in 1948 when he returned from the Army Air Corp at the end of World War II. This member of the greatest generation said to me who do we need to protect our farm from, we own it?

I'm here to tell you the answer is Kinder Morgan. Not only does our farm land get the 30 inch main line that comes into Dracut where it is supposedly ends, we then get 2 lateral pipelines across our farm over 7500 feet of pipe on one parcel of land.

It gets worse, we are the abutters of a massive compressor station right next door. Take a look at the route when it goes from Massachusetts -- from New Hampshire into Massachusetts, most of the way it is traveling on an easterly direction. When it gets to Dracut it turns to the west, crossing farmland to place a compression station in a residential neighborhood.

Dracut borders on New Hampshire, this plan borders on insanity. The people of New England are well education and we deserve better. Don't let a Texas company come to New England to take our land to make a profit by sending gas overseas.

I'm here tonight representative my family. This 30 year veteran of the U.S. Military is asking for your assistance. I ask you to preserve and protect our property and reject this pipeline.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much, the next number 54, Stephen Matthews.

MR. MATTHEWS: Stephen Matthews, p-h in Stephen, two t's in Matthews. I'm here speaking for myself, I'm involved with the task force in the New Ipswich Selectman and my representation of the Municipal Coalition so I have a fair bit of experience with this just lately, more than enough.

For the gentleman from Londenderry who was worried about coming home and finding survey stakes on his land, this was discussed with a local Chief of Police and the point was made once you can't remove those or move those stakes, there is no actual law to stop you adding further stakes.

I was going to talk about compressor stations here tonight but there is a lot of people who have already done that, and I want to get down to more basics. And the basics in this case is that this is a for profit project that is being pushed through by a for profit company using eminent domain which was designed to make things for the good for people. This isn't for the good of the people, this is for Kinder Morgan's

pockets.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir.

MS. JUCHNEVICS-FREEMAN: Wendy Juchnevics-Freeman, J-u-c-h-n-e-v-i-c-s hyphen F-r-e-e-m-a-n. I currently serve as the Chairman --

MR. TOMASI: We'll have more time, don't worry.

MS. JUCHNEVICS-FREEMAN: Seriously, you guys have it already, J-u-c-h-n-e-v-i-c-s hyphen F-r-e-e-m-a-n. Got it?

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MS. JUCHNEVICS-FREEMAN: All right, I currently serve as the Chairman of the New Ipswich Zoning Board of Adjustment so I understand our zoning laws. I am an elected member of our Budget Committee. I understand what New Ipswich can afford and can't afford and a Service Chairman of the New Ipswich Pipeline Task Force and I will tell you that we have spent a lot of time getting ready for tonight and for tomorrow night where I will speak on behalf of the Selectmen.

But tonight I stand before you as a private citizen, a small business owner, a farmer actually, some of the people in this room have actually bought pork and chicken from me. What I am concerned about tonight in particular is our drinking water in the town of New Ipswich, but more specifically my drinking water in that the proposed pipeline is going to go through 3 stratified drift aquifers in the town of New Ipswich.

My well draws from one of these stratified aquifers. Now what we know about our ground water in New Hampshire is that it resides between the bedrock fractures and between particles of soil, sediment and loose rock that tie on top of that bedrock. The upper boundary of the underground area that is completely filled with water known as the water table is only 10 to 20 feet below the land surface.

Our ground water quality is influenced by the bedrock and the overburden material moves through and can be greatly influenced by land use. As you know, stratified drift aquifers -- are you really going to read your phone while I'm talking?

MR. TOMASI: I'm just looking at the time.

MS. JUCHNEVICS-FREEMAN: The stratified drift aquifers are very high-yielding water sources. If we ever did need a public water source in New Ipswich it would likely be one of these stratified drift aquifers that the pipeline is proposed to go through.

We are different from other parts of the country in that our ground water -- our aquifers are shallow and the ground water is limited by our climate change and geology. We also have radon and arsenic, which are naturally occurring and because of these facts we consider these aquifers high consequence areas and we hope that you will as well.

So because of this we would like to look at the quality of the pipe that is used, identify the wells that are drawing from this aquifers and we would like to have them tested for both natural occurring as well as contaminants prior to construction as well as quarterly after construction. And I would be glad to let FERC on my land to test my well.

But you know the big thing we talk about NEPA here, to ask us to identify what needs to be avoided, mitigated, minimized or compensated for without the adequate resources and the time to do so you are not doing anybody any good and you are just assuring that New Ipswich is going to suffer harm from this and likely my farm as well.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up 56, Paul Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: Good evening my name is Paul Sullivan, S-u-l-l-i-v-a-n. I'm an abutter to the proposal at 3 Autumn Street, Windham, New Hampshire, Segment J, Mile Post 34.80. In December of 2000, an executive from Tennessee Gas testified before the New Hampshire PUC and stated there are few, if any human endeavors which can be undertaken without some impact to the environment.

While I vehemently oppose this proposal I find explanations, analysis riddled with double speak misrep-

resentation and outright lies. I do agree with Tennessee Gas on this point, there will be an impact to the environment -- an environmental impact that will leave a permanent scar on the face of this state.

I would like to raise two questions during this hearing -- the first pertaining to the lack of documentation on wetland and watershed areas. It should be noted that this neighborhood is included in the stratified drift aquifer and also part of the upper Beaver Brook Merrimack River Watershed.

Referencing the Tennessee Gas maps of January '15 at mile marker 34.8 an unnamed stream links a series of ponds and drains to Beaver Brook at mile marker 34.9. No wetlands are delineated on the Tennessee Gas maps but a simple review of the town tax map shows a wetland, watershed protection district along the western edge of Autumn Street, including most of lot 19-B, 919. Construction protection district violate town ordinances written for the protection of the private wells in a natural habitat.

The second issue pertains to the aesthetics and the environmental damage. When this neighborhood was developed 35 years ago the power line right-of-way had already been established. The bill to preserve the natural buffer of trees to the right-of-way as the development took shape. Now comes Tennessee Gas who will remove the natural buffer, opening of this comparable to that of the lunar landscape -- no trees, no brush, no buffer, just an unimpeded view of the electrical right-of-way.

And it's not just the abutters being affected by this but residents even across the street who once had a view of majestic trees will now have unimpeded views of power lines and towers. While these two issues have direct impact on the neighborhood one fact needs to highlight my statement. That is as of this date Tennessee Gas cannot point to a spot in the ground and tell my neighbors this is where the pipe will be placed.

Segment J uses construction techniques, road configurations, sub-score 05 and sub-score 06 which would cause a clearing near the 45 feet or 85 feet from the center line of the pipe. This is bad enough but the fact is we don't even know where the pipe is going to be placed to start with.

In its release this week of the Environmental Construction Plan for New Hampshire, Tennessee Gas is proposing that it will locate the pipe 5 feet outside the right-of-way, but in two paragraphs later the loophole exists where it states that adjustments may result in the center line of the pipeline to be located within the existing power easement just outside within 5 feet or greater than 5 feet.

In other words we are allowing Tennessee Gas to put the pipe wherever they want. Members of the Commission you are asking us to offer specific environmental comments about the pipeline yet you don't hold Tennessee Gas in the same responsibility to offer specific, tangible route.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next number we are at 57, Liz Fletcher.

MS. FLETCHER: Hi, my name is Liz Fletcher that's F-l-e-t-c-h-e-r. I'm from Mason, New Hampshire.

Please undertake in depth studies of the "No Build" alternative, analyze how much natural gas New England actually uses and needs. Take into account other existing and proposed natural gas infrastructure, including LNG and all other pipelines proposed for New England.

Please determine the least impact alternatives to meet the need with emphasis on minimizing environmental and community disturbance. Please include analysis of the energy efficiency investments that contribute to New England energy supply as well as sustainable energy sources such as solar, wind and bio-mass. All these studies should be conducted by neutral, third party experts in the energy field, not Kinder Morgan or Tennessee Gas.

The "No Build" alternative deserves in depth position consideration, "No Build" is the best alternative for that. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next we have 58, Caroline Zuk.

MS. ZUK: Good evening, thank you Commission and staff for the opportunity to speak. My name is Caroline Zuk, last name is spelled Z-u-k, team leader of the Dracut Pipeline Awareness Group in Dracut, MASS, I reside in Dracut.

I'm a graduate of Wentworth Institute of Technology and have worked as a regulatory engineer. I presently own and operate Sage Farm farm in Dracut, Massachusetts, a third generation family-owned farm abutting the Ogonowski property and we are under the U.S. Department of Agriculture's agriculture preservation restriction.

We grow vegetables, we feed people. We recognize farm land to be a national food resource and we don't want it tainted. Emissions, airborne toxic contaminants, undue noise levels, increasing utility easements, loss in property values, tariffs, displacement of wildlife habitats and displacement of waterways and the risk of catastrophic events weigh heavily on our minds.

Most of us still don't have a clear picture of what Kinder Morgan is proposing as information keeps changing. To better understand our concerns, we invite regulators to put on hiking shoes and come take a closer look. Visit our populated areas and neighborhoods, citizens, local farmers, Sage Farm, Ogonowski farm and places of assembly such as St. Francis Church, slated to be ravaged by what is perceived to be an industrial invasion.

We have an existing aging gas pipeline infrastructure in Dracut in need of attention on Mathune Street which Kinder Mortgage is not proposing to update. When will the noise and odors from the existing metering station on Mathune Street be resolved? Somebody needs to visit this facility. Why aren't we funding renewable energy solutions instead? Are we really examining the long-term cumulative effect on our communities and on our environment? I don't think so. We don't need this, 3 new metering stations, 4 laterals, a large compression station in the middle of our town of 30,000 people.

Dracut doesn't need this, we are not designed for this. Please tell Kinder Morgan goodbye, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up number 60, Steve Turell, moving on 61, Ron Minor.

MR. MINOR: It's actually Don Minor, 82 Peasley Road, Merrimack, New Hampshire. I could see the light so you don't have to tell me when 30 seconds is up. 3.8 miles of this pipeline is going to run through my town, I'm an abutter to one of those miles. I own a farm. I supply meat, I do beef, pork, lamb and chicken. I sell a great deal of this to a lot of my customers right here and they have now since left.

I have got a huge problem as far as the guidelines that Kinder Morgan is adhering too. I have two dates for you. January 29th at 2:24 PM, 5/22/15 at 2:42 PM -- Kinder Morgan surveyors were on my property twice with no permission at all and it's been crystal clear they didn't even know my name.

Do you know Mr. Hartman? Jim Hartman? Yeah, I have talked to him several times. It's been crystal clear after 5/22 that was a Monday, the following Sunday while I was -- they come when I'm at a farmer's market conveniently. That following Sunday two other people with Texas plates were taking pictures on my side of the road, claiming to be tourists I guess. Peasley Road if you see it's an old barn right there, not really a photogenic option but they are kind of taking these things to the extreme to get what they want okay, that's not a good neighbor.

I have only seen a couple letters saying we are going to be good neighbors and this and this. I have seemed to receive more information from your office than I have from Kinder Morgan, they are not accessible, they are not and there is no information. We were at a meeting in Merrimack over 500 people, maybe I exaggerated, 500 people showed up and questions that were asked or I asked directly were what gauge pipe am I going to get?

Well it's determined on population. I'm in a rural area so I guess I'm getting a number 1 pipe, 1 - 2 I don't know, I'd like a 3 how's that if it is going in. I have another question, what percentage of the property owners, their land would have to be taken by eminent domain to raise a red flag for you to say no, is there a number on that?

MR. TOMASI: Not that I'm aware of no.

MR. MINOR: So 60% might open your eyes pretty good on that.

MR. TOMASI: Those sort of considerations are done by the Commission.

MR. MINOR: I thought you were FERC, you said --

MR. TOMASI: I represent FERC but the Commissioners I should say, the Commissioners make decisions on those. My job is to do the Environmental Impact Statement, I'll add more time of course, but they make those sort of decisions, I pre-disclosed that.

MR. MINOR: Okay so we will shoot for 60% you know, so everyone can participate and you know, do that. Again on my farm I have a septic system, my well is actually 27 feet from the property line, my well which supplies water to all my animals do you want me to go through the numbers -- okay.

So it doesn't just affect me, it affects all my animals, my livelihood, my family's I guess food. I'm used to the power lines underneath there that are going to disturb and I have been told that they are going to re-locate me, I don't know how that's going to happen, how many animals and put it back the way they found it, anyway, thank you for your time.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are at number 62 Rob Chesebrough.

MR. CHESEBROUGH: Chesebrough, C-h-e-s-e-b-r-o-u-g-h. Is this thing on?

MR. TOMASI: Yes, yes.

MR. CHESEBROUGH: All right it is a distinct flavor that you guys do't listen at all. NED is the worst choice for New Hampshire, it does not solve our energy needs but the FERC isn't listening. Over 3,000 comments opposing NED have been filed on FERC under Docket PF14-22, but FERC isn't listening.

13 New Hampshire towns passed resolutions banning this pipeline but the FERC isn't listening. 54 Massachusetts towns banned this pipeline, but the FERC isn't listening. 2 New York towns passed resolutions against this pipeline, the FERC isn't listening.

Kinder Morgan claimed a massive 2.2 billion cubic foot pipeline was needed to solve a New England energy crisis. Residents, representatives and organizations across New England researched this claim and determined it to be false, but FERC isn't listening.

After two years of growth in New England, Kinder Morgan now claims we need a pipeline half that size. Now it's closer to 1.1 billion cubic feet, but FERC isn't listening. Energy conservation has reduced the need for NED but FERC isn't listening. Energy efficiency has reduced the need for NED but the FERC isn't listening.

Energy market reform has reduced the need for NED but FERC isn't listening. Utilization of LNG for peak demand has reduced the need for NED but the FERC isn't listening. Renewable resources coming online have reduced the need for NED but FERC isn't listening.

Other existing infrastructure expansion proposals will better serve New England's electricity needs but the FERC isn't listening. Now I ask FERC to please listen and study a few things. Cost -- Tennessee Kinder Morgan has not proven that 500 dekatherms per day increasing natural gas supply for heating fuel would substantially lower price of electricity, despite their claims of addressing an energy crisis. Please study and report the savings per household should NED be constructed.

The savings per household if tariffs are approved to pass on the costs of a multi-billion dollar NED Pipeline onto its ratepayers -- please study the cost per household should the NED Pipeline not be constructed.

Next let's look at the need. The NED Pipeline is proposed to be constructed through New Hampshire to supply Liberty Utilities with 150 dekatherms, I'm sorry they reduced that to 100. Please determine if there are other pipelines existing through or proposed which will have less environmental impact than the NED supplying Liberty Utilities.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up sir.

MR. CHESEBROUGH: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up number 63, Don Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay Johnson, J-o-h-n-s-o-n. My wife and I are direct abutters to the power lines that

makes us in the planned path of the proposed pipeline and we will lose property to their proposed easement. In 1988 we purchased our house knowing the back property line was a power line easement. The power companies maintained the line, never removed any tall, heavy forested back trees and now plan on building a larger, taller power line but I would still maintain my forest, to protect my property from any negative impact at all and they have never used chemicals to clear the line, Kinder Morgan and will they say the same thing.

The proposed pipeline will destroy my buffer between the power line and my property. Kinder Morgan at many meetings has said that they replant trees, help hide the area cleared and they do that, are they going to plant me a couple of dozen hundred, 150 foot tall trees? I don't think so. What's the Commission going to do to protect the environment, my environment and my neighbor's environment and property?

My town, my state will gain very little from this line. Okay I will be stripped of my scenic and protective back forest, forbidden from putting so much as a shed, I may have to move my current sheds if the line goes through. Who will compensate me for the diminishing property value on a daily basis, inheriting the potential lethal attachment to my property and my way of life?

Also many years ago my well went dry. A well was put in the back of the property. Kinder Morgan's pipeline will necessitate total removal of that well. I had that well checked regularly and the water is always well within U.S. specifications with nothing but a set in filter on it. How is my environment property value and quality of life to be protected if this pipeline goes in? All right.

You people are evaluating a proposed project that claims it is for the common good, but you are potentially condemning hundreds of families for years of financial burden and diminishing quality of life along with tremendous environmental impact.

Throughout this process Kinder Morgan has shown vague pictures, there were times years old, one of the pictures they showed was 5 years old, they didn't even have a whole set of condominiums on it in Windham when it ran through and now they are changing the game just days before you meet with us with another 6,000 some odd pages. All right, they put in their right-of-way, no business would allow this and no power line company is going to allow that.

Coming out with what they will do, now it is a 30 inch line, maybe it is a 36 inch line. You are responsible to protect the environment and the American citizens, I'm part of the environment. You need to get in the field and see what the impact will have. You also need to turn around and not trust Kinder Morgan. Kinder Morgan is a very big, very rich, very smart for profit company, all right.

Everything they are doing is well planned. You got that 2 days ago, 3 days ago, 4 days ago, because that was their plan, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next up number 64, James Martell? James Martell 64? 65? 65? 66? 67? 68?

MS. PAQUETTE: Hi my name is Diane Paquette P-a-q-u-e-t-t-e. I'm from the village of Salem, New Hampshire and the reason I say that it's a village is because my home is not directly affected by the pipeline but when one person in a village is affected all villagers are affected.

There are people in Salem, New Hampshire that could not be here tonight, including the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen and the Town Manager, they will talk to you tomorrow night in Milford. The reason I am here is because there are -- I didn't plan an environmental speech but I do have a damage speech for you, the collateral damage.

The collateral damage is all the people in the room right now, their homes, their families, all the people who can't be here tonight to speak to you. When you purchase your home it is your largest investment in your life. You put your family in it, you raise children in it, you have everything in it. One thing you do put in your home is your piece of mind, what's being taken away from these people in this room and the people who can't be here tonight that are affected by the pipeline is their piece of mind.

They cannot go home and night and worry about being happy in their homes, I'm getting off my speech,

let me go back here. Okay so these are the things that they are worried about. They are worried that they are simply a conduit for the project, a pass-through and that is true. This gas is going to be exported out of the country.

If Kinder Morgan tells you something different they are lying to you. This is a pass-through project, they are not receiving the direct benefit of the gas but they are getting all of the collateral damage to their properties. They are worried about the construction and destruction of their properties as the pipeline is constructed on, around and in some cases, right through their properties.

There are people in Pelham and Dracut that I have spoken with that the pipeline is going to be within 100 feet of their house. I mean think about that with your homes, 100 feet. They are worried about their children in harm's way during construction near their properties. They are worried about access to their homes and neighborhoods during construction.

They are worried about having to move sheds, garages, pools, gardens, or having pipelines in the center of their properties. They are worried about being in the thousand foot zone called the incineration zone. Pay careful attention to those words incineration zone. Those people, if a pipeline explodes, will not even have a chance to call and say goodbye, they will be incinerated.

Where else am I here -- they are worried about living near a compressor station, by the way I believe the compressor stations are unmanned. I have been told that twice by Kinder Morgan representatives. They are manned remotely in Texas. I mean I don't have to talk about that you can figure that out on your own, that's a problem.

You know that's a problem, you know it depends. They are worried about living near compressor stations where lights shine all day and night and loud pigging sounds from the pipes are constant in the area surrounding the station and their properties.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MS. PAQUETTE: Okay sorry, vote no, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Again those people who weren't able to finish their speech please bring it up to me so that I can put them in the record. Next is 66, 67, I'm sorry I apologize, 67, 68?

MR. MONTGOMERY: My name is Huck Montgomery, that's H-u-c-k last name is M-o-n-t-g-o-m-e-r-y and I'm here representing the New Hampshire Building and Construction Trades Council, we are a labor organization and we represent more than 2,000 working men and women in the construction industry in New Hampshire and actually more than 80 working families here in the city of Nashua and I'm really here tonight just to ask you folks, FERC to do your job and listen to the folks in this room.

I think everybody here has really valid concerns and hopefully you all can be very diligent and listen to those concerns and find ways to mitigate the issues that a lot of people do have with some of the proposal and make sure that we can find a way to actually get TS ultimately and build projects like this.

It's very important to our members from a jobs stand point, we have heard that this project could create as many as 520 jobs in the construction sector for New Hampshire workers and that impact would just be incalculable for our membership. Right now the construction industry in New Hampshire has been taking a beating since the Great Recession, it's down more than 30% and it's really only begun to recover and it really makes sense from our standpoint to find ways to build more infrastructure projects in the state of New Hampshire.

Certainly from the job creation standpoint but we do believe wholeheartedly that the need for new supplies of energy in New Hampshire is critical in order to bring down rates, electric rates, energy rates in general are very high in this part of the country and in order to create more jobs and help working families we really need to find ways to bring those down.

I will say that the folks that my membership, from the energy building trades are among the best at what they do, that's what they do, they build pipelines, they build infrastructure and we look forward to working with the company, to working with stakeholders, to working with FERC to make sure that any projects

that get built in New Hampshire they are built safely.

That the craftsmanship on a project like this would be top notch and everybody could count on that commitment from our membership but you know I hope that FERC and the other stakeholders and the folks in this room are willing to work with us to find a way to move forward that respects local property owners, respects the people in this room and also solves some really touch problems with energy supply and not to mention creating lots and lots of really good jobs for working men and women in New Hampshire, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next up we have 71 moving to, 71? 72? 73? Okay.

MR. RUSHTON: Good evening, my name is David Rushton, R-u-s-h-t-o-n. I live with my wife in Windham, New Hampshire and I thank you for this opportunity to speak of our project that I oppose. My property is in close proximity to the planned pipeline, I am not an abutter.

I live close enough so that it will be significantly devalued but more importantly I live with the constant fear associated with being in an area of high consequence should there be a problem with the pipeline. Direct abutters and those of us in my situation are being asked to shoulder the expense and stress of this project while a private company reaps the benefits.

Realistically, any short term benefits to this region will be far exceeded by sacrifices of relatively few of us, most of us here tonight will make. In the long term temporary construction jobs will go away quickly. Depreciating pipeline assets will eat away at promised town revenue.

Safety issues will grow as the pipeline ages and the inevitable exportation of this gas delivered by the pipeline will lead to large market pricing increases negating the potential, financial gains. Our collective dependence on non-renewable energy resources will continue unabated, all the while our environment will continue to suffer in all the ways that you have heard of tonight.

What should you do? Well first of all you should hold Kinder Morgan accountable. And how can you do that? First, during this pre-filing period they are required to communicate with stakeholders, identify areas of concern and attempt to resolve those issues. It seems to me that they forgot the last step, making no attempt to resolve any issues, they are dictating the issues.

It is your duty to require that they work making an honest attempt to resolve all the issues. Unfortunately most of the issues we presented tonight cannot be resolved easily if at all. In a true governmental methodology it would be necessary to brush most of those under the rug and I expect you will.

You should at least require them to work on those issues which can be changed, which can potentially be resolved, and there are many issues that can be resolved, can be debated and can be changed, but they are making no attempt.

One more significant issue that bothers me most -- why is Kinder Morgan not negotiating with the power companies to truly co-locate pipeline within the power line assessments? Specifically, in the sections from Londonderry to Dracut contains a 350 foot right-of-way that can easily consolidate power lines and have plenty of room for pipeline and not affect property owners.

Can you require them to at least negotiate with the power company in good faith and if not, why not? Thank you for your time.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. 74? 76? 77?

MR. COWAN: Good evening my name is Rich Cowan C-o-w-a-n. I live just over the border in Dracut, Massachusetts and serve on the Steering Committee of Dracut Pipeline Awareness. Infrastructure projects can be important but infrastructure should not be build which costs 3 to 10 times as much as other infrastructure projects which accomplish the same goal and deliver the same energy.

Our town with a population of over 30,000 would bear a disproportionate impact due to the proposed 3 meter stations, a compressor station with blow down stacks and the branching out of 4 proposed laterals, several of which have no known customers. It appears that we are the destination of the main portion of

the pipeline for the obvious reason that East Dracut is the end of the bi-directional Maritime and Northeast Pipeline.

That pipeline extends all the way to down east Maine and Goldboro, Nova Scotia, the site of two facilities to liquefy and export LNG. At the beginning of this meeting Mr. Tomasi described some of the changes in the recent resource reports released at the end of last week. As Eric stated, Kinder Morgan did reduce the proposed size of its main line from Wright, New York to Dracut, from 2.2 million dekatherms to 1.3 million dekatherms or DTH.

Kinder Morgan touted the reduction of the diameter and the capacity of the New Hampshire and western MASS portion of its project in press releases so that many, including FERC would notice. What Kinder Morgan failed to say, what they slipped into the latest resource report without any public notification whatever, was an expansion of project facilities in Dracut.

First the 20 inch lateral which threads the needle between Pelsar Road and Sesame Street was expanded to 24 inches in diameter. This is the second expansion of that lateral in 7 months and adds over 50 homes to potential impact radius areas for that lateral.

Second and most ominously, the Maritime's meter station on Wheeler Road intended to send gas north to the Canadian Maritimes was increased in capacity from 120,000 dekatherms to 500,000 dekatherms, an increase of over 400%. I would like to request the following:

First that Mr. Tomasi and other FERC managers when describing the decreased capacity of the main lines at future scoping sessions, also let the audience know about the increased capacity of the lateral infrastructure in Dracut.

Also revealed in the July 24th report under the project description section and secondly that FERC require Kinder Morgan to fully explain the reasons for the upsizing of the Dracut project facilities even when the incoming pipeline entering Dracut from New Hampshire was reduced in size.

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MR. COWAN: Its apparent contradiction begs the question does Kinder Morgan really intend to downsize this project or is their press release just a ruse, thank you?

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. For those of you who may not know we will be having additional scoping meetings in Massachusetts. Generally I didn't talk about the Dracut facilities because we were not in Massachusetts. I will certainly talk about those changes when we do go to eastern Massachusetts in a couple of weeks. Fair enough. Next commenter 77? 78?

MR. CARROLL: John Carroll, C-a-r-r-o-l-l, Nashua. Some time back the Nashua Telegraph said that some of the executive proposing this project are the same people whose financial manipulations brought on the ENRON collapse. That raises a question in my mind as to whether these proponents have either the proper sense of priorities or the management skills to build and maintain this line according to established safety standards.

I urge the Commission to inquire into this question with the same attention that it has given to the environmental aspects, the need for the transportation capacity and the financial viability, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir, 79? 79? 80? 80? Anyone from 81 through 85 please raise your hands. Okay, anyone through 91, is anyone here, we got one, sir? Over here to the right what number are you, okay so 90 come on up.

MR. MCGOUGHLIN: Good evening, I'm Paul McGoughlin, I live at 22 Birch Lane, Pelham, New Hampshire. The electric easement is directly behind my home and the gas pipeline is proposed to be right in my woods. Most of what I had planned to say has already been said and said better by an 11 year old. So let me go on to a few other things.

As a former Conservation Commission member, I listened to a lot of promises from developers. I also saw what happened. I would ask that if the Commission okays this project that they require Kinder Mor-

gan to set aside in advance adequate funds for the remission of the problems that they will cause rather than to see a repetition of the history of the building of the western railroads where the companies went through constant bankruptcies to avoid their financial responsibilities.

As a former history teacher, I would go back to the Declaration of Independence, background England imposed small taxes to stamp back the Tea Act, they were really trivial economically but politically they were enormous. Why -- because they were imposed without the consent of the people.

Here tonight Kinder Morgan is attempting to get the power of eminent domain, the project would be absolutely impossible without eminent domain. They know they couldn't get us to sell to them. Now, on the consent of the people in eminent domain there are times when an odd property must be taken. If my town wants a school, yeah they can take it.

If the Air Force needs a radar station, yeah they can take it. Does Kinder Morgan have any right to take my land why? What benefit do they show to the people of New Hampshire for my being able to breathe, being able to have safe water, being able to see the trees?

Gentlemen, I know you have heard a lot of emotion tonight. There is outrage, there is rage, there is fury in this room. Most people have been polite and restrained, sometimes the emotion comes out, but these things are extraordinarily important to people where they live, thank you for listening to us and please turn this down.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. 91? 92, 92 right here? Okay 92.

MR. FERREIRA: Sir, James Ferreira F-e-r-r-e-i-r-a. I live in Merrimack and the first thing I want to address is Horse Hill Nature Preserve which was a 563 acre property with approximately 60 acres of wetland. It was one of the biggest projects that Merrimack undertook in 2002 to secure this land.

On this property the endangered species include but are not limited to, the northern muppet frog, the brandings turtle, the spotted turtle, the wood turtle, the eastern box turtle, the northern black racer which is rare and protected, the great, great blue heron, rare, uncommon, the coopers hawk, the red shoulder hawk, which also is rare uncommon and has special concerns throughout this country, the bald eagle, which represents American right?

These are just a few, so I own 7 acres of land 5 of which is affected right dead smack with this pipeline. I have built in Merrimack 3 years ago, my house isn't even on the property maps that Kinder Morgan is proposing. How is my house 3 years old and not on their proposed route? It makes no sense. We need updated maps. They need to inform us, no one from Kinder Morgan has even contacted me to date.

So let's talk about Kinder Morgan, specifically about the history of accidents and I will give you a document where all this research was done. In Texas along they have had 36 significant incidences resulting in fatalities, hospitalizations, fires, explosions, spills.

In the U.S. since 2003 Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries have been responsible for at least 180 spills, evacuations, explosions, fires, and fatalities in 24 states, some notable, not even included in this are in Canada.

On November 9th, 2004 just outside of Walnut Creek, California a back hoe struck a pipeline, OSHA in California cited and fined Kinder Morgan \$500,000 for its role that could have been completely preventable but they marked their pipeline incorrectly, that's one of many examples.

Kinder Morgan energy partners Petroleum Products Pipeline also in 2005 found to be leaking gasoline in Summit Creek near California. Approximately 300 gallons were spilled before anything was ever noted or corrected. In May of 2005 Natural Gas Pipeline of America, 30 inch diameter pipeline exploded near Marshall, Texas sending a giant fireball into the sky, hurling 160 foot pipe up into the air, into the grounds of an electrical power plant, 2 people were hurt, 40 evacuated, the cause was stress corrosion and cracking.

If there's one in between me I can stop and start ---

MR. TOMASI: There'll be some time for people to come up and speak again so if you want the next person to go then we will go ahead and come back to other people.

MR. FERREIRA: It's up to these guys, I want to be respectful.

MR. TOMASI: Well why don't you just stop here, we are going to come back to everyone and let everyone come up and speak again if they want, I want to get to the last person. Number 94? 93, okay.

MR. MOLONEY: My name is Dave Moloney I am the Chairperson for the Energy Pipeline Awareness Network. Moloney M-o-l-o-n-e-y. I wasn't planning on speaking tonight so I have handwritten notes, I'll have to give them to you later.

What I would like to know is or what study will the FERC draw on to ensure that Kinder Morgan produces honest customers with honest contracts that do not deliberately undercut market prices so they can reap future benefits in markets outside of New England to include potentially future export markets?

Why this is important is because the FERC is supposed to ensure that rate payers are not left with stranded costs on a pipeline that it approves or buried costs that find their way into the pockets of pipeline companies at the expense of the community they are supposed to serve. What study will the FERC use or conduct to ensure that the combination of stranded costs and undercut prices do not leave rate payers on the hook for private profits of multi-million dollar companies and the benefits of those who have not been asked to bear the cost.

Here's the problem. We have Mid-Atlantic Gas capacity freeing up, creating the potential for 700 million cubic feet per day. We have with the addition of a gas compressor on the Constitution Pipeline, possibly twice that capacity, we have the Algonquin Incremental Market Project with 450 million cubic feet per day, the Atlantic Bridge Project which is now aggregated to the Access Northeast Project with upwards of 1.2 billion cubic feet per day.

We have CT expansion project which could provide laterals to western Massachusetts. We have the SoNo we have the Concord lateral which could be expanded to provide service for New Hampshire. We have the SoNo Project on the Iroquois which is not at capacity by the way which could bring gas up through Canada and onto the PNGTS Pipeline for service in all parts of mid and northern New England.

All of these by the way on existing row without destroying any significant Greenfield project environmental hazard. One competing project actually claims to provide fuel reliability and price stability in the electric market and that would be the Access Northeast Project which is built for that.

The Kinder Morgan Project designed and contracted for heat load can be 30 inches or it can be 30 feet in diameter and when winter peak occurs, and electric generators on interruptible contracts have nothing to draw upon because the contracted volume has been reserved for heat load, no gas will be available to ensure gas reliability or price stability for generators. Generators will continue to resort to spot market supply and speculators looking to capitalize on the spread between current prices of gas and the panic price of gas as peak demand markets are further squeezed will have nothing.

I request that the federal government sue Kinder Morgan for damages to rate payers for false advertising when their pipeline, if built, does not demonstrate the false claim of a fuel reliability or price stability solution for the electrical market. It will not, it does not. Until they produce a long-term power generator contract on this project they won't and they can't help the electric market.

Why does the FERC not hold itself accountable to permit projects that look at all of the energy needs of a region and all of the delivery vehicles available to deliver that energy from energy efficiency demand response cost competitive renewables, LNG which is completely under-utilized and other pipeline project proposals that can cover the same thing, NED will become an export project.

It will have the luxury of being an export project by the time all of those projects are fulfilled and seen to fruition. We ask that you do not segment the capacity and energy needs of New England. Segmentation is something that the FERC is supposed to control, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, back to number 94.

MR. FERREIRA: So James Ferreira again, F-e-r-r-e-i-r-a. Continuing Kinder Morgan's stellar track record on explosions and leaks -- in 2006, November 11th, a sub-contractor on Kinder Morgan's Rockies Express, the RE's Pipeline outside of Cheyenne, Wyoming struck an existing gas pipeline causing a rupture explosion. Two months after this explosion FERC, you guys, threatened to shut down the project if REX didn't improve its poor compliance record. Why was the project not shut down? Why are you still letting them operate? All questions everybody in this room would like to know.

On November 27th, 2006 Kinder Morgan Plantation Pipeline in Charlotte, North Carolina released about 4,000 gallons of gasoline from a Plantation Pipeline company because of a blocked delivery valve. A town had to be evacuated, a town.

In 2007, on July 24th the Trans Mountain Pipeline operated by Kinder Morgan Canada released over 250,000 liters of crude oil, 70,000 of which flowed into a Burrard inlet requiring a 15 million dollar clean-up. Again, where are people regulating this? Where does it stop?

In 2008, September 23rd, a Kinder Morgan Pipeline exploded and burned more than 10 hours in Pasadena, Texas, one person died, another injured. The cause of this significant event was corrosion to their pipelines and this is just one of 18 significant accidents that this class from 2004 to 2013 -- how many people have to die before the pipelines go away?

In 2011 in New Jersey Kinder Morgan had a leak and a fire during maintenance work on March 14th, on April 4th also in New Jersey, violations, civil penalties proposed compliance order from the State of New Jersey after inspection, Kinder Morgan had to pay a penalty of only \$63,000. They are making billions off of this pipeline and we are fining them \$63,000 where's the justice in that?

The union workers that spoke earlier, not everybody is bad, but 1 in 4 pipeline have an issue, 1 in 4 people in this room could be affected.

On November 16, 2011 in Ohio, a well field on a Kinder Morgan Tennessee Pipeline, a 36 inch diameter one specifically, leaving a blast crater 30 feet across and 15 feet deep. Three homes were destroyed by the fire, the leak was caused by displacement produced by a landslide. This was later determined because Kinder Morgan didn't understand the topography of that area.

In 2012 in California, an El Paso natural gas pipeline relief valve and pipe support failed, causing an explosion and damaging the Mohave facility causing complete obstruction of a cherry orchard.

And I'll leave you with this. In 2013 on May 8th Kinder Morgan in Crockett, Texas had a fire that caused over 7 million dollars in property damage. In 2009 alone the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration sited Kinder Morgan for violating safety standards regarding the distance between natural gas pipeline and a high consequence area such as a school, a hospital -- the pipeline is too close for safety, operation if a leak occurred.

That committee sited them failing to maintain, update maps, showing pipeline locations, failing to test pipeline safety devices, failing to maintain proper fire-fighting equipment, failing to inspect its pipelines as it is required and is subject to, failing to adequately monitor its pipes for corrosion levels.

Close examination of this committee's findings found that Kinder Morgan's onshore gas transmission pipeline show fall and infrastructure 45% of the on-shore graphs commissioned pipeline significant leaks. Failures of the pipeline, a cracked well account for another 28.3% of pipe leaks, internal corrosion made up almost 17%.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We do actually have one person listed, whether they are -- I'm not sure if they are hear or not, number 95, Evelyn Taylor, oh there you go, thank you.

MS. TAYLOR: Hi, my name is Evelyn Taylor and it's T-a-y-l-o-r. Hi, I'm very tired but I will try to control myself but it is going to be tough. So one of the things important to protecting the environment is to protect the pipeline and very sadly and very upsetting this evening was we were reminded that people do drive planes into things like buildings, oceans, mountains, maybe pipelines, maybe compressor stations. So I want to know -- I want you to find out and prove to us that Kinder Morgan who can't even get a map

straight, has the ability and access to intelligence to begin to monitor and do it properly for terrorist activity, that's one thing on my mind.

By the way I live in New Ipswich and I'm in the half mile circle and as a kid I was exposed to DDT and I had half of my thyroid removed and the surgeons at MASS General said, "oh yeah in your age group there's a big spike from above-ground nuclear bomb testing."

Now I don't think the United States is at war with itself, but compressor stations and pipelines bring biological hazards and explosions similar to small atomic bombs with radiation.

Another question I have. I think I read there are millions of miles of pipelines so I have to question with millions of miles of pipelines, why is this burden placed upon us? Since I found out about this the night we had the meeting at Macedic High School with Kinder Morgan, I have lost a lot of sleep, I got a lot of stress, I have spent hundreds of hours of all my spare time researching this.

I have written hundreds of little cards and letters to FERC, to the FERC and others so the only reason I could think of why we are here is because FERC always says yes and my question to you is what is so hard about saying no, it's only two letters. That's all.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Has anyone not spoken that wishes to speak? Sir, come on up.

MR. MOONEY: My name is Dan Mooney. I'm a resident of Dracut, Massachusetts, the pipeline runs behind our home, the Linnfield lateral actually. You know really we have 4 or 5 pipelines and I think that the area could be designated there are houses in that area there are over 30 or 40 that are within the potential impact radius so I think that area is a high consequence area. How do we get that designated as high consequence area?

What is involved in that? Is that something that -- I think I would like to have FERC look into that and determine if that's true. We will give you -- when you get to Dracut we will give you the maps and the coordinates and that sort of thing.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir, I believe someone else just came in who hasn't spoken before and wanted to speak, 67, have you spoken yet sir? Okay do you mind this person had a number and had to go out.

MR. HOLMAN: Hi, how are you guys doing? My name is Chris Holman, I'm a Selectman in Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire. More people may know me as CJ the DJ. I signed in and I went to a concert and I came back. Thank you for still being here. It's nice that you guys have the money to be able to afford to stay out this late.

Unfortunately our towns don't. I'm from a town where I was elected about a year and a half ago and in that time I have learned a lot of things that I never expected. I see lawsuits come through, just last year we had the state say that we couldn't regulate quarrying in our town. So people could be blasting and taking out rock at any time.

Well you can imagine to our chagrin months later when we hear that there might be a gas pipeline coming through. Blasting, gas pipeline and both kind of outside of our reach of what we may or may not do anything with. Two weeks after we found out the pipeline was coming through just on a small town perspective, our first town administrator gave her notice. She passed away a few months later, so small town realizes the person who is our communication hub in our town, so we have lost this during the process of working with you guys.

Yeah, sorry I have a loud voice I'm a DJ. My family has been on the same street for a couple hundred years. This street is the road you guys are going to come down. We have a pond on one side of our property and a pond on the other, we are the headwaters in four different directions. All of our dams break towards other towns so the dirty water won't come our way but I still care for our neighbors. I mean the town of Troy just turned 200 this past weekend and I would like to see them make it to 205.

I think that it's a hard situation when you hear that oh yeah there's a need for this for electricity, for bills, while the reality is in New Hampshire we produce 50% more electricity than what we actually need. It is MASS and Connecticut that need it and if we need to do state politics I think we need to think about it.

Maybe the pipeline needs to back to Gasachusetts I mean I hate to say it I don't want to put anything bad on my neighbors than on myself but if they are going to be the gasholes, so in the meantime environment history.

We don't have the money, we have like a Libertarian government where a lot of it is not put into knowing what our resources our and I would love to see a lot of research done before we do this. My sister works for a Fish and Game with endangered species. We don't know what is on the 43 properties in Fitzwilliam that they are going to go through but I do know that this town property they are going through has a big aquifer. We don't even know how big that is.

I see the light is blinking and I haven't been here for anybody else talking so I guess I'm up.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up but you can go for a little bit longer.

MR. HOLMAN: I appreciate that. One of the things we started this year is a prime wetland survey and that is going to help us be able to look at our resources with a little bit more depth. But just in terms of with the wetlands that's a couple year process and that's an expensive one.

You have CEO Mr. Kinder who puts more money into Kinder Morgan than what we do in our 10 years in our town. It would be nice if we had some of this money coming back and looking at okay if there is going to be 43 properties logged, what's going to happen with all the stuff between this, you know if there is ash wars which may come into our area and we can't sell our wood what do we do.

I mean there's all these possibilities of evasive species and other things that may happen. I don't see where this is good for my town. I mean they talked about \$900,000 worth of possible taxes. Well the properties that I know they are affecting add up to \$150,000. That's 150,000 that these families have been paying for generations right next to my own family and I think I owe those people the respect to fight for their properties even if this doesn't go through my home, that's why I am here.

Thank you very much for your time, I hope you guys will look at this and realize that this is not a good thing for New Hampshire. It's not really a good thing for New England and for anybody who cares about the environment but you know if you are going to do it I hope you do it right and you let us know what we are going to lose in the process.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Sir?

MR. FLETCHER: Yes, I'm Garth Fletcher, F-l-e-t-c-h-e-r from Mason, New Hampshire. Just I'm sorry -- just a procedural sort of issue. I understand FERC's sort of disinclination to be judgmental in any way but I have noticed that for instance in the original Kinder Morgan contacts, they said this is a federal project and a number of letters were written to FERC pointing out, no this is not a federal project, this was a private for profit company project.

You know later on there were just a series of misstatements. The whole co-location routine where Kinder Morgan very skillfully sort of implanted the idea that oh there's no more property going to be taken, this is co-locating into the existing right-of-way to the point where our Governor and our federal representatives were actually suckered into believing that and it took a fair amount of effort, in fact not just the union leader of our state newspaper had an article written that swallowed that line.

A whole number of letters were written into FERC saying your applicant is misstating the facts. Kinder Morgan went around the towns in our area showing the picture of a compressor site in Pelham. Nice little rural backed by pine trees, a little tiny building and said well this isn't exactly what we are talking about but this gives you some idea of what a compressors station might involve.

And in fact it was later tracked down that this was a utility building off to the side of the Pelham compressor and the Pelham compressor was an order of magnitude smaller than what was being proposed. And I submitted an article to FERC with pictures detailing this. The list goes on and on.

The report in March was supposed to be followed by a report in June and I think you guys scheduled your scoping based on that time. Things slipped a little bit and in fact Kinder Morgan came in 5 weeks late. This has been pointed out ad infinitum to you.

The common thread is that your applicant is free to lie, to distort, to misstate, to manipulate and despite being reported to FERC, FERC never seems to take any action. Why not? Why would FERC not just say, "Look this application is incomplete and unacceptable, go back and redo it?" Why would FERC not say, "Look this July report is 5 weeks out of schedule so we are just going to have to extend scoping for 5 weeks." But it seems that your applicant can do anything that they want to and it doesn't cost them anything, it just costs all the rest of us.

So that's my procedural issue, I think FERC for whatever it's uncomfortable with, being decision-able if you will, does certainly have the power to maintain standards and if FERC is not going to maintain standards, no one is going to maintain standards and it is absolutely corrosive and it would take -- and I suggested this way back when at the co-location time, saying look if you just said the FERC that it is unacceptable -- I mean to Kinder Morgan, this is unacceptable, you better redo it you are going to send out notifications to everybody that's an impacted property.

No, no, this is not a federal project, this is a commercial project. That would give a little bit of pause to the legal eagle's inside Kinder Morgan about how fast the ones they pull can be. So that I think is part of your job. You are supposed to establish standards for making sure that true information, accurate information is presented to you, is presented to the public and you have been falling down terribly on that.

It was very, very disappointing so please consider doing your job.

MR. TOMASI: Well hold on first. The pre-filing process I want to point this out. I pointed it out to all of your communities where I had meetings the last couple of days. The pre-filing process, when the company enters it that is purely voluntary, they are in a voluntary process and they can remove themselves from the pre-filing process at any time they wish and simply come in as a full application.

So that's one of the things -- the point of the pre-filing process as I mentioned earlier is to get out early and sort of get the information out there. So that's part of it and frankly I would have rather when Kinder Morgan said they originally went for June, you know we want the most complete research reports that we could possibly have and so we noticed that as of the surveys and many of you might be following along in the record and seeing in fact that the notes that we put in the file documenting sort of where they are in survey status, that sort of stuff so we want this complete.

And again I talked about this in the meeting earlier and I want to reiterate this is that the research reports are not complete at this point, we understand that and we understand the concern about that in the public. However, you can file your comments, we still have a year and a half of this process to go through so it's not like this is going to happen overnight.

So once the application is in we still accept comments on the research reports and in fact the entire project. So don't feel that you have to get your comments in right now. We accept comments throughout the entire process. Obviously you want the entire research report so you can comment on it I understand that but I want to point out the fact that you can comment on a project after the research reports, will we of course ask from Kinder Morgan dozens if not hundreds of more questions to flush out the report.

We will be doing their own studies and the fact of the matter is we do take a lot of these concerns of the public very seriously. I have talked to several people in this community and other communities as well about the things Kinder Morgan has done and some of the issues that came up today I will be taking back with me and I will be talking to Kinder Morgan about some of these issues that both have been brought up in this meeting tonight as well as told to me privately.

And we took all the concerns very seriously but some of the concerns regarding access and those sort of things we want to talk to the company and make sure that they are doing the right thing and basically essentially take them to task for some of these concerns that you have and people have said where they don't have access and that sort of stuff so however, having said all of that, you know pre-filing is a purely voluntary process and they could simply remove themselves from it and the problem with that is when they just come with the application, that is a fully formed application and we want to be able to change the route which use alternatives are really in the process so that we can get that line moved early to the point where

the community and the local town that's going through it are happier with it.

Later in the process it is much more difficult to move.

INAUDIBLE QUESTION FROM AUDIENCE:

MR. TOMASI: The question was you know there's been a lot of questions about maps and maps being out of date, stuff like that. One of the things that you would have noticed in the last recess report questions is we went through all the maps and said these maps are out of date, these maps have errors. We will get and go through with a fine-tooth comb all of these things that have been filed.

Again, even for us with a team with 20 or so people that we have working on this project, we have -- there -- it takes a long time to get through this and we will send the data request to the company, identifying all of these concerns because frankly maps need to be much more updated than that, we understand that.

I'm very concerned about that issue and we need to make sure that we have the correct right-of-way. We don't just vet it just using their maps, you know I know where the map is in google maps and I can actually, looking at the most imagery -- using the imagery data from google sort of see it, outside of the stuff that they provide me. So there is other stuff that we do internally to look at these issues to try to find out what is accurate and what is not accurate so.

But again, how do you point those issues out to us? We try to get every single thing we can when it goes to these documents but again no one is perfect. My team is not perfect as much as we try to be but pointing those things out, that's really good for us to know. Having said that are there any other people who have comments that want to get on the record, even if you have spoken before?

The gentleman here who raised his hand a couple of times.

MR. TENHAVE: My name is Tim Tenhave T-e-n-h-a-v-e. I have actually kind of a question, procedural in some ways. We have rare and endangered species plus we have our historical treasures that are directly in the line that is the primary route. How can we provide that information so that you can make proper decisions but not allow poachers and other issues?

MR. TOMASI: This is a really good point and I know a lot of the -- you can file when you look in the E-library system where you file your comments, you can click those little boxes that say privileged.

MR. TENHAVE: Yeah.

MR. TOMASI: Make sure that box is highlighted, then it will be filed as privileged and therefore only FERC staff, and you know staff can see that. We may also share stuff especially about endangered species or archeological issues, we may share that with the State Historical Preservation Organization, the SHPO or the state you know conservation agency, be it Fish and Game, be it Fish and Wildlife those sort of things.

So you can file and anyone can file things that are privileged, even though -- it doesn't have to be a town, it can be an individual or a donor. If you want to file something private you can file it as privileged in our E-library or E-comment system however, one thing I want to point out about filing stuff that's privileged is that anything that is privileged we cannot disclose that in our EIS, because it is in fact privileged.

So for us to use it in a document you know we need it to be public however the details can be privileged so what I would recommend is if you are concerned about that you could file a public version and a privileged version. One without location, one with, that would be my recommendation.

MR. TENHAVE: All right so if Kinder Morgan Tennessee is doing their own studies and uncover these kinds of things couldn't we prevent them from disclosing items that we aren't disclosing ourselves?

MR. TOMASI: The location of information regarding endangered species, regarding you know specific archeological sites are viewed, we require those to be filed as privileged so those are usually filed as privileged. If we do find something like that is not privileged we are going to talk to the company about getting that re-filed as privileged.

Any other comments? Ma'am. Okay.

MS. SZMAUZ: We in New Ipswich had an open house after --

MR. TOMASI: Do you want to mention your name again?

MS. SZMAUZ: I'm sorry, Maria Szmauz S-z-m-a-u-z. We went to an open house for a question and answer period with Kinder Morgan March 25th. It was a couple of days after it became clear that New Ipswich was most likely going to be the location of what we thought then was the hugest compressor station around and Allen Fore was directly asked, this is an information meeting with -- and I think you will find if you talk to people across the state, answers were not given at information meetings.

People went away with more questions than they started with. We asked specifically to that team if New Ipswich is going to get this 80 to 90,000 horsepower compressor station, we have done our research we have seen the research on the emissions and pollution, how is this air quality going to be tested and when? How often and how?

They had no answer for us, not an answer. Looked at the rest of the panel, nobody could give us one answer. I'm sorry they should not be in business. That's what they can give you at an open house, is that their business building compressor stations and pipelines? They should know this information, that's unacceptable, that's what we told them but they never came back to us with any more information.

So that put me on my crusade to find out more so I started making phone calls and I wanted information on comparable compressor stations of that size and quality. I kept the phone log and called and called and called. That was March -- finally April 18th, I made some contact throughout it, some people misinterpreted my questions and finally late in April I found out they had none, they had none on the line that day and had never built any, but that is where that ended.

Finally in June I got a phone call at work from someone named Bill Thomas from Kinder Morgan and I did talk to him for almost an hour about compressor stations, got a lot more information, some of it very disturbing. I was told that the only emissions tested at compressor stations are the emissions from the gas that is used to burn or to fuel the plant.

The natural gas that they are using to fuel the plant. Bill Thomas told me blow downs are never tested, that's inconscionable to me. I don't understand how that could possibly be. He also then, this is mid-June, promised me a lot of materials, air quality standards, federal and state, information on the storage tanks that have peak valves, because in my research I have seen that those are things that leak quite often and cause pollution.

How often they will fill, how often they will be taken away, et cetera. I was supposed to get more information on that, never got it. Kept calling, called 3 times recently. Finally got them the other day and he said, "Yeah I got your messages, that was it." I'm like well it would have been nice to get called back and when I asked him about the promised materials he said, "Well we decided not to send that because we are working on the question and answer page and it won't be out this week, we thought it might be though, probably be out next week."

And I pinned him down and said so you are telling me that the Air Quality Standards will be on this page and he said yes. So I can't wait to see, and I also happen to be the person who talked to Sara McKinley and was told, "Never heard of blow downs what are they." And that's the FERC so that makes me really nervous.

MR. TOMASI: Well first of all Sara McKinley is in our Office of External Affairs, she's not a technical person. Her job is to respond to comments on a non-technical basis. But the thing is -- no I understand that -- I understand your concerns but if you get answers like that in the future that you are not happy with tell her directly that you wish to speak directly with me.

I am the senior air quality person, I will be able to answer questions as much as I can. At this point again we still have a lot of questions out there but on any issue, feel free if she is not giving the appropriate answers talk to me.

MS. SZMAUZ: Well she fooled me because she really did know the process well.

MR. TOMASI: Yes.

MS. SZMAUZ: So I bought into it. Kinder Morgan also has now promoted themselves on the NED website about the pipeline in which they say that they are going to be delivering gas to New Ipswich and other small towns and then there is a tiny little asterisk way down at the bottom that says something else about you know in the future, in ten years maybe when the pipeline is heavily depreciated. That's not transparency and I don't think you guys should let it happen.

You know all of those people that work at jobs, we don't do the right thing we get fired. I think it's time to get them out.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MS. SZMAUZ: And I have one question for you.

MR. TOMASI: Okay.

MS. SZMAUZ: How many pipelines that have gone into filing have been denied?

MR. TOMASI: The question was for those -- how many pipelines have been rejected by the Commission.

MS. SZMAUZ: After filing.

MR. TOMASI: After filing. I think there's been an LNG facility that has been rejected. To my knowledge there was another facility some time ago that was rejected because it didn't have customers, that was a pipeline. So to the best of my knowledge one.

MS. SZMAUZ: That's very, very frightening to us.

MR. TOMASI: I understand.

MS. SZMAUZ: The other thing I know that you are the environmental person and we think FERC is broken and we feel like here we are, Kinder Morgan has billions of dollars, the minute they propose this project they are hitting every Chamber of Commerce in the area, giving money. There should be a rule that they are not allowed to give any money to anything that they didn't already give before the proposed pipeline in that area, it's just not fair.

We don't have those resources. We are working stiffs that work from 9 to 5, put our kids to bed and get online to find out more research about this. Everything we do is our nighttime job. We don't have a million dollars to hire a Tiffany Eddy to give a good repoire for us in New Hampshire and it is not fair. You are putting the burden on us and that's not how this should be, we are on the defensive.

MR. TOMASI: I understand. It's getting pretty late so we are going to take just one more.

MR. LEWICKE: John Lewicke, that's L-e-w-i-c-k-e. It will just take a few seconds. There agent at the state house in front of witnesses told me that he would arrange to meet me to talk about my property on the street in front of my house. I have not heard word one. This is their pattern. They do not respond. Their lies and no response is Kinder Morgan's pattern, not the opposite, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: The gentleman over here I don't think you had a chance to speak yet have you, do you want to come to the mic?

MR. BRODEN: I can speak from here.

MR. TOMASI: Very, very loud because he has to record it.

MR. BRODEN: Bob Broden, B-r-o-d-e-n. I sort of feel like the plaque here, we live in Dracut, New Ipswich now and Mason. You mentioned that one pipeline was denied, but how many were approved so that I can get a ratio?

MR. TOMASI: I don't actually know that.

MR. BRODEN: 100? 1,000?

MR. TOMASI: I mean there have been many, many projects that have come in front of FERC but some of them very small, some of them very big, so anything from things that are almost an automatic authoriza-

tion like something called a prior notice to large projects like this. But I would say the thing that does happen is many projects that come in don't ever get built. That may be a small consolation but there are projects that do get made, start through a process and then they will pull the project or the market doesn't develop or you know the environmental review becomes too difficult and they will pull out of the process or even after it gets approved -- even if it were approved by FERC there are projects that have never been built because of various other factors.

Having said that I know that's not your main question, but I don't know how many have been approved, however again I have already told you the answer to how many have been denied.

MR. BRODEN: But a lot of them aren't being built and they are backing out themselves?

MR. TOMASI: Excuse me?

MR. BRODEN: A lot of pipelines are not being built because the developer was backing out themselves?

MR. TOMASI: We have had numerous projects, in fact I had a couple of projects myself where they came in, they started going through pre-filing and they withdrew.

MR. BRODEN: So evidently they felt it wasn't economically feasible but you guys --

MR. TOMASI: Well again every project is different. Every company will remove themselves -- if they do remove themselves from our process for whatever reason they chose to remove it from. I know a couple of them that I worked on that was not actually for economic reasons it was other issues regarding environmental.

MR. BRODEN: Okay just like a lot of oversight in this one because they are losing customers and it doesn't look like it's feasible for them, might have them take that into consideration.

MR. TOMASI: Give it a day like I said, like I mentioned earlier. It is the responsibility of the Commission. The Commission votes on whether it has -- whether to approve the project or not. We will do our best to write the environmental document in such a way that outlines all the various system alternatives, no-action alternatives, all the alternatives that people have identified here tonight as well as looking at all of the socio-economic impacts that could have like housing values, like traffic, just all the other socio-economic factors that people are concerned about and talked about in this project.

We have time for one more question. Any other people, come on up. Okay well we will do two, because we have exactly four minutes.

MS. LIPOMI: I'm Lisa Lipomi and I'm from Dracut and I will be talking at the Dracut meeting. L-i-p-o-m-i. I usually have a problem with the mic. I am a chemical engineer and I work for the Department of Defense. I have monitored pipe gas lines remotely. I have monitored plant facilities with hazardous chemicals et cetera, remotely too so I kind of know a little bit about business. Not much about pipelines until now.

I will talk about the environmental things and Dracut but I just want to make people aware that I thank everybody for coming and spending their time and money to come here and everybody has been spending a lot of time trying to educate themselves real fast but I don't know if everybody realizes this I started crying when I saw the maps that came out.

In our area there were 322 little blobs in this circle that could potentially go up in a matter of seconds. It included our fire department, on the rim is our water tower, our police department, two churches, restaurants, farms, conservation land, open space, cell tower, area structures gone, our sewer pump station is gone. Who comes up with things that look like this and this is where we must put the pipeline?

I just really have a hard time with this and I am not even getting into any of the environmental things because I will do that at another time, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, sir?

MR. PLAZA: My name is Nathaniel Plaza, P-l-a-z-a. I own property out in Lanesborough, Massachusetts and I have been in this process since last year in December. I know New Hampshire has been way behind

the curve on this thing. Even our Selectmen, they had a letter -- we went to them in March and they said oh we had a letter a year ago, I said then why didn't you tell us about it.

Well they said it was a state responsibility at the time but they didn't know I had called the state the day before and they said no it's a town responsibility. I think it is a responsibility of all of our citizens that no matter where you are in the state go a little further.

I have house lots for sale on this piece of property and I confronted Mr. Fiore about this and I said what am I supposed to do with these house lots? My realtor said I won't be able to sell them now. Well he says someday somebody will come along and buy them. And I said to him I said well I have to pay taxes on these pieces of property and I have got to sit on them while you make millions of dollars through this pipeline.

Why can't we get a share of the gas that goes through that pipeline? I mean they put up these cell towers, they pay these towns or anybody who owns the land, they pay them so much a month. Why should the gas company be making all this profit on my property which I have paid taxes on for many years? It's been in my family for probably 90 years. I mean we should have some value put on this for us and they you know, they continue to give us this run around oh we are going to take care of this, we are going to talk to you about your special circumstances.

I don't believe them. I have read some articles on Kinder Morgan. They are putting a pipeline from British Columbia to the coast and they are having civil disobedience up there because Kinder Morgan is not advising the people of what is going on.

As a matter of fact one of the people against the pipeline he chained himself to an SUV of the surveyor's vehicle so they couldn't move it. Now we are going to be faced with the same thing with Kinder Morgan. They are going to continue to befuddle all of us and what this thing is all about, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Again I want to thank everyone for coming out and staying so late. For those of you who are going to be in Milford I will see you tomorrow evening and thank you again and have a safe ride home.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 12:07 a.m..)

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF: : Project No.
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT : PF14-22-000

Milford Town Hall
One Union Square
Milford, NH 03055

Thursday, July 30, 2015

The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping Meeting, pursuant to notice, at 6:30 p.m., Eric Tomasi, the moderator.

PROCEEDINGS

(6:30 p.m.)

MR. TOMASI: Okay we are going to go ahead and start the meeting. If everybody wants to go ahead -- I would say take your seats but I know everyone who can take their seats have. There is additional room in the other room right behind me in the overflow room. If you want to go over there it is not quite as crowded as it is here.

There is both video and audio feeds in the other room, I also want to point out that if you have a ticket to speak and you are in the other room we will make sure that you have the ability to come over here and speak. I won't skip you so don't worry about that okay.

Okay so first of all I want to thank everyone tonight on behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. I want to thank you for coming out and I want to thank you personally for coming to this meeting tonight and I know we are overcrowded, I know that but we are going to do the best we can.

Now this meeting is for the Northeast Energy Direct Project and it is proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline. The Docket Number is PF14-22. My name is Eric Tomasi and I am the Environmental Project Manager working directly for the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC, and we are the lead federal agency that is going to review the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

I work in the Office of Energy Projects within FERC and I am also the technical lead for air quality, noise and pipeline safety as well as climate change for the Office of Energy Projects. I actually have several people here working with me that are integral to the set-up tonight as well as working with me on developing the Environmental Impact Statement.

That's a contractor, their name is Cardno and the people that are working for me are Wayne Kicklighter at the front table here, Lavinia DeSanto, Jonathan Hess, Bruce Hart, Steven Brand and Peter Marsi so I want to thank them again. And a couple of real quick points here. The bathrooms are down the hallway behind me to the right and we will take at least one break tonight.

Another thing I want to ask everybody is you are welcome to stay as late as you want and listen to all the speakers. However, after you are done speaking if you want to go ahead and leave I think we are over-capacity and so there are people waiting outside to get in, so if you are done -- I'm not telling you when to leave, if you finish your goal here, if you are done speaking and if you want to leave that would allow the fire department to allow more people in, okay.

Now another thing, you might notice a gentleman to my right. This is a court reporter and he is transcribing tonight's events. I believe there is also going to be a video feed from the town of Milford and that will also be on the website for their website I believe.

And the reason we have a court reporter is so that we can have an accurate record of what is said tonight. Eventually an electronic copy of the transcript will be placed into our FERC's E-library system at FERC.gov and that will contain the entire public record of this meeting as well as the public record for the entire

project.

Now, slide -- I want to talk to you a little bit about the purpose of tonight's meeting. Now there are a few things that I want to accomplish. One is I want to summarize the project for you. Most of you will understand what the project is and how it is going to affect you and your community, but I am going to a really quick summarization of it.

Two, I am going to go ahead and explain the role of FERC in the entire review process so you will understand it.

Third, I am going to outline how you can actually participate in the process because you can obviously speak tonight and give me your comments tonight but there are many other different ways for which you can actually give comments to FERC on this project.

And of course the last reason I am here tonight is to actually allow you an opportunity to actually give me your comments in person. If we have time I may take comments at the end. I suspect that we are going to have a lot of speakers and we are going to go pretty late, so if you want to stay late and listen to it I will have some time to answer some questions if we don't go back 1 or 2 a.m.

There was also on the table which you saw when you came in, that's manned by Cardno and on that table is a speaker list. So if you wanted to sign up, sign up at the table and you will be given a card which indicates the number of the speaker under which you will speak. Now, as a rule I let public officials speak first. We do have a lot of public officials who signed up to speak tonight so just to let you know I will let them speak first and then we will let the citizens speak.

And to let you know why the reason we let public officials and elected officials speak first is they represent more than just themselves. They represent the community so again you know it will take a little time to get through the -- you know, elected officials, but we will get through them eventually and most of you will have the opportunity to speak.

Now if we go way, way late in Milford we might have to actually shut the meeting down so again we are going to go as late as we can to make sure everyone gets the opportunity to speak tonight. Now another thing, a couple of other purposes that we have -- that's my overall things that I want to accomplish but there are a few other things, for instance, I always say we need comments and I mentioned this last night in Nashua and mentioned again over and over again.

We want to actually hear from you about issues in your community that you are concerned about. We will have a slide a little later that talks about all of the concerns that we have seen so -- well I'm not going to show you all of them, the top 5 or 6 concerns that we have gotten from the public about this project. I am going to talk briefly about all those points.

But I want to hear about what your concerns are in the community. It's not just big picture issues, I want to hear about the small issues. Perhaps the pipeline is crossing your land and there is a tree that your grandfather planted or grandmother planted, I want to understand -- if you are concerned about saving that tree, you need to let me know so that we can avoid that -- so we can make sure the company would avoid that, and issues like that.

No it's more than just that, we look at other things and we will talk a little bit about how we do our analysis a little later. But again those little things can be very, very important so again we want to hear from you about all of your concerns. We take them all seriously and we will address every single one of your concerns.

Next, again and that goes along with identifying new environmental issues. If there is something that has not been identified for the record we want to hear about it. Now even if somebody has commented a thousand times on that, the same exact comment, same exact issue I should say, we want to hear from you because you might have a different take on it, you might have a more site specific information about why that specific resource was important and what we can do to avoid it.

Last, one of the reasons of course is I am going to explain the FERC process and how you can become

involved and how we go from the very beginning of our process to the time when the Commission would vote on the project and obviously as I said provide opportunities for public input tonight.

Now the one thing I do want to point out is that you know my job is to actually develop the Environmental Impact Statement. I do not make a decision on whether the project goes forward or not. We actually have 5 Commissioners at FERC and their job is to vote on the project. They are the ones who make the final decision whether this project goes forward or not.

My job is to write the EIS which is a recommendation to the Commissioners on the environmental impacts of the project and how to minimize them if they decide to move forward on the project. We will talk a little bit about how they make the decision a little later.

Next slide. Now obviously I talked about public input and there's other ways for which you can actually provide input other than just tonight. Now there are multiple ways to do this. One is you can actually just write me a letter. We got multiple comments from you now that come to me. If they come directly to me I make sure that they get put into the docket.

We have a lot of comments on this project. We have over 3 or 3400 projects -- comments, that are actually in the record about this project. Now there's also a comment form on the table which when you came in -- you can go ahead and fill that out and give that to me to night or mail it in later, whatever your choice is. And of course there's other -- you can actually upload your written comment through our E-library system.

The way to do that is to go to FERC.gov and you click on E-comment in the E-library system and you can simply upload your letter immediately and that will go directly into the docket. One of the big important things for you to know is that any time you file something you have to have the docket number which in this case is PF14-22. That has to be on all communication or else we are not necessarily -- the docket room is going to not be sure where to put that properly, so we need to make sure that gets in the docket.

And lastly also on our E-library system there is something called quick comment. That is a very quick thing where you can just write a really quick, essentially text message and that goes directly into the docket.

Now one thing I want to point out is that we have a pretty large mailing list for this project. Mailing list will contain everyone who has property affected by the project, anyone who abuts the pipeline, the property owner from the ones affected, anyone within a half of a mile of the compressor station as well as local, state and federal elected officials, NGO's, media, many, many issues, many, many other communication that we have to make sure that we send that out.

Another thing is if you file a comment on the record you will actually be -- if you include your address we will add you to the mailing list, okay. So that's important to know. Also if you request to be on the mailing list we will make sure that we put you on the mailing list and there is a sign-up sheet in the back if you are not on our mailing list already you can get on our mailing list.

And the mailing list, what that does for you is any time we issue something, be it the Environmental Impact Statement, be it any notice, we will actually send that out to everyone affected on our mailing list and we will make sure that you get that.

Now there is another way to comment too. Now this is sort of the initial set of meetings that we are having. Once we get all the information from the company, after their application comes in and after we issue our Draft Environmental Impact Statement, we will be back along the entire pipeline route, including these communities in New Hampshire that's affected for another set of meetings.

And in those meetings we are going to ask for your input on our Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Basically whether you think we did a good job, a bad job, whatever, that is your time to give us input on the Draft EIS. Of course there's a comment period that goes along with that and just like during this comment period and any comment period you can go ahead and file -- you can file written comments or through our E-library system.

Next slide -- now this is something that people really need to understand is that the written comments are weighted exactly the same as a comment that people make tonight. Whether you are able to speak tonight or whether you give us a letter, it carries equal weight to us. We don't care how we get that information, we just simply want to get that information and your comments, the comments from the public.

Now another thing is, excuse me, when we get input it is really important for me, as I said, to understand the context and the importance of these issues to you. So we understand that people may be very opposed to this project and I understand that, however, one of the concerns that I have is it is very difficult for me to respond directly to a generalized comment. The more specific your comment can be, the better I can address it and the more ammunition essentially I have to go to the company and say how are you going to address this, so it's really important.

Those comments, we don't just ignore them, they don't go in a box. We actually make sure that every single thing is addressed. Next slide please.

Now we are going to talk a little bit about meeting decorum. I know it's -- we're really crowded in here tonight, I know we are over capacity and that it might get a little warmer than everybody wants, but a couple of things that I want to point out. One, turn off your mobile phones and before I forget let me make sure that I turn my volume down because who knows who might be calling me, okay.

I will be using it as a timer though later. Next -- when -- once we get to the point where people who are called up, I want you to come up to the mic which is right here and you know you can go ahead and give your comment on the record.

Next -- everyone here is only really going to have, with the exception of the elected officials, I give them more time, only going to have 3 minutes to give me your comments, that's not a lot of time, I understand that. However, see what you can do while you are waiting to summarize your comment and then give me your written comments.

Once you are done speaking you could just hand me your written comments and make sure I put those on the record okay so it is really, really important.

Lastly there doesn't appear to be many people here pro-pipeline but if you disagree with a speaker please do not interrupt the speaker. Everybody gets their 3 minutes no matter whether you disagree with them or not. Okay, so the decorum of that is very important. And any disruption is only going to interrupt the next speaker or reduce the time your citizens have to actually give their comments.

I know people are -- emotions are heightened, I know people are going to go ahead and cheer and clap and that's fine but know that the more clapping and cheering that you do, the less people we are going to be able to get through by the end of the night so feel free to have the opportunity to cheer your fellow citizens if you agree with them but try to keep it to a minimum so that we can make sure we get to the next person.

Next slide -- so I'm going to talk about the project information here in a second but I want to tell you a little bit about FERC because some people don't really understand what FERC does -- we are an independent agency that regulates interstate transportation or transmission of natural gas, natural gas and oil and we review proposals and authorize construction of interstate natural gas pipelines just like the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

We also do storage facilities and also we review liquefied natural gas terminals. We also look at hydro-electric facilities. Now the reason we are here tonight in fact is because as an agency that actually licenses anything, we actually have to do natural environmental review. We have a responsibility under the National Environmental Policy Act to consider the potential environmental impacts associated with the project that's under our consideration.

Now the standard for that is what's called a hard look. We have to make sure and that's why I say that we need to know all the concerns that you have because we are required under the law to take a hard look at every comment that you give us and make sure that we address it. Be it impacts the water bodies, be it impacts the air quality, we have to do a thorough analysis of your concerns.

And that's what I say when I use the term hard look. Now we also do -- at FERC we also do some other things, we also regulate non-federal hydropower like I said. We also regulate electric rates and oil rates but we don't regulate power line siting for oil pipe or oil pipeline siting.

Now another thing is we do not regulate the expiration, production or gathering of natural gas which we don't regulate drilling. I have no authority, FERC has no authority to do anything about drilling whatsoever, be it conventional or unconventional fracking gas.

Our authority begins and ends with the transmission or transportation of the gas from point A to point B. So there's other activities like drilling, those are regulated by the states so I can't do anything about fracking. The only thing that we look at is the transmission of the gas. Now we will look at cumulative impacts and cumulative impacts are things that could be outside of this particular project, be it you know wells in the area, be it another industrial facility, be it other things that are being built in the area so we will look at cumulative impacts overall.

Now as I mentioned before we are -- our agency is basically directed by 5 Commissioners. All of those Commissioners are appointed by the President and they are approved by Congress. Right now we have again, we are up to -- we have 5 full Commissioners and our Chairman is Mr. Norman Bay and they are the ones as I said who make the final decision on this project.

My job is to write the EIS and so my concerns, I will make sure that we address all of your concerns, but the final vote, the final decision is the Commissioners. Now I am going to talk to you a little bit about how we make our EIS decisions after I talk about the project information.

Now all of you will have probably seen that Tennessee/Kinder Morgan has submitted some updated resource reports last Friday. I know there are some concerns that they don't have -- the people have not had enough time to review those and I sympathize with those concerns because I have to go through those too. But let me explain something is that even though right now we are in the formal comment period, we look at -- we take your comments, whether you get them in the formal comment period or not, so don't fret or don't worry that you have to get your comments to us by August 31st.

If you get to it then fine, but if you want to give it to us a month or two or even three months later, your comments, it doesn't matter to us we will address them the same exact way. I want to repeat that, you don't have to get your comments in in the formal comment period for FERC to address them. We will address all the comments that came in before the formal comment period, we will address all the comments during the formal comment period, we will address all the formal comments after the formal comment period. We address them up to the point we are actually getting the document ready for print, so we make sure that we look at these.

Now of course it is important for us to get your comments early if it is something that takes a lot of analysis so the earlier you get those comments the better. That is one of the reasons why we come out here essentially, with information that is very iterative.

So we want to identify some of these issues early so that we can start asking the company in doing their own studies to sort of address those. Now as you might be aware of like you said, they did change the pipeline a little bit. They deleted over the last few months they have deleted one lateral in Massachusetts, they have reduced the size of the pipeline from 36 inches to 30 inches from Wright to Dracut.

There's one lateral in Massachusetts which increased in size from 20 to 24 inches and they also reduced the volume of gas that they proposed to transport from 2.2 to 1.3 BCF. Now some of the impacts of that are that again the pipeline reduced in diameter from 36 to 30 as well as the compressor stations reduced in size.

They are still large compressor stations, however they went from right around the New Ipswich one went from about 91 to about 41,000 horsepower at least at their current proposal. So that's something that you know I wanted to point out in case some people did not actually know about that.

Now just because they filed this information on Friday does not mean that the project is a done deal or it's

about ready to go to be approved. We still have a lot of work to do, we have a lot, a lot of work to do in fact. The resource reports that we got last Friday, they are still incomplete, we will be again sending them another rather lengthy set of questions to make sure -- because those research reports they filed have to be a lot more full, have to be a lot more robust than they currently are, that's just a fact.

They plan to file in October at this point that would be their formal application. So that is something that you know we still have some time before they file the formal application but even after the formal application I want to point out that there is still a great amount of time to get both the comments and there is a lot of analysis that has to be done after the application comes in.

So as I said you know the comment period is going to be ending at the end of August but again I want to point out that we could keep looking at your comments no matter when you file then, so that's really, really important.

Now I want to talk briefly about -- next slide please -- we will, we will. We will let people speak here in a second okay, this is just some of the maps, we can go through them. Keep going, these are some of the concerns that you have already identified, I just want to go ahead and say that we are still analyzing these, we still have a lot of work to do to address all of the concerns that you brought up.

So we are listening to you, we actually went through the data base and pull those out from number 1 to number 6, next slide. And as I mentioned the application should be filed in October and we still have a lot of work to do after that. As I mentioned there will be a Draft EIS at some point and after that point we will of course have another set of comment period -- another comment period and another set of meetings here.

After that we will develop the final EIS, which will then again go out to everybody on the mailing list. Both the draft and the final EIS currently goes out in a CD form. If you want a hard copy you need to let us know either there's a form on the table or you can let us know or you can return the last page of your NOI, return that for free, we will go ahead and make sure that you get the hard copy instead of the CD.

And then of course after that the Commission has to make their final decision. Because the FEIS is simply a recommendation from me to the Commissioners to determine if this project were to be built, how to minimize those impacts, next slide.

Again we talked a little bit about the EIS, I'm not going to go through this a great deal and you know, but again we are going to address all of the issues, both specific and cumulative, next slide.

Okay so we are going to go ahead and start people's comments here and I want you to understand that again there are a few things that we need to go ahead and point out is that you know please do not interrupt the speakers. There's probably not going to be a lot of people pro-pipeline but let them speak. And there is going to be a little timer on the table right here, Wayne could you hold that up.

That's going to give you the time limit for everyone to speak. When it turns yellow you have 30 seconds left, I will also tell you that you have 30 seconds left, and then when it turns red your time is up and I will ask you to stop. Obviously you can give me your comments in written form and we will go and put those in the record.

Also when you come up to the microphone please speak as clearly as you can and please spell your name for the court reporter, that's very important. Give me one minute so that I can get the speaker's list ready and we will go ahead and start the comments. I'm going to take care of that, just a second.

Is this on? Can everyone here me, okay. Down, down, down, first I would like to call up State Senator Gary Daniels.

MR. DANIELS: For the record my name is Gary Daniels. G-a-r-y D-a-n-i-e-l-s. I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak to you this evening. I am a member of the Milford Board of Selectmen and I also serve as the State Senator for New Hampshire District 11, a district whose population exceeds 50,000 and which is comprised of the towns of Amherst, Merrimack, Milford and Wilton. It's in the Senate capacity that I testify as 3 of the 4 towns I represent, Amherst, Merrimack and Milford are impacted by the pro-

posed Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project.

While each of these 3 towns assemble task forces to study this project, vetting various aspects, proposals and concerns and ultimately all opposing it, I chose to focus primarily in the areas of community need and community benefit. Over the past 6 months I met with Kinder Morgan and Liberty Utilities numerous times, both formally and informally.

In addition I attended briefings involving ISO New England and the New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission. With the loss of fossil fuel generating stations, natural gas and wind power dominate the new resource proposals in the ISO cue.

With natural gas at 63% I do believe southern New Hampshire and the towns I represent need an alternate source of energy but I am not convinced it is necessary to construct the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline to achieve this result. There are other transporters and other routes that may fulfill the need without disturbing 71 miles of southern New Hampshire terrain and impacting numerous residential properties.

While I do believe there is a need, the real problem comes when I ask how the project is going to benefit my communities. From the beginning Kinder Morgan has stated that it is just the transporter of gas and therefore the pipeline alone offers no benefit to any community without a distributor.

That's where Liberty Utilities comes in. Liberty Utilities currently distributes gas in this area from Kinder Morgan straight to Concord lateral. I meet with Liberty Utilities representatives numerous times inquiring each time how the NED Pipeline was going to benefit my communities beyond the potential the existing 5301 natural gas customers in my district may see lower prices because the gas would come from the Marcellus shale instead of the Gulf of Mexico, I have been told directly that Liberty Utilities cannot guarantee there would be any benefit to the towns of Amherst, Merrimack and Milford. No guarantee yet some of my constituents face the prospect that their property could be taken by eminent domain.

I do not feel it unreasonable that a request be made to Liberty Utilities that they disclose where they intend to extend their customer base so that those in my communities will know whether or not there will be any benefit derived from this project or if those communities are just being used as a pass through with no public benefit left behind.

I understand the issues of eminent domain need to be addressed now in the process as it is too late to try to address this issue after a certificate has been granted. My understanding of eminent domain has always been that it is supposed to be used in instances where land is taken for public use or purpose that is for the public good. I have already stated that the pipeline by itself serves no public good.

Liberty Utilities has been and will continue to be the gatekeeper to any benefit offered to the communities. What we are being asked to do now is to support a pipeline which by itself offers no community benefits while the entity that holds the key as to whether or not there are benefits, stands on the sideline in deafening silence. This is not right, the process is broken.

To my point if Liberty Utilities plans to expand their customer base in the more densely populated communities of Nashua, Manchester or Concord for instance, there are more direct paths for a pipeline to follow than cutting across 17 southern New Hampshire communities who would experience no benefit.

I respectfully ask that the FERC issue a stay of order until such time as 1: all questions asked by the community task forces are answered; 2: Ask Liberty Utilities have made available to the public a detailed plan for expansion that identifies the towns in which expansion would take place and 3: Upon identification of Liberty Utilities expansion area, we assess the routes that the expansion area -- to that expansion area on environmental and personal property impact criteria.

To summarize and in conclusion if we cannot -- if we do not know where the expansion is taking place and the pipeline by itself offers no benefit to communities then how can eminent domain take effect for the public good?

Again thank you for your time and I respectfully ask that you take these comments under act of advisement, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up, Senator Kevin Avar.

MR. AVARD: Thank you my name is Kevin Avar, I represent District 12. I want to congratulate Senator Gary Daniels on his statements, I fully agree with him 100%.

I represent the towns of New Ipswich, Greenville, Mason, Rindge, Brookline, Hollis and three wards in Nashua. So we are really impacted by this. We have been on this since the beginning we have talked with many people from Hollis early, early on and we saw that they had an impact with you folks as well, you re-routed you were going to go through some property there and apparently they spoke up loud enough to where the pipeline was changed, am I correct?

MR. TOMASI: Well actually that was actually Kinder Morgan's decision not FERC's.

MR. AVARD: Okay, anyway we have reached out and we have talked with Kinder Morgan, we have even addressed it with the Governor as well, we have addressed it with at least 60 or more questions for months the district, I have yet to have any answers from Kinder Morgan or from anybody with regards to these questions.

The value of the properties, the eminent domain issue, you know how is this going to help New Hampshire, how is it going to help the towns that are affected by this pipeline? The bottom line is I have not had one email out of the thousands in support of this pipeline and I am just hearing opposition, so thank you for taking my comments here.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next Representative James McConnell.

MR. MCCONNELL: Thank you, my name is James W. McConnell M-c-C-o-n-n-e-l-l. I represent Cheshire 12 which is Richmond and Swansea. I would like to address 3 areas very quickly. First off the environmental area because after all this is building towards an Environmental Impact Statement.

We are going to suffer an enormous amount of difficulty here and degradation when all the blasting starts. After all, there's a reason they call New Hampshire the Granite State. Most of the people in my district are dependent on wells and a great many are as well in the southern part of the state.

Finally the aquifers depend on -- the aquifers are going to be affected. That's my principle concern, my principle issue is in the event that we have a spill that will add enormously to the initial difficulty that we face when there is the blasting and everything else that will disrupt everything that we have got beyond the fact that we are going to be a 30 inch pipeline through everything.

The long and the short of it is in the event that there is a spill, the aquifers are going to be seriously affected in a lot of cases and the bottom line is that is something that has to be addressed. FERC has to look at that and frankly no Environmental Impact Statement that comes out without that is going to be worth the paper it is printed on.

And I also want to touch on the subject of the fact that this is an export pipeline. There's no hiding that fact, I mean you have a couple of fig leaves over a couple of companies that Kinder Morgan has an interest in, but it indicated that perhaps, gee we are going to get some benefit out of this, but it is a pretty thin read.

In May of 2014, 22 senators, including by the way Senator Jeanne Shaheen who has since gone quiet on this apparently, indicated that coming to the Department of Energy's approving exports for a 6th export facility and I will quote this, "this means the total approved exports, combined with existing improved export pipelines now exceeds the total amount of gas that is currently used in every single American home and commercial business. This level of exports well exceeds the high export scenario referenced by a Department of Energy study in 2012 that indicates prices could increase by up to 54%.

Fearing exactly that the Industrial Energy Consumers of America filed with the Department of Energy to get them to deny the export permits that would be required for this pipeline to send gas from this pipeline through Canada to the Maritimes for export -- there fear was exactly that, that the price would go up and that they would lose whatever competitive advantage they currently enjoy."

That's a serious problem and it's a serious problem for us in New Hampshire because in excess of 50%

of our electricity is generated by natural gas. Of course natural gas goes up and absent a big increase in supply to meet the world pricing will -- bottom line is we are going to get the neck on that too, so we are going to find that we will be paying increased electricity prices.

That's a terrible deal in just about every respect. Quite frankly I am hard-pressed to find something that makes any sense from our standpoint in this deal at all.

Finally I want to comment on the recent change rather, recent change last week to the Kinder Morgan proposal. They dropped a 6571 page proposal last week, changing just about everything. Some of the changes were good, we are going from 36 inches to 30 inches. We are going to have a smaller compressor station than we were, okay that's fine, but the long and the short of it is that Kinder Morgan has made this intentionally difficult for us to keep track of. In my view they are just trying to run out the clock.

On the 2nd of April I sent FERC a letter indicating that all of these things that we are looking at are full of TBD's from Kinder Morgan, to be determines. Well that makes it pretty hard. I followed that up in the middle of May, May 15th with a letter that addressed in some ways the same point. They are trying to create the appearance that they have done a great deal, that they have got everything going, this, that and the other way.

The bottom line is in my view they are running out the clock and I am unhappy and very disappointed to see that FERC is willing to go along with this because at this point I don't understand why we are having these hearings. This thing should be put off until most of those TBD's are gone, maybe all of them. The fact is Kinder Morgan seems to be getting its way.

They are going through an important step right here and we are all the losers for it, I don't appreciate it, I'm not happy about it, I'm very disappointed with our federal representation, because as far as I am concerned Senator Ayotte, Senator Shaheen and Congresswoman Kuster have been a whole lot quieter around this than they ought to be.

This is a bad, bad project for New Hampshire, it's a bad project for the New England grid, it makes absolutely no sense, we are losers in every respect, we are going to wind up paying to have this put in, we are going to wind up paying in higher electricity costs, we are going to suffer environmental degradation and terrific risk, the bottom line is we don't get a think out of this.

And for our representatives not to be able to figure that out, I'm a lowly little State Representative, if I can figure it out all by myself, give me a break. In any event, I guess you got the picture. I am not happy with this, I doubt I'm going to be happy with this. The long and short of it is I would like to see some big changes in this thing.

I would like to see these guys go back home, thanks.

MR. TOMASI: Next up is Representative Jim Parison, I apologize. Hit the little button.

MR. PARISON: Okay are my 3 minutes up?

MR. TOMASI: No, no.

MR. PARISON: My name is Jim Parison for the record. I represent the towns of New Ipswich, Temple and Sharon. Two of the towns are directly affected of course New Ipswich greatly affected with the hosting of the proposed compressor station if the project is approved.

Also for the record just I serve on the Science, Energy and Technology Committee in the House and have for several terms and so I spend a lot of time looking at these types of issues with regard to power and so forth, exciting issues. I have attended several of the meetings of the pipeline opponents, I have answered hundreds of e-mails, and I have met with area Select boards.

I have also met with Kinder Morgan representatives and with Governor Hassan and as a member of the Committee, I have also heard hours of testimony from citizens, utilities, regulatory agencies and from energy experts. Also the FERC sends me every day maybe about 50 or 60 emails that document every submission for PF14-22 and I read all of them.

I will say that from the citizen's comments that I have looked at with the exception of one fellow in New York State who is not affected by the pipeline, every single one of the letters has been in opposition. So this is an Environmental Impact Statement that we are developing and I guess I didn't know about the format if we would be allowed to ask questions, but one of the questions I have about environmental impact is actually I have two questions.

One is -- is the environmental impact only considered for rare amphibians and plants that are endangered species and swamps and things, are we also considering the impacts on people?

MR. TOMASI: I'll answer the question. We actually do look at impacts on people, both from the safety standpoint as well as the socio-economic standpoint.

MR. PARISON: Thank you, it was a serious question, I wasn't trying to be flip because I know that there have been a lot of submissions on behalf of you know plant life and bogs and things like that.

The second question that I have is the Certificate of Need, what I've heard and of course this is the rumor mill so now I get a chance to get it straight from the horse's mouth. Does the FERC -- are you required to consider this project in a vacuum? That is, consider the 1.2 billion cubic feet per day as satisfying a need that we project in 3 or 4 years in the absence of all other projects?

MR. TOMASI: I'm not sure I could speak for the Commission on that particular answer. We do what is called system alternatives to see whether the gas could be delivered to point B for another system pipeline or something like that, so we do look at that in the EIS.

The Commission looks at overall need issues.

MR. PARISON: Okay thank you. That makes a lot of sense. So ISO New England predicts and you probably know all of these numbers, that we will be losing about 3,500 megawatts of capacity on the electric grid here in New England in the next 3 years or so. And as you also know for a 4 to 1 ratio about 1 billion cubic feet for day of gas will satisfy that need.

And the projects that I see in the que right now that are being proposed, probably total to 8 or 9 cubic feet. And I know that the Spectra projects would be much less disruptive than the one being proposed to go through the state of New Hampshire because they are proposing to put increased capacity within existing pipeline corridors.

I have also learned from talking with Kinder Morgan representatives that they actually -- besides the rumored doubling maybe of Liberty Utilities customers, that they actually haven't gotten any agreements with any utilities for this gas to be used to generate electricity so I don't see it as satisfying any kind of shortfall in the electric grid anyway because they don't have any contracts with electric generators.

In addition I was very curious, actually I am not going to get any cheers for this but I was actually kind of excited about a new pipeline capacity because the stranglehold on gas is actually one of the reasons that our gas prices are so high, especially during the winter months when we have peaking we have to buy you know, liquid gas and so forth.

So I was sort of enthusiastic about it but in correspondence I learned about how you all felt about it and I had to change my opinion. But one of the things that changed my mind was after talking with Kinder Morgan, you know I asked them gee Keene has all this infrastructure and you know they are paying for really expensive gas and they have all of the pipelines in place.

Since you are going up through the Troy area you know, and Richmond and Fitzwilliam, a short lateral to Keene would really help those guys probably reduce their energy costs by 60 - 70%. Well I haven't heard about any plans to do anything with this gas for the citizens of New Hampshire so if I'm wrong about the capacity issues and the FERC decides that we do need this gas and that the pipeline capacity is warranted, I would like to say that bringing it through New Hampshire doesn't make a lick of sense.

The original route through Massachusetts was the most sensible way to get the gas to Dracut and of course you know as well as everybody in this room it was political opposition that caused that thing to be re-routed into what's called the co-location.

Now I submit to you that co-location is a ruse. And here's the reason -- along my marathon training route, down in Framingham, Massachusetts, I run on a pipeline clearing. It's just a little clearing through the woods, it really has no visual impacts, most of the residents around there don't even know it's around.

This pipeline that would be put into New Hampshire goes along a transmission line corridor, what's different about that? Well, Science and Technology Committee, our biggest meetings that hold hearings for days with hundreds and hundreds of protests have been over the Northern Pass Project.

The Northern Pass Project is an electric transmission tower project that is trying to bring electricity from Canada down into Massachusetts and Connecticut to power their air conditioners and the people in New Hampshire don't want to look at these towers because it is a huge impact on our environment which I believe is the environment for people is also important, not just endangered amphibians, and the transmission towers are such a controversial issue in New Hampshire that that project has been held up for 4 or 5 years already and I don't know if it will ever be built until they put it underground.

The pipeline threatens to expose 70 miles of transmission towers and suddenly my constituents, their homes will have these giant transmission towers in their front and back yards that have been hidden from view for generations because of the trees that have grown up, there's a hedge along there that is going to be taken down by wiping out 150 swath of trees alongside of that. So I would say that the environmental impact in New Hampshire, by going alongside the transmission towers is much worse than it if were to just go someplace through the woods.

And because Kinder Morgan has no co-location agreements with public service as far as I know the last time I checked. They have to go beside the power lines and so it is not really a co-location and it is a much more severe impact.

Last point and you are going to hear this from our Select Board probably but I know the Governor and Select Boards, I saw this in the FERC submissions have asked for a little more time since Kinder Morgan has recently changed the plan, we have a 41,000 horsepower compressor being plopped in our town.

A small town Select Board doesn't have the expertise to adequately assess and report on environmental impacts and other types of things on such a project. Now I am an engineer and I would not know where to start on this because this isn't my area of expertise.

Our town, quite frankly cannot afford to hire the number of consultants that we would need to adequately assess what the impacts of this would be and so we are asking for some help for funding, if necessary, from the company who is trying to do this and also some more time from the FERC and I hope you will consider the Governor's letter that made that request and also our Select Board, thank you.

MR.TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next, Representative Richard McNamara.

MR. MCNAMARA: Thank you, Representative Richard McNamara, M-c-N-a-m-a-r-a. I represent Hillsborough County, District 38. I have a 10 town district that starts in Hillsborough and winds its way down and ends in Greenville. When I first which was quite several months ago, got information about this proposed project, at first I said, "Oh this will be wonderful, we could increase the gas supply as some of my fellow representatives and senators have mentioned."

I would like to say I do like to see the bipartisan effort that is going on here in New Hampshire today. We may not agree on many things in the legislature but I have come on board with my fellow representatives and the people in the Senate to see that this project leaves a lot to be desired and let me get into a little bit about that.

I would go back and say that when it first came -- because we have talked a lot about energy costs, we talked about what new Hampshire needs to grow, and it appeared on the surface that increasing the pipeline would bring more energy into the state would be a logical thing to do.

However, as I have begun doing my homework as I have received many correspondence from constituents and I will also state as the other members have stated here who represent you, that not one person has written to me in support of this project. All of my constituents and I am hearing of course from Green-

ville, I represent them, are telling me that they are opposed to this project.

And they are opposed for many reasons and so am I. They -- and I won't restate everything that has been said because they have done a wonderful job here before me but it is a cost benefit analysis. When this first was proposed as I said, if I thought this was going to benefit the people who -- the pipeline that is coming through the towns and if it would benefit the state of New Hampshire, because I represent not only those 10 towns as I mentioned but the whole state of New Hampshire, and I have come to see that there is no benefit for New Hampshire in this project.

If Dracut was located around the corner, maybe I would be saying something different here today but that is not the case. The pipeline is not a direct benefit for this state and I serve on Fish and Game and Marine Resources and as my fellow representative mentioned here when we talk about environmental impact, in the Committee I sit on where you are constantly listening to testimony and looking to how we can improve the wildlife habitat here in New Hampshire for the people who hunt and fish and this project is not going to have any benefit for the hunters and the fisherman of the state of New Hampshire.

Lastly I would like to just say that I have served on many committees, sat in many hearings and I would just hope that the FERC Commissioners come into this with an open mind and listen very carefully to the testimony that we have heard so far tonight and will continue to hear and not have their minds made up as some committee meetings that I have been to where I know the Chair of the committee has already made up his or her mind ahead of time, regardless of the testimony.

But if we listen to this testimony from my standpoint as someone who came into this open-minded there is no question in my mind and my background as some of the other ones, is in science. My Master's Degree is in chemistry and I know the environmental impact of chemicals in our water supply and what's affecting people and I can tell you this is not a benefit for New Hampshire, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next we are going to call up Wendy Freeman from New Ipswich.

MS. FREEMAN: My name is Wendy Juchnevics-Freeman. That is J-u-c-h-n-e-v-i-c-s hyphen F-r-e-e-m-a-n. You're welcome.

So in New Ipswich I serve as the Chairman of the Zoning Board of Adjustment. I'm an elected member of our budget committee and recently appointed Chairman of our Pipeline Task Force. Tonight I represent our Board of Selectmen from New Ipswich where we have a proposed over 6 miles of pipeline as well as a compressor station.

We have a series of concerns that we have been able to put together despite the TBD's in those resource reports from Kinder Morgan. So I would like to outline those with you tonight and then look forward to the opportunity of expanding your knowledge or these and our knowledge of these as we go through the process.

And I would ask that each of these concerns, even though we feel like they are incomplete, be included in your comments to Kinder Morgan around the 1st of September so that each of these will be addressed in their application.

So the first thing I would like to say is this has a tremendous impact on the town of New Ipswich, both the pipeline and the compressor station. As you may have heard already we have no public drinking water, we rely on wells. Some of those wells draw from stratified drift aquifers, others draw from bedrock aquifers.

We know through our analysis that this pipeline will segment 3 stratified drift aquifers. We do not know how many bedrock aquifers will be impacted by this pipeline. And our water table is typically only 10 to 20 feet below the surface so we believe that this pipeline and this compressor station will have a very significant impact.

Blasting without understanding the impact to those bedrock aquifers should be avoided so we would like for you to consider alternatives such as drilling or cutting as opposed to blasting. We need to identify the wells that are drawing from the impacted aquifers, whether they are stratified or bedrock. So in order to

do that we know we need a high geological study to identify those bedrock aquifers in particular and then once we identify the wells and we have that well inventory we are looking for those wells to be tested, both before construction as well as after construction and then periodically after construction for contaminants, whether naturally occurring or the leaking from this pipeline.

And that is another reason why we think this is an area of high consequence and we want to look at the quality of the pipe that is actually being used through the town of New Ipswich. Ground water is our lifeblood in New Ipswich. What I didn't realize when I started this work with the Pipeline Task Force was how many dug wells we had in New Ipswich. And it's probably because our water table is so high and because of the stratified drift material making our water so clean.

So again with the compressor station and the emissions coming off of that compressor station, a significant amount of wetlands on the site of the compressor station leading directly to our neighboring towns primary drinking water supply, not to mention the Temple Elementary School. We think that we have to do some serious work to figure out how to control these emissions, identify these dug wells, whether they are in close proximity of the pipeline or the compressor station or not, because they dug wells are too susceptible to influence by those emissions.

We also want to look at alteration of terrain best practices because we know that the construction will alter the flow of water also affecting and would like for you to agree that no herbicides will ever be used to keep this site clean.

From a health, public health and safety perspective we needed to share some information about New Ipswich. First of all our emergency management team is all-volunteer and does not have the expertise to address this pipeline. We have yet to receive a single thing from Kinder Morgan concerning emergency management and our first question from these folks was well, what's the emergency response plan -- I have no idea. I need to know that.

We have an all-volunteer fire department. We rely on our neighboring towns, what we refer to as mutual aid. Because we do not have a public water supply we take in water to an incident. A wall of fire in the town of New Ipswich with our limited water source for firefighting is a huge problem. We have no way to even begin to tell you what we need in order to address that problem.

What is the compressor station design? Is it active or passive fire suppression? We don't know, it's not in the resource reports. What kind of training do we need? What kind of special equipment do we need? We don't know. We are starting to assess what our budgets need to be over the next several years because of the impacts to an all-volunteer fire department, how are we going to do this?

Our police department doesn't have 24/7 coverage, probably not something the chief wanted me to announce tonight. Again, we rely on our neighboring communities and mutual aid. So what are we going to do about compressor station security? How are we going to address it? How is Kinder Morgan going to address it?

I read something on a website, that got taken down pretty quickly by Kinder Morgan but it said, "who lives in New Hampshire anyway" if I could paraphrase. These folks do. We do.

Continuing on with public health and safety, our roads are not suitable for the type of equipment and heavy truck traffic that will be coming in to our area during the construction. One of the things that we are concerned about is that we know there is a process with FERC that bonds need to be placed but this needs to be a condition of the permit not something that we have to negotiate later because we are reading from community after community where this never happens.

One of the issues with New Ipswich and the other southern New Hampshire communities that you are looking to bring this through is we do not have straight roads. We wind around mountain hills, okay. We have a very diverse terrain and in the wintertime it makes it hard to get from point A to point B.

We need you to look at automatic shut-off valves on this pipeline because the time response to an incident, heaven forbid, is too risky so we need to look at that. And I don't know how we do this but I understand

that we are going to have a little trouble with this co-location because of corrosion of pipes. The electrical interference with the gas pipeline is going to require Kinder Morgan to clean those pipes.

Well I understand that the pigs that are used for cleaning those pipes can't go up steep slopes. Well Hardy invited you to New Ipswich and somebody yesterday mentioned you should bring your hiking boots, I agree with that we have got some steep slopes we need to avoid those because you need to be able to clean this pipe. Our lives matter and public safety is our number 1 concern.

Let's talk a little bit more about that compressor station. New Ipswich is a quiet little community. Currently our noise level in New Ipswich is very low, 30 decibels during the day 20 at night. We believe this gives us the right to a reduction in the FERC standard of 55 decibels during the day to 45. We would like for that to be evaluated.

We do have a rural sky, a truly dark sky and we understand this compressor station is going to light it all up. We got to figure out how to build this compressor station so that we contain that light and we don't pollute our night sky.

And then air pollution I can't even begin to think about all the impacts of the air pollution but we do need to control the emissions, we would like for you to consider the NAAQS standards as a maximum and we want you to test for emissions. We understand this is something that is not necessarily done today.

Again we need to test those dug wells for contamination and you might as well go ahead and sign us up for a health monitoring program because I think we are going to need it.

From a socio-economic perspective let's talk about New Ipswich, we are very economically diverse, we have very few businesses, 91% of our town is residential and we are a veteran community. Our tourism is limited and you are going to go right through two very important tourism aspects of our community.

We are going to see reduced property values, we are expecting those property owners to come in for abatements on their taxes, we need to study and identify these impacts because we have no way of assessing what they really are. And because New Ipswich is very economically diverse we are concerned that there is going to be a disproportionate impact on the low income within our community.

A greater property tax in the town of New Ipswich will change our socio-economic character. When I talk about tourism I mentioned that there were two very important things to New Ipswich that were being impacted by this pipeline. The Wind Blown Cross Country Ski Area is losing a considerable amount of its easy trails. I know Al Jynx is here to talk tonight but I don't know how a cross country ski area sustains itself without easy trails.

And he doesn't have the terrain because we are mountainous to rebuild those trails. You are going to cross the Wapack Trail 3 times. Our land is already, a lot of this land is already in conservation easement so we are already protecting it. We talk about mitigation, well we have already mitigated the impacts of building in our community by preserving this land.

We can't clear cut that land, we can't build on that land, but yet we can put a pipeline on it? It's not logical. These impacts need to be avoided. We have Native American and religious sites that need to be avoided, we can get some more detail into that and we need the impact of deforestation studied in the town of New Ipswich. I already told you, you are killing our tourism but what is it going to do to our aesthetics when someone goes and hikes up a mountain and all they see is a -- because this is the taking of green space.

We do have threatened and endangered species, I won't go over those but those do need to be studied, monitored and protected. And finally, we just learned of Kinder Morgan's intention to come into New Ipswich in December. We have over 21,000 TBD's in March from the Kinder Morgan resource reports. We found out at the beginning of June that we were getting a compressor station.

You announced that you were having these scoping meeting with less than 2 months to go in the pre-filing phase. We just got new resource reports on Friday and no one has had time to count the TBD's, but I can tell you that I have scanned them and they are no more complete than the March ones. We need time to

study and identify the impacts and as Jim Parison mentioned we are not technical experts in this. Asking us what needs to be avoided, minimized, mitigated or compensated for without the additional resources or the time to do so can only guarantee that New Ipswich and the southern New Hampshire communities you are looking to go through will suffer irreparable harm and some of these studies can't be done right now.

So we need more time. If these environmental issues are really important, if NEPA is really your charter than why are we rushing this?

MR. TOMASI: Next up we have Mark Bender from Milford.

MR. BENDER: Thank you, that's Mark Bender, B-e-n-d-e-r. I'm the Town Administrator here in Milford. I also serve on the 15 Town New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition. Mr. Tomasi has already made comments about the Kinder Morgan announcement just this past month reducing the diameter of the pipeline from 36 inches to 30 inches and that's a step in the right direction.

But I would like to also comment about some things that were in that announcement. My comments will be strictly relating to the fundamental need for this pipeline. According to the announcement it says that NED will serve the commitments we have received from New England local gas distribution companies, ELDC's and commitments we expect to receive from other LDC's and electric gas distribution companies EDC's to provide domestic low-cost environmentally cleaner natural gas for New England's residential and industrial consumers and to meet New England's existing and anticipated gas fired electrical generation demand.

So while the diameter reduction is good, the troubling part of the announcement is that even at this late stage, Kinder Morgan is announcing commitments that they expect to receive. They didn't reduce the size of the diameter of the pipe because they sold too much gas, it's quite the contrary.

So while we understand that the electric grid in New England is shared regionally among all the states, we also know that New Hampshire has over 60 operating power plants and the Sea Brook Nuclear Plant. New Hampshire is actually a net provider of the electricity to the region, not in that consumer of that electricity.

Senator Daniels and other people have already talked about the minimum benefit that New Hampshire will receive in consideration for the enormous impact that this pipeline would create -- a 71 mile Greenfield project that leaves Massachusetts only to run through New Hampshire and then terminate back in Massachusetts.

Liberty Utilities, the only LDC in New Hampshire that has made a commitment to NED, actually reduced their commitment also. They originally signed up for 115,000 dekatherms per day, they have reduced their commitment to 100,000 dekatherms and of that 50% of it is for gas that is already being delivered to New Hampshire on existing pipelines.

So the only thing we are getting is 50,000 dekatherms per day, that's less than 4% of the reduced diameter size and the 1.3 billion dekatherms per day.

No EDC's from New Hampshire have made a commitment to NED. As a matter of fact Kinder Morgan in my understanding only serves 1 electric power plant at this point. So our request to FERC is that we look at the EDC's and the LDC's and we detail exactly what their commitments are. That we look at those and make a full analysis of how much of that gas represents replacement gas that is already running through existing New Hampshire pipelines and how much of it represents true, real, incremental growth of gas being supplied to New Hampshire.

We would also request that you quantify all of these expected commitments that Kinder Morgan is talking about in that announcement. What are they? How much of it is for LDC's, how much of it is for EDC's and explain to FERC why these should be included in the evaluation since they haven't been officially committed.

Should also quantify the amount of gas presently being delivered by Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline to the EDC's in New England for the past 5 years. You should require that Liberty Utilities detail

plans for their NED commitment to show the communities that will be served and when they will be served during their commitment that extends out over a 20 year period.

We would also ask that you compare competing pipeline plans to NED that are well-known to FERC to determine the least and best cause solutions and prevent the gross over-building of pipeline infrastructure and also quantify the amount of gas lost in the current transmission and distribution pipelines throughout New England, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up we have Mark Fougere.

MR. FOUGERE: Mark Fougere, F-o-u-g-e-r-e. I'm the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen here in Milford and Mr. Bender you just went in front of me speaking so I will be remembering that at budget time you can be assured. First on behalf of the Board of Selectmen and all residents I would like to welcome FERC representatives to Milford and thank you for holding the scoping meeting here in our historic town hall.

I think you see a trend here in the comments and I am going to follow up on those. Our Board of Selectmen have met with Kinder Morgan, attended open houses, the Commission Task Force to evaluate the impacts and benefits to our community. As a Board we are opposed to the pipeline for the following key reasons.

First it seems illogical to route the pipeline from Massachusetts into New Hampshire for 71 miles in the Greenfield Project only to end in Dracut, Massachusetts. Liberty Utilities is the only company in New Hampshire that has signed a commitment to NED so the benefits to New Hampshire and to our community are minimal.

While NED's project scope has been reduced to a 30 inch diameter pipe, it remains a gross and unnecessary over-build for our state. We are very concerned about pipeline construction impacts, particularly on blasting, private wells, septic systems and foundations.

Bonding and third party arbitration should be required to protect municipal and private infrastructure if this project is approved. We are the Granite State and you are sitting in a granite town and there's lots of it here.

We are concerned about the safety for residential neighborhoods. Some have limited egress for emergencies. How will our volunteer firefighters and emergency responders be trained for catastrophic situations? The rapid shift to natural gas for electric power generation has created a need for additional pipeline capacity.

Spectra Energy presently serves over 70% of New England power generators and has plans to increase pipe capacity. Finally, Milford is a historic and rural community and the proposed route will impact scenic roads, historic property and residential communities and is in conflict with our master plan.

The Milford Board of Selectmen respectfully request that one, FERC ensure the NED and competing pipelines are the right sized for legitimate commitments that FERC has accounted for unsubscribed capacity to prevent the obvious over-building of the pipeline infrastructure.

Two, FERC study all competing pipeline plans including Spectra Energy, Portland Natural Gas Transmission Services and NED to rank overall socio-economic impact to each and determine which will be best for the long-term needs of New England power generators.

And lastly FERC require that TGBKM explore all available utility, roadway, railroad cars through Massachusetts to eliminate the unnecessary convenient routing through New Hampshire. Potential roadways presently exist including the MASS Pike and Route 2 where adequate right-of-way is presently planned, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Okay next up we have John D'Angelo, Amherst.

MR. D'ANGELO: Thank you Eric. My name is John D'Angelo, that's D-'-A-n-g-e-l-o. I'm a resident of Amherst, a member of the Amherst Board of Selectman and I'm also the Chairman of the Amherst Pipe-

line task force.

In December of 2014 Kinder Morgan proposed a route change in their NED Project that resulted in 71 miles of pipeline being run into southern New Hampshire, through 17 towns including Amherst. The Amherst Board of Selectmen wanted to make an informed response even though like New Ipswich we don't have a large staff of environmental and engineering experts to help us evaluate this.

So we asked our Conservation Commission to do an environmental impact assessment and we formed the Pipeline Task Force. In March we received the preliminary environment report and discovered that as we feared the 4 miles of pipeline through Amherst was going to be highly disruptive to several environmental resources as well as to our quality of life.

So in March the Board of Selectmen sent out a letter to FERC documenting our concerns and attached the environmental impact report. If you would like the details of our environmental issues, I refer you to that letter. However, we continued to study this thing to try and understand whether this pipeline would be a benefit to Amherst either indirectly or to New Hampshire.

And through our Pipeline Task Force we came to the conclusion that it will not. There is one and only one customer signed up for this pipeline that is Liberty Utilities. Senator Daniels went through the paralyzingly vague question of what Liberty intends to do with that incremental 50,000 dekatherms of gas so I won't repeat his words.

80% of the committed volume in the NED Pipeline to date will be off-loaded from that Pipeline before it crosses into New Hampshire. There's one and only one customer for less than 4% of the capacity of this pipeline. There are no power generators signed up to take gas from this pipeline.

As was mentioned earlier New Hampshire is a net exporter of electricity. We produce almost twice and much as we use and export the rest, a lot of it to Massachusetts. The original route which had this pipeline passing through Massachusetts and terminating in Massachusetts in my humble opinion and in the opinion of the Board of Selectmen is a much better allocation of the burdens of the pipeline but for the people benefitting from the pipeline.

By moving 71 miles of this from Massachusetts where the benefits are accruing to New Hampshire, they have burdened the residents of New Hampshire to for the ease, comfort and convenience of residents in Massachusetts.

In June the Amherst Board of Selectmen sent another letter to the FERC outlining our concerns, expressing our doubts about the need for this pipeline and the gas that it carries in New Hampshire and stating, "The proposed NED Project's original route through Massachusetts only entering New Hampshire with a lateral pipeline to supply the sole confirmed customer in New Hampshire was a much better attempt to assign the burdens caused by the project onto the residents of the state who received the majority of the benefits from the NED Pipeline.

The decision to re-route this proposed pipeline through 71 miles of New Hampshire through the detriment, harm and potential taxation of New Hampshire residents and for the ease, comfort and convenience of the residents of Massachusetts, would if approved by the FERC potentially represent an unconstitutional taking from the residents of New Hampshire of the benefit of residents in another state.

Should FERC condone, encourage and permit such an abuse of power to take place we the governing body of the town of Amherst either alone or in combination with other New Hampshire towns residents will be similarly exploited for the benefit of residents of other states would feel compelled to seek full constitutional redress including injunctive relief to assure that the United States Constitution's provisions related to taking equal protection and state's rights are properly followed.

I would like to close by saying that I too came at this thing with an open mind. I lived in Texas for 25 years. I lived a couple of hundred yards away from a buried natural gas pipeline. It wasn't a problem, I wasn't concerned. But as I look at this thing I found no real reason for this pipeline to be in New Hampshire.

MR. TOMASI: Next up Kelly Collins, after Kelly Collins will be Susan Silverman.

MS. COLLINS: Hi, I'm Kelley Collins, I'm the Town Administrator in Greenville, New Hampshire. K-e-l-l-e-y C-o-l-l-i-n-s. I'm going to speak just about the compressor station.

The town of Greenville has a population of 2,105. It has town-owned water plant that is physically located on Route 45 in Temple and draws its water from the Toby Reservoir on maps identified as the Greenville Reservoir or the Temple Reservoir which is also in Temple.

The Greenville Water Department has approximately 356 water connections one of which is serving 190-unit mobile home Park. The water service includes all the downtown businesses, one of which is a manufacturing facility that produces vinegar and mustard that is sold to the public as well as restaurants, convenience stores, a bakery, et cetera.

In addition the Greenville Water Plant provides the water for the Temple Elementary School as well as the water for pressurized fire hydrants in that area of Route 45 in Temple. In the case of a catastrophic incident at that compressor station, Greenville assumes that they will want to use those pressurized hydrants and we think that Kinder Morgan should have to study where they are sufficient to address that.

The proposed compressor station for the NED Project will be approximately 7/10's of a mile from the Greenville Water Plant. Since our water plant provides water to approximately 65% of our population, we have grave concerns regarding any type of pollution of the Toby Reservoir as well as any underground disruption of source waters of the Toby Reservoir.

The town of Greenville would like to ask Kinder Morgan to provide environmental studies showing that the blow downs and general operations of the proposed compressor station will have no impact whatsoever on the value or purity of the Toby Reservoir and it will not adversely affect any water department operations.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next is Susan Silverman.

MS. SILVERMAN: Good evening my name is Susan Silverman, S-i-l-v-e-r-m-a-n and I live in Fitzwilliam where I serve on the Board of Selectmen. Last night I spoke about -- for the Coalition for a number of towns, tonight I would like to focus on the Town of Fitzwilliam.

Fitzwilliam has numerous concerns regarding water resources along or near the proposed pipeline. Water is the most valuable resource we have and if you think about it there are many alternatives for energy, there really is no alternative for clean water.

We have in Fitzwilliam -- in Fitzwilliam we have intersecting by the pipeline and impacted by Scott Pond, Scott Brook, the aquifer and town conservation land, numerous wetland areas and 4 watersheds that begin in Fitzwilliam as well as numerous private water systems, wells, you know, all different kinds of wells.

We have historic homes, 5 of our historic homes may be directly impacted by the pipeline, one of which was built before 1800, I don't remember the exact year. We also are home to Rhododendron State Park, this is a valuable designated park that extends into Richmond and Troy and we would -- we feel that -- I actually changed this because I was going to ask that FERC look into all the possible permissions necessary, but I really don't think this should be touched. This has been a designated park for a number of years, but before that -- it has been in existence for over 100 years as a preserve of botanic importance.

We also have questions about Little Monadnock, how will the steep slopes and woodland character be preserved during and after construction? We have 3, 2, no sorry 3 trails, the Monadnock Trail which is a very ancient interstate trail, we have a Wapack Trail and the State Rail Trail which was part of the state trail system.

How will the proximity of the pipeline affect the use and character of these trails? How much of these trails will be effected? Additional questions we have is why is the pipeline route, why does -- and these are just sort of all over, but why does the pipeline route cross under the Ever Source right-of-way several times in Fitzwilliam and what is the plan to protect the pipe in that proximity to the electro-magnetic field of the transmission lines?

There doesn't seem to be any reason why it's going like that. How will the pipeline react to extreme weather conditions such as freezing and thawing like we had last winter? Will individual wells be tested prior and post construction? How will contaminated well water be remediated? Will the delicate eco-systems of headwaters be impacted? How many and how severely?

How will ponds and brooks be affected by horizontal drilling if that is what is intended? Have these impacts been studied and quantified? Brooks and streams have banks and riparian zones that often contain wetlands and can be severely impacted by a disturbance. How will this disturbance be minimized and mitigated?

These banks need to be restored to pre-construction conditions. Specialists need to be used for this work, not general contractors and they should use the most current site-specific methods. How would the release of natural gas or product affect water eco-systems, including wetlands and ground water?

How big of an area could be affected and how many people would be affected? How would you compensate or mitigate for an accidental release? Will herbicides or drilling fluids be used at any point in this project? How will the use of herbicides and drilling fluid affect wetland areas and water resources? How will these affects be mitigated?

We have a number of wetlands as I mentioned, we are concerned about construction activities that can impact wetland functions, especially through disturbances to vegetation and soils. What would be done to mitigate these effects? Wildlife that are dependent on wetlands can also be negatively impacted through loss of habitats, what will be done to mitigate this impact?

Permanent loss of wetlands will result when those lands are replaced with fill. What will be done to alleviate this kind of impact? As far as our aquifers how would the aquifer be impacted by construction? Have the impacts been studied and quantified? How would these impacts be minimized or mitigated?

Property values -- property values in or near the right-of-way would be affected negatively by this project as they are the other part of the co-location piece which has been pointed out by others? How would these property owners be compensated for this loss of value?

The effect on our town finances would be significant. Tourism -- Fitzwilliam depends, like many of our towns, on tourism for most of the businesses in town and this project would adversely affect this aspect of our town due to our quiet road character and historic homes. Fitzwilliam unanimously passed an article, a fairly long article at our 2015, March 10 meeting that made clear the concerns listed above and was supported by the town as a whole.

And I want to read just a little bit from that and not the whole thing. Many of the concerns were such that the construction, operation and maintenance of the project through drilling, blasting, rock crushing and excavation using heavy equipment and trucks, causing the contamination of service and ground water from blasting emulsions and compounds, air contamination from dust and debris, and air contamination from diesel exhaust from crushers, heavy equipment and trucks.

The construction operation and maintenance of the project threatens adverse impacts to town forest lands, recreational and conservation areas and the construction operation and maintenance of the project will require involuntary taking of town property by the pipeline company, including precious conservation and recreation property by eminent domain in violation of Article 12A of the New Hampshire Constitution, the provision that property cannot be taken for private use.

The construction, operation and maintenance of the project threatens the economic well-being and aggregate tax base of the town and finally the people of the town of Fitzwilliam find that construction of the project violates the rights of the people of the town of Fitzwilliam, their environment and neighborhoods by threatening their health, safety and welfare.

And I want you to realize that there was a unanimous "yes" vote when this article was read and voted on in our town meeting. We don't want this.

MR. TOMASI: Next up is Terry Silverman, after Terry Silverman is Charles Moser.

MR. SILVERMAN: I am Terry Silverman, I'm the Chairman of the Planning Board in the town of Fitzwilliam. Our town is a member of the New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition. The problem many of the towns face in dealing with FERC process regarding the energy project is illustrated by the Town of Fitzwilliam. Our current master plan created under RSA 6741 by the Fitzwilliam Planning Board was revised in 2012.

The master plan's vision statement charges us to act as stewards for our natural resources. The town must balance issues of energy, conservation, protection of natural resources and economic development and maintain our rural character and sustain a viable community.

The Conservation Commission's open space plan adopted in 2011, the table of important resource ranks the following resources on a scale of 1 to 7: water - 6.85; clean air - 6.81; protection of wildlife habitat - 6.51; protection of wetlands - 6.43; peace and quiet for natural areas - 6.35; and scenic quality is 6.29; land and water recreation - 6.28; historic features - 5.99.

These values would be undermined by the construction, maintenance and infrastructure associated with the NED Pipeline Project. Chapter 110 of our Land Use Code of the town of Fitzwilliam governs blasting, this would not be followed if the project goes forward due to pre-emption.

Chapter 113 of our Code is the ground water protection overlay district. This would not protect the town if this goes forward. Chapter 137 covers our rural territory including Night Skies Ordinance, this would not protect the town if this project goes forward. The town of Fitzwilliam's incorporated 253 years ago and having lawfully adopted by vote, the highest and best zoning practices, we are unprotected from the effects of this project due to federal pre-emption.

We are a rural community with some of the cleanest air and water in the world and we strive to protect it. We are becoming overly dependent on a single fossil fuel. We have done this with coal, we have done this with oil and now we are doing it again with natural gas. It is unsustainable and there are no borders with regard to this pipeline. This is not a Massachusetts versus New Hampshire problem, it is a unsustainable solution, thank you.

MR. MOSER: My name is Charles Moser, M-o-s-e-r. I'm a Selectman from the town of Mason. I am here speaking on behalf of the 15 member New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition which are 15 towns affected by this pipeline.

If NED is approved we are asking that FERC impose as a condition of approval that Kinder Morgan and its subsidiaries comply with all federal, state and local laws, regulations and ordinances with respect to the siting and construction of the pipeline.

New Hampshire has a fairly comprehensive set of environmental regulations. We have the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Commission for siting energy facilities. The Federal Clean Water Act, Chapter 401, water quality certificate applies to this project. It is administered by the state.

New Hampshire drag and fill permits under RSA 482A, shore land permits under RSA 483D. A general construction permit under the U.S. Clean Water Act, New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services emissions permits states issues consultations with the Fish and Game and Drag Historic Preservation Act Review within the New Hampshire Division of Historic Resources, large ground water permit, withdrawal permit and surface water use registration and alteration of terrain permits, all from the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services.

All of those permits have been identified by Kinder Morgan in Table 1.6-1 in Resource Report 1. They left one out that I could think of and that was the New Hampshire Department of Transportation Driveway Permit, which is for curb cuts.

The problem with this list is that Kinder Morgan will come in and argue that many of these things are pre-empted by federal law. Therefore we are asking FERC to hold Tennessee and Kinder Morgan's feet to the fire with respect to these regulations by making approval contingent on Kinder Morgan adhering to the regulatory requirements that it has already identified.

And we are asking them -- we are asking you to ask them to avoid or minimize the use of pre-emption. In addition to those permits and licenses that I have identified on the state level, each of the 17 towns that this passes through has zoning ordinances, sub-division regulations, site plan and review regulations and other land use laws that they have passed on the local level.

Many of the 17 towns have aquifer protection ordinances, wetland protection ordinances, storm water management ordinances and regulations on nuisance, noise and outdoor lighting. Many of the 17 towns have excavation regulations and/or blasting ordinance.

These local ordinances represent many years of hard work basically by dedicated volunteers who cared deeply about where they lived. Zoning ordinances in New Hampshire have to be enacted by majority vote at a town meeting or by ballot on Election Day. The zoning ordinance is the direct reflection of the will of the people as to what their town should look like, what quality of life means to the voters, how the people believe the land should be used.

Blasting and excavation ordinances are enacted for the safety of the community and to ensure the construction and industrial activities do not obliterate the quiet enjoyment of neighboring properties of the town in general. No one knows better than the residents of a community what kind of laws and regulations is needed to preserve and enhance the values of that community.

Respect for local ordinances equals respect for the people of the community, therefore we ask FERC to require assurances from Kinder Morgan that they will adhere to local regulations regarding zoning, wetlands, aquifers, surface waters, wells, blasting and excavation and in cases where there are conflicting regulations to require Kinder Morgan to follow the more stringent regulation.

When Congress passes a law that pre-empts local law they are basically asking the local people to take one on the chin for America. And a lot of the time that's not a problem if it really benefits America. And when FERC issues a Certificate of Convenience and Need authorizing eminent domain you are telling us to take it on the chin for America and we might understand if it benefits America.

But if FERC authorizes a project from which New Hampshire gets no benefit and only 20% of the gas in New England and 80% for export, you are telling us to take it on the chin for a private company, Kinder Morgan and that is unjust and unconstitutional.

MR. TOMASI: Next up is Mr. Tad Putney.

MR. PUTNEY: Thank you my name is Tad Putney, P-u-t-n-e-y. I am a member of the 15 town New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition and Brookline's Town Administrator. Knowledge of the land over which the pipeline is proposed suggests extensive blasting will be required in many towns in order to bury the pipeline.

FERC must be mindful that New Hampshire is known as the granite state for a well-founded reason. Burying a pipeline will not be an easy task in our communities. It is also worth noting that New Hampshire is also known for high levels of arsenic and radon in well water.

A 2010 New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services report entitled "Rock Blasting and Water Quality Measures that can be Taken to Protect Water Quality and Mitigate Impacts" identified the risks of rock blasting on ground water in New Hampshire. It identified materials such as detonators and explosives which are not entirely combusted during blasting and leak into ground water. This has resulted in a detection of nitrates and nitrites in ground water.

Additionally the report found that blasting can cause silt, sand, rock particles and chemical precipitates that bind fracture surfaces to loosen and increase turbidity or cloudiness of well water. High turbidity can damage household equipment and fixtures, be aesthetically unpleasing to drink and importantly increase concentrations of metals and other contaminants.

The New Hampshire DBS has encouraged municipalities to enact blasting ordinances that not only focus on pre and post blast inspection of nearby structures but also pre and post blast testing of private wells for both water quality and yield. These tests are critical to identifying any adverse impacts resulting from

blasting activities.

The following towns currently have blasting ordinances in place, at least: Brookline, Fitzwilliam, Merrimack, Milford, Pelham and Windham. The 15 towns of the New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition request FERC require that Kinder Morgan number one: Follow the existing blasting ordinances in all towns that have them. Number two: Pay for the pre and post blasting water testing for any private or public wells located within at least 500 feet of any blasting. The water testing shall include a standard water well test plus tests for arsenic, minerals, metals, PH, percolate, nitrate, bacteria, all other organic compounds including MTBE and benzene and radiological analysis for uranium and radon gas as well as water yield, both before blasting within two weeks of the completion of any blasting and quarterly until a year after blasting has concluded.

Number three: Avoid any blasting within 1,000 feet of any contaminated soil sites and finally number four: Submit an Alteration of Terrain Permit to New Hampshire DES and follow the permitting requirements in order to enhance the protection of ground water, both during and after construction, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. I'm going to go to somebody out of order. I believe someone that has to leave soon is Joel Desellates still here? Joel Desellates? Okay then we are going to move on to the normal -- Martin Barry.

MR. BARRY: Good evening, I'm Martin Barry with the Troy Conservation Commission. That's B-a-r-r-y. I'm a professional engineer in New Hampshire, a certified industrial hygienist, I have a PHD in Bio-Medical engineering and I have extensive experience in risk assessment. So I'm going to talk about risk assessment.

A human risk assessment more than anything else -- I'm really concerned with those who are living near the so-called incineration zone and the potentially devastating consequences -- we are talking loss of life and the severe environmental damage that could come from a pipeline leak, accident or fire.

Now I recognize that statistically, the chance of a major catastrophe with a brand new properly installed pipeline is extremely remote but, and this is a big but, so to speak, considering Kinder Morgan's history of pipeline safety violations that is pretty well documented, in the Wall Street Journal, on and on, Google search it. I am concerned that the pipeline will not be properly designed, the pipeline will not be properly installed, and most critically though really, that the pipeline will be neglected and poorly maintained.

I'm concerned about the risks that our children and our grandchildren will inherit from a deteriorated, poorly maintained pipeline, 30, 50, 100 years down the road with a pipeline still in operation. So I ask FERC so when you are doing your risk assessments, so when you are literally predicting the number of hypothetical deaths, that this pipeline will bring to our communities, run your risk scenarios on a -- wouldn't even call it a really worst case scenario -- run it assuming improper design. I'll put on line to guys what I think some of those design criteria would be.

Run it assuming poor construction, bad wells, that type of stuff. Assuming inadequate seismic bracing. Assume that Kinder Morgan will poorly maintain the pipeline. Don't just drink the Kool Aid that Kinder Morgan is going to feed you saying how well they are going to maintain the pipeline.

So you need -- you know, assume excessive pipe corrosion over time, assume that there's going to be a significant amount of erosion under the pipe, under the pipeline, the land and materials, destabilizing the pipe. And specifically calculate the risks. Again the number of theoretical deaths that our children should expect to occur, not just during the first decade of operation but after the 5th decade, the 9th and the 10th decade, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up is William Matson, after William Matson is Gail Cromwell.

MR. MATSON: Matson, M-a-t-s-o-n, one "t." I'm a Selectman from the town of Troy. Tonight I want to express concerns regarding the location and the impact on Troy's superfund site, the pipeline gouging its way through Rhododendron State Park and the pipeline's impact on Troy's emergency services.

Like most of the towns along the proposed Kinder Morgan NED Pipeline route, we are a small town

funded primarily through property taxes. While the impact on our town property values is of concern, our biggest worry is that Troy is the only town along the route with a superfund site by which Kinder Morgan now proposes to locate its pipeline 110 feet away.

Approximately 8 million dollars of federal funds were spent cleaning up the 2 acre Troy Mill site which contained various chemicals and contaminants of concern. It was the largest superfund site of disposed toxic drums, okay, 55 gallon drums in the nation.

8 million dollars, various chemical contaminants -- I'm sorry. The site still is considered somewhat fragile and is currently in the middle of its second 5 year review by the EPA and the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services. It's adjacent to Rockwood Brook which feeds directly into Troy's swimming and recreational area.

Adjacent to the superfund site is the 8 acre landfill site full of mill waste, fabric scraps, filters, dye cutters and other solid waste, much of this is considered to have flammable potential. A pipeline spark, leak or corrosion when coupled with the proximity to the high-power electric transmission lines could produce a catastrophe for the town of Troy.

We just celebrated our Bicentennial last Saturday and we would like to make it another 100 years. So we are asking of FERC one, please determine the impact of a pipeline explosion on the Troy superfund site, the adjacent landfill and all related water resources. Please study what protocols are necessary and what studies exist regarding how to handle a pipeline explosion or incident affecting the integrity of a superfund site and subsequent safety impacts on the residents and the first responders.

Please study and analyze what data exists regarding natural gas pipelines and superfund sites, particularly ones with such a close location to one another.

My next concern is for the safety of our volunteer fire department and first responders along with police personnel. Just 3 business days ago Kinder Morgan finally released its 3rd pre-application pipeline plan, over 6500 pages and we counted them.

10,200 TBD's -- now imagine our surprise when we learned that on Friday that Troy has now been designated as a pipeline staging area, with over 30 acres needed for that. Among other items it appears explosives and other materials that we store there during pipeline construction -- all other towns, we don't have night coverage.

Our volunteers and our police do not have the training, equipment or power to deal with either a pipeline explosion, a superfund disaster, vandalism or problems at the staging area. In fact it appears Kinder Morgan plans to have a computer alert their corporate employees first and then local town personnel are contacted.

It appears the response by the towns is to wait for the Kinder Morgan people. Wait for the town to burn, that's crazy. Please look into Kinder Morgan's pipeline accident protocols on all levels. Please study what's been Kinder Morgan's response in such matters. Their record of pipeline accidents, explosion, ruptures and leaks is readily available at least in the earlier occurrence we were just looking through.

And please determine how Kinder Morgan and small towns and rural areas have dealt with previous Kinder Morgan incidents.

Finally, Kinder Morgan wants to put its pipeline through Rhododendron State Park, affecting the three towns of Troy, Fitzwilliam and Richmond which include the park and the town boundaries. Rhododendron State Park is New Hampshire's only designated Botanical Park. Since 1982 it's been on the U.S. Historic Natural Landmark Registry and the Old Patch Place Cottage has been on the National Register of Historical Places since 1980.

It's the only patch of native Rhododendron north of Virginia I think. It's a beautiful spot and they want to put the pipeline right through a state park. I mean what kind of planning is that, would you do it through Yellowstone? So we would like FERC to determine what's the pipeline and what's the impact going to be on the various water sources and the park itself?

Please determine the impact on the vegetation and forest in the park and there's also endangered species in there, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Gail Cromwell. After Gail is Beverly Edwards.

MS. CROMWELL: My name is Gail G-a-i-l Cromwell C-r-o-m-w-e-l-l. I'm Chairman of the Temple Select Board and Temple is a member of the 15 Town Municipal Pipeline Coalition. You have heard many concerns here tonight about how the pipeline will affect our water and air quality and even noise and all of those things are important. We share those concerns however, we are asking you to add light to the list of environmental factors to be considered.

I cannot find anywhere in those thousands of pages of resource reports just released that light is even mentioned yet all over the world scientists are discovering that artificial lighting is damaging. It affects people and it affects our wildlife, our birds, bats, turtles, frogs, even trees that in turn host a variety of insects and wildlife.

It is particularly bad for migrating birds. Many of our towns, including mine, have passed dark sky ordinances to halt the growth of indiscriminate lighting. Without regulation of its lighting the proposed compressor station covering many acres of land will be like a small city needlessly polluting our skies and destroying the very special gift of being able to see the night sky.

In addition station blow downs will release both light and heat, to say nothing of the toxins threatening our migrating birds, bats and especially raptors. New Hampshire has one of the few pathways for the migration of raptors. Thousands are reported each year on Monadnock as they begin their flight south in the fall, 14,000 in just a recent year.

The proposed compressor station in New Ipswich is on the lead line of this very special migration. The nearby Wapack Trail will be affected and is an important nesting ground for a number of threatened species of birds. Night light also affects adversely the breeding habits of turtles and frogs. We acknowledge that light is needed for safety, but at the same time we ask FERC to require Kinder Morgan to specify the details of the lighting at all stations to minimize the light pollution.

These details should specify angles of illumination, intensity of light, the wave length characteristics, all to try and minimize the effect on people on our wildlife. We should have the latest research on bird and especially raptor migration and if possible the blow downs at the compressor station should be limited to daylight hours to minimize the released heat and light that harms our wildlife, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: After Beverly Edwards is Sean Tadcliffe.

MS. EDWARDS: Bev B-e-v Edwards E-d-w-a-r-d-s and I live in Temple, I am the Chairman of the Temple Energy Committee. Why would any corporation make the reckless decision to construct a 41,000 horsepower compressor station a mere half mile from an elementary school?

And site it where the emissions can pollute the nearby reservoir which supplies the school kids with their drinking water? Why would FERC approve it? Well that's Kinder Morgan's plan in Temple and if un-stopped they could make the same plan somewhere else.

Schools aren't just where kids go to class, it's where they play outside at recess, they have lunch, they have indoor and outdoor after school activities and where they wait in line to get on their buses to go home. We request that FERC require an in-depth training for the decision makers at Kinder Morgan focused on the particular vulnerability of children to the harmful effects of toxic pollutants and we request that the training include wellness research on health hazards within a 2 mile radius of compressor stations.

The Madison County New York Health Departments report on health impacts from compressor station emissions, the Southwest Pennsylvania Environmental Health Project Summary on compressor stations and health impacts and Mina Hamilton's document More Than a Pipeline, a Toxic Industrial Infrastructure.

We request an investigation of the effects of compressor station noise and low frequency vibrations on the ability of children and adults to concentrate plus the short-term and long-term health impacts of blow

downs, fugitive emissions and other gas releases associated with compressor stations with the special concern for kids with asthma.

We also request a pre-construction baseline health survey of the students and staff at our school conducted by professional public health practitioners and paid for by Kinder Morgan with a commitment to have the children's health profiles monitored for 10 years.

Clearly it's not a priority of Kinder Morgan's to responsibly site their compressor stations and contain or eliminate their emissions of toxic pollutants and in light of their willingness to subject children to the health risks posed by their facilities, their negligence requires a serious investigation.

Let it begin. And we further request that it be followed by a list of steps that will be taken by FERC and Kinder Morgan to correct this public endangerment. Our children deserve better.

MR. TOMASI: Sean Radcliffe.

MR. RADCLIFFE: Sean Radcliffe, R-a-d-c-l-i-f-f-e. I'm with the Temple Conservation Commission and on the Temple Pipeline Advisory Commission. Kelley Collins in Greenville described earlier the risks to the Greenville or the Toby water supply due to the compressor station in New Ipswich. I will connect the dots for you.

The proposed site of the New Ipswich compressor station is what we call a scatland property at the corner of New Ipswich, Temple and Greenville. The scatland is between Route 45 and Old Temple Road uphill from either road. The land is a big steep hill of granite. If they need the compressor station to be on level ground, it could mean a lot more blasting on the scatland. Residents with bedrock wells are at higher risk to the additional blasting with the compressor station.

More sensitive are those dependent on surface water. The Kinder Morgan map shows one small wetland on the map where the compressor station map -- but it doesn't show the large area of hydric soil that it is sitting on. A few hundred feet from the compression station site is a pond that is wet 12 months of the year. That pond is part of a series of larger ponds which is one of 3 tributaries, main tributaries to the town of Greenville Reservoir, the Toby Reservoir.

There are nearby farms that irrigate this surface pond with surface pond water. The area is part of the Souhegan River watershed. Residents like myself surrounding the scatland have dug wells. Our dug wells have extremely clean water because the land around us is extremely clean.

The scatland is actually uphill from us. Every time there is a heavy rain or snowmelt, water runs from the direction of the scatland, through our land, towards the tributaries of the Greenville Reservoir behind our house. Any contaminating substances from the compressor station will percolate downhill like a fountain and local residents like myself will be drinking and eating them.

Yesterday in Nashua, Kathleen Gauvin pointed out that heavy molecule substances such as radon, palladium and other radioactive isotopes could get into the soil and ground water. Those substances are heavy and will drop quickly in the adjacent lands and waters during blow downs. We are not paranoid. There are recent reports that people near fracked wells and compressor station that have poorer health than the average in other towns, adjacent towns.

Stop these projects until harmful health effects are understood and the public can be kept safe. How many 41,000 horsepower fracked gas compressor stations are cited on hydrate soil that are uphill from stratified drift aquifers and ponds less than 1,000 feet away?

Are there studies looking for contamination to surface water and dug wells that are checking for seasonal affects? Is contamination greater in the spring thaw due to contamination being trapped in the snow? Is contamination greater in the dry fall season when the stratified drift aquifers are naturally lower levels than contamination could be concentrated?

Are there studies that look at the health effects for 5 years, 10 years? Some of this contamination coming downhill could take time.

Lastly you said you were interested in the cumulative effect. The cumulative effect of any contamination to the aquifers that are surrounding compressor stations will be huge. If the aquifers and the ground water get contaminated, these 3 towns are going to be crippled, practically make them un-livable, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MR. KIELEY: My name is John Kieley K-i-e-l-e-y, the town of Temple. I have been combing my list of comments as others from Temple and other towns have spoken but I would like to start by adding to what Gail Cromwell said a minute ago about the flyway along Temple Mountain. It is the largest and most important flyway in the northeastern part of the United States with 10,000 raptors a year using it, collecting there and using it as part of their migration south.

The Audubon, New Hampshire Audubon has been studying this site and the phenomena for many years and we would refer you to their 2014 annual report on their findings. The concern is that the site of the proposed compressor station is right along that pathway and that if built the compressor station would subject these raptors to noise, light, air and thermal pollution that would emanate from that facility.

Research should be conducted to ensure that the compressor station could not interfere with this migration. I would next like to speak to the subject of the Lukas community, L-u-k-a-s. Lukas provides the required tranquil environment for 20 developmentally disabled adults, many of whom have lived there for decades.

The facility is in close proximity to the compressor station so residents would be particularly affected by the noise and air pollution emanating from that facility. Research should be conducted to assure that the quality of life of these fragile residents is not diminished in any manner by the compressor station.

I would like to add another level of comment relative to the Temple Elementary School. The town uses the elementary school as our emergency shelter. During the 2008 ice storm that facility kept our residents warm, showered and fed for 2 full weeks. Research should be conducted on the appropriateness of continuing to designate that facility as our emergency shelter given its close proximity to what would become our biggest hazard.

I would also like to pick up on some comments that were made relative to Liberty Utilities. Those of us who have attended the PUC hearings have had a chance to really understand the relationship with Liberty Utilities and its parent company Algonquin and most significantly Algonquin's interaction financially with Kinder Morgan. Liberty has provided extremely little information on how they would expand their distribution networks within New Hampshire's cities and towns. They have not provided any concrete information, despite their comments that the Dracut supply that they access now is in any way going to be diminished into the future.

All they talk about is the need for additional gas. In their testimony a week or a week and a half ago, they did admit, under cross-examination, that they have looked at no other alternatives to the NED Pipeline. They were asked about Spectra and they said they hadn't considered it, they were asked about Portland National Gas and they said they hadn't considered it. They were asked about Liquefied National Gas which other utilities and distribution companies in Massachusetts have signed on to long-term agreements with.

Under cross-examination they were also forced to admit that their parent company Algonquin has a 400 million dollar investment in this pipeline. So I think when you add that all up no information on why they need more gas, no information on why they can't get the gas they might need through Dracut, admission that they have not looked at alternatives, particularly Spectra, PNG or LNG, admission that their parent company will benefit if this pipeline is built and the admission that board members of Liberty and Energy North are the same people who are board members of the subsidiary with a 400 million dollar investment in NED.

It smells and FERC take that into consideration. I would also very quickly like to make a comment on the pipeline itself, there have been a lot of concerns expressed by different towns, but one thing I found quite revolting from the get go on this was that because we are a rural area, and I'm thinking about points west

now, Kinder Morgan would be allowed to use thin-walled pipe, not the pipe that they would normally use in more populated areas, perhaps like Amherst and Milford.

Also in the rural areas they are only required to put remote control valves, shut-off valves every 20 miles. It seems to me that's a pretty dangerous combination, thin-walled pipe and a 20 mile supply if there should be a catastrophe, a fire. So our volunteer fire departments in Temple we have 20 members some of whom are at least my age, trying to address and protect our public after the developer has been allowed to use thin pipe and only put control valves every 20 miles, it just seems like it is a real invitation for disaster, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next up is Tim Roache, after Tim is Albert Lefebvre.

MR. ROACHE: Thank you Eric for having me. My name is Tim Roache it's R-o-a-c-h-e. I'm the Executive Director, yep sorry guys -- I'll do that again, my name is Tim Roache, it's R-o-a-c-h-e. I'm the Executive Director with the Nashua Regional Planning Commission. NRPC provides technical planning services, land use transportation and environmental planning services to 13 member communities in the region, 8 of them who are impacted by the proposed NED Pipeline.

Early on in the pre-filing process, NRPC formed an Energy Facilities Advisory Committee made up of citizen members, many of who are present here this evening and that group worked tirelessly charged to produce and find facts relative to the project and compile those facts so that they could be used by our member communities.

In addition to that, NRPC has worked with the Southwest Regional Planning Commission out in Keene, as well as the Regional Planning Commissions in Massachusetts in the western part of the state that are impacted by the project. And with that work we have combed through the resource reports to produce about 26 pages so far of information that we feel needs to be included in the EIS. It's a work in progress and we are hoping to complete it in the next few weeks.

But as you know and you have heard many times this evening on July 24th Kinder Morgan added these updated resource reports, we feel that it is really necessary that they go back and take a look at what's out there relative to what we have produced so far.

We believe it's really important for NRPC and its member communities to have the time to review and understand what's in those resource reports. The NRPC, as a Commission, the members, the residents that serve on the Commission will come together on September 16th to revisit the issues that are relative to the NED Pipeline and they just need that time -- they need additional time to synthesis this information.

So for these reasons we are asking that the commentary be extended to October 23, 2015 to allow all of these people, the NRPC and the member communities and the communities of the Southwest Regional Planning, that additional time that they need.

We really believe also, I know you have tried to hold an additional scoping meeting in Cheshire County, I think that's great. I think it would be helpful to have an additional opportunity here in the Nashua region as well if that's possible.

And finally I know you said earlier in your opening remarks that don't worry about the comment period your comments will be answered, that wasn't our understanding leading into this point and if you are -- you know you have heard it a number of times, you have heard a number of comments and if you are going to respond to those comments I really just urge you to respond to this one and the same comments as you have heard from others and do what you can to extend the comment period, thanks.

MR. TOMASI: After Albert is Patricia Martin.

MR. LEFEBVRE: My name is Albert Lefebvre, L-e-f-e-b-v-r-e. I am from Rindge, New Hampshire where in the last election in March over 70% of the population voted against the pipeline and a number of articles. I am a member of the Rindge Conservation Commission and as a Commission member I request that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, like the fellow before me, schedule new scoping sessions after we and other conservation members have had the opportunity to review and respond to the over 6500

page report prepared by Kinder Morgan recently and I add many items are still to be decided.

Kinder Morgan is a multi-billion dollar corporation with vast and varied resources at its disposal that it can draw upon and pay for. It is associated with and can draw upon the whole worldwide energy structure for assistance. And their resources, financial resources are like a huge goliath compared with those of the small towns along the proposed route.

They can throw people at this project that we don't have. You, as a regulatory Commission have a staff that can review a 6500 page report much more easily than the small towns and the Commissions before me.

And lastly I wanted to mention the fact that I am -- in the media it seems that people think it is being referred to as "not in my backyard issue", a nimby issue. With all the people who have spoken before, they have given numerous reasons why this is not a nimby issue and I know why the media, particularly MUR maybe, that is indicating that we are only concerned because it is going through our neighborhood.

We are not concerned just with our neighborhood we are concerned with this pipeline and with all the well-educated and spoken people before me given the numerous reasons about why it shouldn't be here. There's a good foundation for that, they are speaking from their mind.

These are well-educated, intelligent people given you good, solid reasons that this pipeline is not needed. We don't need it. Please extend the scoping period. Please give the towns adequate time to look into and point out the problems with it, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir.

MS. MARTIN: Hi, I'm Pat Martin, M-a-r-t-i-n. I'm Chair of the Rindge Energy Commission and I'm speaking tonight on behalf of the Municipal Pipeline Coalition and addressing the issue of need. Does New Hampshire need NED? No. We know that New Hampshire already has more energy than we need and we export almost half to the rest of New England.

We now know that last winter's high electric rates were not due to scarcity but to timing. In spite of a colder winter than the previous one, wholesale prices fell 60% by January without any new pipelines. For months now we have had the lowest demand for electricity in 12 years and electricity wholesale prices are lower than they have been in 16 years without a single new pipeline and with the retirement of 4 major power plants.

As the President of the New England Power Generators Association said, the energy crisis was overblown. But for any winter peaks we are already covered by Vista Gas, LNG, Nepool's proposal and the Winter Reliability Program. Portland Natural Gas Transport System will also be available soon and wouldn't waste a destructive and expensive construction process on rate fares.

AIM and TGP Connecticut Pipelines are already approved by FERC. They would all be less of a burden for rate payers than NED and not harm Southern New Hampshire's economy, travel industry, real estate markets and communities. Please show us how adding more fracked gas to the line-up of projects already in que for New England will not create an imbalance in our supply when we are already using gas for 50% of our generation. Adding more natural gas to our generation actually reduces diversity.

Please explain to us why New Hampshire's state energy strategy should abandon the price protections and security offered by supply diversity. Prove to us why we would be better off with Kinder Morgan's 5 measly permanent jobs rather than thousands of good, permanent local jobs from energy efficiency work and installing renewables.

Kinder Morgan keeps telling us that prices will go down if NED is approved. Show us the error in the EIA calculations that predict prices for gas will rise due to exports. Explain to us when most of NED's fuel hits its destinations in Asia and Europe where they pay 4 times as much, how it won't force gas prices to rise here at home.

Explain to us why the Industrial Energy Consumers of America who are fighting the exportation of gas should stop worrying about the manufacturing and transportation costs rising and explain to us why

thoughtful applications of alternative won't be a smarter choice than squandering our U.S. fuel resources for higher profits abroad and depleting our resources at home that future generations may need.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is Michael Barrett.

MR. BARRETT: Hi welcome to Milford tonight, good to see you. My name is Michael Barrett B-a-double r-double t. I live in the town of Temple and I am here representing the Board of Selectmen. Am I speaking loud enough? Okay, great thank you.

So I've been tasked by the Board of Selectmen to look from a safety perspective and an environmental perspective regarding the draft environment report, I have been working on safety assessments for decades. I look at the probability of occurrence and the severity of hazard. We look at loss of life or when it is specifically calculated how many times someone is going to perish in an unforeseen event.

This report says in Section 11-4 that it complies with CFR 49 Part 192. I don't come to that conclusion at all. I think if it is going to be labeled draft fine, but don't say you are compliant because it is really a very low value report. So on behalf of the people in Temple I have the following request and I would like to describe why we have it.

I'd like to have a comprehensive hazard analysis done by either a PE, a professional engineer or someone at the PHD level that knows what they are doing and understands unique features that we can talk about tonight. None of this is in your report. It's absent of anything constructive. So I would like to ask for you to have a hazard analysis that identifies all potential hazards to the local environments and in Temple's case resulting from the compression station because we abut it, but also its impact on the migrating falcons that we have heard about as well as the fact that we physically have a separated police station and policemen that reside two towns away, an ambulance service that resides 10 miles to the west and an all-volunteer fire department.

I was hoping to see some substance tonight, I appreciate it is a draft, but it is very poorly done. So you have heard about the falcons talked about this evening in our small town of 1300 we are outnumbered at times on given days by these migrating birds. We enjoy it and we consider it a national asset. There are only a few places that these birds can do it and they can't change routes because they are trained to look at the topographical features of the 5 mountains that form our town.

So you can't relocate them. A previous company tried to look at the feasibility of putting in a windmill and concluded they needed 2 years of study to not impair and adversely affect the falcons. I don't know how to do it, I can promise you that. I can evaluate the report. Furthermore our town is unique in that in order to save funds we actually had our police station relocated 2 towns away. At times we have no police on staff, at times one and at times two but if you look at the geography if there is a hazard that unfolds at the compressor station or its adjacent pipelines, the police may very likely and probably will be unable to get to Temple.

So when people talk about the school that is located within a half mile of it as we understand it, our policemen are our first responders, we don't have the fire in town and we have the EMS folks in Wilton so we have a huge disadvantage. The school plan in this case for an unforeseen effect is to march the kids over to an adjacent wooden building, a wooden building, we have to certainly change that, we are not prepared for this.

So I would like to see in a final study where the probability of police are unable to come to town what effect it has on loss of life or in impairment of people in town. We talked about the school and it's already been mentioned that's our only emergency shelter and so that should also be included with having an experience in the year 2008 we had a national or emergency declared by the Governor, if anyone here is local. We had no ability to leave our town for over a week.

We had no electricity for up to 11 or 12 days, there was so many power lines down and trees down that none of us could get out of town. The police were limited, everyone pulled together, it took the National Guard to come and help us out. On the 11th day the National Guard came up my driveway. It's not an

exaggeration to say we cannot deal with these events and in order to look at how we might, we need to see a real professional variant of an analysis done.

This is not even an outline of something that I deem professional and I'm not trying to be negative, I don't know who wrote it.

We talked about the school we talked about the emergency shelter. No one has talked about Our Lady of Hope, a local religious facility. Sister Lorraine is here she may not know, but I am one of the volunteers that rakes that lawn in the fall with a whole bunch of other folks.

The leaves are so dry I often wondered if anyone dropped a cigarette how we can even stop a fire from propagating. Now it's across the street from the compressor station and the pipelines are running through their lawn. So I wonder who is going to protect the 5 permanent people there and their up to 22 guests that visit in regular periods.

It certainly isn't addressed here. I know you are not familiar with some of these details so I do hope that you will take into consideration and try to help us get a hazard analysis that really allows us to act because this doesn't.

I also did -- as part of my due diligence I checked with the police department. Not one person from Kinder Morgan has ever contacted them about any safety issues local to our town. I contacted our fire department. I contacted the Wilton Line borough of Temple ambulance department, I contacted Our Lady of Hope, there's been no contact.

Although they stage these shows they didn't come and talk to Chief Matay, what is it that is going to hurt you, that will limit you from helping the population, it just has not been done. There has been zero contact with our safety officials and here we are a half a year into this. So I hope it gets better, I hope you can help us and I thank you for your time.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you next is Carol Coleman.

MS. HOLDEN: Good evening, I'm Carol Holden, H-o-l-d-e-n. I'm one of the County Commissioners for Hillsborough County and I represent 23 of the 29 towns in Hillsborough County and I come before you to, as a resident of Amherst I am expressing concerns heard from the communities in my district, it's district 3.

The planned site in route of the pipelines was done in ways to reduce the environmental and community impacts. Ponemah Bog Wildlife Sanctuary in Amherst is slated to require blasting to install the pipeline. Let's hope the Sanctuary can be saved.

It features a 3 acre pond surrounded by a floating, sphagnum mat all encircled by a oak and pitch pine woods. The bog is a kettle hold created by the retreat of the glaciers. What a shame if this is not saved.

According to -- my second point, according to the Amherst taskforce, the pipeline was not to be sited on a dead-end street for safety reasons. Is the pipeline going to be routed in all streets, in any streets that are dead-end? And that's a rhetorical question.

Three, the pipeline was not to be situated near a school. I have an example, the Amherst Christian School is at the end of Patricia Lane in Amherst. The capacity of the school is approximately 100 students. The pipeline goes through the parking lot of the school yard.

Consideration for abutters living near a transmission site was to be given. Senior citizens might want to sell their homes in 3 to 5 years, some of them would not be able to wait the 10 to 15 years to see if the pipeline safety is adequate. Who is going to pay for their losses if they are not able to sell their properties at a fair market price?

Firefighters in our communities as in many others are volunteers. In the path of the pipeline how would they be trained and to know what their role would be if there was an emergency? Finding pipeline easements to get detailed information about a specific parcel if you have questions you should contact the Hillsborough County Register of Deeds and provide them with the parcel number of your property and

that you want to learn more about. The Register of Deeds can also help locate a deed and determine if the pipeline company indeed holds an easement of it.

You need to make sure that if you have a utility easement, it may not be the 30 foot easement that the pipeline might require so check your deeds, get your number, and I represent 10 communities that are on the pipeline and I hope you will consider gentlemen the concerns of these residents and I tried not to repeat what has been said before this evening, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up George May.

MR. MAY: Good evening my name is George May that's M-a-y and I'm here representing the Souhegan Watershed Association and the Souhegan River Local Advisory Committee and I want to speak in favor of protecting the Souhegan River, probably the most important conservation resource in this whole area.

The Souhegan River is a special river and because of that deserves special protection. There are two citizens groups that are trying to protect the river, the Souhegan Watershed Association and the Souhegan River Local Advisory Committee. The Souhegan River Local Advisory Committee is appointed by the state of New Hampshire to make recommendations and to advise DES permitting and to the state and to the towns.

The Souhegan Watershed Association has a number of programs that involve the river including kayaking trips on the river, and adopt a salmon family program where students in local schools raise salmon in the classroom and then release them to the Souhegan River right here in Milford in the springtime before they get out of school.

A number of significant improvements have been made to the river in the last number of years -- recent years. The Merrimack Village Dam was removed at the mouth of the river to allow fish passage to come up.

There is still underway an instream flow study that was commissioned by the New Hampshire legislature and used the Souhegan River as the pilot for all the protected rivers in the state of New Hampshire so lots of money has been spent on the river and now Kinder Morgan wants to drill under it in several different spots.

The pipeline would be buried under the river in Greenville, a very difficult access and then again it would cross the river -- am I too far?

MR. TOMASI: Get closer to the mic please.

MR. MAY: Okay I'm getting feedback here. And then it would cross the river 4 times in Amherst to avoid going by the Souhegan High School and so they came up with a series of recommendations and I'm going to put them in order.

The first thing that we would recommend --

MR. TOMASI: Well sir, I think everybody might have to, -- my understanding that you are an elected official, is that correct? Or are you just an association, a member of an association?

MR. MAY: I'm appointed by the state.

MR. TOMASI: Okay continue then.

MR. MAY: The first thing would be to take a look at alternate routes. The route that we have is not a good one and probably the least invasive environmental solution which is what we are all about here. It is for the pipeline to be removed from the Souhegan Watershed completely.

Kinder Morgan has the ability and has easements in northern Massachusetts that would do the job which means there is probably a better less environmentally-upsetting solution to this proposed route.

If there are concerns for this route are more than mimicked here in New Hampshire and this would be an upset for a still, pristine area. New Hampshire it depends on tourism that could be affected, our recreational programs on the river would be upset.

People at the present time would become much more concerned about studying and protecting the area and the river and this would be a bad signal to send. Most of the river crossings in all of the communities now have signs as you go over the bridge saying this is a protected river and many of the towns along the river have put up additional signs to identify the brooks that the roads crossed the bridges.

Also I would like to point out that 75% of affected landowners, including some of the municipalities have not given Kinder Morgan access to their property to survey it which shows essentially how deeply the mood is against this project. So the best way of taking care of the environmental problems is to eliminate it and find a different route, there are other routes.

If the route has to continue through New Hampshire, we would ask that the route through Amherst and Merrimack be changed. Once the route of the powerline reaches 101A in Amherst it crosses the highway and then into Ponemah Bog, continues on through flood plains that do flood to Souhegan High School.

After a short while it crosses into Horse Hill Nature Preserve in Merrimack. All of these are problems that people don't want affected here.

MR. TOMASI: Sir did you put your information in writing, all of your concerns in writing? Because I know people are getting a little antsy, we want to be able to get to the citizens, so if you could wrap it up really quickly please.

MR. MAY: Okay. What we would like to do, there is an additional route that would eliminate the Amherst and Merrimack, that would eliminate crossing through Ponemah Bog going under the river at Souhegan High School and crossing Horse Hill in Merrimack. It's possible that there is another utility that could go down the railroad that runs right alongside where they could take a look at anyway, the railroad that runs right alongside 101A down to South Merrimack and then go out Continental Boulevard.

MR. TOMASI: Hold on sir, is everything you have in writing?

MR. MAY: It is.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. The last representative we have I believe is Edward Dekker from New Ipswich. Is Edward Dekker -- Ipswich?

MR. DEKKER: Hello, my name is Edward Dekker, D-e-k-k-e-r. I am the Chair of the New Ipswich Planning Board. Now I would like to talk a little bit about procedure. In New Hampshire we have got a tradition of small local communities with volunteer government. In particular I am part of a Planning Board. We evaluate site plans for projects after the zoning board has done their job. We work with Selectmen who have a role in land use as well, they control the roads, a project that is going to require enhancement, modification of the roadways, the Selectmen are involved.

This gives the decisions about the site plan at the local community level. Now you just gave an example at the very beginning of the meeting about an oak tree. Does anybody in this room really think it makes sense for someone in Washington to decide every oak tree that is going to be cut down by a project?

That's a local decision. That should be done by a local land use board, not done by Washington. I'm making these comments as a way of requesting that whatever the FERC does, make the decision you make subject to the local land use Board's approval of a project, using the local procedures.

Now I'm the Chair of the New Ipswich Planning Board. We have a lot of expertise on our Board. We wrote a wind farm ordinance dealing with noise levels and the impact of the community, that ordinance has now been adopted by 30 communities in the Northeast.

Our expertise is not infinite but it is substantial as are the other Boards in local communities affected by this pipeline. Yes, we have to hire experts and our local procedures say that the applicant will pay for the experts hired by the local land use board. I see no reason that shouldn't be done here. We should be able to hire experts at Kinder Morgan's expense to evaluate the proposal.

The areas that we would look at in a site plan, and I'm not giving an exhaustive list but I am going to touch a few of the high points, would include noise. We are a quiet community. Applying the same noise

levels to a quiet community that one would apply to the neighborhood of a boiler factory in the Bronx makes no sense.

We have local ideas of what we should have for noise. It should be quiet. We shouldn't drown out the peepers in the spring, we shouldn't affect the wildlife, we shouldn't affect the enjoyment of the neighbor's barbeque in their back yard.

Lighting -- dark skies are important to us as mentioned by previous speakers. There is no reason whatsoever that any lighting in a facility like a pumping station shouldn't be faux pas dark sky compliant and moreover, why would light be turned on if there is nobody there, if it is unattended?

If it's security lighting for television cameras, hey use infrared, it doesn't need any light. Now I'm sure people -- bright people in Washington can come up with these too, but then again if you grew up in Manhattan what difference does a few lights at night make?

We are not the Vegas strip, we are not downtown Manhattan, we're New Ipswich and we understand the difference between New Ipswich and Las Vegas or Manhattan. I don't know how we would get enough time with decision makers on the FERC. Not people who write reports and compile thousands and thousands of messages they won't read, but the actual people who make the decision to tell them what New Ipswich is like.

They are not going to be able to come out and spend a week talking to the people of New Ipswich, the people of Rindge, of Temple. Pass some of that decision-making authority back to the people in the local community. And the other things we would look at with our local decision-making in the site plan review would be the fire safety.

We would get input from somebody who has a little bit to say about it, the fire chief, what does he need in order to assure the safety of the community and then that would be placed as a requirement on the applicant. You have got to upgrade it to these fire safety things.

A fire chief is a lot better person to provide input on what fire safety changes are needed for New Ipswich than again somebody in Washington, because it has already been pointed out to you that we don't have city water, we rely on tanker trucks. How many tanker trucks would we have to have in order to provide enough water to control an emergency at a pumping station? Maybe not put out the fire at the pumping station, but preventing the entire woods from catching on fire.

How big a building would we need to heat, to keep the tanker trucks during the winter? It's cold here, if we park them outside they would freeze.

MR. TOMASI: Sir, you have run about 7 minutes or so could you wrap it up really quick?

MR. DEKKER: Okay. So, in summary I'm just going to say keep the local decision makers in the loop don't cut us out. We have an important role to play, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. While my court reporter swaps out his files is that correct? So give me one second while he does that and then we will start with speaker number one which will be Stephen Matthews.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken, to be reconvened.)

MR. WHEELER: Good to go, tape is all changed. I apologize for stepping away from decorum for a moment but you know I felt I needed to do that. It is very disturbing to me, to digress just for a minute that you come here from Washington and you don't even know what our form of government is here.

Just so you know what the Executive Council does we are the second highest elected state official in New Hampshire government. We hire the Public Utilities Commissioners or fire the Public Utility Commissioners, we hire the Site Selection Committee members or fire the Site Selection Committee member and we have a significant role in the state in developing the state's energy policy.

Also if you think this pipeline is going through Rhododendron Park, it ain't going to get my signature to sell the land, have an easement on the land or a right-of-way. And now I will go to my prepared remarks.

Every town, save one, affected by this proposed pipeline project is in my district and I would like to summarize real quick because I know a lot of other people want to speak, the comments that I have heard through e-mails and constituent reporting and from the people in this room tonight and other people across the district.

I'm asking you please hear them and listen to what they say when they detail their testimony tonight. Granite Staters are not pipeline pushovers. Every public works project has an environmental impact, including this one. Every eminent domain project also has had a substantial New Hampshire benefit. This export pipeline does not benefit the Granite Staters. Especially those who live in export pipeline affected towns.

This project will steal over 1500 acres of land from New Hampshire homeowners. They will be required to give up their land, their forest, their crops, their privacy, their property values, clean, pristine water and the list goes on and on and on.

Air quality and water quality will be affected far beyond the 1500 acres of this proposed taking, 10, 20-fold or more will be affected. Part of my duties as an Executive Counselor is to appoint and serve on highway layout commissions. If this 71 mile taking was for a highway it would never pass environmental protection muster.

You know in fact the proposed circumferential highway project that would be in Hudson and Litchfield was turned down. We were told by the EPA and the Federal Highway Administration, don't even both applying for the permits, you are not going to get them, you are not disturbing that much land, you are not taking that much from the people just forget it.

But now comes a 71 mile comparable project and that wants to sail right through. Also in New Hampshire a highway would never and I mean never be built with the kind of citizen opposition that was in Nashua last night and that's here tonight.

So that begs the real question here: will you listen to these people or will you recommend that this project be forced upon us? The only responsible environmental finding or recommendation for this project should be "no build", thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Okay we will call the first person then, number 1 Stephen Matthews.

MR. MATTHEWS: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Proceed.

MR. MATTHEWS: Just another quick comment on the fact that we are not in a position to comment on all of this bearing in mind what came out last week. We cannot realistically comment on a report that basically does not exist. We would welcome the opportunity and the time to comment on that submission of a complete report. We must be allowed a realistic time frame to review the documentation in order to provide relevant, intelligent comments.

And the bulk of my talk is on the compressor station which has been sited on a brown field polluted site. It has lead pollution. Run-off from the site is collected by a stream that runs into the reservoir. If you don't disturb the land it doesn't run off that way -- if we are going to put construction work on there that leaking will end up in Greenville's reservoir, the town reservoir, their only source of water.

And the site is less than half a mile from Temple's elementary school. Sure -- sorry, the questions at the Kinder Morgan open house in the meeting in New Ipswich earlier this year, questions were asked about chemical emissions from that system, pipes and compressor stations. Their response was they didn't know any details. They did say that they would find out and they would let the New Ipswich Board of Selectmen know the answer, their answer has never been forthcoming.

I can understand that difficulty, finding such information on the internet is very difficult. It took maybe 10 minutes, 12 miles if I wanted to get fussy and read the peer review papers. Someone ought to tell whoever it was that was designated at Kinder Morgan they should give up the search, we have found the answers. They have the sort of answers we suspected we would find, they are not the sort of answers that we want-

ed to find. This is what we found.

There are 6 reports I'm giving you giving details on the chemicals that are emitted by these. There are 43 chemicals on this list. Effects from these chemicals include pretty much every health problem you can think of. So, we are --

MR. TOMASI: I'm sorry your time is up.

MR. MATTHEWS: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next number 2, John Belliveau. After 2 is obviously 3 Darren Copple.

MR. BELLIVEAU: Hi, John Belliveau. B-e-l-l-i-v-e-a-u. As been mentioned by speakers before, New Ipswich has no public drinking water of course we are all on private wells. We are aware that this project will segment at least 3 stratified drift aquifers.

In the New Hampshire DES Water Resources Primer, Chapter 4 Ground Water states, "Ground water in New Hampshire supplies water to 60% of the state's population." It also states, "Dependence on ground water is not isolated to humans."

"Additionally water beneath the ground in New Hampshire is stored at relatively shallow depths and is well connected to surface waters and the land surface. It also states ground water quality is influenced by the bedrock and overburden material it moves through."

"It also can be greatly influenced by land use." The report also states 79% of the high capacity wells in New Hampshire are located in stratified drift materials. It continues, "The nature of New Hampshire aquifers differs significantly from many other parts of the country where aquifers are more uniform and much deeper. Unlike these places the amount of water that can be stored in New Hampshire has ground water is limited naturally by the state's climate and geology."

"Land use change also alters the occurrence of ground water in the state." Referring to the same document, radon and arsenic in particular, are naturally occurring and "concentrations can increase due to the disturbance called by pipeline construction."

Referring back to the document "Because it is an unseen resource, on-going routine monitoring of ground water levels and quality is also critical to effectively protect this important resource." Please ascertain and specify how FERC and/or KGP will perform this on-going routine, monitoring of ground water levels and quality in their EIS. Please identify all wells that draw water from these stratified drift aquifers in your EIS, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, number 3 Darren Copple.

MR. COPPLE: Good evening my name is Darren Copple, D-a-r-r-e-n C-o-p-p-l-e and I live in New Ipswich, New Hampshire. Given the incomplete nature of Kinder Morgan's research reports and recent changes to the scope of the project, these scoping meetings are being conducted prematurely and therefore failing to provide information that would benefit the NEPA process.

As John just stated New Ipswich has no public drinking water, we are all on private wells. The nature of New Hampshire's aquifers differs significantly from any other parts of the country where aquifers are more uniform and much deeper, unlike these places the amount of water that can be stored in New Hampshire as ground water is limited naturally by the state's climate and geology.

Land use change also alters the occurrence of ground water in the state. Please do a hydro-geological study to identify the bedrock aquifers impacted by this project. Please identify all wells that draw water from these bedrock drift aquifers. These wells should be tested prior to construction and quarterly after construction for flow impacts.

Blasting of crystalline bedrock can contaminate water resources. There are 2 primary methods by which the quality of ground water can be changed by blasting crystal and rock. One -- contamination of ground water resulting from a release of regulated or unregulated -- thank you -- substance of the groundwater and two -- agitation of the subsurface may cause turbidity in ground water to increase.

Blasting should be avoided at all costs. Please consider alternatives such as drilling and cutting. Asking us to identify what needs to be avoided, mitigated, minimized or compensated without the adequate resources or time to do so can only assure that the town of New Ipswich will suffer irreparable harm from this project, thank you for your time.

MR. TOMASI: Number 4 Patricia Canaday.

MS. CANADAY: Good evening my name is Patricia Canaday, C-a-n-a-d-a-y. We are told that these meetings are the opportunity for impacted citizens to voice our concerns before the federal agency will ultimately determine our fate. I would like to acknowledge that I respect these scoping meetings are open to the entire public as they should be.

The estimated 600 people who attended the scoping meeting in Nashua last night and the hundreds more who are in Milford this evening are not here because we are paid spokespeople nor because we were ferried in from out of state. I live in New Ipswich, New Hampshire, one half mile from the proposed compressor station in our town.

The initial proposed route for Tennessee gas pipeline's NED Project in this region went entirely through Massachusetts when the state of Massachusetts protested loudly enough, the route was moved to New Hampshire. So suddenly, miraculously this project to benefit Massachusetts was rebranded to somehow benefit New Hampshire. This is a myth.

With this proposed pipeline, this proposed pipeline -- New Hampshire residents are being called to bear the burden without benefit of this unnecessary project -- the burden of noise pollution, air pollution, water and soil contamination, the burden of lost land for corporate gain. We did not invite Kinder Morgan into our communities.

Kinder Morgan imposed itself upon our collective lives the moment they looked at a map and drew a line through our land. We the citizens of New Hampshire are already feeling the tremendous burden of this proposed project. Ordinary people with full-time families, full-time jobs, full-time lives must now make time to become pipeline experts.

The one positive however is that because of Kinder Morgan we know more of our neighbors. Because of Kinder Morgan we know what we are made of and because of Kinder Morgan we know what our neighbors are made of. Because of Kinder Morgan we are a village.

I know that FERC has the ear of Kinder Morgan in a way we will never have. I ask you to look into these faces tonight and Mr. Tomasi I respectfully ask you to give Kinder Morgan this message. This is a David and Goliath moment, Kinder Morgan you are a multi-billion dollar Goliath, but we are made of sturdy stock in New Hampshire. United we stand before you tonight. Kinder Morgan behold our united David.

MR. TOMASI: Josiah Barthelmess, I apologize for the mispronunciation.

MR. BARTHELMESS: My name is Josiah Barthelmess, B-a-r-t-h-e-l-m-e-s-s. I am 11 years old. I live across the street from the proposed compressor station in New Ipswich, New Hampshire. I told you that you would see me again. Kinder Morgan's slogan is "we are good neighbors".

Webster's Dictionary defines neighbor as a person who shows kindness or helpfulness towards his or her fellow humans. FERC how can a compressor station be my good neighbor? Do you think it's kind to emit toxins into the air I breathe? For the record a good neighbor doesn't steal your stuff. A good neighbor is someone you trust and respect, good neighbors don't lie.

Kinder Morgan says this is the only answer for New England yet we have heard right here there are clearly better alternatives than this pipeline. FERC my question to you is can we start speaking truth here? You have seen these last couple of days that the residents of New Hampshire are not backing down. They are well-versed, educated and far beyond thinking they will benefit from Kinder Morgan's lies. Hearing about taking the land of the people on the name this New England Energy Crisis, how can you even think of moving forward with this project?

This doesn't give my generation much hope in our government and the laws we the common people must

abide by. How is it those with deep pockets can rewrite the law? I asked my dad and mom to explain this to me and I didn't like their answer. Now unfortunately this is the way the world works, well that isn't good enough. What answers do you have for me?

Aren't you a federal organization that will make sure Kinder Morgan follows the rules? Won't you enforce them? What boggles my mind is why their rules are different than the rules we have to follow. If this is what my federal government is like and what you stand for I'm moving to New Zealand where there is no government.

Please give me and my generation hope that you are truly looking out for our best interest and not that of a corporate giant or the next corporate giant. You have already had a good look at me. Outside this building right now, my generation is gathering in protest. The next generation is being informed and I will make sure all will remember the decision you will make in regards to this project. How do you want to be remembered?

I want to remember you as a good neighbor, somebody I can trust and respect when all of this is done. FERC at the end of the day I want you to be able to hold your head up high, I will because I fought for what was right, don't let me down. I promise you will see me again and the voices of the Kids of the Pipeline Resistance will continue to be heard, thank you for your time.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are on number 6, Sebastian Barthelmess.

MR. BARTHELMESS: Man that's a pretty tough act to follow, I'm proud of you boy, I'm proud of you. He and his mother were up until after midnight last night writing that by the way because they spoke at the last one that they were pretty late at.

Okay I am going to go briefly here because we have a lot of people to get through and this is an under-sized FERC meeting as usual. I'm going to speak to vernal pools and wetlands. The name is Sebastian Barthelmess I live just feet from the proposed compressor station.

Fresh clean water is our single, most valuable resource for sustaining life. Not gas, not oil or coal. New Ipswich has no public drinking water as you have heard before and we are all on private wells. We are worried about this. Our wetlands are of great importance to flight control, water filtration, water storage and recharge for both ground water and surface water, I think you know that but we would like you to keep researching that stuff for us.

They are essentially for a wide variety of plants and animals, I won't go into that because everybody in here understands that. It's good to know 66% of New Hampshire species of greatest conservation concern, turn it down if you want, are wetland or surface water dependent -- I'll hand this over to you soon -- alteration of terrain best practices should be used to avoid indirect impacts to wetlands.

That's as defined by the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, I'm sure you guys will visit that during the EIS process, I hope. The quality and thickness of the pipe needs to be increased significantly to prevent leakage and water contamination along the entire route involving wetlands. We are requesting that for the record.

We require they use no herbicides during construction or maintenance along the pipeline and compressor station properties. Besides the wetlands impact this also effects organic farming, even the honey bees we have in our backyard and in the greater New Ipswich area. This is a high consequence area, you have heard that before and you will probably hear it again. I would also like to address light pollution from the proposed compressor station.

We have heard compressor station -- I think it's more akin to an airport right across the road from us here in rural New Ipswich. We are identified as having a rural sky and regarded as a truly dark sky. You'll probably want to look it up it was spoken of earlier before. Our Bortle scale which is the scale that is used to measure it is under 4.5 which is a beautiful night sky and it's fairly rare in this area if you push any further east and this is actually taken at Meeting House Road, several towns away so we would request an accurate reading at the proposed compressor site that needs to be taken now and then maintained post

production.

Also so if we are going to build this thing up we require that all lighting, interior and exterior follow energy efficient shielded LED form factors

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MR. BARTHELMESS: for the proposed compressor site and adjacent buildings and that only minimal exterior safety lighting is permitted and only with motion sensors. So overall in conclusion asking us to identify what needs to be avoided, mitigated, minimized or compensated without the adequate resources or the time to do so can only insure that the town of New Ipswich will suffer irreparable harm from this project, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. So we are on number 7.

MR. LEOUSACOS: John Leoutsacos L-e-o-u-t-s-a-c-o-s. I live in Temple, New Hampshire. I am a proud neighbor of the 11 year old who just spoke before you last night and tonight. How many 11 year olds do you know that have the courage to stand before all of us and intelligently fight a battle against the corporation? Make no mistake it is a battle against the corporation? My bet, not many. How many 11 year olds have stood before FERC at scoping meetings? My bet not many. Listen to him for your decision it will have a direct effect on his future, please make it a positive one.

I'm going to begin and end my comments echoing my friends in New Ipswich because you need to hear us and so far it appears you are not listening.

First of all giving the incomplete nature of Kinder Morgan's resource reports and recent changes to the scope of this project, these scoping meetings are being conducted prematurely and therefore provide information that would benefit -- I'm sorry, fail to provide information that would benefit the NEPA process.

I have several serious concerns regarding the water sources for hydrostatic testing. There's a definite need to identify the water sources to be used for hydrostatic testing during construction. As typical hydrostatic testing utilizes millions of gallons of water, will these sources be replenished and if so how?

Is monitoring of the used hydrostatic test water for toxins required? If the water is found to be contaminated who is this information reported to and -- sorry, how is this water purified or disposed of? An extremely high number of New Hampshire residents rely on private wells as their sole supply of water.

And being that gas companies are currently exempt from the Safe Drinking Water Act and do not have to disclose the chemicals in the pipeline, a pipeline leak could contaminate our water sources with undisclosed chemicals. In addition to the okay -- in addition to potential damage caused during the construction process, these wells may be negatively impacted by contamination from ground and surface waters.

Asking the effected towns to identify what needs to be avoided, mitigated, minimized or compensated without adequate resources or time to do so can only assure that the state of New Hampshire will suffer irreparable harm from this project.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up sir thank you.

MS. FREEMAN: My name is Elizabeth Freeman, F-r-e-e-m-a-n. I live in New Ipswich and tonight I wish to address the issue of potential noise created by the proposed compressor station. I am the Vice-Chairman of the New Ipswich Planning Board but today I speak as a private citizen.

Several years ago the Planning Board wrote an ordinance governing the construction and operation of commercial wind farms. In the process of writing that ordinance, the Board researched numerous issues, including the impact of industry and commercial noise on a quiet rural community.

The Board consulted with acoustical engineers with many years of experience in community noise control. Our consultants referred us the cautionary warnings for quiet environment published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the World Health Organization.

While I did not by any means become an expert on community noise of helping to write this ordinance I did gain an understanding of certain issues. First, that New Ipswich is a quiet area with no industrial or

commercial noise sources which establishes us as a quiet rural community.

The existing background noise levels in New Ipswich are less than 30 DBA and 20 DBA at night without natural sounds. Second, if the noise level generated by a commercial or industrial use are not designed to operate quietly there will be a serious negative impact on the health and welfare of residents of the community.

And third that industry and commercial noise level limits, for a quiet rural community need to be significantly lower than those for an urban setting. My concern is that the noise standards used by the FERC, while appropriate for an urban setting are not appropriate for a quiet rural community and ignore the cautions found in Appendix D of the aforementioned EPA document.

While more expensive, it is possible to build a compressor station with noise levels lower than FERC's standards of 45

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MS. FREEMAN: DBA LEQ nighttime. Additional expenses for doing this can be better controlled if an acoustical engineer takes charge of the entire acoustic footprint. There are noise control material providers that specialize in the design of very quiet compressor stations. In order to preserve the quiet rural environment of New Ipswich and to provide protection from excessive noise levels that cause adverse impacts to public health, welfare and well-being I request that Kinder Morgan be required to meet a noise level standard for the compressor station that is less than 38 DBA LEQ nighttime at the boundary effect.

MR. TOMASI: Next we have number 9 Karen Sullivan, thank you.

MS. SULLIVAN: My name is Karen Sullivan, K-a-r-e-n S-u-l-l-i-v-a-n. I have the misfortune of living within a half mile of the compressor station in New Ipswich. I am here tonight to speak about the health impacts. According to Wilma Subara the ex-Vice Chair of the EPA National Advisory Council for Environmental Policy Technology, she has compiled a report reporting the health impacts of people living 50 feet to within 2 miles of the compressor station, metering stations and the pipeline.

The following illnesses are what is affecting people living this close to the pipeline. It's frequent nausea, throat irritation, burning eyes, nasal irritation, sinus problems, bronchitis, persistent cough, weaknesses, tiredness, chronic eye irritation, shortness of breath and asthma, muscle aches, dizziness, ringing in ears, sores and ulcers in mouth, ear infections, depression, decreased motor skills, falling and staggering, frequent irritation, brain disorders, severe headaches, frequent noses bleeds, sleep disturbances, difficulty concentrating, joint pain, nervous system impacts, forgetfulness, irregular and/or rapid heartbeat, strokes, allergies, easy bruising, severe anxiety, excessive sweating, abnormal EEG's, spleen problems, lumps in breasts, pre-cancerous lesions, thyroid problems.

Today on the WMUR News at Noon, they had a segment on asthma in New Hampshire. New Hampshire has the highest rate of asthma in the nation. This alone leads to an over-burdened health care system for New Hampshire.

Now, at all the health problems I just mentioned this pipeline and compressor station is not only a health-care problem for the citizens living in the towns within the pipeline but is going to cause an economic nightmare for all of New Hampshire citizens, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much, number 10, Greg Hanselman.

MR. HANSELMAN: Hi I'm Greg Hanselman, H-a-n-s-e-l-m-a-n, New Ipswich. I'll be brief. I've been a realtor in these towns for the last 28 years. Prior to that I was a State Representative representing five of them -- a quick shout-out to Dave Wheeler, great job, my old opponent and colleague. But what I would like to say tonight is I found out about this pipeline project over a year ago when I had friends and former clients whose property was going to be directly affected and they were concerned about how eminent domain might work.

Well I have to tell them tonight and everyone here you will be lucky if they take your property through eminent domain or more lucky than if you live across the street or new door because then you are just go-

ing to be stuck. And property values are already being affected. Anybody who has had his house on the market since January when this project got kicked north has been affected, so that's where I leave you.

How is Kinder Morgan going to accommodate all of those abutters and all the neighbors in the whole region? Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Number 11?

MR. WATKINS: Hello my name is Ron Watkins, that's W-a-t-k-i-n-s and I live in New Ipswich, New Hampshire. One critical area that requires far more study is public safety. Small communities like New Ipswich are nowhere near prepared to contend with the kind of catastrophic event that this pipeline could cause and only our public safety departments, severely underfunded and underprepared to respond to this type of emergency with New Ipswich like other towns is a volunteer fire department and no 24/7 coverage. Under normal circumstances, small communities such as New Ipswich have a long tradition of relying on mutual aid. But how do we do that if we all have to respond at once? Nor are our communities prepared for mass evacuations. Not only will our roads become clogged, it will require comprehensive evacuation plans, practices and emergency equipment.

How will we secure the proposed compressor station against vandalism or even acts of terrorism? Events such as these could trigger massive explosions and catastrophic fires. Kinder Morgan is unable to adequately prepare our emergency management departments for this kind of property damage and human tragedy.

The area within 1,000 feet of each side of the pipeline represents an incineration zone, how would small, under-prepared, under-staffed emergency services contend with this? This is not a pie in the sky scenario. In 2009 the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration cited Kinder Morgan for violating safety standards regarding the distance between the natural gas pipeline and a high consequence area such as a school or hospital.

In other words the pipeline was too close for safe operation. In 2011 the PMHSA cited Kinder Morgan for the following safety violations: failing to maintain updated maps showing pipeline locations, failing to test pipeline safety devices, failing to maintain property fire-fighting equipment, failure to inspect its pipelines required, failing to adequately monitor corrosion levels. Nor is this threat hypothetical. In fact according to the PMHSA between 1994 and 2013 there were 110 serious incidents with gas transmission resulting in 41 fatalities, 195 injuries and over 448 million in property damage.

Or consider the pipeline explosion in Madera County, Kentucky just last year. It threw large rocks and sections of pipe in the air, flattened homes, burned barns and left a 60 foot crater. Public safety is a very serious issue.

So as we are here to address the environmental impacts I would argue that the environment is about more than animals, trees and ground water. People's lives matter, this is their environment.

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MR. WATKINS: And each of us here has a story. My son is in the fire department through the Explorers Program. I am concerned that someday he may have to respond to a fire. This is very much a human concern in addition to an important environmental issue. I think any impact study on public safety should include a finding of what Kinder Morgan plans on telling the mothers and fathers whose children don't come home because of the pipeline, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Okay number 12, Susan Williams. After Susan we are going to take a quick 10 minute break because we have all been sitting here for some time and I definitely think my court reporter needs a short break.

MS. WILLIAMS: Susan Williams, W-i-double l-i-a-m-s. I'm Susan Williams, I am a professor emeritus of history at the Fitchburg State University and I'm also currently President of the New Ipswich Historical Society and as such am requesting consulting party status for that organization during the project area survey.

My focus tonight is on the impact of the NED on cultural resources in New Ipswich. I have reviewed the resource report included in the current version of the Draft Environmental Report submitted by Tennessee Gas. The report states that field surveys are on-going for the New Hampshire portion of the pipeline.

Strangely the document lists no resources in New Ipswich. I assume that the Section 106 review, conducted in concert with the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation will remedy this omission. There are important cultural resources in New Ipswich that are at risk if this project is approved. Let me offer a brief list.

The Abanocky presence is evident throughout this region, including here in New Ipswich where, among other things, there's a known burial ground in the path of the pipeline. The New Ipswich Center Village Historic District has been included in the national register of historic places since 1992. This District includes many buildings, structures and sites all of which are a mile and a half to two miles from the proposed compressor station.

The District proximity to the compressor station raises issues about sensitive resources outside of the 1 mile barrier when exposed to air, noise, light pollution and blasting. What will be done to protect these sensitive historical resources from environmental damage caused by the compressor station and pipeline construction?

The town is also the site of a highly significant religious commemorative site dating from the 1840's and in continuous use from that time. This site is the focus for traditional association with the group's historic identity and it lies in the direct path of the pipeline.

New Ipswich has other important cultural landscapes with rich, historical integrity including remnants of old mills, stone walls, colonial roads and agricultural sites dating back to the early settlement of the period. Several of these agricultural sites also offer significant evidence about the history of Finnish settlement in New Ipswich dating from the last 19th Century.

Finnish-Americans remain the strongest and most cohesive ethnic group in New Ipswich today. It is important to preserve and protect evidence of their contributions to our history.

MR. TOMASI: 30 seconds.

MS. WILLIAMS: Mitigation is not an option for a cultural landscape and structures as far as traditional cultural properties are concerned. Once they are disturbed they are lost forever along with their power to re-inforce local, regional and national identity. I urge FERC to consider carefully the impact of the NED Pipeline on these resources as you may your determination about the Tennessee Gas application, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: We are going to have a quick 10 minute break, we will be back here at 10:25 to start.

(Whereupon a short recess was taken, to be reconvened in 10 minutes.)

MR. TOMASI: And we are going to go ahead and restart with 13, Al Jenks if Al Jenks is here. Also I wanted to go ahead and point out if you are leaving before we call your number please drop off your number at the back table so that I know to cross you off, it will save a little bit of time so that we can get through everyone, okay? Thank you.

We are at number 13. If everyone could quiet down please so we can hear her please. Everyone take a seat and quiet down please thank you.

MS. JENKS: Hello, my name is actually Irene Jenks, I'm filling in for my husband Al Jenks, he didn't want to stay quite so long so I am reading what he wrote first and then adding a few of my own comments. So my name is Irene Jenks J-e-n-k-s. This is what Al wrote and then I'll add my own.

I live in New Ipswich, New Hampshire. I have built an run a cross-country ski area known as Wind Blown since 1972. A half mile of pipeline is proposed to go through my property, taking away my most valuable beginner terrain. Trail relocation will be necessary because of visual degradation and the perceived threat of danger.

Costs can run as high as \$80,000 per mile of trail rebuilt. Off-road vehicles will have greater access to my property, winter and summer. I'll just add off-road vehicles are not welcome and a lot of erosion as well as noise and great destruction --- we know that from the past just because the power line goes through and we have gotten all kinds of off-road vehicles just because they pass along the power line.

This land is under current use construction during the winter will curtail ski operations because of all the blasting required. All the buildings at Wind Blown are heated by wood from the land. We actually harvest over 15 cords of wood from our wood -- our own trees to heat all of the buildings that don't use any electricity or natural gas for heating our homes, or oil.

I'm currently installing solar panels to off-set electrical use. I'm familiar with the eminent domain proceedings. On October 10th, 1969 as a First Lieutenant I returned from fighting in the Center Highlands of South Vietnam. Next day a Sheriff appeared at my parent's door, served me papers to appear in court in Manchester to take my land. The power land had been built to either side of my property, I was not here to fight for my land then, I am here now, thank you or listening, Al Jenks.

Now what I would like to add is the proposed pipeline if built would be co-located with more than 10,000 human beings who create on this property every year. The ski area brings tourists to southern New Hampshire from all over New England.

The ski areas has been my family's livelihood for 43 years, we are currently in the process of passing the ski area on to our son with no intention of shutting it down. I would like to add that our property is certified by the American Tree Farm system.

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am your time is up. I have one question for you, what is the name of your resort?

MS. JENKS: Wind Blown Cross-Country Skiing.

MR. TOMASI: Okay thank you.

MS. JENKS: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up number 14.

MR. JONES: I am Tim Jones, do I need to spell that? Thank you. My wife Deb and I are part of a 265 year tradition of farming in New Ipswich, New Hampshire. We have chosen organic farming in the believe that while slower and less profitable than farms that use chemicals it contributes more to human health and improves our local community.

We chose New Ipswich because of its open space and respect for nature. In fact we were struck by the fact that the town's master plan starts out by citing the importance of a country environment free of pollution from water, air, noise and light and characterized by farmlands and woodlands, it seemed like a natural setting for us.

Unfortunately at this point we feel the town's vision is very much in jeopardy. I've got as those behind me can see, pages of notes on what organic farming is all about. I'm going to skip that because of the hour, because some of you showed me number 68 speaker on the list, but the kind of things that organic farming ties into is very much environmental.

It's the absence of heavy chemicals, herbicides, pesticides and all that stuff to accelerate production. Its natural amendments, microbes, fungi, earthworms, covered crops, rotational grazing where we move our livestock, there's electric fencing so they are happier, the land gets fertilized naturally if you will and the whole process works.

But it's a very slow process. It's not as profitable as chemical farming and it takes longer. The reason I go through that is what can affect it the most is environmental impacts such as the pipeline. If the pipeline has any kind of pollution on a regular basis or on a catastrophic basis an organic farming has a 3 year window. You had to be free of chemicals for 3 years before you can be certified organic, so we are now on the 3rd year, now we can certify ourselves.

If we lose that due to the pipeline we go back to square 1. The margins in farming in general organic

especially are not sufficient you go another 3 years to battle that. Two comments in my 30 seconds -- my wife and I wonder it seems that our community is being penalized for its focus on a healthy, open environment. What easier place to park a massive construction project than where there is low population density and second and we are trying to sort out what tips the scale so that much of what our region holds dear is forfeited to a large corporation, chasing huge profits, paying lip service to helping New Hampshire energy needs, all while exporting the product to foreign markets, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Sir, do you want to give me your letter. Next number 15, 15 going once, twice okay we move to 16.

MR. CARDINAL: My name is Brandon Cardinal, that's C-a-r-d-i-n-a-l and I am from New Ipswich, New Hampshire. Like many of my citizens that have been here tonight that have spoken, I also live a half of a mile from the suggested compressor station where it's set to be built along with Our Lady of Hope, people go to, to spend time for spiritual growth.

A couple of comments here, Liberty Utilities, one of the subsidiaries of Kinder Morgan's partner in this endeavor has already stated that it will build a lateral pipeline from NED through Cheshire County to Keene. This is a segmentation of the project and against FERC's mandates. ISO New England has also already admitted that existing New England pipelines are currently running at 20 to 80% below 2008 levels. 20 to 80%.

Adjusted prices are lower now than they ever were at any time. ISO also stated that to decrease prices further would send the wrong signal to consumers about the relative scarcity of this resource. Energy Industry's experts are already questioning whether Marcellus holds enough supply to cover the costs associated with building this pipeline, and unneeded, unwanted pipeline will be laid to pump fracked gas for how long?

What would the pipeline be used for then and would residents have any input on that process and decision? As FERC you have an enormous responsibility. You hold the gavel of energy of the future in your hands. Your decisions affect numerous individuals and families, businesses and communities.

Today I ask you with the new responsibility to own this but don't allow us to bear this particular burden. I ask you to include the negative impacts the pipeline and compressor station has on our society and community situated around them because our future relies on it.

My identifying how to improve public projects such as NED, primarily based on the least amount of impact to the environment is not only performing half of your due diligence, it is simply a job left undone. Every action in our world is balanced by an equal and opposite reaction. We are required to live with those reactions. It's time for change, change that doesn't continually feed our consumption nation but that instead responsibly assists in supplying a balanced supply of truly renewable energy.

As a telecom engineer if I would attempt to push through a project of this size that has no financial or future benefit for the company, I would expect that company to stop me dead in my tracks. That is what I expect you, the FERC to do for us. We are concerned about your ability to deliver to us, please prove us wrong, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next, number 16 -- that was 16 sorry 17, Laura Lynch. 17?

MS. LYNCH: My name is Laura Lynch, L-y-n-c-h and I am from Temple, New Hampshire and I am here representing anyone suffering with lung problems such as COPD, asthma, bronchitis, emphysema and the many, many more that are out there. Gas pipelines involve a mix of chemicals including known carcinogens and radioactive gases such as formaldehyde, benzene, methane and radon.

Radon, an odorless gas is considered the second largest contributor to lung cancer in the United States after smoking by the EPA. Natural gas mining consumption have been associated with several public health and environmental degradation do to these chemicals in dozens of communities across the United States the majority of which are world fog locations.

The formaldehyde is also considered a hazardous air pollutant by the US EPA. It is one of the emission's

chemicals that the natural gas development industry is required to report. According to these reports, compressor stations are the highest source of formaldehyde. A recent study of air emissions in the Barnett shale region of Texas found concentration so formaldehyde at sites with large compressor stations.

Some of these concentrations were greater than the Texas Commission on Environmental Qualities health protective levels. Formaldehyde is one of a 101 chemicals found in association with methane in this study. Research shows that aromatics in particular were associated with compressor stations. Air exposures to formaldehyde target the lungs and mucous membranes and in the short term can cause asthma-like symptoms, coughing, wheezing and shortness of breath.

The EPA classifies it as a probable human carcinogen. The World Health Organization classifies it as a carcinogen to humans. It has also been associated with childhood asthma. The California Office of Environmental Health Assessment has identified formaldehyde as a toxic air containment and gives it an emulsion reference exposure level of 55 for acute exposure, which is the upper end of unhealthy for sensitive groups.

Acute REL is 74 PPB based on irritation of asthmatics. It has also been linked with adverse pregnancy outcomes and reproductive and developmental toxicity. More recent investigations on formaldehyde near compressor stations are focused on the chemical reaction between methane and sunlight. While it is well known that stationary compressor station engines emit formaldehyde it is less well-known that formaldehyde may also be formed at these sites through this chemical reaction.

While the research is going on it suggests that health hazards associated with formaldehyde may be greater than previously thought. Because reported health symptoms near compressor stations such as respiratory impacts and shortness of breath can be caused by exposure to formaldehyde, targeting monitoring of this chemical at these sites would and should be recommended.

For all the people suffering with lung problems such as myself, this is not satisfactory. My husband and I bought a beautiful home for the first time in Temple this year. It is our dream retirement home and we are now with our neighbors in the fight of our life. Those of us who suffer these types of problems seem to be considered expendable by Kinder Morgan, Tennessee Gas and if this compressor is built we might as well prepare our final arrangements, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next we have number -- 18.

MR. DARCHIK: Nick Darchik, D-a-r-c-h-i-k. The -- since the start of this project I have had a feeling that this project is not meant for New Hampshire. This project will create a non-recoverable impact on the environment. With 150 foot clear cut work area and the proposed 71 miles in New Hampshire being impacted, 1,309 acres of pristine lane will no longer remain useable. This is the pipeline route only.

And in addition the proposed 57 acres for each compressor station, possibly 2, this now removes 1423 acres from the total area of New Hampshire and the globe. This equates to 2 and one-quarter square miles gone that can never be used for anything again.

I personally think that 2 and a quarter miles is a lot of area to give to a private entity. This loss does not appear to be that great of an impact however if the original route in Massachusetts is used, the total miles of pipeline will be reduced. That is the most direct route, the original route that was proposed going from west to east to Dracut and MASS.

In addition there will be an additional reduction in the land loss in the state and the total impact on the environment and the globe. The original route needs to be re-addressed to minimize any and all impacts to the environment.

1309 acres lost in New Hampshire. New Hampshire has 5 million 984 thousand acres, that ends up to 200ths of 1%. That same acreage in Massachusetts equals 193/100th of a percent. In the lovely state of Texas this would amount to 760 ten-thousandths of a percent so you see where our buddy Kinder is coming from, but it wouldn't affect him at all.

The larger the area the less the impact on that area only -- the impact globally remains the same. We need

to keep what we have for real estate since no one can go out and buy more. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next we are at number 19.

MR. DILLON: My name is Brian Dillon and I live in Amherst, that's B-r-i-a-n D-i-l-l-o-n. This is currently the view from my home into the proposed path. My home abuts the land where the proposed route will begin to deviate to avoid Souhegan High School and Middle School. This is also where a water line in Milford is buried as well.

This picture is what I am trying to prevent happening to that land. Part of Kinder Morgan's pitch to New Hampshire has been that we will now have a less costly source of energy to use, this is a false premise. Currently many towns do not have the existing pipeline infrastructure that would be needed to get this gas into our homes. Several of us looked into getting natural gas hooked up to our home because there is an existing natural gas line along Boston Post Road. I would cost us around \$150.00 per linear foot to run that pipe to our home.

My home is roughly 423 feet from that line. That does not even consider the cost of purchasing and having installed a new furnace that would burn natural gas. Kinder Morgan is not offering one cent toward the infrastructure in the town's impacted by their pipeline either to get to the gas to our homes, nor are they offering anything to the homeowners.

The threat of this project has already caused my property value to decrease. Once built that value will decrease even more, like many people my home value is part of my retirement plans -- it is going to take a very long time for my property value to recover if at all.

Additionally I asked my insurance agent what it will mean for my homeowner's insurance if this pipeline is built and now I will be living in an incineration zone. Initially nothing, but that does not mean it would stay that way. The real problem could occur when I go to sell it, that is when the home would be evaluated and now that that home is in an incineration zone, the cost of homeowner's insurance could make it too costly for a new owner.

I'm already in a flood plain and have seen my yearly flood insurance premiums dramatically increase, especially after super storm Sandy. I can barely dig a whole without jumping through a lot of hoops. How in the world is the same government that forces me to buy flood insurance is allowing a flood plain to be ripped to shreds and all vegetation around the pipeline be killed off?

At some point after this pipeline is built it may be better financially for me to simply send my house keys to Kinder Morgan and walk away. This pipeline could destroy everything I have worked for in terms of property value and lifestyle. Shame on Governor Hassan, our two senators and our congressmen and women here in New Hampshire -- while opposition to this pipeline is abundant all of them have stayed on the sideline and the most any of them will say is that we need more time to study this.

In the words of Teddy Roosevelt, "bull feathers". We do not need more study time, we need this pipeline sent back to Massachusetts where it is needed. The federal government wants this and Kinder Morgan wants this. Use the land owned by the government, bury this line down the middle of 495 to Dracut. There is not a need for this in New Hampshire as we are already a net energy exporter and our electricity rates are going down.

Finally this whole process and the threat of friend's and neighbor's property being taken by eminent domain has really soured me and got me thinking about running for Congress. Someone needs to fight for us here. Many need towns, livelihoods and qualities of life are about to be steamrolled by an over-reaching federal government and a company built by the alumni of Enron, remember them? In order to put in a pipeline that will ultimately export natural gas under the guise that natural gas is needed in New Hampshire, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, go ahead number 20.

MS. DERBY: My name is Lisa Derby Oden and I live in New Ipswich, New Hampshire, O-d-e-n. Given the incomplete nature of Kinder Morgan's resource reports and the recent changes to the scope of the proj-

ect, these scoping meetings are being conducted prematurely and therefore failing to provide information that would benefit the NEPA process and more importantly given that need has not been demonstrated, I'm really unsure as to why we are here at all.

Though my concerns are many I am going to talk about pets and farm animals. They are going to be affected by the pipeline construction, noise and vibrations as well as compressor station construction and operation. I own dogs, cats, and horses and they are a large part of my life. Indeed one of the reasons that I live in a pristine, quiet, healthy, rural environment is so that I may have all of these animals and I'm not alone in this.

Subjecting our pets and farm animals to ongoing construction noise as well as compressor station noise, vibration and emissions is just not okay from an emotional or a financial point of view. Pet and farm animal owners invest a large amount annual to their care and well-being. Animal health issues related to construction and compressor station operation will result in increased veterinary bills as well as premature loss of the animals.

Similarly health impacts to farm animals represent loss in production and subsequent will directly impact the livelihood of those with production farm animals. At the very least, FERC and Kinder Morgan need to provide us with the following:

1 -- Determine the pets and farm animals owned across the NED Project.

2 -- Investigate the cost to relocate these animals during construction phase and offer relocation to those requesting it.

3 -- Conduct meteorological studies to evaluate weather patterns year round and impact areas of the toxins that are air borne that our animals will breathe.

4 -- Identify the chemicals used in the fracking process that are emitted during the compressor station operation as well as the animal health related problems associated with that.

5 -- Calculate the economic loss to local businesses that supply pet food and treats that veterinary services, animal sitting, kennel boarding, grooming, et cetera and the loss as a result of construction and compressor station emissions when we lose these animals for these reasons and don't replace them.

6 -- Identify the resources and availability to evacuate our pets and farm animals in an emergency.

7 -- Provide on-going animal health monitoring during construction and when pipeline compressor station are operational, pay on-going increased vet bills and production loss cost. Provide a plan and adequate funding for all of those humans, pets and farm animals impacted by the construction and operation of any, to be made whole, not just mitigated.

And my final request would be also for other items, studies and resources that are TBD.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We'll move to number 21 here. I want to see if there is a woman here with some young children, would you like to go next if the numbers 22 through 24 would want to go in case you wanted to go home a little earlier? Okay that's fine, 21, go ahead.

MR. MEYER: Hello my name is Alec Meyer, I'm a resident of New Ipswich. Given the incomplete nature of Kinder Morgan's research reports, coupled with the recent changes to the scope of the proposed project, these scoping meetings are being conducted prematurely and therefore are failing to provide information that would benefit an EPA process.

The southern New Hampshire region contains multiple endangered, threatened and protected species of animals, insects and plants. The flora and fauna of this area include, but are not limited to blanding's turtles, marble salamanders, golden eagles, spotted turtles, wood turtles, blue spotted salamanders, wood frogs, lady slippers and bearberry. Several of these species have been identified by residents that are located within what is called the incineration zone. Unfortunately with the limited time we have been given and the lack of resources and properly trained participants, we are bound to have missed, many, many, more.

If the proposed pipeline and compressor station are allowed to be built the result will include some defor-

estation which then leads into a population boom of invasive species -- a weakened eco-system is then left open for more disease and insect destruction. We also face the onslaught -- we already face the onslaught of emerald ash borer, hemlock wooly adelgid and the Asian longhorn beetle nearly on our door steps.

Combine all of that with the potential unknown impact the proposed project will have on local honey bees and other pollinators. Who is going to implement an IPM program for evasive controls? What damages will be done to the micro-climates and eco-systems within the region? Where are the case studies on the impact to an already threatened region? How will the emissions from the compressor station impact migratory paths and breeding grounds?

When will our lands be safe? And another point to make is also, one of the residents has PTSD from serving our country, what is the blow out going to do to his PTSD reactions? I have a letter from him as well. He is currently serving overseas, I can only say that he is in the Middle East because of OPSEC.

It says, "To KM, the environmental impact of this project itself is too great for us to let this happen. Taking any trees and wood lands will affect the local wildlife. The possibility of polluting our natural wetlands and more important are residents underground drinking water is a great hazard. Sound and noise pollution is something that no small rural town should have.

I am current deployed and living on a small military base that is run by generators. I can assure you it is not pleasant but here it is required to maintain quality of life and provide security to defend our troops, our nation and our partner nations. A large compressor station surely has no reason being in our town. The ground vibration alone would be enough to force wildlife from the area and cause issues with the natural eco-system.

The negative economic impact it will create will drastically and unfairly reduce property values. Homeowners insurance rates will climb for anyone within the region of the incineration zone."

And I'll give you his letter.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, 22.

MS. DURLING: My name is Susan Durling, D-u-r-l-i-n-g. I'm a resident of New Hampshire and proud to say that my family has lived in this state for more than 400 years. Prior to my questions for this meeting I am going to request like everybody else that the scoping meetings be postponed until everyone has had an adequate time to respond to the gigabytes of data that Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline posted last Friday.

Of special concern to me is the town of Winchester which has the longest segment of green fields, areas far from power lines and as yet does not have anything nearby to go to a scoping meeting, unless you are getting the one scheduled that you are promising hopefully for Cheshire County.

MR. TOMASI: Yes, Cheshire County will definitely have one, I will give you some extra time but yes, we will definitely have one in Cheshire County.

MS. DURLING: Okay, my questions for you are will Kinder Mortgage PGP provide a list of citizens of affected towns with whom it has contracted for services and the fees paid to them? If unable to identify them because of privacy issues, how will the number of persons and financial or material compensation by town be made known?

What will be done to avoid impact to Winchester's natural wonders of Pulpit Rock and Pulpit Falls? The pipeline enters Winchester through conservation lands deeded to the town with the caveat that these towns be protected. We want these areas avoided. What will you do to protect them?

Most homeowners rely on wells for their water supply given the rocky nature of the Granite State, blasting will no doubt be required to complete construction. Please look into how the company plans to avoid contamination, damage and changes in water levels. Will the company preserve stone walls, historic foundations, dams and mill sites within the project area of potential effect and I am seeing no reference to Native American traditional cultural places within the projects APE although it was just posted last Friday.

Does the company have a plan for dealing with the unanticipated discovery of pre-historic sites, historic properties or human remains and what is that plan? And lastly I did not find that the company had contacted Elizabeth H. Muzzey, the Director of Division of Historical Resources a New Hampshire's State Historic Preservation Officer and I would request that she be contacted by Kinder Morgan or by the FERC thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are on number 23, Laya Fercilli? 23? 24? 24 is Richard Fercilli? 24, okay -- 25 then.

MS. SZMAUZ: Hi I'm Maria S-z-m-a-u-z and I am also from New Ipswich. I was able to speak here last night and I spoke about conservation land. Surprisingly adding up all the lands on the New Hampshire conservancy documents I came up with 8.3 miles of conservation land with the NED running through it in New Hampshire which happens to be about 10% of the route and I think that that's incredible, that a project could come to a state and go through that many miles of conservation land that would equal 10% of its route and not consider it a Greenville project but that's not what I am going to talk about tonight.

Tonight I want to talk about inquiring minds and what we want to know but first I would like you to hear something that I heard this morning. If I can play this loud enough (birds chirping). That's what I heard on my deck in the morning and it is a quiet place and I want it to be a quiet place and I don't want to wake up to something like banging and drilling and blasting.

And along with that I don't want other people in town to wake up to that and hear noises of the compressor station every morning and every afternoon and every night. We are just mere mortals, working 9 to 5, stuck with this project and stuck with doing the research to protect ourselves because we really feel that we can't trust Kinder Morgan. Kinder Morgan lies, they have a website out now telling the world and heralding to New Hampshire that all of these little towns are going to get gas from this and it's not true.

They have their little asterisks at the bottom but who reads those? The northern part of New Hampshire is beginning to believe that this is really going to help us and that's not fair. I'm concerned because I feel that they are not telling us the truth, we have to do the research ourselves and I went on a mission to find some information out after our meeting in March in New Ipswich where we had just found out that we might be getting a compressor station and we were told they knew not how air quality would be tested.

So I had a conversation with someone there who gave me a lot of information. Apparently they really do know what's going into the gas as it comes into our town because it is metered along the way and chromatography tells them exactly what's in the gas, I think we should get to know exactly what's in the gas when it comes into our town. I think we need to know what they are going to do with the particle matter that's filtered out and the 8 foot long cigarette filters.

I think we need to know how big the storage tanks are going to be for the condensate that is stripped from the pipe so it won't corrode the pipe. We are told it is mostly water, hydrocarbon salt and sand but --

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am your time is up.

MS. SZMAUZ: But we would like to know.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Number 26?

MR. SOMERO: Timothy Somero, S-o-m-e-r-o. My comments are extemporaneous. I don't have anything to report. First of all I want to mention scoping because we have a lot of representation from New Ipswich, I live in New Ipswich, each town is affected and we need transparent reporting and we need help with that.

Maria brought up a lot of things, formaldehyde, benzene, all of the stuff that was not part of our existence until this happened -- 24 x 7 x 365 monitoring and reporting, fugitive gases and emissions from the whole pipeline. We are starting to recognize this as an American problem. We are not experts, I'm a computer guy. And volunteering at night I'm exhausted. It's 4:30 in the morning when I start my day, many of us.

So we had to reach out across America and this is the same story, again and again. We are problem solvers, we are tough, we are courageous, we want to help. We were offered help from other places in Ameri-

ca, we want to return that, we want to fix it.

So I am here to talk about socio-economics. Society economics right -- and one of the rules in business, the only indicator of future behavior is past behavior. Kinder Morgan has a bad track record. The first time I met with them they told me I would get natural gas. New Ipswich, New Hampshire will never get natural gas.

So if we start a precedent of deceit or untrustworthiness then we can expect that future behavior -- you know our future behavior we are going to fight, we are going to be here, we are well informed, respectful, we are working within the boundaries of what America has decided that we are supposed to act.

We don't see this private corporation doing that. So we can't even begin until the design is set, because we have to figure out how much to tax them so if we have even a chance to recoup the losses that we may, we are going to endure, roads are going to be cut.

The girl from Texas, she was down in Texas, she showed me pictures of the mess that Kinder Morgan left, they cursed at her and told her to go away, Ashley, I just met her. We are collecting the real story okay, so we can't even start until a design is set and we need to have that clock reset for the whole pipeline, scoping meetings in each town, each community and we are looking for your help, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: We are on number 27, Colleen 27? Okay, moving on, 28?

MR. LEAHY: Thank you I am Matt Leahy. L-e-a-h-y. I am the public policy manager for the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forest. We are as you may know New Hampshire's oldest and largest land trust. We own -- 3 of our forest reservation parcels are located along the route of the project. The 58 5 acre heel tract parcels in Greenville and Mason and the 45 acre Bakken's force in Hudson. As such we are in the process of doing a full assessment on the potential negative impacts the project may have on those parcels and we will be submitting more detailed comments in the future, in the near future.

But I just want to summarize the written comments that I have already submitted. Because the proposed route will cross significant land and water resources as well as wildlife habitats. Our concern goes beyond just the properties that we own and we would ask that as you determine whether this project does provide a public benefit, we believe you should also give equal weight to the project's adverse effects, especially over the long-term and not just during any construction period.

Secondly we would urge the agency to develop true alternate proposals to what has been avoided here that will avoid and minimize impacts to protected, conservation lands and other sensitive natural areas along the route.

Finally as you know the Natural Gas Act grants private gas companies that receive FERC approval the power of condemnation. This authority is a powerful tool and provides those companies a significant advantage over landowners and therefore we would ask that FERC exercise extreme diligence and restraint before granting any such power.

And we would ask FERC to set the high review threshold for determining if this project will provide a substantial benefit to the people of New Hampshire before granting any eminent domain authority. As I mentioned I did submit formal written comments and will be submitting additional comments in the future, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, we are on number 29.

MR. HEWITT: Richard Hewitt, H-e-w-i-t-t. I would like to speak about the compressor station and the discharge during the blow down periods. There should be very specific information available regarding Marcellus Shale, not Bakken shale or something else, Marcellus Shale being the discharge coming out of compressor stations that exists. That information should be required from Kinder Morgan. Which of these components is identified by the EPA as hazardous or harmful to human health and given the different gases embedded in the discharge of different densities and molecular weights, their disbursement pattern will be different.

What is the anticipated disbursement patterns for these individual gases for this specific meteorological re-

gion? I just stress that New England is generally most of the year ground zero for the jet stream, maybe I should say air zero so you know some tests done in a different part of the country that doesn't reflect the meteorological conditions here is invalid. They should be able to provide that kind of information and then the last part of that is what is the cumulative effect of these toxins, and these elements in the discharge on people and wildlife and livestock as much of this area is also agricultural and on that.

I would like to say two other things, one is to FERC. By accepting this grossly inadequate application, you have played into Kinder Morgan's hands. Once you accept it the clock has started ticking. They can fiddle around and give out information in dribs and drabs like they are doing, meanwhile each day that goes by they are getting closer to their goal, you should never have accepted this in the first place, it was just wrong.

And so now we are in this situation where every day we have to look and see what did they change today, what hoops do we have to jump through? I think that was a serious mistake and I hope you will rectify it. And finally I would like to say something to my fellow New Englanders. I'm from Massachusetts, this is not a question of should it be in Massachusetts or should it be in New Hampshire.

A lot of speakers have pointed out the majority of this is for export. That doesn't benefit Massachusetts. This shouldn't be a question of Massachusetts or New Hampshire, it should be a question or should there be a pipeline or no pipeline. And I hope FERC, and I hope that EIF will seriously consider the "no-build" option which is the proper solution, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, number 30?

MS. MCGHEE: My name is Kat M-c-G-h-e-e. I live in Hollis and I was the Chair of the Pipeline Impact Study Task Force there about a year before most of the towns here were on the pipeline route and I was asked to join the Nashua Regional Planning Commission Energy Facility Advisory Committee by my town after that and I serve on that group still and I am also on the Zoning Board of Adjustments in Hollis. So on the NRPC Energy Committee I have been reviewing the issue of demand and need. And I know that we were instructed to keep our comments specific to siting but that serves you but it doesn't really serve us. In the time I have been involved with the Senate hearings in Concord and the public utility filings and the hearing in MASS and New Hampshire and the interactions with FERC it has become abundantly clear that the system at the state and federal level is strongly weighted towards the industry.

I say this because each agency hides behind a segmented responsibility giving you cover to ignore the big picture. The only picture you consider beyond business as usual permitting is economics. But ignoring the total picture of our energy and environmental decisions is also a bad term long economic decision that's being swept under the rug to aid the current gas boom.

We don't need regulation to help pipeline companies, we need regulation to maintain a balance between commerce and the common good. The NED Pipeline would not be found to be in the public interest if we factored in the context of 21st Century greenhouse gas emission levels. We could also argue it is not in the public good to throw good money after bad investing rate per dollar in a new unsustainable energy infrastructure, but then vision is not your department.

Now it may be said that you don't want to hear these words and it may also be said that you don't believe that these very real issues are among your very specific charge which is, if I understand it, to facilitate the permitting process. Since your charge compliments the industry that pays your salaries, it is designed to make opposing gas projects very difficult.

So from the outside looking in there's a lot wrong with this picture. So here's our proposal. Why don't you update your mission for the times in which we live? Why don't you recognize that having access to sufficient gas to bridge our clean energy strategy is a far cry from permitting every reasonable project when the industry seems to be so good at convincing you that every project is reasonable?

Their burden of proof is too low. We ask that you recognize that the cumulative effect of permitting NED, on top of the existing infrastructure projects that will bring ample new gas to the region and there are

ample projects that will bring gas to the region, is going to change the landscape of our energy markets to the detriment of clean energy alternatives and goals.

NED will bring a negative effect --

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MS. MCGHEE: Really?

MR. TOMASI: Your time has been up, yes.

MS. MCGHEE: My time has been up, okay, all right, well I'll pass it in.

MR. TOMASI: Okay thank you, yes. Next is 31, Diane Hewitt.

MS. HEWITT: My name is Diane Hewitt, spelled H-e-w-i-t-t. I'm also a resident of Groton, our property is included in the original pipeline route and our son and his wife have just moved into their first new home in New Ipswich about 2 miles from the compressor station. Our intent has always been to stop and not to move the pipeline.

Here's a true story. One bitterly cold snowy winter night this past year I attended a Kinder Morgan open house near Wilmington, Massachusetts. For those of you who aren't aware Wilmington now only has one functioning town well, because of the contamination of the ground water over 25 years ago by a large corporation based in the neighboring town of Woburn.

This environmental catastrophe is chronicled in the book of civil action most of you probably know it. As you can imagine Wilmington has gone to great lengths to protect their last remaining well. A concerned citizen at this Kinder Morgan meeting asked a Kinder Morgan engineer, what would happen if this last well was contaminated?

His answer was we will make it whole. Standing next to her I asked in all seriousness and without a bit of irony, how are you able to do this? How do you make something like this whole? After pausing for a few minutes the engineer replied we would ship in bottled water.

Shift the scene now to New Hampshire where you have heard all evening about the towns on well water and residents and town officials are tremendously concerned about their aquifers. If their wells are contaminated what will be done? Bottled water, for how many decades and at whose expense?

This calls into question the whole notion of mitigation. What can actually be mitigated? Not contaminated wells, not the loss of a hundred year old sugar maple trees upon which a farmer's livelihood depends, not the loss of an endangered species, not the loss of agricultural land, not the pollution of a vernal pool, river or stream and not our health and safety so I call upon FERC to define mitigation.

What does that actually mean? And then study and question every aspect of the Kinder Morgan proposal and ask the question what do they mean when they speak about mitigating environmental damage? Is it possible? Can the damage be reasonably reversed? In what time frame and who will pay, who will benefit? Apply hard science, engineering expertise and common sense.

Here's the second point. Last night in Nashua you publicly advocated that residents allow their properties to be surveyed so that Kinder Morgan can be aware of any special issues related to their land. You went on to say that once a property is going to be taken by eminent domain it is important that the property owner consult an attorney because it is a complex transaction.

Well we did consult a top eminent domain attorney in Boston. His advice, don't let your land be surveyed, don't provide Kinder Morgan with any information, because the minute the eminent domain negotiations begin, everything you have said, all of the information you shared, can and will be used against you, so this is a dilemma.

Here's what I am asking you to do. Consult your top eminent domain lawyers and ask for their legal advice and the best legal advice in the interest of the property owner, let's level the playing field. FERC should be concerned about insuring the best possible outcome for the homeowners and communicate these recommendations to the public.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up, number 32?

MR. MILLER: My name is Nick Miller, M-i-l-l-e-r. Mr. Tomasi, in your opening remarks at yesterday's scoping meeting in Nashua, you requested that affected landowners allow Kinder Morgan contractors to survey their land stating that this can help to avoid or mitigate possible impacts to their property and that such permission does not imply approval of the pipeline nor willingness to grant Kinder Morgan an easement.

Perhaps you can understand the people on this side of the microphone might have trouble totally trusting you on this one. You are a FERC employee and FERC has done little if anything to earn your trust at this point, quite the opposite. Your suggestion to the people that will clearly make your job easier -- more surveys means a quicker and easier FERC remediation plan.

You state that you are neither an advocate nor an opponent of this pipeline proposal and yet I get the feeling that you believe that this pipeline will be built, that it is unstoppable and since resistance is futile, landowners might as well accept it and try to mitigate the damage. But I assure you that people are concerned about much more than a tree planted by their grandfather.

Your belief that this thing will get built is not necessarily shared by those in attendance here this evening. FERC has indicated in the past that an increased need by a pipeline applicant, to use eminent domain against landowners, does count against approval of the pipeline application. Many people feel that a survey denial is one of the few ways open to them to send what they hope is a clear message that they will fight this pipeline tooth and nail.

They believe that the more of them that refuse permission to survey, the stronger the message that is being sent to both Kinder Morgan and to FERC, take your pipeline and go away. I would like to return to the matter of trust. Each month Kinder Morgan reports to FERC staff on the percentage of landowners who have given permission to survey along the NED Pipeline corridor.

Considering the orgy of misinformation that Kinder Morgan has treated the public to in the last 18 months, I ask that FERC require Kinder Morgan to prove these numbers. On other projects, Kinder Morgan has admitted that they were counting the percentage of landowners that had been asked for survey permission, not the total number.

And at Nashua's scoping meeting last evening, we heard from one New Hampshire official that Kinder Morgan had grossly undercounted the number of affected landowners in their town. These sorts of tricks make the percentage of landowners allowing surveys to look much higher than they actually are. Kinder Morgan has a history of making misleading statements and has every reason to spin their survey numbers, that's why I mistrust them and why I am asking that FERC verify this before they publish it again, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, I believe we are on 34.

MS. LYNN: Hello my name is Ara Lynn, that is spelled A-r-a L-y-n-n. I am -- I have owned a business in New Ipswich for almost 30 years. I hire employees. My employees work outside, we produce food, this food is eaten by tourists and by people from Massachusetts who come at great distances to get our products and it's also eaten by local people.

The prevailing winds to our farm come from the direction of the compressor station. So we are very concerned that chronic pollution entering the air during blow down events will impact our health and our employee's health and will irreversibly pollute our land, land that we have grown organically for almost 30 years.

Once the land is polluted there is no remediation for us and Kinder Morgan is under no obligation to be responsible to us, excuse me. The only solution for us is prevention. I ask you, representatives of FERC, of the federal government who have the power to make the decisions to please use your power to protect the health and well-being of us and of our land. Please do not allow corporate cost-cutting measures to jeopardize our health and safety. Please require Kinder Morgan to use the highest quality materials for

their pipeline so that it doesn't fail during our famous frost season in the winter.

Please require them to build a heavy-duty compressor station with state of the art containment building to try to prevent as much pollution, noise, air, water and light pollution as possible. Please hold them accountable to us. Please approach your decisions as if your children were attending Temple Elementary School.

Please act as if you were eating the vegetables and chicken that comes from my farm. Please act as if you were enjoying watching the night stars in the peaceful land of New Ipswich which is still God's country and there's not a whole lot of that left on the east coast.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up number 36, is 36 still here? No -- 37, that's fine.

MS. FLETCHER: My name is Liz Fletcher, F-l-e-t-c-h-e-r. I'm from Mason and Kinder Morgan's continued use of outdated maps is a very bad sign. Either they are trying to deceive about the impacts of the project or they are incompetent. Bad maps indicate that Kinder Morgan has a practice of cutting corners. Please determine the financial stability of Kinder Morgan, this is crucial for protecting the environment.

Kinder Morgan should be required to post a 5 year performance bond to ensure the success of all mitigation, erosion controls and re-vegetation for all properties along the pipeline, in all the states in all the hundreds of miles. They should also be required to have insurance coverage sufficient to cover the worst case scenario and this insurance should be maintained annually.

They should also be required to establish a de-commissioning fund to remove the pipeline when it is no longer used and they shouldn't be used for anything else than what they were originally permitted to use it for. Land owners should not be left with a rusting relic full of toxic sludge.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you 38?

MS. SCHONGAR: Hi, my name is Jennifer Schongar, that's S-c-h-o-n-g-a-r and I have lived in Mason for over 20 years now. I would like to start off by thanking Mr. Tomasi for listening to everyone late into the night last night. It should be clear now that there are more people who wish to speak than there is time allowed and therefore more scoping meetings should be held.

To be blunt, this pipeline is not the right decision for New Hampshire. We will never get any benefit from this pipeline. None of the proposed power companies signed up for this pipeline and offered service in this area of New Hampshire and the idea that this pipeline will open up the chance that someday we could get gas pipes to our houses is ludicrous.

Many of these small towns have very few municipal services, we just don't have the money for them so if our towns can't even afford to run internet lines above ground, there is no way we will ever afford to run gas pipes underground.

Southern New Hampshire is teeming with wildlife, frogs and other amphibians are considered to be the barometer of the health of the land and judging from the songs I hear them sing, our land is clean and yet their numbers are still decreasing even in these areas that are natural. To consider putting a gas pipeline through virgin land when there are alternatives where the earth has already been denuded of nature is unconscionable.

You have requested input on environmental issues and they need to be mitigated if this pipeline goes through. There is no way anyone can cover all of the miles of the proposed corridor in the time we have been given, especially the miles of state forest and conservation land that it would go through. My land includes almost two acres of wetlands, it would take a lot of time I don't have to search every inch of it to find any endangered or at risk species and since I am not a biologist I am certainly no expert on identifying different species of plants and animals and the wildlife certainly isn't going to help by lining up to be identified.

We have heard last night from several hard-working union men and I appreciate their candor that they need work. Natural gas and other fossil fuels are going the way of the dinosaur, let's give these hard-working men and women jobs of the future on renewable power projects, not more dead-end jobs on fossil

fuel projects.

This gas is a bridge fuel, there are so many new pipeline projects further along than this one that together they surely already form a large enough bridge to get us into the future where renewable energy will be the main generator of power. So instead of stealing hard-earned money from the thousands of home owners by taking their land and therefore reducing their property values with no benefit to them and destroying precious eco systems, please come to the same realization that the NED Project is not needed or wanted in New Hampshire, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you 39?

MR. ROGER: Good evening Eric and fellow concerned citizens. My name is Jim Roger and I am qualified to talk about pipelines because I worked on one for 11 years, I have worked for the Plains All American Pipeline Company which was just on the news recently by the way with an oil spill off the coast of California.

And I retired from that job in 1999 by the way. I was a skater technician and supervisor control and data acquisition so I have an intimate knowledge of how pipelines function, anybody can ask me a question if they want to. But first I want to talk about something semi-related. I understand from the FERC document that I read over 6,000 acres are going to be cleared. If I want to have this lumber on my own property I have to get a permit, I have to pay taxes before I can reap the revenue from that. So with 6,000 acres being cleared where is that money going and will those taxes be paid to the state of New Hampshire?

I haven't seen anyone address that. I haven't heard anything about that. Now getting on to the subject of pipeline with only a few minutes left. I assure everybody in this room if you live within 3 miles of a compressor station you will hear it 24/7. When you go in your house and you try to hide from that noise you are going to feel the hum in your building constantly, a lot of people can't sleep anymore -- I'm not even talking about light pollution yet and if you want to have that Saturday afternoon barbecue with all of your friends and relatives, every once in a while you are going to smell the stench coming from the blow off from these compressor stations.

And also this whole idea of clean, natural gas this is fracked gas. The whole nature of fracking gas releases every contaminant and chemical running the stata beneath the earth, that's the nature of it, that's what it is. You are releasing hydrogen sulfide, benzene, radon gas, all of this stuff. So who among us would want to cook our next meal over radon gas or hydrogen sulfite? Not me, not for sure and I ask you to consider Eric that with little or no benefit to the residents of New Hampshire of this pipeline that I believe that this is for the greater good of Kinder Morgan, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is number 40, is number 40 here? 40? 41?

MR. VORE: Good evening my first name is Jon Michael J-o-n M-i-c-h-a-e-l last name is Vore V (as in Victor) - o-r-e. I live at 23 Simian Wilson Road in Amherst, New Hampshire. The pipeline is currently slated to come directly through my hard about 30 to 50 feet away from my bedroom window. As you can imagine I am 100% opposed to this pipeline coming through New Hampshire. I request FERC to study the supposed need for the proposed NED Pipeline.

Kinder Morgan views all of New England as one state and doesn't evaluate the individual needs of each state. KM makes gross generalizations stating that New England needs this which is factually false. New Hampshire produces enough energy to meet our needs and a significant amount of that energy is exported out of the state. Bringing more natural gas to New England will in no way benefit New Hampshire or fix our energy issues.

Our problem is not due to quantity, but rather our ability to distribute energy. FERC needs to be sure that there is an actual need that can't be addressed with other, more reasonable means before they start granting a private company the right of eminent domain to take my land.

Why should people who will not reap any benefit from this pipeline, bear the responsibility of having to house it? I would also like FERC to evaluate the current route through Amherst which brings the pipeline

in very close proximity to three of our schools, including Souhegan High School, Amherst Middle School and RESC Academy, thank you for your time and consideration.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Number 42, 42? 43? 43? 44? 45 - 45?

MS. NIGRO: My name is Jean J-e-a-n Nigro N-i-g-r-o and I would like to speak to my concerns about the noise pollution in the vicinity of the compressor station. As we know compressor stations do emit loud, blow down noises as well as on-going operational sounds. FERC guidelines permit those thresholds to be to a maximum of 55 DBA average.

The problem with that is that there are a myriad of health studies which indicate that threshold levels of over 50 DBA actually lead to significant health effects, those including hearing loss, sleep disturbances, diminished productivity, absenteeism, increased drug use and also including high blood pressure, coronary disease, migraine headaches and the contribution of low birth weight with newborns.

Additionally a number of studies have evaluated classroom noise for children. I remind you that the compressor station location is one half mile from the Temple Elementary School. Negative effects on classroom DBA's over 50 include poor auditory discrimination and speech perception, poor memory, poor reading ability and lower average test scores on nationally standardized tests. I am greatly concerned about the impact on the children in Temple.

Additionally, beyond just DBA measures, we need to be thinking about the qualitative aspects of noise pollution. Low frequency noise which is noise that is produced at a threshold lower than human hearing -- that is lower than 20 hertz, is something that is transmitted through ground vibrations, underground and along the ground. There are negative health effects that have been cited including anxious, anxiety, nervousness, difficulty with central nervous system problems, extreme depression, all associated with these vibrations.

The vibrations are insidious because they are not audible and you only realize that you are being exposed to them when you have these internal sensations. The vibrations are transmitted across the ground, they emit up through buildings and also you could be standing on the ground and get these vibrations. There are multiple negative effects from those and I would call on FERC to require that Kinder Morgan do an exhaustive study of the implications of low frequency sound, the levels that are being produced by the compressor station, the potential negative health effects and also to seriously consider the siting of this location of the compressor station so close to the Temple Elementary School, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are number 46, Oliver? 46? 47? 48? 49?

MS. SHIMBERG: Hi again, I'm Kathy Shimberg K-a-t-h-y S-h-i-m-b-e-r-g and I say hi again because we have already been together at a couple of other scoping hearings in New York state and I wasn't going to speak tonight because I'm not local but I'm visiting friends in Fitzwilliam and they are along the pipeline and I have friends in Massachusetts who are along the pipeline route and we now along the Constitution route also on the Kinder Morgan NED route and I'm just requesting that FERC use sufficient diligence so that you listen to everybody hear and take what everybody has said to heart, we are facing all the same issues in upstate New York and elsewhere.

And FERC did give the certificate to Constitution Pipeline which hasn't completed its building yet but we hope you will deny Kinder Morgan NED because it would be much, much worse. We now have compressor stations scheduled for Franklin, New York which is very close to me so I am requesting that you pay heed, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. 50?

MR. HERLIHY: Hi my name is Craig Herlihy, C-r-a-i- H-e-r-l-i-h-y and I'm from Wilton, New Hampshire. I'm a concerned citizen of the United States here before you. I don't have the pipeline slated to go through my backyard, but it is nearby and I'm concerned for those that are next to it because I wouldn't want it in my backyard and I don't want it in the town next to me either and I used to live in Massachusetts and I don't like the idea of it going through Massachusetts either.

What I think we all want is clean energy and this is not going in that direction and I moved here with my wife 8 years ago and I love the town I am in, I love the state of New Hampshire so I am concerned with the state of the long-term impacts here.

We moved here looking for a special place to raise our children and hopefully invest in a house that would increase in value and I do believe we found that here however these things are all in jeopardy as a result of this pipeline and I think there's a lot of people getting you know, a lack of sleep over this issue.

The beauty of nature preserves in our area as well as the backyards of average citizens are at stake here. We are all here in the hopes that our voices combined will stop the grinding machine of Kinder Morgan from misusing eminent domain, this is a classic example of it and their selfishly motivated intentions.

The pipeline would also be a soft terror target and I haven't heard anyone talk about that tonight, but that's a big concern in today's crazy world of people who don't like Americans. And furthermore it would lower the property values and we have talked about that quite a bit as well because no one wants to live in a danger zone you know.

If the pipeline was where they are intending it to be when I was looking for a house I would have looked elsewhere so I know that other people are going to do the same. And lastly, no clear benefit is outlined for anyone in this community so I am strongly opposed to this and I think the answer is a resounding no, don't bring this pipeline here.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you we are at 51? 52? 53? 54.

MS. LOWRY: Hi, I'm Rose Lowry I live in Temple. My last name is L-o-w-r-y. Most of us agree that this project really changes the character of our region but it is not just switching from quaint and rural to industrial. There's also a way that it goes from being a thriving region to a depressed region. When you bring in a project like this, people leave. The wealthy people leave, the educated people leave because they don't want to raise their families in this and they can because they have the means.

And then you have people who can't sell their homes, their homes end up being abandoned, people will go through bankruptcies because their houses can't be sold and what the result of that is is that our tax base becomes decimated because we are losing a lot of participants in our structure.

And then our services are diminished because they have less taxes to work with and then more people leave. The quality of life is drastically changed, all of this because of this pipeline coming through. There's a cost to the individuals as well, I mean not just as a region, the region changes but the individuals, not just the 800 or however many families have the pipeline going through their backyards but the thousands of people who lose everything because their home value evaporates.

Energy should not be cheap, energy should reflect the real cost, the cost to all of the people who are here talking about what they are going to lose. The cost of something like an energy project like this should not be on the shoulders of by-standers, the producers should carry the costs, the profit makers should carry the cost.

I'm from Temple, my house is less than 2 miles from the compressor station, I'm a very active volunteer, I've spent years on the Planning Board as Chair, I know how rare and precious this area is, the land, the people, the wildlife, the dark, the quiet, there is nothing like it. We have fantastic people who work really hard to preserve the wonderful resources that we have here, the natural resources, the historic resources, a thousand things.

Who is going to take care of this property when those good people leave? No company should be allowed to stroll in here and ruin these people's lives. No company should be allowed to ruin a truly idyllic corner of the world that is like no other, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, we are at number 55? 56? 57?

MR. NICKERSON: Hello my name is Peter Nickerson, that's N-i-c-k-e-r-s-o-n. I have a Bachelor of Science in Natural Resource Conservation and a Bachelor of Science in Ocean Engineering so I have some framework to talk about this with you. First off I want to say that I am duly impressed with my fellow

citizens and representatives and their eloquent precise argumentation so far today, there was just a vast majority of issues that I think all of us are concerned with.

This is not a knew-jerk reaction of a nimby opinion. Progress often puts a heavy burden on a few people for the greater good and when it is for the greater good it can be justified. However, this project produces substantial environmental, health, safety, social economic impacts that are to say the least, non-trivial. Asking New Hampshire residents to assume these risks and costs without significant benefits to offset these risks and costs is unreasonable.

Three points I would like to address is that engineering failures occur not from a single failure but from a series of failures. How many levels are being looked at to evaluate the impacts of these designed for possible failure? The chemistry of the soil that they are going through changing could end up adding into that aspect.

What assurances do we have that any agreements that Kinder Morgan to gain permitting for this will be upheld in the decades that we will be living with this pipeline in the future? That if they promise to do something how are we going to make sure that they do follow through on those plans? What end do we have?

And last I've only heard two other times so far tonight is a study and plan in the decommissioning of this line in the future is obviously not going to be around forever. At some point it will become to the point that it is no longer feasible to run either by maintenance or by usage so with that comes to what I was going to say, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Thank you very much. We are on number 58? 59? 60?

MR. HYATT: Hi my name is Tre Hyatt. I live in Greenville, New Hampshire about .7 miles from where the station is going to be built in New Ipswich and I just want to come and speak on a few things that maybe haven't been addressed tonight. I am a resident of New Hampshire and I am a registered nurse in New Hampshire and it just so happens that I take care of people with brain injuries, spinal injuries and neurological disorders.

So I hear about chemicals like formaldehyde being dumped into the environment, concerning to me especially since I have already taken care of people whose neurological systems have been damaged by those chemicals and knowing that I really didn't know a whole lot about this pipeline thing until about 2 weeks ago when my wife asked if I was going to be here tonight and I actually went on You Tube and started watching things about it and seeing the pain that Tucson Valley out west has been through and the after effects of such a pipeline.

And then just in some reading I know the thing that we talked about was methane levels coming off of these natural gas producers or users and methane is up in our country so we are damaging our own atmosphere with increasing natural gases, is something I wonder about. And one thing a gentleman over here mentioned earlier and I just wanted to add to that because I live there -- where we live geographically, we are right at the mountains.

So our weather patterns are kind of interesting and sometimes we don't get a breeze and if you don't get a breeze whatever is there stays there so in the winter time sometimes when our fireplaces are burning and the smoke is coming out of the chimney it goes up and it comes back down, it just permeates this cloud all around your home. Twice in the past I have actually put out the fire in my fireplace because our own smoke from our fire was choking us so with this being built in the Monadnock Valley and this compressor station constantly emitting our fumes is it going to fill our valley when there is no wind and we have nowhere to go, we just have to sit and choke on it and I am a little concerned about that.

I am a father of 4 and where we live it is a bit of a hill and we have a tribe of kids that are outside running around all the time so it is a concern and thank you guys for being there and listening to us, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are at number 61?

MR. FERREIRA: James Ferreira, F-e-r-r-e-i-r-a. So I was lucky enough to be able to speak twice last night

in the Nashua scoping meeting. Once I spoke on endangered lizards and turtles and other environmental impacts that this pipeline is going to cause. My second time I spoke at Kinder Morgan's long history of accidents. So tonight I figured I would change it up a little bit and talk about FERC.

And I found an interesting article written on November 25, 2013 and it is called, "What the FERC", originally established as the Federal Power Commission in 1920 it later was transformed into FERC, what we know now in 1977. It's classified as an independent agency which I think begs the question.

How can FERC be part of a federal government and also be independent you ask. First off, none of FERC's decisions are reviewable by the President or Congress so my lecture today in my speech is to inform you what powers FERC has and what they don't and how we can fight them.

This isn't intended to uphold FERC's independence as a regulatory agency and ensure fair and unbiased decisions when they award pipelines. The agency is completely self-funded. It pays its bills through annual charges, fees and by recovering costs directly from this regulated industry. So the pipelines they put in are the fees that pay their salaries so just for instance in the statistics right from the 2015 stats that came from the FERC office of the Chief Financial Officer, 5 of Kinder Morgan's companies, now mind you not all of them, but just 5 of them equate for 4.8 billion dollars.

FERC annually collects over 6 million from these 5 companies. The total companies listed on these pipelines make up 44.6 billion dollars. Annual fees FERC collects are just under 62 million and again these stats are directly from their Chief Financial Officer.

But there's hope. Being independent doesn't mean it's invincible. All FERC decisions are still reviewable by the federal courts and you better believe if this pipeline gets approved we will go to every step to every court that will listen to us and we will fight this to the bitter end. You have approved 451 projects since 2006, you would think you would have solved the energy problems this country faced with 451 projects being approved since 2006, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up number 62?

MS. FERRERIA: Hi, my name is Alicia Ferreria, F-e-r-r-e-i-r-a. I have many concerns in regards to the pipeline going through the state and first I own 7 acres of property in Merrimack, most of which is an easement for power lines and an additional easement that a property owner has right-of-way to construct a driveway in the future, not sure if Kinder Morgan knows that.

I knowingly purchased my property and built a home in 2012 choosing a street with a cul-de-sac knowing my daughter would be born that year and wanting a place of safety to raise her. Merrimack is a safe community with a larger population than most New Hampshire towns. I recently read, it was the 19th safest town in America.

I also recently learned Kinder Morgan wants to put a gas pipeline through my backyard. The backyard that I thought would be a safe place to raise my child. I have fears for her safety and health and that is very unsettling. Another concern is the preservation of the wildlife in New Hampshire. Within the last 2 years the following animals have passed through my own yard, owls, black bears, coyotes, turkeys, herons, hawks, woodpeckers, deer, blue jays, hummingbirds and varieties of snakes.

I have neighbors who have seen bald eagles, I know we have more species in our towns than nature preserve Forest Hill. I have concerns that our town's wildlife would be greatly threatened if the pipeline ran through their home. I'm not only concerned for my family and the wildlife but I am also concerned for the safety of the residents and visitors that come to Merrimack. Most of the town has city water, I believe it is about 85% which will be affected because of the pipeline running alongside the wells.

We also have a major shopping center, Merrimack Premium Outlets, which seems very unsafe to run gas pipelines in a populated area like that. The last pipeline map I saw my house wasn't on it, it was built in 2012 three years ago, my dream home, my forever home, so FERC my house exists, I exist, my husband and my 2 year old beautiful daughter exist, and please keep the nightmare out of our state.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are now at 63? 64?

MR. GAUT: In my mind I ask when did --

MR. TOMASI: Please speak into the microphone so it could be recorded, thank you.

MR. GAUT: My name is Robert Gaut, I live in Milford, New Hampshire, I'm probably the first person from Milford to speak tonight. In my mind I ask when did I surrender and when did the people of the Souhegan Valley surrender their rights of self-government to the interest of a criminal corporation's profit? Profit which we know is to be extracted from the property, the hard work, the savings of the people of this Souhegan Valley. When was it that permission to comment replaced our inalienable right of self-government? Never is the answer. Not ever. So somehow, somewhere a subversion, a theft of our liberty is being attempted. The issue here is more than on the merits of the unneeded, unnecessary, gargantuan, potentially catastrophic pipeline.

What I think we should be considering here is the future of our liberty to govern ourselves in the Souhegan Valley. We vote to build roads and schools and municipal water and sewer, yet are unable to vote for a potentially catastrophic incendiary device passing through the heart of friends and neighbor's property.

What are the forces arrayed against us attempting to divert us from our traditional civil right of self-government and self-determination? What is going on? FERC asks for our comments, but not our consent. Why is the pipeline here? What is the history of this pipeline? Whose idea was this pipeline? Where are the minutes of every meeting between Kinder Morgan and officials of the FERC?

Does a simple hazard analysis exist? And why have we not been informed of the results so we can make our own judgment in a quantitative search and manner. I repeat the Federal Energy Management Commission should be asking for our consent, not our comments. They need our permission, our consent. Are we seeing here a comment is something to be ignored and public relations issue to be dealt with by simple functionaries for indeed we are being ignored, otherwise FERC would be telling us why the pipeline is a good idea in detail, not sales pitches and then asking for our consent.

Instead we are being told that everything already has been decided a way down in Washington. Everything is okay without the facts which allow us as adult citizens to decide collectively for ourselves. Even more infuriating is the carrot that we are being offered is that if we are nice and polite --

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time is up.

MR. GAUT: Maybe the route will be changed, however the pipeline remains and still will go through.

MR. TOMASI: Sir your time is up.

MR. GAUT: We will have pipeline Kinder Morgan says no matter what.

MR. TOMASI: Sir, there are other people who wish to speak.

MR. GAUT: Yes I know.

MR. TOMASI: Once you let them speak you can come back up.

MR. GAUT: Can I trust that?

MR. TOMASI: Yes. Next up is 65? Is 65 here?

MS. CABANA: My name is Amy Cabana, C-a-b-a-n-a-, I'm from Temple. Good evening and thank you for being here tonight. Based on my knowledge of how the federal government works you are employed by us the people of the United States of America and tonight you are here to hear us the people of southern New Hampshire. I'll refrain from the emotional rhetoric because I know that while it is most important to us, it is not necessarily germane to your decision-making process.

I'm sure you are aware that one of the proposed compressor stations is a half mile from the Temple Elementary School and I'm sure you know our volunteer fire departments are ill-equipped to handle even a small accident. I know you will take into consideration the quality of life we enjoy here. The fresh air, the clean water, the solitude, the peace and the conservation land we so diligently put aside for future generations to enjoy.

I know you will consider all of this because you represent us, the people. This is not the least expensive place to live and not the easiest, but it is ours and we love it. I am far from the most knowledgeable person on this subject and have relied on the efforts and dedication of others to gather information and I have tried to look at both sides of this issue. Based on my understanding there is a perceived need for energy in this region and that the term “energy crisis” has been bandied about to justify this pipeline proposal.

One does not have to dig too deeply to find out that this is a fabricated need by those who will benefit financially from it and not an actual one. One also doesn’t need to look too hard to find out that the vast majority of the natural gas this pipeline will move will not be used in New England. The one company that has signed up to utilize a very marginal amount of the gas is -- wait for it -- affiliated with Kinder Morgan.

I guess if you can’t legitimately find a need, if you have enough money you can create one. I am not sure what Kinder Morgan thought they would find here but we are not the semi-educated backwoods hicks they might have expected. We are country folk for sure because we choose to be. I could say thank you to Kinder Morgan for this issue has united and galvanized a large population that might not otherwise have come together. I think they have underestimated how fiercely we love this place we live and how fervently we will fight to protect it.

We live here for a reason and if anything this proposal has given us great motivation to pursue alternative and renewable energy resources, to reduce our energy consumption, to buy more energy efficient products, we as a nation should be moving in this direction rather than increasing our reliance on fossil fuels.

I believe it is your job to facilitate that process. I challenge you to give us a year to let us show you through nothing but our concerted efforts that we can in fact reduce our energy consumption, that we can pursue other options, that we can live comfortably without having our homes and communities pillaged and plundered by deceitful and greedy corporations.

I will leave you tonight with a quote by Margaret Meade, “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful committed citizens can make a difference. Indeed it is the only thing that ever has, you my friends have run into a group of very committed citizens and as our state motto suggests we will indeed live pipeline free or die trying.”

All of us here and especially the children of the Temple Elementary School thank you for your thoughtful and rationale consideration as you deny this proposal.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next I think we jumped to 71, 71? 72? 71?

MS. SCHMIDT: My name is Catherine Schmidt and I’m S-c-h-m-i-d-t. I am one of the residents of Amherst and I’m a new resident to Amherst. I actually came today not prepared to speak and really thought that putting my name down at 71 that you would not get to 71 so I am kind of thrilled that we have.

That being said I don’t have anything written prepared to give you yet, but I will follow up with comments. My thoughts are kind of on the small things we have talked about a lot of the large impact of what this will do to many of the towns but we haven’t talked about some of the small individual plants.

When I bought my house this spring was the first time that I have been there and I was 100% pleased to find out that I have some pink lady slippers on my property. I don’t know if you are aware of pink lady slippers being someone who grew up in New York not in New Hampshire I had never seen them before.

Coming to this state they are not an endangered species but they are quite rare to see and they take about 100 years to have their roots established and are very hard to grow. My property is one of the properties along the pipeline that would be impacted and the area that these are in would be completely wiped out so I urge you to think of not just some of the large and full species that would be decimated but some of the small ones that definitely would not be replaceable.

There would be no way to mitigate or put those back in any reasonable time frame. Additionally I also wanted to talk to the topic that had been brought up a couple of times of decommissioning the route at some point everything needs to be decommissioned and I think in this day and age we think of you know

how do we put things in, how do we do that, but we never think of their after impact of when they are there for the long term.

I work in an industry where I am constantly in information security and I am constantly cleaning up old messes that have been thought of and we spend more of our time dealing with problems because old messes have been left and not been cleaned up so I want you to think about making sure you put into place a plan for them to you know if this does go through how it gets taken out, maybe even 100 years down the line, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are on number 72? 73? 73? 74? 74, does anyone have a number that I haven't called yet? Raise their hands? 74, 75, 76, 77 so I have gotten to everyone. Mr. Gaut if you want to come back up and finish.

MR. GAUT: Again I'm speaking to them because I don't think you have any standing. Infuriating is that the carrot that we are being offered is that if we are nice and polite maybe the route will be changed, however the pipeline remains and still will go through.

We will have the pipeline Kinder Morgan says no matter what. The rights of Kinder Morgan's energy partners as shown by these actions to be greater than the rights of the citizens of Milford, New Hampshire, here assembled, I don't know if anyone here is from Milford anymore.

The people of the Souhegan Valley and by extension the people of the state of New Hampshire, we are being treated not as adults with rights, but as minor children we are only allowed to speak when granted permission. Evidently FERC uses the power of the federal government, finds it more important to ensure that Richard D. Kinder, formerly of the criminal corporation Enron needs an addition to his 11,000 million dollar retirement fund.

I close with the following proposal. Citizens of Milford, I propose a motion be placed on the floor for debate and passage. I propose this motion pursuant to New Hampshire statute section 31-5. I propose that the motion read that a special meeting be held no later than October 1, 2015 to discuss the merits and viabilities of the Northeast Direct Pipeline Project's passage through the town of Milford, New Hampshire. Information to be presented to the voters of New Hampshire shall be made publicly available.

Information shall include hazard level along each section of pipeline. For each section of pipeline quantitative information to be made publically available, such that others independently are able to judge the basis and methods used to determine such hazard levels.

Further, fees paid by Kinder Morgan Energy Partners, 1 Allen Center of Houston, Texas and/or Kinder Morgan, Incorporated, KMI, no address available, to the Federal Energy Management Commission also be made publicly available.

Now if there were still Milford residents here I would ask for the moderator so we could have a public meeting about this but the filibuster was very effective.

MR. TOMASI: Is there anyone else who perhaps doesn't have a number who wishes to speak who hasn't spoken earlier? Come on up. Excuse me if you didn't get to finish, let's have some people who haven't spoken first and we will get back to you. There's another person over here who wants to speak, have you spoken yet? Okay well then you can come up too after she is done.

MS. DEVORE: Barbara Devore, D-e-v-o-r-e, Mason, New Hampshire. Mr. Tomasi it is of great concern how Kinder Morgan lied and lied and lied and was deceitful in their presentations and trade shows in this area. If they are lying to the public what are they doing to FERC. Please consider that carefully.

Also when you go back to Washington please invite all the FERC Commissioners to accompany you next time you come for a scoping meeting, we would love to have you visit this beautiful Monadnock Region before it is destroyed by a project that is based totally on greed, not need, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MS. LONG: Cecelia Long, L-o-n-g, New Ipswich. I just moved there a couple of weeks ago because it was

so beautiful and nice and I'm a night worker and it is quiet and I can sleep during the day and not have to be woken up all the time and now I discover this is going on with a compression station not very far away from me and easily looking up information over the past week or so about Kinder Morgan and their deceitful ways, I'm just very concerned and I hope FERC really takes into consideration all the information that the residents here have taken so much time and effort into compiling for you on just how devastating this is going to be for this region to allow something through here that offers us nothing, nothing for the state of New Hampshire for the residents and is going to be cost detrimental because Kinder Morgan, what is this going to be in ten years or five years they have a disaster, the whole southern region of New Hampshire, this is going to be a superfund site if we are not careful because they won't have to be responsible, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, is there anyone else who has not spoken, come on up.

MS. MCGHEE: I don't think I put my name on the testimony, I don't know if you need that.

MR. TOMASI: I will need that your name yes, and if you would repeat your name again.

MS. MCGHEE: Sure it's Kat McGhee, K-a-t M-c-G-h-e-e. So yeah I was kind of shocked because I have been working on this stuff for two years I had one page and I couldn't get through it. Okay, so I think you know I just wanted to say that I think you have seen that the people here in New Hampshire, a lot of them are getting up here saying I am a Selectman or I'm a Senator, I'm a volunteer fire person, I'm on committees, because folks here are very civic minded and very involved in their communities and I think that's why you are seeing such an outpouring.

So to pick up kind of where I left off -- we ask that you recognize that the cumulative effect of permitting NED on top of the existing infrastructure projects that will bring ample new gas to the region is going to change the landscape of our energy markets to the detriment of clean energy alternatives and goals.

NED will bring a negative effect to fuel rates when gas market dominates forces prices up and energy portfolio diversity for which New Hampshire has worked long and hard will be undone and these are all socio-economic impacts that run counter to the public interest.

The issue seems to be that the state uses a microscope to approve straight forward precedent agreements and the FERC facilitates permitting as long as basic environmental rules are upheld but what we need from you in 2015 is a lot more acknowledgement that these decisions have consequences that no longer can be kicked down the road.

Under these conditions, the conditions that have been defined by the industry, the public good has no ability to be served. It is up to the FERC to reinvent itself for this century, when the fossil fuel industry is exploding its last gasp to the fullest at the expense of future generations.

You have to say no to projects that mean excess capacity is being harvested and burned. I taught my children the difference between want and need. It's time you teach the gas industry the same. We ask that you rise to the integrity of public servants who can see the common good means, we must restrain against an industry that wants to burn as much fossil fuel as it can and as fast as it can.

We will not have time to create generative sustainable technologies if we acquiesce that excess pipelines like NED are needed. The NED plan goes against the public interest and we ask you to reform your charge for the environment we face today and deny this permit.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MS. HORSLEY: I would suggest that we as citizens will need to organize ourselves and probably put in a federal lawsuit, I don't really see almost any option. It takes a great deal of organization to find good federal attorneys at the Supreme Court level and if we lose anyway because I've seen too many cases where that is the fact, I would suggest that we as citizens should have our own people supervising the construction of this.

You have been concerned and you have actually participated in the pipeline. I gave birth to 6 boys and a girl, my last 4 sons are all in construction. They come home and they say mom you wouldn't believe the

sloppy work of such and such group and of this and that, you wouldn't believe how the engineers are completely ignorant of what needs to be done on a practical level and I would suggest this man talk to some of the key political people. He has been on the job, he knows what it takes and if only someone like this who has an interest in making sure this pipeline is done properly.

There have been too many accidents, my boys tell me, barely looking at the internet, hundreds of citations from this company. We need our own experienced people, not engineers only, I'm talking about people who have been on the jobs and know how to make sure this thing is done properly if we fail at the federal court level, that's all I have to say.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you ma'am. Ma'am what was your name?

MS. HORSLEY: I'm Judy Horsley, H-o-r-s-l-e-y, we have the old spiffy shop and by the way the home that we are in is less than a mile from what do you call the pump houses.

MR. TOMASI: Compressor station.

MS. HORSLEY: And there are people here who have invested it and said that it is not even that costly to bring the decibels down to 30, you know these things must be done, we need an oversight committee created by us, the citizens, not the federal only oversight committee.

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am do you want to come up for additional comments? Come on.

MS. JENKS: Yes hi my name is Irene Jenks and I just wanted to say three more points that I didn't quite get to previously, that's J-e-n-k-s.

As I said before I own a business in New Ipswich called Wind Blown Cross Country Skiing and there's just three things I wanted to get back to and one is that I haven't heard anybody speak about this tonight or last night. I'm not sure they are really aware of the terrain in New Ipswich, we have a mountain range that goes through it's called the Wapack Range. They are small mountains, the elevation is 1850 on the mountain that we own, Bear Mountain, but they are significant on the landscape, actually throw called it the Front Range, because it is the first range of mountains that you get to from the ocean.

And part of the Wapack range is a hiking trail that's called the Wapack trail which goes 21 miles along the ridges and then passes through Wind Blown property quite significantly, there's a stretch probably a mile and a half of the Wapack Trail passes through our property and it's not just that it's a hiking trail, it's actually a wildlife corridor for major animal wildlife throughout all southwestern New Hampshire, it's a wildlife corridor not just for the hawks and the eagles that people were talking about earlier but the bears and the bobcats and the deer and there's actually another animals that nobody ever dares mention because the New Hampshire wildlife people don't even like to say it exists but there actually are mountain lions.

We have had evidence of mountain lions at Wind Blown several times and they pass through, they have large corridors of land that they need to exist and I realize you are probably not going to deal with it because they supposedly are extinct but they actually aren't.

So the other thing that I wanted to mention was Maria Smauz earlier said that the pipeline was covering I have to get back to the other page, sorry, 10% of the route is actually land that is in conservation. I want to point out that that number does not include land that is also what could be considered conservation land. Someone last night explained current use which is a way of taxing land so that people don't build on it.

Our property is in current use. We have 300 acres in current use, that is conservation land that is not included under 10%. Also our land is a tree farm which is a certified tree farm which is also another form of conservation.

And I just think that's really important to recognize and then the last thing I wanted to say is that the half mile of the pipeline route that passes through Wind Blown, basically all of that follows a historical stage coach road which was the original road the settlers built from Boston to Keene and that entire route will be completely destroyed and part of it includes a bridge that was built by the early settlers of stone culvert, that is an earth bridge on top and it is still functioning today and it will be completely destroyed and to me it is one of the most historic pieces in the town, is this road we use it as a ski trail now, we drive our snow

cats over it and it is totally functional and it was over 200 years old and it will be completely destroyed in the construction, that's all I have to say thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. You can come up.

MS. TAYLOR: Evelyn Taylor, hello again. T-a-y-l-o-r. I just wanted a couple things that came up yesterday and once today was about those incorrect maps that are not showing houses, homes where people live. Since this is repetitive I think this is a very serious offense. I think it needs independent audit, inspection, not only for this filing but I think it merits going back to other filings that they have done to see if this is a deliberate effort to underestimate the impact to people and homes.

And to some of the last points here I'm not going to let this pipeline harm me. I'm right near the compressor station and I will stay there as long as I want to stay there and I refuse to let them douse me with poison chemicals and other health hazards, the chemistry is in, science is in, it is proven, it is criminal.

If I did the same thing to them I would go to jail.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

MR. GAUT: In my opinion you have no standing here at all. Okay, you are paid by Kinder Morgan, you know that right, all of your salary, everything else right? I'm not even sure why you have a right to be controlling any of this, this is the town of Milford. Okay what I would like is that most of us here from all of the towns, we need to start thinking about you are not in charge, okay.

Whatever it takes they are not in charge, okay otherwise you won't stop this thing, you know. I know you think we are silly --

MR. TOMASI: No, I certainly do not think any of this is silly.

MR. GAUT: And earlier I objected to your filibuster, 45 minutes of filibustering, I object.

MR. TOMASI: Very well. Is there any other comments?

MS. SHIMBERG: We are dealing with all the same issues in New York and it is not a matter of should it be this part of New Hampshire, should it be New Hampshire, should it be in Massachusetts, should it be anywhere? It shouldn't be anywhere and the people in Pennsylvania are really suffering because of the fracking that is going on there which is going to carry the gas up through here probably to Canada, probably for export.

And I did also want to say that we in upstate New York think that FERC issued its certificate of convenience and necessity in spite of the fact that the FEIS didn't really deal with all of the issues that you made comments on in the DEIS and there are still some outstanding things that we think are not sufficiently dealt with and we are afraid that that is going to happen with the Kinder Morgan Pipeline too and we hope not and we also don't trust Kinder Morgan, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, would anyone else like to speak before I close the meeting? Okay we are going to close the meeting now I want to thank you for staying so late and again I apologize if the room was a little over-capacity. I also want to point out that we will be back for another meeting in Cheshire County we are still locking the location in, but we are looking to be near the end of August, thank you.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 12:31 a.m.)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Office of Energy Projects
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC Docket No. PF14-22-000
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

Dracut Senior High School
(Auditorium)
1540 Lakeview Avenue
Dracut, MA 01826

Tuesday, August 11, 2015

The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping Meeting, pursuant to notice, at 7:00 p.m., Eric Tomasi, the moderator.

PROCEEDINGS

MR. TOMASI: First of all I want to go ahead and say good evening and thank you on behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. I want to go ahead and also introduce myself. My name is Eric Tomasi, I am the Project Manager who works directly for FERC and I will be preparing the Environmental Impact Statement for the Northeast Energy Direct Project that is proposed by Tennessee Gas.

And the Docket Number for this Project is PF14-22. I work in the Office of Energy Projects at FERC. I also have several people here tonight that are working with me and they pretty much integral to the set up for tonight's meeting as well as developing the Environmental Impact Statement. Most of them work for the Department and first I would like to introduce one of them at the front table -- she's an engineer at the Office of Energy Projects and works with me.

We also have a working directive partner, we have Oliver Puhl at the table here, We have Wayne Kicklighter, Peter Marsey, Darcy Metzler, Jen Ward and Noland Elsaesser and I apologize for messing it up. And I apologize to any of those who are speaking tonight I will mess your names up and I will apologize in advance.

Now I want to go ahead and also state that we have a couple purposes for tonight's meeting, a couple of purposes. Now obviously we are here tonight basically to gather the information both so that we can put together analysis for this project. Now there are a few things that we have to do here and obviously you can see up on the screen here to my right -- we have to gather issues for the analysis.

Now obviously I want to stress that we are going to do our own very distinct analysis of every single aspect of this project. We are going to do as thorough of a job as we possibly can, but one reason to come out here is to actually get and identify new environmental issues. I was in the field a little bit today and I am going to be back again in the future looking at the location of the Dracut Compressor Station as well as some of the laterals. I will be back up in the area as well, looking at both alternatives in the proposal in the future.

But what is really important is to get information from the public and I don't mean to do our job -- my job for me but what I know is that you live here, some of you have lived here your entire life, some of you have for several generations lived here. I want to know basically what is important to you, number one and with the current route as proposed by Tennessee Gas, what is it about it that could be improved.

You know are there things that we are missing, things that you don't see in the environmental reports? Those are the sort of things that it is really important for us to know and so that's one of the major reasons why we are here tonight. Another reason obviously you can see is explaining the FERC review process. There is a huge amount of work that goes into all of these projects and we are still pretty much in the early stages of this and I am going to go ahead and talk to you for a little bit about where we are, where we have been and what we are going to go forward in the future.

And then obviously provide an opportunity for public input. Now a lot of the concerns that people have is that well I only have 3 minutes to speak, I only have 4 minutes to speak, I can't get all of my information out, you know. I can't tell you all I have to. Well that's why we want to look at your written comments as well.

I know for a fact that most of you who are really passionate about opposing this project or even for this project for instance, are not here to give me all of your information in dribs, I know that. That's why I will stress to you that when you come up and give your speech, if you haven't been able to get through it, give it to us so that we can put it into the full text of your speech in the record so that we have it, okay?

Now again, this goes right into this next slide, what other ways are there to comment -- obviously as I said you know, you can comment here tonight, that's important. Also you can even send your comments through the mail, there's a comment form on the table out front that you saw, there is also that you can mail them directly to the FERC as well and there is also you can go through our e-library system. The e-library system at FERC.gov and you look at the e-comment at the e-library there's a way to go ahead and upload your comments.

Either direct letters and there is also a quick comment format which is just a real quick -- you just type out a real quick message or using the sort of the written comment, the e-library to upload an entire letter, an entire document, an entire multiple research papers if you want, we have had people do that in the past so you can upload as much or as little information as you feel that you need.

In addition I do want to point out because it has come up a couple of times. If you are concerned about giving us too much information -- and what I mean by that is if you know for instance a cultural resource on the land or you know, perhaps there is an endangered species habitat on your property, I want to go ahead and let you know that there is a way that you can actually go ahead and file that as privileged so that not everybody would see that.

I would see that, but the general public would not see that. I do want to point out that anything you file that is privileged I can't still use in the document publically but you can still give me the information so that we can make sure you can avoid those resources, that's really what we are striving for now.

Another avenue for public comment is the comment period after the draft environmental impact statement. Now this is not the only meeting that we are going to have up in the area. Obviously we have had other scoping meetings you know, which occurred and will have a little more after this in New Hampshire, but we will also come back after we issue the draft environmental impact statement for another set of meetings.

Now what those meetings are going to be for is for you, the public, as well as agencies or anyone else to tell me what you thought about the environmental impact statement and how you think it could be improved so there are many avenues which you can provide us input and I want to go through the procedure tonight.

Again I want to re-iterate that written comments are given the exact same weight as verbal comments. If you cannot speak here tonight, if you don't wish to speak file the letter, it is exactly the same as if you had spoken tonight. Now because one of the things that we do here tonight you might see me speaking to the gentleman in front of me right now. He's the court reporter, he is hired by Ace Federal, we have a contract with Ace Federal.

Now what they would do they are going to take down every single word that is spoken today at this meeting and make sure that it gets into the public record. Now within a few weeks this document will be in the public record in this docket so that you can go ahead and review every single thing that was said here. So I want to make sure that all of this information that was said will be in the public record and it will be just as if you had written it.

But again feel free to include as much detail as you wish in written comments. Now one thing I want to point out and there is obviously a rare tradition in the northeast, you know town public hearings and this is

not a public hearing and this is not really a public forum where I can discuss the merits of the case, this is me coming out here and getting information from you so that we can develop the project.

I can't really discuss the merits of the case. If there is some time after everyone is done speaking which we will see, I can answer some questions after we are done, but you know, my main job here tonight is to make sure that everyone gets the opportunity to speak on the record.

Now obviously we have heard some cell phones go off already and so I would like to remind everyone to please go ahead and turn off your mobile phones. You probably saw that there is another microphone up here in the front that's where the public is going to be giving their comments and everyone when you came in you were given a number and it's a little card with a number as we go through that and make sure you come up and give your comments.

Now I want you to know that I will allow and have allowed, and will tonight allow elected officials to speak first. Maybe about 10 or 15 elected officials to speak first, they are going to go first because they represent more than just themselves, they represent communities or towns or in some instances an entire state.

Another point is I know we keep harping on this but if you have a letter that you want to put into the record, you know, give it to us in hard copy and if you have it with you here tonight try to summarize your points because you only have 3 minutes, it is going to go by much quicker than you think it is going to, so try to summarize and see if you can get done in the time.

Again don't interrupt the speaker. Now I am going to stress that a little more tonight than I would otherwise because I know there is a lot of passion here tonight, there's also people here supporting the pipeline. Even if you do not agree with the people who are speaking please respect their right to speak for 3 minutes. Everyone is going to have a chance to speak so let them speak even if you don't agree with them, give them their 3 minutes.

Now also this evening a lot of emotion so people are going to want to clap and cheer and that's fine, I have no problem with that, but just remember the longer the cheering and clapping goes on, the less people we are going to be able to get to by the end of the tonight. Because we don't necessarily this venue all night, we have until a little after midnight, and I will stay here as long as it takes but when they tell me to shut it down we have to shut it down.

And again any interruption of any of the speakers is only going to disrupt and restrict other fellow citizen's ability to speak tonight. Now this is basically all of you know about the project, this is some of the project information and as you well know there is a compressor station here and you know, in this town, in the town of Dracut as well as both the main line as well as the delivery lines.

As I mentioned I was out in the field today looking at some of these lines, driving through the communities taking a look at what is there and we are going to be back and you will also note of course that on July 24th Kinder Morgan did file a new set of draft resource reports that filled in some of the gaps which we marked. Obviously we are quite aware that not all of the information is yet available from the company on all of the impacts.

We will be preparing another large -- I suspect, a very large data request that we are going to send to the company, identifying data gaps that we want to see. So and one of the things that you might have seen them compressed as well as this July 24th meeting, sorry -- filing that they did reduce the size of the pipeline to some extent. They reduced the amount of gas that they would be delivering from 2.2 billion cubic feet per day to 1.2 billion cubic feet per day.

And they reduced the size of the line from Wright, New York to Dracut, the main line from 36 to 30 inches in diameter. You will note however that the Lynnfield lateral did increase in size from 20 to 24 inches and that does affect this community so make sure you are aware of that. And of course the compression station in Dracut, you know that is an issue which we are going to be looking at to see how to minimize those impacts at the particular station as well as alternatives.

And I guess I should have updated the slides, since I said it, updated them on Friday, there was actually a couple of Fridays so I apologize for that. Now this is a product map, this is the eastern side and I want to talk to you a little bit about who FERC is and what we do. I'm not going to get way into the detail but we are actually what's called an independent agency and we regulate the interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas and oil.

Now when I say independent agency, what does that mean? Well that means that basically our decisions are made by the Commissioners are not reviewable by the President or Congress, they are reviewable by the courts so that's something that you need to be aware of and also as I mentioned the FERC can review proposals and authorize the construction of an interstate natural gas pipeline, storage facilities, LNG terminals by natural gas I should say, as well as licensing the inspection of hydro-electric projects.

Now one thing we do not do is we do not regulate either local distribution, nor do we regulate exploration or drilling so fracking, other well-drilling, we have no authority to regulate however, we will look at the cumulative impacts of the pipeline as well as other projects within the area. And so I want to stress that because we do have a responsibility to look at those impacts.

And I guess that brings to why do we have this responsibility well because we are a federal licensing agency, we have a responsibility under the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA and we actually have to consider all the potential environmental impacts from any project that we review. And so that is my job. My job is not to approve the pipeline my job is not to deny the pipeline. My job is to write the environmental impact statement, to review the proposal that Kinder Morgan has given us and then also look at reasonable alternatives for that pipeline.

And that is what I want you to understand, that is what I will be doing. What my job is, like you, I take that environmental impact statement and the recommendation to mitigate the impacts as well as any other recommendations and I give that to our five Commissioners and they vote on if this project should or should not be built.

They give what is called a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity which means that they have determined whether they choose to approve it and it is publicly need so ultimately this is their decision. My job is just to given what the environmental impacts of that project would be and recommending mitigation methods.

Now I talked a little bit about the current status of where we are at. I told you about the recent filing for the resource reports and we will go ahead and do a request for them to fill in those gaps. The company -- we're still in what's called the pre-filing stage, it is still relatively early. In fact the company has not planned to give us an active formal application until October of this year and after that point we still have close to a year until the environmental review will be completely done.

But even though we don't have an formal application now, we are going to get more information as this process goes along. Now you might thing well, hold on a second doesn't the scoping period, the comment period end after this month? Good point -- now let me tell you something is that even though the scoping period will end for the formal comments, we will still take comments from anyone throughout the entire process and we will address those comments throughout the entire process, whether we get them in the formal comment period or not.

Whether you file comments before the formal comment period or if you file comments after the formal comment period, we will address those. I want to make sure that that is absolutely clear.

And obviously after we get through the EIS process we will issue what's called a draft environmental impact statement and after that draft, as I said earlier, we will be back out here again for an additional set of meetings to get comments from the public. And of course just like now you can file your comments on that draft EIS to be able to address all.

They are a little different, comments that you provide in this phase we will address without identifying you specifically, whereas if you file after the draft environmental impact statement is issued, you will

basically see your letter and then our response to it right next to it and then an appendix so that's how that would work.

So here's the map which you are very much aware of, the map of the project, and there's a western portion and as I said we have I think at last count earlier today we had a little over 3,600 comments on the record on this project which is a very, very large amount of comments for just about any project that I have ever seen.

And we have a lot of concerns which the public has identified. These are some of the comments, obviously the public has identified their concerns and they have expressed an interest in the current session today, to develop alternative energy and so that's one of the things that we want to tell you, to hear your concerns, and that's something we need to do as well as concerns regarding export.

And again, I heard today as well even though this isn't necessarily a rural community, a lot of the -- it appears to be a very pretty and very nice community and it has qualities which are very rural in a certain way and we understand that this can disrupt that nature and so we want to make sure that you know we address the concerns from the public and see what we can do to minimize their concerns as much as possible or minimize the impacts actually.

Obviously we have developed some high density residential areas that is also necessary. This area has you know both farms and it has very dense residential areas so we understand that we need to address both of those concerns as we go through a community such as this. As I mentioned earlier cumulative impacts as well as the issue of you know transporting gas that's from fracked -- unconventional fracked that's something that we will have to address and we will look at it.

Obviously private well damage, something we get a great deal of concerns about from the public and is something that we will address and have addressed in all of our documents. And of course very specific to this area there is compressor station noise and air emissions. Not so much that they are planning to use electric units at the Dracut station but there are concerns about emissions and blow down emissions and these are things we will be looking at.

So I told you a little bit of the process anyways but next slide -- now one things that I want to point out is that even after we issue the FEIS as I mentioned, that is my recommendation or my team's recommendation to the Commissioners on how to minimize the impacts for the proposed project. We are still a long way from that and obviously the Commission will make that final decision and then that decision will be issued in what's called their Certificate Order.

And that's where they lay out their rationale and their reasoning for approving or denying the project. Now I talked a little bit about the EIS and this is on another slide and one of the things that I really didn't talk about before is we are required to do a hard look and that's a legal term, is that we need to, not just -- we can't just like essentially say, "Oh yeah this might not be a big impact", no, everything that you bring to my attention or the team's attention, we need to take a hard look at.

We can't just very cleverly write it off, we have to make sure that we analyze it because this is as it says, a part of that, this is an analytical document so we need to make sure that all the science that goes into the analysis makes sense and is clear to the public.

This isn't just a document to our Commissioners it is also a document to the public. We need to make sure that you understand it, not just the Commissioners and as I mentioned before the EIS will address all of the comments, both things that are mentioned here tonight as well as have been identified in written form, both specific and cumulative.

Now again we are about ready to go ahead and start bringing up speakers. I want to remind everybody that you know when we call your number, come up to the microphone, please be aware of what number we are on, again there's lot of people here so if we are on number say 20, 21, 22 you might want to start getting up and getting ready.

Also try to speak clearly, as I mentioned we do have a court reporter here tonight and I want to make sure

that you can spell your name for him so that he can get that correctly. There will be an enforced time limit and that will be 3 minutes. Now the rule is not to say that the elected officials have more time but for the public it is 3 minutes per person and I'll hold the little light there when it's time.

There's going to be a little stop-light here so that it can help you see when your time is running out. It will be green while you are speaking and when it turns yellow you have 30 seconds left and then when it turns red that means your time is up. I will try to remind everybody when there's 30 seconds but as I said, please do not interrupt the speaker because I want you to show respect to fellow citizens, I want everyone to have a chance to speak tonight okay.

And again, please don't interrupt the speaker, there will be people here tonight that you do not agree with and I want to make sure that everyone can give their comments in 3 minutes, okay.

The first elected official on our list is we have speaking on behalf of Senator Warren we have Ariel Vega.

MR. VEGA: Well thank you for inviting us and welcoming us here. I apologize the senator couldn't make it but I am here for her. First of all I would like to thank the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for holding these scoping meetings and for taking into consideration the many important viewpoints on the proposed project, both for and against.

I think everyone in this room can agree that high energy costs are an issue here not just in Massachusetts but throughout New England and therefore I think it is critical I think that these pipelines are well and safe and that citizens of Massachusetts have adequate time to review and make sure that they are safe and that they have an adequate time to review the FERC licensing procedure.

I know we mentioned earlier this evening that FERC is planning on taking on comments even after the public comment period so FERC, our office is urging that FERC actually extend the public comment period past the date of August 31st. It would allow time for additional communities to either revise environmental resource report filed on July 24th and an extension would also allow for the completion of Attorney General Maura Healey's ongoing study on the electricity reliability needs of Massachusetts.

So again it is our hope that you know residents will be impacted -- that are impacted by this project will be given ample time to consider all available options before the comment period is closed. So again, thank you I don't want to take up too much time because there is a lot of people here that want to speak but I just wanted to let you know that we are here and we are listening to all of your comments as well as FERC's responses as well so thank you for having me and I hope that it goes well.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next speaking on behalf of Congressman Niki Tsongas, Katie Enos.

MS. ENOS: Good evening, the Congressman regrets that she is not able to be here this evening so I am the Congressman's Chief of Staff and Russell Pandres who is my colleague is also here on behalf of the Congressman to deliver this statement from her so I would like to read her statement now:

First I would like to thank you for hosting this scoping meeting in my District today and I hope it is the first of several opportunities for constituents I represent to provide their input. I recognize FERC's challenging responsibility to ensure that our energy system is reliable and to minimize natural resource degradation in the face of a quickly changing energy market.

Constituents and businesses across Massachusetts have trouble absorbing the increasing cost of energy and there is agreement that the best solution to New England's energy issues would be through careful, long-term planning and significant public input. Meetings like this begin to provide the public with that opportunity.

I also appreciate the opportunity to continue my office's dialogue with FERC and to share directly with you some of the foremost concerns brought to me by my constituents, hundreds of whom have contacted me about this proposal. Concerns that I share and believe must be taken seriously by the regulators reviewing this proposal.

As I am sure you will hear tonight there are many concerns for the impact that this proposed pipeline will have on the environment and the surrounding ecology. My constituents and I have worked hard to pre-

serve our diverse and historic Massachusetts landscape and I value this long determined effort shared by so many of the communities that I represent so that future generations can enjoy our treasured landscape well into the future.

We must protect our historic farmland as it is rooted in New England's character, heritage and economy, being both an important source of income to local families and integral to the historic New England landscape. Environmental protection should be held to the strictest standards with this proposed project. We know how precious and vital our wetlands, state and local conservation land, threatened and vulnerable species, and watersheds are to our own quality of life and the ecology surrounding us, a lesson hard learned in New England's industrial past.

We have made significant progress cleaning up our rivers and restoring habitats. To see this work regress would be devastating. Questions such as does drilling a pipeline crossing rivers such as the Nashville River, currently being vetted for wild and scenic status by the Department of Interior agitate pollutants?

How will farmers be compensated for loss of future crop production and how temporary is minimal impact? These questions should be thoroughly explored. Home owners are understandably concerned with how the pipeline might affect the individual property values. A house is an investment for one family and for future generations, as pipelines and compressor stations are sited near residents how will homeowners be compensated for the potential loss in property value even if their property is not directly impacted?

I have heard the very reasonable concern that property owners, both directly and indirectly impacted by the construction and route of the pipeline may see the value of their property decrease only to see the gas ultimately moving through the pipeline exported overseas with no benefits to the communities serving as its host.

How is the community compensated for loss in property value, especially when they are not serviced by natural gas but are simply hosting a portion of the main line? How will FERC know the company has made every effort to avoid utilizing eminent domain? How will public need be determined if there is the slightest potential to export natural gas?

Residents are also concerned with the public safety risks from potential accidents, a reality we must confront with honesty and transparency. While remote technology has improved dramatically in the last few decades, can residents living near a remotely-manned compressor station feel at ease? What measures will be taken to ensure that disruption of the ground while drilling, blasting and laying pipe will not negatively affect the wells that so many of my constituents depend on for drinking water?

Will there be constant monitoring of the ground water and residential areas that depend on wells? Do we understand the long-term impacts of living in proximity to a compressor station? I have also heard concerns regarding the process with which this project has proceeded.

Contact with local town officials who are best able to identify local concerns has not gone as smoothly as desired. For example, local officials were not the first parties contacted, but instead discovered an energy company was proposing to build a massive infrastructure project from their own constituents. There have also been many concerns with the speed with which the public meeting has been scheduled without providing complete resource reports in advance.

For example in the most recent release thousands of "to be determined" were noted throughout the report as is the case with very large infrastructure projects, there will be constantly changing information and this process is in the early stages, however I fail to see how my constituents can comment as informed citizens with so many unknowns.

Additionally I would like to ask that FERC consider reviewing the numerous natural gas pipeline processes, pending or approved in the New England region in a holistic manner to ensure that we are not overbuilding our pipeline infrastructure for domestic need.

As a country we have made a commitment to building a renewable future and not reducing the competitiveness of solar, wind, hydro-power and other alternative sources in favor of additional pipeline infra-

structure. Accordingly would FERC consider a no-build option, instead considering the option to repair our existing pipeline infrastructures and for our region's energy needs?

Also knowing that the Massachusetts Attorney General's office has conducted a study to determine regional pipeline infrastructure need to be released in October of 2015 I ask in advance that this study be given consideration in FERC's decision. I respectfully request consideration of these questions raised by my constituents closely and carefully before deciding and I would like to request additional FERC scoping meetings to be held in the early months of fall in locations that have not yet hosted scoping meetings to give my constituents further opportunities to provide input on this project.

Thank you again FERC for holding these scoping sessions and providing me with this opportunity to present the concerns that my constituents have brought to me. I look forward to your responses and to continuing this dialogue on behalf of the 3rd Congressional District, sincerely Niki Tsongas, Member of Congress.

MR. TOMASI: And I want to call up in advance, I don't actually know -- there is a State Senator here tonight, I don't actually know your seniority so I am going to call the first one who signed up, that is Kathleen O'Connor Ives, state senator?

MS. IVES: Thank you very much my name is Kathleen O'Connor Ives, I'm the State Senator for the First Essex District which includes the communities of Newburyport, Amesbury, Salisbury, Merrimac, Haverhill and North Andover. It's notable that in a city of the few and the current proposal of Kinder Morgan will include the lateral line directly impacting the residents from the city of Methuen.

Kinder Morgan came before the Methuen council on June 13th to make a presentation and I raised concerns at that convening as well that include the following. I am extremely concerned about public safety during the construction stage of the project. I am also concerned about the question which was posed regarding the time for fire response in the event of an emergency from a trained firefighter who expressed very grave concern about the response from Kinder Morgan because that response time was too long.

From my understanding there is no direct benefit to the Methuen residents for this impact. There are no guarantees or reductions or even a maintained energy cost. The only certainty that the residents of Methuen have are public safety burdens and reduced property values. In terms when it comes to environmental impact statement, it is my understanding that the purpose of the scoping sessions is to develop an environmental impact statement and to consider the idea of avoiding, minimizing or mitigating the impacts on the environment.

The only way to logically avoid environmental impacts is to recommend to your Commissioners that no action be taken because there is no realistic way to mitigate all of the environmental impacts that you have already described. Some of the concerns that you listed on that one slide, one slide long of environmental impacts only begins to be the tip of the iceberg in terms of the ripple effect.

Now this line is going to be impacting residents in terms of this construction but residents in outlying districts have grave concerns related to the support of fracked gas and the impact it will have on the water quality and environmental degradation to our entire nation.

It is my sincere hope as well that these scoping sessions are not simply an exercise in futility where the will of the public is discounted and disregarded. The public's concerns need to actually impact the process. Actually consider some of the flaws of this proposal and respect the will of the public.

I think with a background myself in environmental law I appreciate your discreet role in creating a draft environmental impact statement and creating multiple opportunities for public input but I do know that these scoping sessions are happening in the peak summer season and I echo Congressman's Tsongas's desire to have future opportunities available to people that might not be available at this peak time, because when the recommendations are made in the draft environmental impact statement, our residents are going to be left with your decision indefinitely and we take that responsibility very seriously to give them every opportunity to voice their concerns in this project, like I said at the onset has no direct benefit to the

residents of the Commonwealth only burdens, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Senator Barbara L'Italien?

MS. L'ITALIEN: I'm just going to move this a little bit, it is a little awkward just looking at you with this audience behind me so, great, my name is Barbara L'Italien. I am a state senator and I represent 4 communities, 3 of which would directly be impacted by the proposed gas pipeline here in Dracut, in Andover and in Tewksbury. I was here about a week ago talking with the state and the Facility Siting Review Board.

Thank you for being here. I am deeply concerned about this pipeline proposal and how it may impact the communities, not only of my district, but throughout Massachusetts. I share many of the concerns that my constituents have questioned how the pipeline will impact homeowners, home values and the community at large due to permanent easements for construction and operation of the pipeline, permanently altered land features as a result of the pipeline construction, increase risks of air and noise pollution from the pipeline and compressor stations and other facilities.

The possible use of eminent domain during the construction process and the lack of discussion regarding what constitutes just compensation for taking like this and how and when land owners will be compensated.

I am also concerned about impacts on the people's ability to get home-owner's insurance, what their rates are going to be, and I actually I guess being an elected official, had an opportunity to speak with someone from Kinder Morgan this week and they stated that there would be no adverse impacts on people's ability to keep their home-owner's insurance, no change in the rates, no change in their home-owner value and I know you look primarily at environmental impact but that really concerns me.

Because again as my predecessor's had mentioned, all of these people sitting here are going to live with this probably with the largest single investment of their life, their home.

MR. TOMASI: I want to point out something that we will be doing what's called a socio-economic analysis and one of the things that we have heard over and over again was concerns about property values and also insurance. That is one of the things that you know I take very seriously and we are going to have a look at that and if that means it is going to add additional work internally to try and figure out what those would actually be we are going to do that.

MS. L'ITALIEN: Yeah, the person that I asked -- the person that I asked was genuinely surprised that I would ask that question and I have to believe that there is a place that you can gather that information. So my district is home to many multi-generational family-owned farms, some located here in Dracut. For these individuals their livelihoods depend on the ability to raise and sell crops to individuals and vendors. A pipeline could have a serious impact on local food sources because pipeline construction on or around whole fields may severely deter farmer's abilities to tend the land and maximize their profits and in fact there was a very well-spoken farmer who I hope gets up tonight from Dracut that will speak to this I hope later on.

As the proposed route continues to shift many questions are left unanswered. Property owners need properly analyzed pipeline impact on neighborhoods as newly drawn maps indicate additional neighborhoods impacted by the pipeline route. These residents should be afforded equal time and opportunity to analyze the pipeline proposal and ask questions of Kinder Morgan company representatives.

And again I will echo what Congressman Tsongas said and Senator O'Connor Ives said, I know you mentioned it in your opening but I really can't stress enough that I think we need to have more scoping sessions, they need to be not just in Dracut and not just additional New Hampshire, but there will be reps following me that are coming here from Danvers because of the lateral there and I feel that you should be adding more sessions along the lateral.

So I'm also concerned about how this pipeline could negatively impact some of our areas protected agricultural spaces. Some of the lands in the path of the pipeline include local habitats, water supplies, veg-

etation and recreation spaces protected by private conservation trusts. More than a hundred land parcels located in the path of the pipeline are protected by Article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution. Their current use for the public would be threatened by possible invocation of eminent domain during the pipeline construction.

Some of my district's farms are currently protected by the federal open space laws and agricultural preservation restrictions. I share the worries of my constituents over how toxins may impact local food supplies and fertile lands.

I worry that the pipeline may also negatively impact local water sources and waterways. Kinder Morgan plans to use methods of horizontal directional drilling when constructing the pipeline under wetlands or major water bodies like the Merrimack River.

It's important to know how this construction will impact downstream communities such as Lawrence, Haverhill, Newburyport which all uses the Merrimack River as its primary water source. We need to know if construction and operation will disrupt river sediments from pass milling and farming activities and how that could impact downstream water supplies.

This project requires constant monitoring to address concerns about how blasting and drilling will impact local wells and wetlands. With changing Kinder Morgan reports it is difficult to generate an accurate environmental impact statement. We need to know more information about impact on air quality, archeological resources, socio demographic populations, and natural resources.

We need to fully understand how possible effects of construction such as water displacement will impact local communities. One of the things that was not listed on the board, when you listed all the concerns that you are going to take a look at is public safety. I share many of my constituent's concerns about how possible type line failures during construction propose a safety risk to individuals and properties -- the potential impact radius of 861 feet from main lines, 633 feet for the length of the lateral according to the formula published by the Federal Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration.

A main line with a 30 inch diameter natural gas pipeline with a high pressure of 1460 PSI would travel through Dracut and by comparison local pipelines are usually 100 PSI. Lateral lines would pass through Andover and Tisbury in my district, including the Lynnfield lateral which was original proposed at 20 inches and as of July 24th was mentioned increased to 24 inches.

I have additional concerns related to the 23,000 horsepower compressor station in Dracut. Will it be controlled or monitored remotely which poses a serious threat if something goes wrong? We need to know who will respond immediately to any of the issues at the compressor station, how long would that take?

It is essential that Kinder Morgan addresses public safety concerns with elected officials, homeowners and safety response teams before FERC approves the proposal. Again I mentioned I asked a question of the Kinder Morgan folks this week in Boston about all of this and they couldn't answer me as to what the chain of command was and what the training structure was and how folks would be trained in public safety, who would pay for that et cetera. There are still a lot of questions that are not answered.

Incidents-related problems with the pipeline have the potential to overly burden the public safety of infrastructure. Lingered questions and concerns include if something goes wrong with the pipeline or compressor meter stations, what is the detailed public safety response plan and the rest of the issues with the least amount of negative consequences?

If something does go wrong, are local public safety teams expected to respond and how will they be trained to adequately and safety respond to such incidents? We have at least within this town public safety is really stretched quite thing. This town, because it doesn't have a very strong industrial tax base struggles every single year to balance their budget, every year to meet the costs of their schools, their transportation, their public safety -- those are all very real concerns for me, how they would respond if this compressor station in particular have a problem.

As you will see tonight this pipeline proposal has generated much concern among state officials, boards

of selectmen, town meetings, local businesses, activist groups and individual homeowners. More time is needed to fully analyze the possible impacts of this proposal before FERC issues its decision.

Since Kinder Morgan continues to alter details of the pipeline and this was mentioned, has many things yet to be filled in, it is difficult to generate accurate studies related to impact and public safety, individual properties and local environment. Therefore FERC's public comment filing deadline of August 31st is too soon for citizens to have an opportunity to comment on the most recent plan revisions.

I do believe we need more scoping sessions here and with the most recent revised resource reports issued on July 24th just a little over 2 weeks ago, it is difficult for community members to fully comprehend the most up-to-date details of the proposal. Again I would like to say there need to be scoping sessions happening in communities impacted by the Lynnfield lateral and in Tewksbury.

My immediate concern, but certainly anyone affected by laterals in their area need to be our concern here in Northeast Massachusetts. It's necessary for these densely populated communities to have an opportunity to raise their concerns. The pipeline has the potential of dramatically impacting our communities and add increased pressures to public infrastructure, it's necessary that Kinder Morgan address concerns related to home values, the environment and public safety before FERC makes its final decision, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Again I want to apologize and I don't know the level of seniority for the you know, the Massachusetts House of Representatives, so the first person that signed up was Theodore -- again I'm apologizing, Theodore Speliotis. And again I want to remind you to completely spell your name for the court reporter.

MR. SPELIOTIS: Thank you very much. For the record my name is Ted Speliotis, this is spelled S-p-e-l-i-o-t-i-s. I live in the town of Danvers, Massachusetts and I represent the communities of Peabody and Middletown as well, all 3 are affected by the Lynnfield lateral coming from this area to stopping in Danvers, MASS. I'm here -- first I would like to thank Senator L'Italien for raising the question of being able to have an additional hearing in my particular area of the lateral. It would be very helpful for folks.

We have one of the most endangered rivers in the nation and it happens to serve as our drinking water, the Ipswich River. It actually dries up in the summer, that's how frightening it is and because of a whole myriad of federal regulations it would make a lot of sense to use the Merrimack River but water basins are what they are and they almost doesn't even seem explore-able when we discuss them.

So that's an important consideration. We have quarries in the area, we have neighbors immediate abutters, but I think what's most important for me to raise to you in a 3 minute span is something that perhaps my constituents can't raise to you. Or are not likely to as much -- and you are familiar with the ISO New England and their projections I imagine, and I don't know if you happen to see their main report.

They projected and this was their words, "that there will be no roads in electric need between now and 2014" because of the conservation work we have been doing in this state and in this region, it is really remarkable. If you look at our environment, if you look at our efforts and solar and wind and water, you would have seen zero in 2008.

If you look today you see not a huge amount, but 867 megawatts, but to show you what's happening in my little district, just the other day we opened a new power source in the town of Danvers funded by a local sports entity. A sports entity, indoor sports that is perhaps the largest in the country that is chosen to provide 1.3 megawatts of power they are going to supply all of the electricity for their facility and 2% of all the homes in Danvers.

250 homes -- but it doesn't stop there. We have a live yacht club that has done the same thing, we have had other commercial entities that have done this and they are viewing it purely through the efforts of the Commonwealth and the credits that we are offering.

So it's near, it's financially feasible to have it and it's being recognized by the ICO and I'm asking you when you are looking at these laterals especially, why, why do we need that lateral? And I really question

it. I'm here and you talk about seniority. I don't know if there is anybody more senior, I have been doing this my entire life and I supported every single pipeline up to this point.

Why -- because I don't want coal. We have a power plant in Salem that was coal-driven and no longer, that's a plus. I didn't support Seabrook, the nuclear power plant, stood up as the first elected official to oppose it. This is the first time I am coming to you and saying look, we have had enough, thank you so much.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. We have Linda Campbell.

MS. CAMPBELL: Good evening, thank you for being here this evening. I'm Linda D. Campbell, C-a-m-p-b-e-l-l just like the soup and I represent the cities of Methuen and Haverhill in the state legislature. I am also currently serving as the acting chair of public safety in the house.

I will convey to you concerns that have been raised by my community on the effect in my district. I want to begin by disclosing that this pipeline does pass behind my home but not through my property. First and foremost in the city of Methuen, just down the road here there are legitimate concerns regarding the environment property and safety.

In Methuen this pipeline is very close to homes and I emphasize very, within a few yards in many cases. It traverses neighborhoods and driveways and primarily through wetlands and conservation. Residents have legitimate concerns regarding investments and mature landscaping which they planted when the pipeline was originally laid. They have concerns regarding property value.

I share the concern that this expansion may not contribute to reduced energy costs and I do not accept the premise that we can do nothing in government to insure that this expansion benefits New England and Massachusetts primarily. This seems to be a supposition and a proposition that we are accepting automatically and I challenge that.

This expansion cannot be allowed to serve primarily as an enhancement for export across the Atlantic. This must be part of an overall strategy to contribute to the reduction of fossil fuels and I don't see this as part of the ongoing analysis to date. I also ask that you review the impact that this project will have on local rivers which are a source of drinking water for the city of Methuen and others.

Again I want to thank you for being here this evening and I hope that you will demand very specific answers to many of the questions that will be raised here this evening as Kinder Morgan plans are always evolving and they are always changing. I have ask Kinder Morgan some very specific questions and yet to receive answers. There meeting times have changed substantially in my community during the summer months on several occasions making it difficult for us as citizens to attend these meetings.

I will provide testimony and for reasons that were previously stated I ask that the comment period be extended to the very minimal point that we allow the Attorney General of Massachusetts to comment specifically. Again I want to thank you for being here and I thank you for your presence in our community and I hope that you will be in other communities as well, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is Colleen Garry.

MS. GARRY: Thank you, my name is Garry, G-a-r-r-y. Good evening and welcome to the town of Dracut. Thank you for holding the scoping meeting here in the community of Dracut, the community which will be the most affected by the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline Project.

My name is Colleen Garry and I have had the distinct honor and privilege of serving as the state representative of the town of Dracut and Tyngsborough in the Massachusetts House of Representatives for the last 20 years. I join with many of my colleagues in requesting that more scoping sessions be held in the future since new information was just released on July 24th by the company.

More time is needed to battle that information. That being said I will go on with some of my comments. I have learned that in the gas pipeline world, Dracut has become the hub of it all. It certainly is the hub of this project. Well for those of us who live and raised our families in Dracut this is the hub of our universe. I realize that your job is to evaluate the proposals, setting aside a lot of the nimby not in our backyard

arguments to meet the energy needs of what you might call the greater good.

Let me tell you a little bit about Dracut, you said you were out there today. During the Revolutionary War, Dracut sent more men and boys per capita to fight for our nation than any other town in the 13 colonies. That's Dracut people recognizing the greater good. We sit here in a beautiful auditorium in a 60 million dollar high school renovation project that raised our property taxes we did it for the greater good of our children.

We invested \$803.00 of community preservation tax dollars to help preserve 85 acres of farmland at the Lezinsky Doomras and Savior Farms which actively grow produce for our community and beyond for the greater good.

When other Catholic churches were closing, St. Francis Parish was building that beautiful church on the hill in the center of this proposal. Dracut parishioners, giving of themselves for the greater good of their parish -- and finally this small community of 30,000 people with little commercial and industrial base, each year raise over \$100,000 in scholarships to the Dracut Scholarship Foundation for the students graduating from Dracut High School to go on to college, again giving what we can for the greater good, our future.

So as you see, we as a community we understand the greater good. We as a community has been an extraordinary living example of sacrifices for the greater good for 314 years, the greater good, we get it. What we don't get is this project as proposed. It tears up an entire section of our community. It puts at risk the jeopardy, the air, water and noise pollution and a real safety factor for a large wholly populated neighborhood and those very farms that our community has invested in.

The compressor station proposed backed up right into this residential neighborhood with its noisy blow downs and chemical emissions. As you can tell our community has an incredible heart and soul. What our community doesn't have is the capability to handle an accident at that site. We are under-manned in our fire and police departments should there be an accident.

We are a small community. I respectfully request that you painstakingly examine this proposal, that every health environmental and safety concern, this is not a "not in my backyard" argument. This is about the greater good, the greater good of Dracut, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next up is Sheila Harrington.

MS. HARRINGTON: Thank you very much. I am Representative Sheila Harrington, H-a-r-r-i-n-g-t-o-n and I am the representative for the 1st Middlesex District which includes Groton, Pepperell, Ashby, Devens and Dunstable. Presently there is a lateral from this pipeline that is proposed to go through the town of Townsend. I have to say that one of the things that gave me hope tonight was in your introductory stage when you said that you were going to give this a hard look, a really hard look.

I would ask that when you view this a hard look, you don't just give it a hard look as to scoping where the proposed pipeline should go, but whether we need it at all. I would also refer you to a couple of things that I have prepared for you to consider how the state is affected.

One of them is the position of our Governor, Governor Charlie Baker who has said that he is committed to diversifying the Commonwealth's energy portfolio to reduce costs and ensure reliability for Massachusetts rate-payers through a balanced approach, renewable energy investments, increasing energy efficiency and expanding natural gas capacity along existing routes.

Governor Baker has shown commitment by his new hydro-electric power proposal but the existing routes proposal that he has given here or suggested here, I don't know if that has been fully vetted. I believe it's the position of the Governor as well as many of the legislators that there is no need for a pipeline, what we do need to do and we are starting to do is look at other sources of clean, renewable energy so that in the future no new pipelines are going to have to be built in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, our power will be affordable and we are going to be able to fuel this Commonwealth to a level that we will fuel it now and beyond.

I would also say to you that the last couple of years many of the legislators have met with the representatives from Kinder Morgan and I know that at least on one occasion with a group of legislators, a commitment was made to follow the laws of the Commonwealth, both state and local and most importantly to observe Article 97 of our Massachusetts Constitution. I won't go very much longer providing you have a lot of people to listen to tonight, but I do think that it is important that you understand that this was so important to the legislature for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that we amended our state constitution. And it says, the Article 97 of the Amendment to the Constitution, "that people shall have the right to clean air and water, freedom from excessive and unnecessary noise and the natural scenic, historic and esthetic qualities of their environment and the protection of the people in their right to conservation, development and utilization of the agricultural, mineral, forest, water, air and other natural resources is hereby declared to be a public purpose.

Please observe our laws here in the Commonwealth. We put a pretty high bar on our Article 97 takings. It requires 2/3's of the legislature, it's that important to us and we ask that it be that important to you, we ask you to take that hard look to the necessity of this line at all and look at what we have in new proposals for energy to meet our future needs as well as our existing infrastructure, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Okay next up I think that was the state representative, we have next Mr. Ron Marsan.

MR. MARSAN: Thank you for being here this evening. Ron Marsan, M-a-r-s-a-n, President of the Metheun City Council, the Metheun City Council has recently passed a resolution standing in strong opposition to the Kinder Morgan Northeast Pipeline. We call upon Kinder Morgan to take the necessary steps to avoid our community.

We feel that this larger, high pressure line that will be in close proximity to many established neighborhoods will bring into question the safety for our citizens and the first responders in the event of a disaster. There will be a significant disruption to our conservation of land, our wetlands and areas of historic relevance, increasing the width of the right-of-way will also and eventual decrease of property values. We ask that Kinder Morgan seek alternative routes and proposals that will not impact Metheun. Metheun will get substantial risk with no direct benefit.

Once again the city of Metheun is the closest to the Kinder Morgan Pipeline Project. The city will be submitting documents proposing in opposition, thank you again.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next we have Mr. Steven Tagmelis.

MR. TAGMELIS: That's Tagmelis, T-a-g-m-e-l-i-s. Before I get started I just want to make an announcement, I will also mention tonight there is a scoping session in Lunenburg tomorrow night at the high school at 7 o'clock for all of you that are concerned.

Okay my name is Steven Tagmelis and I am Chairman of the Board of Selectman. I first want to thank the FERC representatives that are here tonight for holding this public scoping session and for listening and documenting the voices of the people affected by the NED Project.

I am here tonight on behalf of the considered citizens of the town of Pepperell who adamantly oppose the Northeast Expansion of the Tennessee Pipeline Project. Last night at our Pepperell Selectmen meeting, the Select Board in opposition to the pipeline voted to support a resolution to become an intervener in the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Project.

Pepperell was one of the first communities to oppose the pipeline with a non-binding resolution of the town meeting and to take the initiative to start a Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition which membership now includes over 13 Massachusetts and New Hampshire towns and cities.

I will now read for the record Pepperell's non-binding resolution opposing the Northeast Expansion of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline which was passed by unanimous vote by 432 registered voters at the Pepperell's special town meeting on June 3, 2014 and it goes:

"Whereas the proposed high pressure pipeline and the lateral pipeline carrying natural gas may cut

through Pepperell and the neighborhood communities and move through Dracut, Massachusetts, Nashua, New Hampshire and where the pipeline contravenes currently. Massachusetts's commitments to renewable energy and combat global climate change and whereas the pipeline will transport natural gas obtained through hydraulic fracturing, a drilling method well-known for potential for ground water contamination, impacting air quality and the harmful health effects of chemical by-products among others and the high pressure gas pipeline by its nature carries potential for leaking, rupture, devastating explosion, causing untold damage for property and lives and

Whereas said pipeline will destroy unknown amount of forest, wetlands, conservation lands and farm lands and would pass beneath the national rivers which require maintenance with perpetuity of a 50 foot right-of-way, with the possible use of herbicides and where a thick pipeline would adversely affect property values, adversely affect resident's livelihood and otherwise negatively impact the integrity of the town's ecologic character, and

Whereas the cost of said pipeline will require Massachusetts citizens to pay a utility bill tariff, the loss of environmental cost not required by the Tennessee Gas Pipeline making residents take the financial risk for the risk of a private corporation and

Whereas our energy challenges are better addressed through adjustments and energy conservation measures as well as green renewable energy solutions,

Now, therefore, we resolve that the people of Pepperell, Massachusetts, hereby call all of our selectmen to stand in opposition to the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's Expansion Pipeline Project and not allow -- and stand in opposition to all civil projects that may be later proposed, also oppose any pipeline carrying natural gas or petrol drawn through fracturing within the borders of our Commonwealth and

Finally, hereby instruct, which you are hearing tonight, our state fellow legislators and executive branch officials, to enact legislation and take any such actions that are necessary to disallow such projects that go against our commitments to life, the environment, the economic well-being and safety and to legislative restricted energy efficiency and further exploration of subsidies of renewable energy sources.

And again that was passed at our town meeting on June 3rd of 2014 and currently there are 72 Massachusetts communities that have now passed non-binding resolutions so there you are talking about thousands of citizens in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts opposed to this NED Project and that is a fact that should not be ignored, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Mark Andrews?

MR. ANDREWS: Hello I'm Mark Andrews, that's A-n-d-r-e-w-s. I would like to thank all of the federal and state officials that have brought so many points to this discussion this evening and for your presence. I am speaking tonight as a representative of the Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition. Our Coalition is composed of duly appointed representatives of the following Massachusetts and New Hampshire municipalities, and there just happens to be 13 as the representative before me point out, just like the colonies.

The towns of Ashby, and members and residents of these towns please stand, Ashby, Andover, Dracut, Dunstable, Groton, Littleton, Pepperell, North Reading, Townsend, Wilmington and Brookline, New Hampshire. This coalition is comprised of elected members of boards of selectmen, town leaders, city and town administrator's municipal staff. Our mission is to gather knowledge and work collaboratively to provide the representation and information with regard to this issue, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Project proposed by Kinder Morgan and its effect on our communities.

Over the last 14 months we have been working hard on numerous issues and we are unified in our steadfast opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project and the overwhelming majority of our members have joined once again as Steven pointed out, he's a senior partner -- I'm just a junior partner, of 70 plus towns in Chatham County, Massachusetts, in New Hampshire and New York in passing resolutions against the pipeline.

As others have mentioned the coalition is tremendously concerned that the project is moving far too rapidly. I think I recall a meeting in Andover during school vacation week which is totally out of the question, it should have been held at the convenience of people who needed to be there and wanted to be there but they went on vacation with their children.

On July 24th Kinder Morgan released updated resource reports that remain willfully incomplete and for the record there are an estimated 10,000 TBD's in regard to that report. We understand that the preferred format of this hearing is to submit questions to you for FERC's study and consideration. In effect we are submitting all 10,000 questions for these TBD's in Kinder Morgan's resource report.

All the municipalities and the members of our coalition share significant concerns about the aspects of this proposed pipeline as mentioned here this evening, including but not limited to the impact of the construction and operation of the pipeline of protected open spaces, federal, state, rare and endangered species, as my state representative Sheila Harrington pointed out on line 7, water resources, forests and farm lands, we question all of these issues going forward.

We share with the homeowners of our towns in their collective concern about falling real estate taxes and I know you mentioned sir your efforts relative to the socio-economic reports that will be done. Take this into consideration, there's not a town administrator or mayor or city manager that doesn't go to sleep at night worried about something called the overlay account.

In Massachusetts in Chapter 54 of the Massachusetts General Law, we put aside money for local tax payments in that overlay account. They are budgeted and they take money away from as the state senator pointed out, police, fire and our schools. And we have to do our best estimate for what they might be. In that account, we also have veterans exemptions and abatements for home owners and businesses that might incur a fire, they might be out of business for a certain period of time, this will put a tremendous strain on municipal resources, make no mistake about that.

Most importantly we are concerned about the negative impact on the physical health and safety of our citizens. While this is only a cursory reporting reservations about the pipeline, please be assured that we will be submitting extensive written comments to FERC and hopefully the deadline will be extended.

Last I want to mention to you, the state promotions something every legislator in this room, some of them called green communities, was in the process of becoming a green community and many of the 13 and many across the state, there is over 150 green communities that we have made a commitment locally in our municipal buildings, school buildings, to save 20% of our energy costs over the next five years.

That's where we should be heading, not with a bigger pipeline. Finally I would like to specifically and respectfully request that you postpone the proceedings until the late fall when the Massachusetts Attorney General Healey releases her independent study and basically put forward information that will help with the overall plan and proposal that you will be undertaken.

As residents of Massachusetts we have well-documented past experience, we are keenly aware of the pitfalls and un-intended consequences of large projects like this including famous dig dig. We respect and request that you schedule additional scoping meetings to be held on that information and be provided by Kinder Morgan so that we can understand it and have better knowledge upon it.

We cannot collectively allow this project to go forward. I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening. On behalf of the Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, Jeffrey Yull?

MR. YULL: Thank you. I want to thank the Commission for having this hearing. As you can see there are many people who are concerned. My name is Jeffrey Yull and I am of the Methuen lateral pipeline. I am not going to speak long because there are many people who have many things to say and therefore there is a lot to listen to.

Residents of all communities involved are extremely concerned and you heard through the public officials but hopefully you will hear from the citizens of all of the communities that are involved.

I would like to say that FERC has interstate responsibilities which means it has national implications but then it comes down to affect us locally.

The bigger question is what will be the impact on the communities and that big question is what is the impact, but it's not just the demand, the environment is sovereign to each community here is at stake. Safety and negative costs to each community, impact on local government, the safety issue, the fire departments, we are planning on a meeting with our fire department, it happens at whatever meeting we have with Kinder Morgan. So we can understand how they will respond and there is a big concern with that.

Private property rights, there may be an issue with eminent domain. I don't think anybody likes the government taking over their property just to supply their prize the run their business. Article 97 as mentioned earlier is there a certain of ours that we need for that to be protected, and not over-run by the pipeline.

This pending tariff coming up which concerns us because it is going to be a charge against the electrical customers and the want the extra customers to pay for the pipeline, there is a fairness issue involved there. And then as mentioned by Mr. Andrews there's the impact on the town overlay accounts where we have to -- the side, hold on to the money and then we have to on a rainy day situation use it, that puts a stress on us that is dramatic. I think a key thing that I am concerned about with the Kinder Morgan Pipeline is that the document that has been mentioned many times already and which should be the documents submitted by Kinder Morgan are incomplete with thousands of to be determined dates.

I ask that you delay extending the scoping hearings until the documents are more complete so experts and property owners have adequate time to review them so many unanswered questions can be addressed thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up is Tony Archinski.

MR. ARCHINSKI: Thank you very much good evening. My name is Tony Archinski and I'm the Chairman of the Board of Selectman for the town of Dracut. Thank you for coming to our town to hear the legitimate concerns of our citizens, especially those who will be most impacted by the construction and operation of the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project.

I know that there will be many speakers tonight, most of whom will probably be speaking in opposition to this project for a variety of reasons. I will keep my remarks brief and I will submit a more detailed testimony in writing. I would also like to inform the panel that I will be submitting a non-binding resolution voted on by the majority of the Board of Selectman opposing this project.

As an elected official of this town I believe that it is my duty to also inform you that it is my estimate that 95% of my constituency is opposed to this project. They believe that it is not necessary, that it would endanger wildlife, it will ruin protected land, decrease the value of their homes, degrade air quality, increased noise pollution and set the table for a potential public safety disaster that would wipe out whole neighborhoods, a disaster -- a disaster that our small town of limited public safety personnel would not be able to handle regardless of the training.

I have not spoken to many people who think that this pipeline is necessary or worthwhile so my 95% estimate should be considered a conservative estimate. I have tried very hard to look at this project in an objective manner. I have tried not to become emotionally involved while examining the facts, but how does one determine what the facts are when we have a constantly changing, moving target that has changed -- a target that has changed location, route, diameter of pipe several times, supported by thousands of pages of documentation -- documentation that only the pipeline industry truly understands.

Phrases like burn radius and incinerator zone are pretty scary words to these good American citizens who play by the rules, who work hard to provide their families with a home that overlooks rolling hills and beautiful farm land in our rural town. No one is willing to trade the sound of song birds for the sound of the 23,000 plus power compressor --

Dracut has a long-standing practice of preserving open space. It is evident by our participation in the state

of Massachusetts, 61-A farm preservation program and the Community Preservation Act, which citizens in this community pay an additional 2% assessment on their property tax so that the town may purchase large tracts of land for preservation, not for pipeline installation.

Most of the speakers tonight will tell you that this project will affect their property, their farms, their livestock, their neighborhoods, all based on incomplete or unknown facts. For this reason alone I ask that your Committee insure that the comment deadline be extended past August 31, 2015 so that we may have sufficient time to study changes that were made and submitted as recently as July 24th.

In closing I will say that I find that the benefits of this pipeline to my constituents, does not outweigh the risk and the negative impacts to our town. We already have enough pipelines in this community, we have done our share of satisfying public demand, we are not interested in becoming the pipeline capital of the Northeast, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, the next speaker is Kathy Richardson.

MS. RICHARDSON: Hi, good evening. As a resident and selectman in Dracut the majority of opinions that have been expressed to me have been against the pipeline project or an overwhelming feeling of frustration that the project is coming and there is nothing we can do to stop it. I do want to thank you for coming and hearing our concerns and my residents are very willing and able to stop this animal.

Most clear are my residents' concerns regarding a decrease in their property values, safety issues and residual effects to the agricultural activity of our rural farming community. As a selectman I brought the need for a resolution to oppose the pipeline to my fellow board members and voted to uphold that resolution which Mr. Archinski gave to you recently.

As a selectman I have been attending meetings of the Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition for over a year and a half on behalf of my residents. The information that I obtained has helped me formulate the following opinion.

Given the other pipeline projects that are in process at this time which are less intrusive and have much less in new green field construction, given the very estimates of the life expectancy of the Marcellus shale field, given the significant investments in conservation land throughout the state, which this proposal will decimate and given the green energy initiatives the state of Massachusetts has embraced, it would therefore be my opinion that the Northeast Direct Pipeline is not needed in Dracut or anywhere.

I respectfully request that FERC look at all all of the above factors, not only whether or not Northeast Direct with their customers in their opinion to justify the Northeast Direct Project. Additionally an extension of time line for FERC is absolutely warranted. For instance, when Kinder Morgan's new filings on July 24th, ten new towns were listed as affected by the Northeast Direct however they were not notified of the siting board meetings which are allocated to them.

I do want to give you the environmental factors that are moving in the gap, light pollution from the proposed compression station is concerning -- especially given the close proximity of the proposed site to the Dunlap Sanctuary, East River Reserve, Dennis McNamara and new entries at stand-able firing sites and extensive agricultural lands around town. These fragile eco-systems house owls, coyote, fox and raccoons and many other nocturnal creatures.

Dot-org quotes "Cycles of light and darkness are necessary for the production of plants, including food. Bright lights at night can adversely affect livestock breeding, foraging and sleep cycles as well as general health and agriculture. Animals such as dairy cows and chickens it is believed to decrease production and weight loss that reduces agricultural revenues.

In environmentabout.com all the lightings cost to us in terms of energy consumption is staggering. In the U.S. alone excessive use of light at night wastes over 2 million barrels of oil a day. In the USA, over 5 million birds migrate at night, died after becoming disoriented by the lights and colliding with tall towers.

The breeding habits of turtles, toads, frogs, salamanders have all been recorded as being damaged by excessive light. Many species of bats are threatened by suburban light as it creates no cove areas for them

to search for food or meals. Certain moths only mate on dark endless night and it is the same with fireflies and glow-worms.

There is also a concern that the sheer number of insects it would kill by binding to the lights at night present a great act of eco-systems, there is so many animals and birds depend on that for food. In physics-- said that seemed to concentrate on wildlife looking for easy meals from insects cachet around the lights. Such concentration could lead to vast disease transmission of our predators, and species not to mention the vast depletion of their food source.

Studies demonstrated that only 10 to 15 minutes of exposure to moderately bright light, include the twilight levels can shift the circadian clock by 1 to 2 hours for nocturnal animals so let's extrapolate that to the compression station that is going to have lights on 24 hours a day.

Those animals that do not highly hydrate properly need more time to find food for their survival, lights at night therefore decreases the number of hours that they have to find food and lead to hungrier animals and where are those hungry animals supposed to go?

Although the above cites examples of disastrous effects of overlaying on the animals there are many studies that site the negative effects on people such as insomnia, headaches, and stress-related symptoms. Finally, Dracut is being burdened with a very large compression station, three metering stations and major line and 3 lateral extensions. Dracut will be affected and significantly and it is unclear at best as to how residents will benefit but it is very clear to my residents as to how Kinder Morgan will benefit and this is unacceptable.

In closing my question to you is simply this, is it acceptable to expect rate payers to share the burden of an expense of the pipeline that only manages a billion dollar for profit company using eminent domain and a tariff which is still under scrutiny, I think not, thank you gentlemen.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. And I believe we have one last elected official, Jim Keller.

MR. KELLER: Good evening thank you for the courtesy of being here. I'm Jim Keller, spelled K-e-l-l-e-r and Chairman of Salem, New Hampshire's Board of Selectmen. Salem for those that don't know the current population is like 30,000 and it swells to about 60,000 in the summer time.

What I would like to read is a letter, a resolution by the Salem Selectmen and some personal commentary. The Town of Salem, New Hampshire was notified in 2014 by Kinder Morgan that they were planning to construct a third natural gas line -- third natural gas line that will be located in the existing right-of-way where two existing gas lines are located if possible.

Kinder Morgan's came up with the locations for installing the third gas line in position to not be taking of additional property. More recently in 2015 Kinder Morgan changed the original route through the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to a new route that passes partially through Massachusetts and partially 71 miles through the state of New Hampshire before turning to Massachusetts to terminate at the gas line in Dracut.

This is before the application on July 24th. This new route includes approximately 2 miles through the town of Salem, New Hampshire for the Haverhill lateral. Kinder Morgan also determined that they would replace one of the existing lines, replace them with 2 new 20 inch gas lines.

As a duly elected Board of Selectman responsible for directing municipal government in the town of Salem, in line with wishes of its residents, we have strong reservations with the NED Project as proposed, specifically as a judgment of the selectmen the proposed route through Salem is poorly chosen with numerous adverse effects on our community and must be changed so the pipelines don't pass through the town at all.

The reasons for this judgment are set out below. First, the character of the town -- the possibility of expanding our right-of-way for the proposed natural gas pipeline through conservation property, over important natural resources, through existing residential neighborhoods, by the way one of those is mine.

And far outside the borders of the town existing commercial zoned areas conflict with the most recent

master plan. We have attempted as a town to address this situation and the proposed route directly conflicts with the town's master plan and with the desire of a majority of its residents.

The current pipeline project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline and the company Kinder Morgan would disturb and permanently diminish the quality of life in existing residential neighborhoods because of the significant construction through neighborhoods that because of permanent clear-cutting and pipeline maintenance and because of the potential seizure of privately owned land through eminent domain.

Two -- unnecessary risk to wetlands surrounding one of the town's most precious surface waterways, World's End Pond, which is a pristine piece of town's conservation property. It is also worth noting that New Hampshire is the second most heavily forested state in the United States behind Maine. The people of Salem, as in many other New Hampshire communities, live here partly because of the heavily forested environment, it is integral to the character of the town.

The extent of the tree cutting required by the pipeline construction will therefore permanently disrupt it, especially in the residential areas and degrade New Hampshire's flavor of semi-rural character we seek to preserve. While the town of Salem is not opposed to new commercial industrial development in order to broaden its tax base it should not be done at the expense of our natural resources, conservation properties and existing residential neighborhoods that we propose in the exhibit for the record which shares that.

Two -- the World's End Pond, the World's End Pond is a 138 acre body of water which flows southwest and joins the Spicket River. It's bottom is covered with a very thick layer of cane vegetable matter. Around World's End Pond are three parcels of the Rockingham Planning Commission radius, high priority for the town that was purchased to preserve and conserve. That recommendation is based on the soils and the wildlife on the property.

These properties have also been identified in the exhibit.

Three - public safety concerns. The town of Salem shares in all of the concerns of the impacted communities regarding a high-pressure gas transmission pipeline passing through their community. These concerns are made more acute by the close routes of passage through residential neighborhoods. In particular, we are concerned with its proposed impact in the neighborhoods including Bounty Court Avenue.

Residents of these neighborhoods are concerned for the potential safety risk of pipeline construction, with the potential for a pipeline incident that could isolate and trap residents, indoor residents -- access to them by emergency vehicles and services.

It is difficult to see how the concerns of these residents could be addressed by the currently proposed pipeline.

Conclusion: The town of Salem and its Board of Selectmen strongly oppose this currently proposed project through the town of Salem, New Hampshire and its surrounding communities. With the possibility of needing to impact property outside of existing natural gas right-of-ways, the proposed route is disruptive to the character of the town and all of the residents, threatens unacceptable harm to the eco-sensitive areas and represents irresolvable safety concerns for at least some of the residents on or near the proposed route.

Based on the lack of specific information provided to the town by Kinder Morgan during the planning process, it does not appear that Kinder Morgan has explored alternative routes that would be less obstructive and have a lesser impact on the environment. The Salem Board of Selectmen is strongly in favor of increasing energy supply in both availability and pricing to benefit more businesses coming to the town and region but believes the Kinder Morgan Project is too excessive for the town of Salem and the region.

When Kinder Morgan is ready to re-think the selection of the route through the town of Salem, the Board of Selectmen would ask that Kinder Morgan engage the town in the early planning process. The currently proposed unsuitable route has generated much concern and certainly for the residents of Salem. It would be preferable to engage early the representatives of the town and present a much more detailed project and put together an unsuitable route with such concerns on the Salem residents and it is signed by the Board of Selectmen.

Let me add this anecdotally through personal experience. I had representatives of Kinder Morgan, I should say agents of Kinder Morgan because they weren't actually employees, put pamphlets on my door that said they wanted to come on my property and do surveying before they ever notified the town of Salem they were doing anything in our community.

I then met with Kinder Morgan representatives and was personally assured face to face with six individuals that they would be transparent, share all information, send a group of concerned citizen's emails with any updates and really address the safety concerns the residents had, that never happened.

Nor did they answer the questions about the process regarding eminent domain, property values, safety, or anything else. So what I share with you, and I appreciate and we appreciate you being here, you have immense responsibility for all of these folks and anyone else in any communities that are impacted.

Your responsibility is to understand the impact of this project on every single property owner along that route. When one discusses impact, whether it be environmental, socio-economic, there is nothing more egregious than a homeowner not understanding whether they will be able to live in that home 3 years from now or for anyone to explain to them what eminent domain means, or what a negotiation means.

So for those fans of Starterek okay, Kinder Morgan can be perceived as the Board and they are trying to -- I will share with you resistance is not futile. This process is very important and I encourage you and FERC to extend the commentary period, reach out to individual landowners in some other mechanism and forum, because these folks I can tell you, some of them are my neighbors -- they do not understand what is about to happen to them and they ask and they ask and they ask and they do not get answers. And if no one helps them, if no one helps them they are out left in the cold, so sir I challenge you to make that happen, I challenge FERC to make that happen and we appreciate anything and everything you can do to make sure that this is done in a very detailed, thoughtful way, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are going to start calling the numbers now, our first one is number 1, first in line, McKenna Prenus come down and then whoever numbers 2 and 3, if they would come on down.

MS. PRENUS: My name is McKenna Prenus, M-c-K-e-n-n-a P-r-e-n-u-s and I am from Pepperell, Massachusetts. I was 13 when a Kinder Morgan representative came to our door in January of 2014 and asked to survey our land for the proposed pipeline.

We soon came to find out that the path of the pipeline was going to cut through a piece of our 2 acre property only about 100 feet away from both mine and my brother's windows. Ever since then my family and countless others both affected and non-affected have been using almost all of their free time to fight this major corporation.

Now on the FERC website it states that the job of FERC is to regulate and review proposals to build LNG terminals and natural gas pipelines. But regulating shouldn't mean that hard-working individuals lose their land to a multi-billion dollar corporation. Regulating shouldn't mean that people must pay a tariff to build the actual pipeline and regulating shouldn't mean that they should have to fight and defend what is rightfully theirs.

What I am wondering is how can a federal board, compromised former energy industry executives, approve the pipeline installation instead of destroying people's land? Who is in charge here? Who are we the people relying on to represent us? Who can we, the homeowners, the rate payers rely on to represent our interests? This is my generation's future. I have asthma, I want my air contaminant free. Keep our air clean, keep our water pure, keep our skies dark and our protected lands should remain just that, protected.

With power comes responsibility and I would ask you to listen to each of these people here tonight and as a federal agency, represent us the people in this fight for our rights, our freedom and our property regardless of where this pipeline is proposed to be placed it is wrong. Even as a teenager I know that. My 11 year old brother knows that. If kids were allowed to hold positions in government I can assure you that we would not be here tonight.

Review the issue of need, I know the difference between right and wrong, do you?

MR. TOMASI: Next up is Caroline Zuk.

MS. ZUK: Good evening. First thank you for the opportunity to speak honestly to a staffer, coming to a town to hear our concerns -- my name is Caroline Zuk, last name is spelled Z-u-k. As President of the Dracut Pipeline Awareness group here in Dracut, Massachusetts I value this town. I was raised in this town, I own and operate the family farm, a 56 acre property under the agriculture preservation restriction which produces thousands of vegetable plants for local home gardeners, 100,000 ears of corn and thousands of pounds of tomatoes and other vegetables each season from April to November.

Many customers come to my farm stand for untreated vegetables as they are dealing with specific health issues. They tell me they experience improved health when they consume my produce. Here in Dracut we have good reasons to want to protect our land and our farmland. Through the 70's and 80's Dracut worked hard to remove industrial contamination from among us. Dracut joined the fight to discontinue the use of DDT for removal of brush and power line easements after farmers and neighbors observed large numbers of dead birds everywhere.

Dracut pursued the closure of the Exxon facility on Route 113 when scores of wells became contaminated with hydro-carbons spiking the rise in cancer rates. My farm, the Butzfield Penosky Farm, Saja Farm, which is slated to be trenched with new gas pipelines -- the trenching operation will happen across wetlands and waterways which flow into my farm.

The proposed site of the 23,000 horsepower compression station will be located less than 500 feet away from my fields ready to spew into the air a toxic gas cocktail on July 1st. I have a brain, I can't sell a vegetable if there is something on it, I can't even sell a vegetable if somebody thinks there's something on it. Perhaps data from baseline studies of existing air quality, water sampling could provide a guideline to see if further contamination may present itself down the road.

Personally I don't feel comfortable selling a vegetable that may have received toxic residues as fall out from the compressor, emitting toxic gas and we ask that the FERC weigh heavily the input from residents this evening and listen closely. We don't need this project or the compressor that goes with it. Send Kinder Morgan back to Texas, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Grace Cashman?

MS. CASHMAN: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Move the mic down a bit.

MS. CASHMAN: My name is Grace Cashman, C-a-s-h-m-a-n. Welcome to Dracut, Massachusetts Mr. Tomasi and the others of FERC. I have lived here my whole life, 10 years now, I love my town. Many people will be speaking tonight about the lack of need for this pipeline project. Endangered wildlife, water quality, toxic emissions, emergency planning, property values and how Kinder Morgan sent out a 6,500 page report last minute and used old maps again.

As an active member of the Dracut Pipeline Awareness Group I understand all of the work that everyone in this room from towns all across Massachusetts and New Hampshire have given research in meetings, preparing calling, sending emails, spending money, not sleeping and giving up family time, this is all because of the billionaire company Kinder Morgan refuses to do their homework. We all have to do their homework for them.

If I don't do my homework I get in trouble. Kinder Morgan should get in trouble too. By the way we are taught in school that nobody should be bullied and that we as students must be nice and stand up to this kind of bad behavior, well that's exactly what our family, friends and neighbors are doing here tonight, we will not be picked on or ignored.

We live here, we work here, we go to school and we will probably die here and that is why you must listen to our voices, no pipeline here.

Lastly please help me understand why our federal government sends many people overseas to fight for our freedom, safety and rights only to allow Kinder Morgan to take it all way, God bless American, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up number 4, Peter Clark.

MR. CLARK: Why did I have to follow Grace? I have pared my comments down by about 90% so I will keep it brief. My name is Peter Clark, C-l-a-r-k, I lived in Dracut, Massachusetts for 32 years. Tennessee Natural Gas, part of the Kinder Morgan company for the proposed pipeline through my yard, excuse me, adjacent or co-located as it is called through the collectable power region, which takes up a small portion of my lot at its current standard. In addition my home is located about 24 miles from the proposed compressor station which will reportedly be powered by a 23,000 horsepower electric engine, the size and scope of this is far beyond my perception.

There are many factors concerning the health and the possible danger and chief among them is the unlikely present danger of catastrophic occurrence. I have some experience with Kinder Morgan personally. Some of the Tennessee gas line people have been extremely disingenuous for example.

Well after the time they acknowledged receipt of the registered letter that I sent them denying them permission to come on to my property to survey my neighbor saw them doing just that. He removed them and he had begun frustrating them because he knew I had denied permission. The men apologized quickly moving on. It is pretty obvious that they figured out that they could just sneak on my land.

You know I'm just one of several people who have had that experience. Now I alone, with many of my neighbors attended an open house in Annville, Massachusetts presented by Kinder Morgan. Collectively we felt that the representatives who were there were all smiling and friendly and explained that they were there to be helpful but they were in fact anything but.

They treated us like balls in a pinball machine, so ridiculous, bouncing us around. This company has unlimited resources. They have incredible knowledge and ability to advertise and the money that was spent lobbying politicians to vote in favor of their project. The Concerned Citizens of Dracut are very fortunate to have several well-educated members protected by their scientific backgrounds who are able to analyze information at their level.

But all that we can see, the amount of gas that they intend to bring through our community is far more than New England could utilize for decades to come. So the obvious plan to anyone who is looking at this project, which they are not even share, is that the gas is for export. I believe that this goes way beyond public good and is completely in line with the profitability of this very profitable company.

I'm going to conclude now, they want us to believe that Kinder Morgan with their resources knows exactly what answers to provide when the FERC asked their questions. My experience on this topic is extremely limited but I have been in business for 40 years, and I recognize when being played. I would ask FERC to carefully scrutinize all the aforementioned provided by Kinder Morgan on every detail, including the interest of the citizens of Dracut and put those ahead of Kinder Morgans.

MR. TOMASI: Mr. Daniel Mooney.

MR. MOONEY: Again why do I have to follow Peter Clark. My name is Daniel Mooney, M-o-o-n-e-y and I live at 71 Heaven Road, I'm an abutter to the Lynnfield Lateral. First I would like to thank Mr. Tomasi and FERC for coming to hear us tonight and we talked a lot about laterals and Kinder Morgan's Northeast Direct Pipeline can only be justified by its laterals. Without the laterals is only purpose would be to send gas to Canada for export and no politician would support an export-only pipeline.

But yet Americans take homes and properties simply to supply a car and lock it, to fill up corporation's pockets. This is especially true of rate payers being asked to pay for the construction of the pipeline so the laterals are an essential to Kinder Morgan's plan, they are essential to having FERC approve Kinder Morgan's plan. But are they necessary for us the public?

Let's look at Dracut. The Lynnfield Lateral is a 24 inch pipeline that is particularly intrusive to the densely populated area over this entire land. One 20 miles east of Dracut there's already a 30 inch Spectra

Energy Pipeline, going through the same place, Danvers as part of the Maritime and Northeast Pipeline.

So if Kinder Morgan is connecting to Maritime's and Northeast to send gas to Canada why can't they send it to Danvers, Massachusetts on the same pipeline? The Lynnfield Lateral appears to be unnecessary unless Kinder Morgan wants to increase their transportation market share by not using the existing, competitive Spectra Pipeline.

This is hardly for the public interest. The 1:57:23 Lateral is an existing lateral that supplies natural gas to New Hampshire from the south. In 2002 Tennessee replaced 19 miles of pipe with the 20 inch pipe from Dracut to Londonderry to supply the Granite Ridge Natural Gas Power Plant. That's a done deal, the gas is already flowing.

The Kinder Morgan Pipeline coming in crosses the existing Concord Pipeline in Pelham, New Hampshire. The NED Pipeline continues south, parallel to the Concord Pipeline on Madrid, turns west, connects to the Concord Pipeline behind Curry Drive and then the gas goes back to Nashua all in all it's a 50 mile loop-the-loop.

If the NED were connected to the Concord Line in New Hampshire then there is no need for a connection in Dracut at all.

Lastly the Haverhill Methuen line that is perhaps the most intrusive of all the laterals -- ironically it appears to be a pipeline to nowhere with no new customers. We would like you to make these considerations as part of the environmental impact study. The overall environment will impact the laterals could be reduced to zero, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, number 8 Matt Ferri.

MR. FERRI: Hello and good evening my name is Matt Ferri, F-e-r-r-i. I live at 217 Shoburt Road in Dracut, Massachusetts like my friend Peter Clark here about 1/8th mile away from the proposed compressor station so the proximity of our house as you can see is the risk of the pipeline devastation area, very important to me and my family. So I go to go Northeastern University, I study economics. More specifically economics at the energy sector and I have done a lot of research here into the solar and wind alternatives to the gas pipeline as you may know.

Solar and wind obviously are a lot cleaner and safer and Tesla, the company has been making great strides in the field of cheapening solar energy to make it more accessible. These days Tesla has made it very affordable for many households to get solar energy unlike in the past. So these 10 kilowatt our home batteries announced in May will actually cost \$350.00 per kilowatt hour next year. Now these numbers may not sound very important but these projections are -- were never priced this high until 2022 so Tesla is 6 years ahead of their timeline for these batteries so they are making it obviously very affordable and very logical to consider these solar energy alternatives in our everyday life.

According to Rocky Mountain Institute and I quote, "7 year accelerated price reduction means tens of millions of more customers will be able to cost-effectively install solar plus battery systems than we originally modeled. This announcement came just months ago in early June, so I ask that the FERC considers these new developments and be constantly updating the world of solar energy when they decide on allowing Kinder Morgan to put the pipeline in, thank you for this opportunity tonight.

MR. TOMASI: Next Samuel Zuk.

MR. SUK: Hello my name is Samuel Zuk, last name spelled Z-u-k. I'm a lifetime resident of Dracut, I'm the son of Caroline Zuk who as you may have been told is the owner and operator of Saja Farm. Saja Farm is a family farm passed down through multiple different generations and currently supplies the town of Dracut, specifically east Dracut, the section that will be affected the most by this pipeline proposal in Methuen.

With me living directly next to and working on this farm I have the pleasure of being exposed to the peaceful landscape of this farm on a daily basis which is something that few people can attest to. This made the news of the Kinder Morgan Pipeline Project all the more worrisome. When I first heard that the

area was going to be disturbed by a large pipeline, I was quite shocked to say the least.

Shortly after I was informed of the large compression station that was also proposed to be put into place a short distance from my home. After doing the necessary research it became evident that this Northeast Energy Direct Project if put in would be a huge burden and a huge risk to the town.

Here on this farm our job is to grow food and one huge thing I have seen is how this community looks up to farming. We get a lot of people coming into the farm not just to buy vegetables but to take a look at the thing that plays a huge part in making Dracut what it is.

And I would not be at all comfortable with the project coming in to change this farm community in the face of the town. In 2008 a Kinder Morgan Pipeline exploded in Pasadena, Texas killing one and injuring another. In 2009 a line exploded in Silver, Mississippi killing 1 and injuring 3. We, the citizens of Dracut do not want to be met with the same fate.

I ask you, the members of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to take a much closer look at this proposal for the safety and well-being of the members of this town that I call my own, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up number 8, Richard Cowan.

MR. COWAN: Good evening my name is Rich Cowan, I live in West Dracut and I am a founding member of Dracut Pipeline Awareness. I know that some of FERC have heard what the concerns of neighbors, towns and concerned residents all across New England are thinking. How do we negate this? I am actually asking you to consider a more serious response to this pipeline to review what our group is about to say. If the issues we bring warrant the attention of the security risk, do more than delay it for a month or so in order to design and impose a small number of conditions on the developer. As our friends from Salem reminded us in June at the American Legion, FERC -- Kinder Morgan is not the government, they are just the private developer.

Here in Dracut when a developer wants to build something, our local boards can drastically reduce or deny the project. There is no developer who is "too big to regulate". At the federal level this should apply to the power of FERC to regulate Kinder Morgan. You can do more than mitigate, you have the power to do a lot more.

As other speakers have said the NED Project would involve the addition of an enormous amount of new infrastructure, far more than is required by the current energy policy of the state for projections for growth. We don't build highways just for the sake of building highways.

The scale of the construction proposed by NED simply does not make sense.

Simple low-cost alternatives of this pipeline have been dismissed by Kinder Morgan and all New England rate-payers are facing the potential costs not only of this pipeline but of other lines proposed to serve the same customers. I would like to address need. Dracut is the terminus of a modern 30 inch pipeline jointly owned by Spectra Energy and for the natural gas. This pipeline was recently expanded in 2008, an off shoot of this pipeline terminates in the town just south of Danvers as Dan previously mentioned.

According to a study by our organization, of pipeline usage data available at infopost.spectraenergy.com this pipeline is not fully utilized. The delivery point where gas is received on this pipeline is in West Port, Maine. That is the point most relevant to Massachusetts and in most recent winter there was over 350 million cubic feet of spare, unused casing on this pipeline on all but 8 days.

Some of those days were actually in March so those 8 days were not even the coldest dates. I therefore ask FERC to acknowledge the existing pipeline from West Port to Dracut, plus the branch to Danvers that my friend Dan cited are not fully utilized and to fully explain in the EIS the terminus alternative as this is a route from the growing supply of Marcellus gas in eastern Canada to be delivered to our region.

It makes sense because they build pipelines deliberately to go up around New England to not go through the Green Mountains or the White Mountain National Forest, or populated areas like Dracut or Andover which have a combined population of almost 120,000 people.

Domestic gas --

MR. TOMASI: Sorry your time is up.

MR. COWAN: Oh, --

MR. TOMASI: Feel free to give us the rest of your comments.

MR. COWAN: I will do that, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up number 9, Diane McGary.

MS. MCGARY: Good evening my name is Diane McGary, M-c-G-a-r-y. I live in Dracut. My environmental concerns about the Kinder Morgan Pipeline proposal are many but since I am a Dracut resident I am limiting my comments to this town and the effects of the compressor station and incineration zone.

What would be released during the venting and blow offs? We know they will happen but we don't know what the contents of the venting will be, that's TBD's to be determined, so how can the risk be assessed? It can't.

An article on Fracked Dallas entitled "Compressor Station Hazards" states, "a recently released peer-reviewed study of the University of Colorado's School of Public Health entitled "Human Health Risk Assessment of Air Emissions from Development of Unconventional Natural Gas Resources", reveals the elevated risk levels for certain major health threats and should serve as a warning that natural gas production is not compatible with neighborhoods or places where people gathered for work, recreation or other purposes."

Look at the map of our town and the incineration zone and by the way be sure you have a current map because some of the maps do not have all of our streets and owners on them. The compressor station is in the middle of farmland that means the loss of livelihood and loss of food. Our farms serve the greater rural area from here to Kingsborough, Methuen, Cambridge, East Boston -- our food gets around but it won't if the soil is polluted with chemicals or incinerated.

St. Francis Parrish is also inside the incinerator zone as are many homes. Just barely outside is the Merrimack Valley 7th Day Adventist Church, Veteran's Memorial Park, Campbell Elementary School, our second fire house and our police department and many, many more private homes and condos.

These are neighborhoods where people gather for work, recreation, education and prayer not compatible with compressor stations. We need some leverage to make sure that the company's response times to problems are quick, reliable and appropriate. Townsfolk should be notified immediately when there are any issues, are electric companies already immediately responsible or responsive during power outages?

Kinder Morgan should be held to the same standard with equal -- with unexpected consequences. Demand that there be emergency plans for possible scenarios and that they are in place in every municipality along the pipeline just as the federal government did after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. This is very important after the Boston Marathon bombing where many oil agencies could just come together because they already had established who to contact, how to work together and how to bring things together quickly and efficiently. This saved lives. We need a similar program in place along the whole line of the pipeline and it shouldn't be at a cost to the residents, it should be at a cost to the business, thank you my time is up.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next number 10, Suzanne Conroy.

MS. CONROY: Thank you my name is Suzanne Conroy, S-u-z-a-n-n-e Conroy, C-o-n-r-o-y. I live in Dracut, I grew up in Dracut, my mom grew up in Dracut, my children did and I am one of the multi-generational people that you have heard about. I'm also a chemical engineer and I work for a medical device company and that has led me to the two comments that I want to make.

First is more of a comment that other people have touched on, is regarding the 10,000 or so TBD's in the recent document and like considering other speakers, I ask you to consider those.

Kinder Morgan, I actually work and regulate industry, it's the FDA and TBD's, to be determined's are not

allowed on any of the documents that I would be submitting to the FDA. If I were to submit something that had 10,000 TBD's they wouldn't say that's very nice, that's a good idea, why don't you go back and come back when you have the answers to these things.

And also TBD's are not allowed by the FDA on something that can be as simple as a billing, why are they being allowed here?

So the other thing that I wanted to comment on is actually on something that I deal with at work. I was recently hurt by an accidental release of caustic fumes and so I'm fine but what it caused me to think is what are the safety procedures?

There is always going to be something. There is always something that will go wrong, something that we planned, and can Kinder Morgan adequately provide assurance that in the event of such an incident, large or small, that the environmental impact is going to be contained and mitigated and what is the best intentions which some people are questioning with Kinder Morgan's hands tied.

Site security is 4th of the top 5 concerns for U.S. Utilities, and 1/3 say the culprit here is Kinder Morgan. This is not theoretical. In 2008 there was a coordinated cyber-attack on the pipeline in Turkey. Hackers shut down the alarms, cut off communications, super pressurized the crude oil and caused an explosion that took days to get under control and the main weapon was a keyboard.

In 2011-2011 cyber-attacks stole critical information from 23 U.S. natural gas operators. In 2013 other attacks were launched on U.S. gas compressor stations. In 2014, 25 holes in security software used to control pipelines were identified and I want to know is Kinder Morgan one of the people affected by this?

The Department of Homeland Security takes a search very seriously, they released a plan, excuse me -- they released a plan to address cyber-security and where is Kinder Morgan on this? Are they compliant to it? Have they conducted the audits as they were supposed to? Do they have a corrective action plan? Is progress noted on it or is this also a TBD?

These are some concerns that I would like to have addressed before the expansion of the pipelines in Dracut, in MASS, in New Hampshire and frankly anywhere around here, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Number 11, Mary Bickerstaffe? And while she is walking up we will be having a break at some point, probably in the next 15 or 20 minutes we are going to call a 10 minute break.

MS. BICKERSTAFFE: My name is Mary Bickerstaffe, B-i-c-k-e-r-s-t-a-f-f-e and I live in Dracut. My -- why is the compressor station located near so many family homes? My home is less than 800 feet from where the compressor station is proposed to be located. I abut the compressor station. Why does this 23,000 forced power compressor station designed to be so large? Why are there -- why are the blow downs that we are told are pipe depressurizations? We understand they are needed but don't these blow downs make toxic gases in to the air we breathe?

How will this affect us, our wild life and our water supply? What happens when it rains all day, how does this affect pipe generation -- does the rain bring down the toxic gases faster and then the rainwater seeps into the ground and streams and flower beds and trees?

If there are toxic gases in the air will we see more disease in the general population over time? I was told sometimes they have planned blow downs, how will we be notified of this? What about the loud noise that will be heard and the impact on our environment during and after a blow down? The noises scare wildlife and will certainly frighten children and any of us, especially if they happen at night.

My grandchildren and I have made this beautiful God given creation part of our lives with all the rare birds and rare species of plants, trees and animals that live around us. How will they make a new home here? They can't, all of these trees have been here for ages, especially the sugar maples. They cannot grow in a year or two, it may take several generations to restore some of the habitat, but due to the enormously wide easement we will have lost it all.

I will lose a lot in my land because I have the easement for the power lines and they are going to be coming in more to my yard so I don't want to lose anything that my grandchildren play on.

We implore you to reconsider installation of a project like this because not only the cost that we would be charged with but my neighborhood will never be the same and our town will be destroyed and its natural beauty will be lost forever.

I was also handed a map, a new map that just came out and my house isn't even on it. So it's going to show you that that part of Dracut doesn't exist. It's like -- but I do exist in the incineration zone so you can see my house clearly so I also want to leave this with you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MS. BICKERSTAFFE: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Number 12, Katherine Gaynor?

MS. GAYNOR: Good evening my name is Katherine Gaynor, G-a-y-n-o-r and I'm a union laborer and I would like to express my support for this project. It is no secret that New England faces an energy crisis as we currently pay the highest prices in the country for natural gas. This not only hurts our family budgets but local businesses will not hire or expand without having utility cost reliability.

Gas capacity and accessibility constraints threaten to slow production and will further hurt our economic recovery. The unemployment rate in the Commonwealth across many sectors is still too high and we cannot afford to sit back and wait. I ask FERC to approve and support this project. Let's get our region back on track and most importantly let's get people back to work building our energy future, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, everyone has 3 minutes. Next number 13 Chris Hebert, number 13?

MR. HEBERT: Hi my name is Chris Hebert, H-e-b-e-r-t and I just want to let the residents that may be getting a compression station and let them know that I already live near one on Mammoth Road in Pelham, New Hampshire. Other than dealing with the noise pollution when I leave for work in the morning with my 3 year old daughter we walk out the door and she starts choking because of the smell of natural gas.

I have made a call to Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline and they had somebody call me back, swing by my house, 50 minutes later to hop out of the truck and say I don't smell anything. So you know, I don't know what people are expecting but when you have a problem they don't do anything about it.

I guess that's all I have to say.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Number 14, Edward Nadolny?

MR. NADOLNY: Thank you. Good evening my name is Edward Nadolny, N-a-d-o-l-n-y. I will be both a pipeline abutter and a resident within a quarter mile of the proposed compressor station. I am concerned about the negative impact this project will have on the property values and the analysis surrounding this subject.

For Kinder Morgan to propose placement of a massive compressor station in close proximity to 2 previously established densely population residential neighborhoods indicates their lack of commitment to minimize the economic and environmental impacts of the pipeline construction. This is unacceptable.

The proposed site for this compressor station will place unnecessary burden on both Parker Village and Neville Creek neighborhoods. There are several studies on the effects of the pipeline construction on the property values referenced by Kinder Morgan. Each states that there is little to no effect on pipeline construction on property value. Many studies are performed in areas with the low population density.

Some have been performed in arid climates, where the clear cutting of mature forests and loss of privacy are not factors.

The studies are old and do not reflect current data available, on mortgage appraisal techniques, health risks, fear of terrorism and the impact of social media. Most importantly none of the larger studies adequately quantify the financial impacts of living with in close proximity of a compressor station or metering station and do not adequately define impact of decreased property value and the resulting loss of revenue to the town.

The editor and publisher of the Marcellus Daily News, a pro-pipeline publication just this week has admit-

ted that property values within of the mile of a compressor station may negatively impact property value. It goes on to state and I quote, “We have heard first-hand from people living very close to compressor stations whose property values are affected because of the noise and odor, this is a valid concern”.

What is not in there is that massive pipeline compressor stations, metering stations have a long-lasting devastating impact on families, neighborhoods and farms. Therefore I would like FERC to study and quantify the loss of property value to homes within mile of 30 comparable-sized compressor stations where 100 or more homes are affected.

I would also like FERC to study a quantified loss of property value of homes within mile of 100 comparable sized metering stations where 50 or more homes are affected. Both of these studies should include the impact of current day social media, contemporary property appraisal techniques and the impact of decreased residential tax revenue for the town, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up number 15 Donna Nadolny.

MS. NADOLNY: Hi my name is Donna Nadolny, N-a-d-o-l-n-y. Again I would be both a pipeline abutter and live within mile of the proposed compressor station and the potential metering stations. It is unacceptable for Kinder Morgan to propose placing this much above ground structure within such a close proximity to hundreds of residential homes. One of my concerns is the noise level coming from the proposed compressor and meter stations.

There is no adequate information available regarding the projected sound measurements. There has been applicable data regarding the level of sound measurements for each of the seasons. Additionally there is little to no compiled data publically available regarding the noise level and frequency of scheduled and unscheduled blow downs.

The overall lap and transparency in reporting is unsuccessful to the hundreds of residents that will be residing in close proximity to the structure. Therefore I would like FERC to study the projected sound levels for all of the above ground pipeline structures during all four seasons of the year, especially the time all of the leaves are fallen and before the snowfall.

I would also like FERC to study and release to the public with frequency over the past 10 years of scheduled and unscheduled blow downs at all currently operating compressor stations. The results of these studies should be made available in a clear and transparent manner for public review and included in the application for any pipeline project, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. 16, we will get to you and then we will have a 10 minute break after you are done.

MR. SCHNEIDER: Good evening, my name is William Schneider, S-c-h-n-e-i-d-e-r. I'm the operations manager at Benevento Sand and Stone. We are a very active quarry in Wilmington, MASS and we are bisected by the power line corridor that Kinder Morgan's Lynnfield lateral plans to follow.

The Benevento quarry has been actively producing stone since 1950o on that site and we employ about 120 people. The production of stone is done by drilling and blasting of granite. This is a daily activity at our quarry and it takes place approximately 250 feet from the power line easement that is the proposed route of the Kinder Morgan Pipeline.

Given the close proximity of the blasting stone in our quarry it stands to reason that we have safety concerns. The average blast of our site fractures 16,000 ton of rock in less than 3 seconds. Kinder Morgan representatives have stated to me that blasting is not a safety issue for their pipeline regarding their facility. The conclusion by Kinder Morgan is done without an understanding of the geology of our site or a thorough knowledge of any seismic activities that occur during the blasting process used at Benevento Sand and Stone.

Without understanding the risks and as Kinder Morgan Pipeline comes through fruition it is possible due to the safety concerns that it can cause the closure of our quarry putting 120 employees and their families out of work. Kinder Morgan representatives state they are committed to employment opportunities per-

haps but not in this particular situation.

Our question of Benevento Sand and Stone is are there better alternative corridors for gas transmission pipelines in the area, specifically the Northeast or the Portland Gas Transmission system, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. A couple of things real quick before we take a break -- we are on number 16 of 69 people that are signed up to speak. Now we are going to be here until after midnight. If for some reason you can't speak tonight you know we do have another meeting tomorrow at the Lindenburg High School, you can get the address out front.

So if we can't get to you tonight you can go there and sign up as well. We are going to take a 10 minute break and then we are going to go ahead and be back right at around 9:45 thank you.

(9:46 p.m.)

MR. TOMASI: If everyone would take their seats I am going to go ahead and restart. If everyone could sit down and be quiet so that we can hear the speaker. Everybody sit down please so that we can hear the speaker. Sir do you want to go ahead?

MR. VINCE PRENUS: Good evening I'm Vince Prenus from Pepperell, that's P-r-e-n-u-s. I am going to try to be half as eloquent as my daughter McKenna was a few moments ago. Tonight I am here to challenge the case for need. Last December I sat across the table from Gordon Van Welie, CEO of ISO New England to discuss his unabashed advocacies of pipeline expansion.

Mr. Van Welie has not been the most ardent defender of taxpayer, rate payer interest. Rising utility rates have far more to do with his actions and inactions than the alleged pipeline constraints, I'll give you two examples.

Last September FERC Commissioners Bay and Clark openly criticized by the failure to address the exercise of market power in the 2014 forward capacity auction. Just prior to that auction, Grover fought break and point with the intention to close it. Unable to meet the installed custody requirement the auction defaulted to a non-competitive price resulting in a 75 million dollar windfall for that broker and record 3 billion dollar price tag on us for future capacity payments.

Your Commissioners asserted that ISO New England may have violated its tariff, by failing to carry Pittsburg of salvaging the auction results for just and reasonable. ISO and FERC declined to take action despite being urged to do so by no less than 16 members of New England's Congressional Delegation.

This winter electricity cost 30% than last thanks to the peak shaving liquefied natural gas. This, despite suffering the most severe winter in 80 years, recall in 2013 ISO prohibited LNG from participating in its winter reliability program, a concern for sending the wrong signal about the scarcity of natural gas.

Electricity prices soared when it could have been prevented. This action bore the un-mistakable appearance of market manipulation with the AIM propping up the weak case for pipeline expansion. This fuel source agnostic, I'm not even sure that it's legal.

New England's natural gas inflow capacity is nearly twice the region's demand. Energy efficiency, demand response, recovery of gas loss for leaks and commercially available storage technology all combine to refute the facetious case for need. Our actionable request of this Commission is do your job, regulate. Your job is not to "put steel in the ground", a show of equipped at an energy roundtable last October.

Your job is to confirm that the numbers clearly show the case for need is not made. The export plan for wealthy Texans is no justification to impose eminent domain on these working families. China may need this gas but the New England rate payers that will bear the burden surely do not.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, number 18.

MR. PRUDHOMME: Good evening my name is Paul Prudhomme, P-r-u-d-h-o-m-m-e and I live here in Dracut. If this compression station is completed I will be within a half a mile. I would like to ask you if you love the neighborhood which I hope all of you do. That is why we have to oppose this pipeline and above all the compression station.

If you don't or do love your neighborhood I invite your immediate family to visit my wife Deborah and I for 24 hours or longer if you would like then you could see the many varieties of plants and flowers and trees we grow to attract the birds and the bees and the butterflies and all of nature's sounds.

Maybe if you had a hummingbird hover in front of your nose, 2 feet away from you it would bring a tear of joy to your eyes, it does to mine all the time. These things and many more are why Deb and I love to live here in the town of Dracut. To have anything change so drastically would break our hearts, each and every one of us. To allow this project to happen would degrade, not improve all of the environment, the farmlands, the wetlands, the forest, the wildlife, the encroachment would not only burden all of us financially but also emotionally and psychologically, it already has.

Not only environmentally wrong, this compression station creates danger, -- noise pollution for schools, churches, fire and police stations, all of it in this radius. We were put on this earth to be stewards of the land so the next generation can enjoy what we have. Why do so called "big business" always want to mine, dig and destroy what God and Mother Nature has given us?

They, big business, they say that this project is for our benefit, but all I see are CEO's and shareholders reaping all the wealth while we suffer. It's nothing but greed. If this project is accepted it is not a matter of if or when a disaster will happen because when mankind is involved in changing nature's way, eventually something bad will come.

If your collective consciousness will be at peace with a decision to allow this project I pray for you and your families because we will never have peace here. A quote from Bob Dillon says, "Take care of your memories for you cannot relive them", thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up number 19?

MS. KULIG: Good evening, my name is Joyce Kulig, K-u-l-i-g, a 32 year resident in Acorn Heather Road in Dracut, Massachusetts. As a retired 35 year public school teacher this is a civics lesson I never imagined I would have to learn. Clearly you have heard a lot about the environmental impacts of this proposed project, but the most egregious impact is what this project as proposed would do to the neighborhoods of Dracut that were in its path.

I would like to speak about the construction and maintenance of the pipeline that is proposed to run in our backyards. Currently behind my home as well as others in my neighborhood, there's a 200 foot electric utility easement which has been replaced since we all bought our homes.

The electric lines themselves only encompass about 50 feet of that easement. Kinder Morgan has proposed that it is co-located with that utility but that is not true. Kinder Morgan wants their own easement therefore they are really co-locating with our backyards.

This co-locating will require the destruction and clear-cutting of at least a hundred foot swath of mature trees and vegetative buffer on our properties. Kinder Morgan would then need to maintain this line with our tree cover. This would also require Kinder Morgan to obtain this land through eminent domain proceedings because I for one would not be a willing seller of my property for the proposed pipeline.

Some of the other reduction in noise mitigation and the actual reduction in mature wooded trees. I would ask FERC to review how many abutters will lose their shielding from the power line easements after the destruction of the aluminum pipe barriers on private property are confiscated by eminent domain.

This coverage would embark between the power lines and our homes is where our children and grandchildren play and enjoy the woods. The environmental impacts and possibly resulting impacts to our health, physical and stress relates, as well as have a negative impact to our property values.

In your letter to me dated June 30th, 2015 you indicated my comments should focus on these effects and provide reasonable alternatives to avoid or lessen the environmental impacts. The way to do this is to not locate this pipeline in my neighborhood or any other neighborhood in Dracut, Massachusetts.

Kinder Morgan's pre-application says that the proposed pipeline is being co-located with existing utility easements but the truth is the proposed pipeline is co-locating with our homes, properties and families.

Should FERC allow Kinder Morgan to use the eminent domain to violate our property when there are reasonable alternatives, including the no build alternative? Certainly not. Thank you for listening.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Number 20, John Lewicke?

MR. LEWICKE: That's John Lewicke, L-e-w-i-c-k-e. Good evening. We are here tonight because Kinder Morgan says there is need for a pipeline. That need was artificially created by an independent system operated in New England, ISO during the winter of 2013-14 with the complicity of FERC. The way they created the need was by manipulating energy markets, including the market for natural gas.

Manipulation of the natural gas market is illegal under the Federal Natural Gas Act. There is no provision in that Natural Gas Act that says it is okay to manipulate markets as long as FERC says it's okay. The way they manipulated the market was to spend 66 million dollars of rate payers money to buy oil and prevent liquid natural gas from being used to generate electricity.

That 66 million dollars came out of your pocket as part of the transmission charge on your electric bill. What happened in 2013-14 was that ISO decided we needed a winter reliability program even though there had never been a reliability problem before. They implemented a centrally controlled solution to a non-existent problem. In doing so, they broke the market mechanisms that had been working for many decades and created the kind of shortages and problems they were claiming to solve.

It would appear that the winter reliability program was really a winter unreliability program. The program involved ISO contracting for electricity from no more than 200 oil fired and dual fueled generators. ISO refused to contract from winter electricity from gas-only generators. That meant that gas only generators would very likely be and actually were idle some part of that winter.

ISO spent 66 million dollars of rate payer's money to pay for the oil that they chose to generate. In September 2013 FERC approved ISO's program without LNG, accepting ISO's false assertion that there wasn't time to include LNG in the program. ISO said they wanted to minimize market distortions. As we all know in 2013-14 markets natural gas to electricity through wood pellets would destroy far beyond what has ever occurred before or since.

It is no surprise that removing a large part of natural gas supply which before and since the supply to New England would likely leave out energy market distortions. They ascertain that there wasn't time is belied by comments from LNG suppliers and conservation foundations proposing conclusions of LNG in 2013-14. That proposal was poo-pooed by FERC.

ISO set their goals to minimize market distortions. How could anyone expect the market not to be distorted by their market manipulation and result in the lack of LNG. They also said compensating natural gas resources would be sending the wrong signal and the natural gas solution would pose a risk of unintended consequences. What was the right signal they wanted to send and what were the intended consequences?

I can only conclude their answer is B there is a shortage of natural gas and more pipelines than need. I don't ask anyone to take my word for anything. All of this is from FERC's and ISO's websites and other publically available sources. I have the fully annotated version of this if any of you would like a copy.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next is number 21.

MR. HOVANASIAN: Good evening my name is John Havanasian, H-o-v-a-n-a-s-i-a-n. I'm a Dracut resident but I grew up in Methuen which is the town just east of here and my father is a third generation family farmer. We work together with a lot of the Dracut farmers so we got to know them very well, many of which are still in operation today.

So I've been associated with the community of Dracut as long as I can remember. My wife and I knew we wanted to live in Dracut, we bought our house on College Road in 1983. We are proud to live in Dracut and the efforts, what we have collected and participated in over the decades to keep our town a great place to live.

The Dracut community has always worked together to expand and improve upon the infrastructure to keep this town viable now and for future generations like families before us have done. During our 32 years in

town we have raised our two daughters, and put them through the great school system.

And our town came together to build a new library, new schools, new fire stations, the police station, most recently at New Town Hall and all the citizens that are concerned about and support saving open space. This was all possible because the people cared about the town and each other.

Our dream was to stay in our house into retirement and enjoy our community. Only one thing in the future, our daughters would live in Dracut and maybe even in our house. Kinder Morgan and the proposed pipeline could destroy that dream. Our house like many others, is in the area they are calling the incineration zone. Our plan for retirement is now fraught with uncertainty and anxiety.

We will stay in Dracut because it is our home, but we don't want our daughters there or their families. We couldn't stand the risk. After all of these years our town finally has a challenge that we may not overcome and certainly one which we cannot ever recover.

It's a decision imposed upon us from outside of our community and one which is completely unnecessary and provides no benefit to us. We can't imagine why anyone would allow this to happen and would do this to our town and its people. For us it is completely inconceivable, it leaves us at a complete loss over this numbing potential.

Just think about it as if it were you, would you want to live in the incineration zone? Would you want your children and your grandchildren in the same situation? We are here tonight because we need your help. We need you to hear us like you have said. We need you to really listen and truly understand what this will do to us and the surrounding towns. We need your help to stop this project. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. 22?

MR. ALUNNI: Good evening my name is Paul Alunni, A-l-u-n-n-i and I'm a own engineer for Wilmington, Massachusetts. A town whose concerns with this proposal focus on 3 main points -- first as many speakers have mentioned before me, the Town of Wilmington respectfully requests that the Commission's comment period be extended beyond the August 30, 2015 deadline.

When Kinder Morgan first presented their proposal to the Board of Selectmen it was on July 10, 2014. The proposed route was reviewed and carefully evaluated by the town, parcel by parcel, the subsequent 8 to 9 month period. While it was earlier stated that the pipeline route through where it would be altered to avoid impacts on our primary drinking water well fields, the change was not made official until the latest filing on July 24, 2015.

Kinder Morgan revealed at that time a completely revised pipeline route through our town. Given all of this new information it seems an extension to comment period is warranted. An extension will allow the town some adequate time to fully evaluate all the impacts that arise from the pipeline and provide that information to FERC.

Our second concern is that the revised pipeline route traverses a parcel owned and operated by Benevento Companies, an aggregate base material supply company at the quarry you heard from previously. The town shares similar concerns with respect to the proximity of the revised pipeline route to blasting operations at the quarry.

Kinder Morgan indicated its portion of the pipeline would be designed to co-exist with the expected operations at the Benevento site. The town requested that Kinder Morgan provide case studies related to their experience of running the gas pipeline through conditions similar to the Benevento parcel. Since that request we have only received general information about two locations of existing gas pipelines near active quarries.

The lack of detailed information with respect to blasting frequency, geological attributes, seismic readings, pipe detail sections and the depth of pipe has made it impossible for the town to draw any meaningful comparison to the counter proposal.

Lastly our third concern is construction of the revised pipeline route will impact the land area within the town zone 2 ground water protection district for 2 of our remaining well fields, the Brown Crossing well

field and the Salem Street gravel path well field. The active quarry also falls within the sensitive area.

I mention these are our remaining well fields because in 2002 the town had to discontinue use of 5 of its 9 remaining well fields due to contamination from industrial users. Because of that you understand that we take protection of these remaining wells and the contributing water shed area very seriously. We feel that further evaluation is necessary for studies to show how this new pipeline trench, so close to an active quarry will have an impact on these two well fields and in water shed areas, thanks.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next number 23?

MR. RUUTTILA: Good evening my name is Eero Ruuttila and its spelled E-e-r-o R-u-u-t-t-i-l-a and I'm here this evening as a representative of the New England sustainable farming project. It's a farmer training program that's located in Lowell and we have two farmer training farm sites in Dracut. One of the farm sites is next to the power lines and so the actual Kinder Morgan pipeline will be adjacent to active fields of where we have a number of farmers that are part of this farmer training program and we grow produce that gets distributed to over 300 families throughout our immediate region.

And also we have another field, the Open House Memorial field that is on the other side of Jones Avenue and it is within the half mile buffer of the compressor station. And the concern that I have with regard to this project and also concern that our small non-profit New England sustainable farming project has with regard to this project is the perceptual sense that individuals coming to our farmer training program could be at risk from working in our fields.

We are concerned about the impact from dust from the excavation of the actual digging of the pipeline as well as the different particulate matter that can be coming from the blow downs or the release of gas vapors and that would be from the compressor station and so we, you know, are concerned about the environmental impact risks to individuals in our program, risks to our staff members and risk to -- potential risk to infrastructure that we build over a number of years for our farmer training program, our water quality, soil quality and the healthy aspects of the food that has been a primary position and would operate from it, our fields are very healthy, we work with organic farming practices and our food is healthy for all the various constituents that we provide food for them so thank you for listening.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, number 24?

MS. COSTA: Good evening. I am Virginia Costa, C-o-s-t-a from Methuen, Massachusetts. I have been a resident for 36 years at 191-A North Groll Street. I also live 3 miles from the planned compressor station. I am asking you on behalf of the town of Methuen to question where does the gas go from the Methuen cable lateral. It just ends at Maple Street in Methuen. The pipelines at Maple Street are extremely small, only 8 inches.

I asked this question once before at at Methuen town hall meeting on June 11, 2015 and it has not been answered satisfactorily because Kinder Morgan does not have a customer or a plan for this lateral. We do not need it to be built at all. I am asking to separately consider no action whatsoever for the Methuen cable lateral, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, we are now on number 25.

MR. PAYETTE: Good evening, my name is Michael Payette and I'm a Dracut resident, practically a life-long Dracut resident. I appreciate this opportunity to express my concerns on this proposed pipeline. One of the alleged actions in this pipeline is that the Edison Pipeline will cover any shortfalls currently experienced.

The truth is that our current supply of natural gas meets our needs on all but a few of the coldest days of the winter which can be offset in many ways. We could continue using LNG as we already do now during winter months. We can continue to liquefy pipeline gas at facilities at Boston, 4:18:08 and Connecticut for winter use. In fact the gas companies have pledged to update all of these facilities.

We can access LNG from imports along the Maritime Northeast Pipeline that flows in to Dracut from Campport and New Brunswick, the largest standing port terminal in use. We can access compressed gas

storage that is now being built right along the Halifax lateral in Nova Scotia and the Northeast Pipeline that is under ways and that already has feeds from Canada right into Dracut.

Our gas companies contract for this storage and it will be available some time in 2018. Of course it could be even lower with less overall environmental impact than building a 400 mile green field pipeline across three states that will ruin thousands of acres of trees and put compression stations right next to the homes of many of my East Dracut neighbors.

Kinder Morgan has proposed the idea that we should not be using LNG peak demand since there is no place to guard the tankers. A report funded by Kinder Morgan released in June citing reports of the purpose to receive tankers has long been a contentious issue since our commitment simply doesn't go away. There is no sited problem because there are two mostly unused terminals built in 2008 located on the coast of Gloucester. Kinder Morgan is also counting on that LNG is 5 times as expensive as other fuels, not true. On peak days when there is really need LNG has often been less expensive than the natural gas prices in all of New England.

It would also seem that the case for this pipeline has built in questionable demand for gas. The ISO New England has issued predictions that power demand will go up, in reality thanks to the switch to energy efficient bulbs and appliances and proliferation of solar panels in many homes in the area, power demand has gone down by 6% since 2005 and the need for power generators has declined by over 15% and continues to decline.

So why do we need a pipeline again? I would respectfully request that the FERC use the more realistic estimates for both power generation and the peak demand for natural gas which are incorporated into the more recent May PUC study conducted by London Economics. This study validates our contention that this pipeline has been proposed to serve a need that simply does not exist and my time is up.

MR. TOMASI: Next number 26.

MR PLAZA: Good evening my name is Nathaniel Plaza, that's P-l-a-z-a from Hudson, New Hampshire. I am a property owner in Lanesborough, Massachusetts affected directly by the pipeline. I also live not too far from it in Hudson. At the scoping meeting in Nashua, FERC recommended that land owners hire a lawyer to protect their interests. Why should we? FERC should be paying one of these lawyers to protect us from the potential land grab by billionaires like Kinder Morgan?

Who does FERC work for -- the gas company or the tax payers? You also said FERC has only turned down one pipeline proposal, make NED number 2. Under the Right to Know Law, if FERC Commissioners receive money from lobbyists Kinder Morgan just gave Londonderry, New Hampshire rail trail, \$300,000 for trail improvements. This sounds like a bribe to me. Who else are they paying off for favorable votes, companies, senators, representatives, selectmen, non-profits and so on? How can we trust them.

Soon Kinder Morgan and KJP are going to file an application with FERC for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to construct NED. Do you as a Board consider taking my property and lying to me about it, a public convenience and necessity and give the profits they make at my expense to private shareholders. So I urge FERC to turn down this NED Pipeline proposal, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next number 27.

MR. JENNINGS: Hi my name is Fred Jennings, J-e-n-n-i-n-g-s and I live in Ipswich, MASS and I am currently President of both the Boston chapter and the Northeast chapter of Trout Limited, representing about 1500 concerned citizens.

I hold a PhD in economics and consider myself eco-logical, I have several questions about this pipeline project. First is it necessary? Second, is it being conducted in a legal manner? Third, what will be its impact on Massachusetts native brook trout?

FERC is it necessary? The proponents of this pipeline are claiming it is needed to meet local energy demand but it looks an awful lot like the whole purpose is exporting natural gas to Europe and elsewhere

for greater profit. Furthermore, are there alternatives, other pipeline routes that only involve expanding the existing facilities where this is a new route that will be very ecologically disruptive to water sheds, et cetera and if the alternative is less destructive those should be pursued.

Second is this proposal being conducted in a legal manner? I'm not an attorney nor an expert on Massachusetts environmental law but this pipeline is being intentionally directed through unpopulated areas. It is my understanding that the protected conservation lands cannot be turned over to private interests, without a 2/3's vote of the Massachusetts legislature and I am not aware of any provision that is made for getting such approval.

This sort of flouting the state constitution is unconscionable. Third, what will be the impact on Massachusetts aided populations of brook trout? The proposed course of this pipeline involves many straight crossings and in only 5% of brook trout historical habitat to fully self-sustaining populations still exist and virtually all of these intact populations are in the western part of Massachusetts where this pipeline project is sited.

This is another important argument in favor of alternatives being explored, someone must speak for the trout. This pipeline proposal should not be allowed to destroy what few remain of Massachusetts remnant and surviving population of native wild brook trout just so one big private company can make a profit supporting natural gas for a short period of time.

It sounds like that three questions, first is this pipeline necessary? Its primary purpose is export. Second is this pipeline proposal being conducted legally to flout the state constitution? Third, are the few remaining remnant native brook trout habitats in this state being duly protected by this proposal, I respectfully request that you take no action on this proposal or at least delay your decision I will submit written comments as well.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next number 28?

MR. CASTONGUAY: Good evening my name is Wayne Castonguay. C-a-s-t-o-n-g-u-a-y -- I am the Executive Director of the Ipswich River Watershed Association, a non-profit organization based in Ipswich. Our mission is to protect the Ipswich River and its Washington region for people and nature. We represent the 21 communities located within the watershed, the 350,000 people and businesses that rely on it for their drinking water every day and our more than 1,000 members.

The river is literally the life blood of our region. Consider the impacts the proposed pipeline is the largest ever to be built in our region. The length field of POE laterals will travel for 11 miles within the watershed, cross the river and dozens of tributaries, traversing over 2 miles of wetlands, alter dozens of vernal pools and be built on the river bank for over 2 miles because construction will require 100 foot clear swath of land and a 50 foot wide cleared zone in perpetuity using herbicides and mowing.

Pay attention to the beautiful photo here in May and every tree in that photo for miles will be cleared along the river and those trees as we all know are critical to protecting our water supply. In short we feel that there is no way to adequately negate these impacts and as such FERC should not allow this project, again it cannot be mitigated.

To avoid as much developed area as possible it is as if this project target conservation areas and we know that it does that to avoid people. Much of this land is referred to as Article 97 land, protected by our state constitution. Can you imagine after all of these decades of hard work for a company to come in and basically use this undeveloped land as a magnet.

While the issue of need for this project is beyond the scoping process as you have heard the Attorney General of Massachusetts is conducting a needs analysis, we feel that FERC should delay the scoping process until this analysis is completed because why go through all of this work when we are fairly confident as we have heard all night that this needs analysis will probably show that this project cannot be justified based on local needs.

Again as we have heard Kinder Morgan only released its draft report on July 24th just a couple of weeks

ago. Given how they completed it is how unjustifiable short a review period this is, the fact that the Attorney General seeks to understand the needs and alternatives more thoroughly, the fact that a redundant pipeline exists, the facts that all alternatives exist with far less impact, we respectfully request that FERC extend the scoping process.

In addition we respect that FERC add another meeting closer to the Lynnfield lateral again well over an hour from this location. So I want to make sure on behalf of the 353,000 people that depend on the river every day thank you for hearing my testimony.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next we are at number 29.

MS. SULLIVAN: Good evening, Suzanne Sullivan. S-u-l-l-i-v-a-n. I didn't grow up in a beautiful place like Dracut. I grew up in the City of Gwen and we were pretty poor, we didn't have a lot of quality of life. My mom used to take me there when I was a kid and I would see my daughter standing there where the pipeline is going to go.

We went there for the security and quality of life, it gave us hope and help, today I'm married I have had 3 children and moved to Wilmington in 1989. I was thrilled when I went there that when I found out the headquarters of -- was there but I was sad when I realized the condition of the river so I became active.

I served on multiple boards, volunteer, non-profits, citizen, municipal board of selectman. I know and I will address it when I see it, I have the experience. I have been working on the power superfund site now for almost 20 years, this site has shut down it links and its water supply due to MDMA.

Owen has written so many environmental reports it's worthy of its own zip code. When they suspected there was a dangerous on lots we were right. Even though we were assured times that are water was safe to drink. We also had to fight the state to shut down the import of a so-called slightly contaminated soils and for our aquifer to dig.

Plenty of reports and environmental impact statements they were too -- more window dressing. It has twice the state average of cancer in its children, watching a failing and losing a child is heart wrenching. 16 years later we still wait for the results of the child with cancer study, I serve on that committee too, more window dressing.

Now we are beginning to learn there is fracked gas, don't worry there will be an environmental impact statement, yeah whatever. More and more window dressing because you cannot mitigate the impacts that those pipelines create, you can't do it.

There is nothing good about fracked gas from cradle to grave and any industry that contaminates drinking water and the air and makes people sick, and innocent children sick takes away people's homes, their land, the economic viability of their parks and rivers is not only un-American but morally and ethically corrupt.

I view fracking as an environmental crime against the American people and the Energy Policy Act of 2005 as an accessory to that crime. I worked a lifetime to protect my water and my river. The rights of the citizens to a quality of life that clean water and available open space provide is mandated by Act 197 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth, as is the right to the quality of life and the pursuit of happiness of the Constitution of the United States.

I challenge your authority to determine my Constitutional rights on an important matter of public convenience and need. Surely our forefathers saw something more than that and they are probably turning in their graves. I think the world would be tyranny.

This pipeline should not be allowed, they don't need eminent domain status, they should not go through aquifers, they should not go through farms, they should not even go through people's back yards, they should not go through the basin rivers and once installed it could possibly even carry fracked waste water treatment and disposal.

MR. TOMASI: Excuse me your time is up.

MS. SULLIVAN: Thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Next up number 30.

MS. LAW: Hi, Kaela Law, L-a-w from Pelham, New Hampshire. According to the Federal Register Order of Notice for the environmental impact statement for the Concord lateral and I have the link submitted to the docket, you are an agency preparing an environmental assessment for the proposed Londonderry 20 inch replacement project through the towns of Dracut, Pelham, Wyndham, Hudson, into Londonderry to expand the capacity of the Concord lateral, that was in 2000.

According to this document again from 2000 and I will submit the link to the docket as well, the 20 inch replacement project was also approved by the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee and was as we understand placed into service.

I am bringing attention to the 20 inch lateral Concord lateral line because I find it concerning that Kinder Morgan has it marked as a 16 inch diameter pipe in Wyndham on their July filed resource reports. There are too many discrepancies such as this within these filings to respond appropriately or to move forward with this project.

If the company continues this process of filing so much erroneous information, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission must use its leverage to ask the company to freeze the initial project design and restart the entire pre-filing process with all of the updates and corrections made otherwise the FERC must not approve this project as it is being presented.

I would also request a much more thorough examination of the Concord lateral pipeline system in the state of New Hampshire and upgrade to certain sections that may count as bottle necks on the existing system and could be an alternative to the Northeast Energy Direct project and I would request that it is evaluated as such.

We have been told by company representatives that the Concord lateral is not presently running at capacity. If this is the case we would first like to be given a solid number for the capacity on the Concord lateral as well as the flow rate or PSI and second, if necessary, we would rather see actual incremental upgrades for natural gas along the Concord laterals, such as the storage facility beside the Granite Ridge Power Plant in Londonderry as an example to insure that the Concord lateral is being properly and fully utilized rather than to see the excessive build-up of a brand new pipeline to the region.

In closing I would request that Kinder Morgan or Tennessee Gas be required to complete and make public through this docket a thorough analysis and report on Concord lateral bottle necks or restrictions, mitigation of any such bottle necks or restrictions and the environmental impacts and costs of doing that versus the large environmental impacts and costs of building the Northeast Energy Direct.

The same analysis should be made for smaller improvements to any of the existing lateral lines where flow restrictions exist. If these improvements were made, gas requirements in the New England region could be met with the "no build" option for the Northeast Energy Direct, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Number 31, is 31 here? We are going to move on to 32.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Hi my name is Ryan Schwartz, S-c-h-w-a-r-t-z, I live on 144 Heather Road, well within a quarter of a mile of the proposed compression station and I would like FERC to conduct studies based on the following:

We know that there are 25,000 leaks in the Massachusetts distribution pipelines, this has been widely reported by the media, but what is seldom reported is that the above-ground facilities on transmission pipelines also leak.

In Dracut there are at least 5 above-ground facilities proposed and therefore we would like FERC to include a detailed analysis as part of its environmental impact statement on 1: the typical amount of leakage from gas and electric powered compression stations in the range of 20,000 to 25,000 horsepower operating at 1,460 PSI, 1, 5, 10, 15 and 20 years into their service life.

And 2: the typical amount of leakage from meter and regulation stations of comparable size to those in Kinder Morgan's fleet with a comparable pressure step down to the proposed 710 PSI at 2 of the Dracut

stations to be estimated at 1, 5, 10, 15 and 20 years into their service life.

We also ask FERC to address the alternative designs to the routing of the pipeline network that will reduce the need for much of this above-ground infrastructure so that it does not have to be installed in Dracut or other towns. And we further ask that all of the equipment installed be capable of operating at a much lower pressure which will be possible within the life of this pipeline as we transition from the use of natural gas to clean air, more renewable fuels.

We also ask if FERC can require Kinder Morgan to install all the methane recovery recommendations made by the Environmental Defense Fund in its report and we are still extremely unclear about compression stations blow down events. These will have a huge impact on overall gas emissions, noise and danger of the station and we ask that FERC consider the vulnerability of all proposed project facilities to cyber-attacks which is important because Kinder Morgan has said these facilities will be largely unstaffed and thus remotely controlled from Houston.

I would further like to ask how frequent are planned blow downs for maintenance of the gas and electric powered compression stations, how frequent are unplanned emergency blow downs for maintenance of the gas and electric powered compression stations and how frequent are planned and unplanned blow downs of typical meter stations.

Kinder Morgan has stated on WCAP radio last Saturday that compression stations have one blow down per year, but recently other pipeline companies have acknowledged that their compression stations have 8 to 10 blow downs per year. All of this information needs to be weighed and clarified before a decision can be made as to whether this pipeline should be approved or denied. Thank you guys for coming out here tonight.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next number 33.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Hi my name is Linda Schwartz, S-c-h-w-a-r-t-z and I live on 144 Heather Road in Dracut, within a quarter mile of the compression station. A portion of Moon Hill Road is susceptible to flooding during heavy rains. Moon Hill Road is also a place for turtles to cross the street. Certain turtle species in Dracut including the blanding turtle and the eastern box turtle are listed as threatened or of special concern by the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act.

I'm asking FERC to conduct a study on how the installation of the proposed pipeline and compression station would affect the flooding on Moon Hill Road and other roads. I am also asking FERC to study the danger that this flooding will pose to local turtle populations as well as to other protected species in the area. Also what percentages of protected species habitats will be destroyed, agitated by the compressor station during its construction and during its operation, thank you for the opportunity to speak.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, 34?

MR. ATWOOD: Good evening my name is Dana Atwood, A-t-w-o-o-d of 86 Pelzar Road in Dracut. I'm a 17 year resident of the town. My wife and I have spent years renovating our house to make it into a beautiful home to raise a family and we have worked with our own two hands working nights and weekends. We have a 2 year old and as of 12 days ago we now have two new ones.

The proposed path of the -- lateral pipeline is literally within 15 feet of our house and our house would have to be destroyed to make way for the pipeline since it would be within the easement. At a Kinder Morgan open house session they said to my face not to worry, they would probably just move it another 35 feet away so that they would not have to actually bulldoze the house, very nice.

If there is an accident my family doesn't stand a chance, neither does my neighbors as this pipeline is going directly through a densely populated neighborhood. There are clear alternative routes that Kinder Morgan could have proposed for the -- lateral rather than to go directly through my neighborhood and effect the wetlands and endangered species on my and my neighbor's property so I will be submitting my recommendations to FERC.

Many of the homes in the neighborhood have well water including mine. I have the water tested regu-

larly and it is completely safe to drink and it is delicious. Not so sure that will be the case after all of the digging and blasting to install this pipeline. At the open house held by Kinder Morgan they treated the concerned residents like ping-pong balls, bouncing us from Kinder Morgan reps with promises to answer questions, never actually answering the questions.

This evening we are hearing people speak of how Kinder Morgan has provided residents and FERC with outdated maps and all kinds of incorrect information. Hence, Kinder Morgan is either incompetent or they are intentionally trying to deceive the residents and FERC. Either way it is not good and it would suggest that the accuracy of all information and reports provided by Kinder Morgan cannot be trusted including their gas use and studies supporting this pipeline.

If FERC were to approve this project and as so much as one cubic foot were to be sold outside of the United States, then the project is not in the best interest of the public good and eminent domain cannot be allowed to apply.

Please do not allow Kinder Morgan to destroy the homes of hard-working Americans for the sole purpose of boosting corporate profits. Aside from the safety issues, this project will destroy the property values for residents that have spent decades going to work every day to earn money to pay their mortgages.

I see solar panels popping up in homes all over Dracut and I intend to join them. I ask FERC to please exercise common sense because this project certainly does not make sense. Thank you for your time.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Number 35?

MS. MARTIN: Good evening thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. My name is Karen Martin, M-a-r-t-i-n. I'm the Environmental Compliance Co-ordinator for the town of Andover Department of Public Works. I am here to express the concerns of our Board of Selectmen, public safety officials, Department of Public Works Conservation Division and Andover residents.

Andover is situated in the path of the Lynnfield lateral. Many residents, businesses and town properties will be adversely impacted by both its construction and operation. Our concerns focus on but are not limited to the following: environmental, water resources, public safety and property impacts.

Regarding environmental concerns -- two maintain bounce stations are not stationed on our town line and a neighboring community. We request details on the frequency and duration of their operation and quantification of air quality impacts including ambient emissions, noise and odors.

Secondly is the siting of temporary and permanent access roads. We request an assessment of their impact to surrounding wetlands and vegetation, storm water management considerations and data on the volume and frequency of machinery and other vehicles expected to work to traverse these roadways.

Our concerns for water resources focus on horizontal, directional drilling under the Merrimack River, a public water supply for Andover and its neighboring communities. The current resource reports are void of information regarding drilling activity. We ask for a complete evaluation addressing the impacts from drilling and its potential to disturb sediments and the impacts from the storage and disposal of fluids and cuttings from drilling activities.

Additionally we take issue with the use of water resources from hydro-static pressure testing of the pipeline. How much water will be needed? Where will it be discharged? Please require water quality testing prior to discharges to assess contamination levels. Discharge location details are needed to evaluate the impacts to wetlands, to receiving land, wetlands and other water bodies.

Public safety -- our public safety officials are concerned about road closures, details and detours and police details required during pipeline construction. Please provide the proposed locations and the frequency and duration of these activities.

We are concerned about the volume of natural gas and its pressure in the pipeline. Who will be responsible for providing and financing first responder training? Property impacts -- it is difficult to assess the full impacts to residential properties as data in the permanent resource reports are willfully incomplete.

There are multiple to be determined notations for residential homes, wells and septic system locations. Review of various plans show construction easements within 6 to 32 feet of homes and other structures. How exposures to air emissions, dust, noise, odors and the stress from construction, equipment and workers to be mitigated -- once construction is complete a 24 inch diameter pipeline transporting pressurized gas on the order of 1,460 PSI only a short distance from homes and businesses will remain.

Consider the impacts from decreases in property values and increases in insurance costs. The town of Andover will be submitting written comments to FERC reiterating these concerns and others, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, 36?

MR. CHASE: Hello my name is Josh Chase, I am with the Merrimack River Watershed Council, we are a non-profit based in Lawrence. Our main point for opposing this project is the effect that the pipeline construction will have on our drinking water and the health of the river due to the change of re-suspension of toxic chemicals and heavy metals in the sediment that may end up in our water supply.

The river provides drinking water to almost 360,000 people in New Hampshire and Massachusetts. While the Merrimack was once one of the most polluted waterways in the U.S. the water quality has dramatically improved but the pollutants of the past are still around. We are very concerned that these past problems will come back to haunt us and end up in our drinking water.

Currently the proposed path crosses the Merrimack and its tributaries many times and in many of those places the Merrimack contains harmful chemicals and heavy metals. For example, the proposed pipeline crosses the Souhegan River in Wilton, New Hampshire.

At the point that the pipeline crosses the river contains high levels of aluminum, iron and lead. The other example is the pipeline that crosses under the Merrimack between Dracut and Tewksbury. That stretch has been contaminated with mercury and PCP's. At the point where it crosses the Merrimack into Tewksbury it is under 10 miles to the intakes for the public water supplies for Tewksbury, Andover, Methuen and Lawrence.

Because of all of this the MRWC has major reservations about this project. We hope that FERC will take these important public health concerns into account, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, we are at number 37, 37 is 37 here? 37 -- 38...

MR. EBERTH: Good evening my name is Franz Eberth. F-r-a-n-z E-b-e-r-t-h. I'm concerned with the safety of the pipeline. Pipelines are opposed large by any standard. The line that would come into the compressor station I believe would be 30 inches and 1460 PSI and it would produce about 1 billion and some odd cubic feet in a day. To calculate that down, that would mean about 41 million cubic feet an hour and about 700,000 cubic feet a minute.

Large pipelines do explode and if you look on the internet there are pages and pages of pipeline explosions from the year 2000 on, a big one was out in San Bruno, California about 5 years ago that killed 8 people and destroyed 38 homes and damaged another 120.

My big concern is if one of those pipelines that is proposed here for Dracut let's go. The response time before that line would be shut down is typically an hour or more. The San Bruno one took over an hour to shut down. As I said that would mean possibly 41 million cubic feet of gas would be thrown out in the air or ignited.

How do you respond to that? How do you cut that response time down I think is very critical. And a town like Dracut has very limited resources as far as the fire department is concerned. Number one they can't shut down the line at all, they have no authority or know the whereabouts to do that so there is time and again an hour would not be unreasonable.

A lot of the causes are caused by poor safety procedures by the company or by lack of oversight by local or federal organizations. The other issue that I am concerned with is that about a mile from part of the pipeline is a quarry where there is a quarry there is blasting, where there is blasting there is ground motion and those three things are not very nice to pipelines.

And that's all I have got to say, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Now we are on 38.

MR. MILLER: My name is Nick Miller, M-i-l-l-e-r. I am here this evening to ask -- call for Commissioners and other personnel to please do your job. You are employed by FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the R in FERC stands for regulatory, not for rubber stamp.

The definition of regulatory is to control or direct account to rule, principal or law. The definition of rubber stamp is giving automatic approval for authorization to the decisions of others without proper consideration. Your job is to regulate this industry and make interstate pipelines that it proposes, but instead you are acting more as the pipeline siting agency as if your job was simply to decide where a pipeline should go and what remediation should be done along the pipeline and path.

A true regulator must first determine the actual need for a pipeline and whether that need outweighs the harm that will be done to the environment, to property rights, to property values and to the public's believe that the federal government is in need of the people, by the people and for the people.

Massachusetts Senator Elizabeth Warren seems to agree. She has said to FERC "I am very concerned about a regulatory agency that is only able to say yes, yes, yes. That's not the job of a regulatory agency."

I am here to ask that FERC 1: Examine the actual need for each pipeline that the energy companies propose to build. The market alone does not determine need, especially when that market consists largely of companies that are themselves pipeline investors and companies that have corporate ties back to the pipeline company.

2: When there are proposals to build multiple pipelines in one region as there currently are in New England, do not simply consider each pipeline in isolation. Step back and consider the total cumulative impact of all of the proposals around the region. Do not blindly approve a massive overbuild of natural gas pipelines.

And 3: When you are weighing the impacts of a proposed pipeline against its possible public benefits, consider all of the negative impacts, not just those along the pipeline corridor. NEPA rules require that you consider the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of a pipeline. In the December, 2014 draft guide from the Council on Environmental Quality, they insist that both upstream and downstream impacts on greenhouse gases and climate change be included in all NEPA reviews.

Unfortunately FERC seems to spend more time explaining why it can't follow these guidelines than it spends trying to honor them.

In closing I again remind you that you are a regulatory agency, please do your job and regulate, the people are depending upon you, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. I believe that was 39 did we skip over you, that's what I thought, come on up my apologies.

MS. MAWSON: He's bigger than I am. You can see me over this podium can't you again? I haven't grown at all since last week. My name is Julia Stead Mawson, oh I'm being attacked. My name is Julia Stead Mawson I'm a biologist and a UNH extension of meritus, I am an abutter to this pipeline proposal in Pelham, New Hampshire, land that I inherited from my family to steward as open space.

Further I live on Little Island Pond which is located less than 2,000 feet from the proposed pipeline. Finally, I am a neighbor of Dracut, MASS and I am seriously concerned about a loss of precious agricultural land and the industrialization of Dracut.

A 23,000 horsepower compressor station in Dracut is not a welcome neighbor to them or to us who live less than 3 miles away. Here is just one of my many concerns. When I was a child in the 1950's and so that tells you how old I am, there were no loons on Little Island Pond, caused by the unintended consequences of DDT.

50 years later a loon returned. Since 2012 a breeding pair successfully raised two chicks each year. Our

story is a positive one but in general this threatened species is not doing well in Southern New Hampshire and Massachusetts. Mercury and other contaminants have been found to be a cause and factor in population decline in loons.

Other species along other biomagnified food chains are affected as well, including fish, song birds and bats. In general our concern and a long list of emissions produced by compressor stations, metering stations and leaking pipes as well as other construction and contaminants is of grave concern but is little researched.

As recommended by the Biodiversity Research Institute of Maine in their report the extent and effects of mercury pollution in the Northeast of North America, long-term monitoring is essential. I extrapolate their recommendation to say that such research regimes need to be done on existing pipelines, metering stations and compressor stations of comparable size in order to identify potential hazards.

Not enough information is available to ensure that endangered and threatened species and prime habitat is conserved. Unintended consequences over the years have cost our communities in New England untold loss of human life, health and species diversity.

In one meeting this spring one of our Kinder Morgan staff said to us, "This pipeline is not something that you are used to." I later heard an interviewer, a survivor in Syria who noted that we humans have an incredible ability to get used to things. I contend that that may be true but it does not mean that it is right. Please deny this pipeline.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you we are now on number 40.

MS. WOODS: Good evening my name is Beverly Woods and I am the Executive Director of the Northern Middlesex Council of Governments and I am here tonight to provide our initial comments on this proposed project. NIMCOD is a regional planning agency, we serve 9 communities in Northern Middlesex County including two communities that are located along the preferred route and 5 that are located on the alternative route.

Our goal is to significantly impact the community as Dracut which would receive 9 miles of new pipeline, 3 metering stations and a compressor station under this proposal. NIMCOD has actively participated in the FERC process and we have assisted communities in forming the Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition which spoke earlier this evening.

Our agency and the communities that we represent have significant concerns about the natural and cultural resource impacts of the NED Project including the direct impacts on public and private drinking water supplies, permanently protected open space, farm land, rare and endangered species, habitat, public infrastructure and cultural and historic resources.

The short and long-term impacts of this project that are on our communities in the region are profound. We ask that FERC thoroughly evaluate the need for this pipeline, particularly given the limited number of agreements that are in place with other gas companies. Even with the recently announced reduction of pipeline size to 30 inches and 1.3 BCF per day only 38% of the capacity is committed.

If a larger 36 inch pipeline were to go forward only 23% of the capacity would be committed. We are very concerned that electric rate payers will be asked to pay for a pipeline that is likely not needed through a tariff. Furthermore if gas is exported through the NED Project we will likely see a steep rise in gas prices in New England as we compete with higher prices in the global market.

We join others this evening in requesting that FERC postpone its proceedings on this project until October when Attorney General Maura Healey will release an independent study on electric reliability needs through the year 2030. This study will outline the options for meeting those needs in the most cost-effective manner possible. We hope that FERC will fully explore more reasonable alternatives to meeting natural gas demand in New England, including energy conservation, renewable energy production, LNG storage, expansion of existing gas pipelines and improved operational efficiencies along other pipelines to recapture leaked gas.

NIMCOD intends to submit more in depth comments in coordination with other regional planning agencies in Massachusetts and New Hampshire before the August 31st deadline established by FERC. Our detailed comments will focus on protection of water resources, protection of air quality and the project's impacts on the state of Massachusetts climate goals, public safety. Others have spoken about public safety this evening and we will offer some more detailed comments to that.

To date the information provided by Kinder Morgan through the pre-filing process has been willfully inadequate and has lacked sufficient detail to allow for meaningful comment. We join others who have spoken this evening to request that FERC extend its deadline so that communities have time to fully digest the environmental documents and to comment intelligently on the project.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MS. WOODS: It is thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Number 41?

MR. HESS: Good evening my name is John Hess, H-e-s-s. I am a resident of Andover, Massachusetts. Today I represent the Andover Pipeline Awareness Committee. The Lynnfield lateral of NED will go through Andover as well as other cities and towns south and east of Dracut. Kinder Morgan has changed the route several times as well as made changes in the compressor stations and other features of the pipeline, including the amount of natural gas to be transported.

These actions confuse local citizens and create a sense of competition among communities and even among states. We look to FERC to fully analyze this project and to ensure the citizens that it is needed for the public good. I would like to ask you to pay particular attention to the following 4 points:

1. As you have heard this evening there are many questions about the need for NED. For instance, is the Lynnfield lateral needed? NED will credit two parallel laterals to Dracut, one through Andover and one through Methuen. Both go to or near Danvers, why are two laterals needed?

Proponents of NED state that there is not enough capacity in alternatives to NED, this is refuted by an official from GDF Suez, an LNG gas supplier who was quoted in the March 9, 2015 article in the Boston Globe as saying that, "There's no need for major changes or new fees to pay for new pipelines."

In light of the recent White House announcement on global warming, FERC should focus on alternative energy sources rather than condoning additional construction for fossil fuel infrastructure.

2. As many others have said given the large number of people who live in the communities south and east of Dracut that are affected by the NED Project, FERC should schedule more scoping sessions in these communities.

As of July 24, 2015 the size of the pipeline through Andover has been upgraded and is now 24 inches instead of 20 inches, at a time when the diameter of the main line has been decreased. I ask that FERC fully explore the reasons for this increase in diameter.

In closing I would like to let you know that this past May the Andover town meeting, the legislative authority for the town of Andover overwhelmingly supported a resolution against the NED Pipeline. Andover has been designated as a green community. The town meeting voters believed that emphasis should be on the repair of the existing lines, use of renewable energy sources and reduced energy consumption. Voters agreed that the size of the pipeline was too large for what is needed.

Town meeting was concerned that excess capacity could be exported, increasing the price of natural gas through local consumption. Thank you for your consideration.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, all right 42?

MS. HUARD: Good evening my name is Peggy Huard. I have written several letters and comments against Docket PF-14-22 with FERC echoing many others concerns as well as specific environmental concerns about the proposed pipeline path running through the aquifers that feed our private wells along with an intricate watershed that feeds one of the most pristine pieces of conservation land in our town, a pond that is

used for hiking, swimming and boating. These environmental concerns are not even discussed in Kinder Morgan's most recent draft environmental report nor is the fact that my family will reside in the incineration zone.

What I want to address tonight is the environmental impact statement and final order form FERC has most recently approved, the Constitution Pipeline. As I read these two documents I shudder to think that FERC has the audacity to be so negligent. I imagine the same ignorant, negligent and criminally corrupt level of tolerance for impact of destruction of the environment with the NED Project.

I really encourage the citizens of Dracut, the rest of the citizens of Massachusetts and New Hampshire that are affected by NED to find these documents in the FERC's library and look for yourself at what happens after the environmental impact statement is prepared.

While I am aware that these two projects differ slightly in scope, there are some common concerns that these reports do not address to an acceptable level for Dracut, MASS, or New Hampshire. In FERC's final order for the construction of the pipeline, FERC claims there is no peer review available regarding the potential effects of pipeline proximity on property insurance nor is the Commission staff able to confirm the validity of these claims through independent research and interviews with regional and local experts.

Therefore Constitution will be required to report the nature and mitigation of any documented insurance complaints in regular courts for a two year period following in service date of project. FERC also states the final EIS concludes that a significant loss of property value due to the construction of a pipeline is not supported by the literature. FERC agreed with this conclusion.

This conclusion is not acceptable for us on the NED Pipeline. Please perform a greater study in this area. The final FERC order for construction pipeline also claims the total of 101 speakers provided comments on the construction of the pipeline project at the scoping meeting. I can't help but wonder how the numbers will be recorded in the scoping meeting tonight. Will the report read that 70 speakers spoke?

This regards that you FERC only allowed 70 speakers to speak tonight, this regards the fact that all 700 people that showed up here tonight and many, many more have numerous comments that they have not been given equal opportunity in your pathetic, negligent parameters. You have failed to meet with enough people impacted by this project that could spend hours, not 3 minutes explaining the intricate details of the environmental impacts of the proposed projects.

The FERC final order for construction pipeline shows that a formal evidentiary hearing for the proposed project was requested, FERC denied that request.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MS. HUARD: No sir it is your time that is up, we the people will pursue a full audit and investigation of FERC and their continued negligent approvals of environmentally destructive pipeline projects, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, 42, 43?

MS. DRISCOLL: Yes I'm Alice Driscoll, A-l-i-x D-r-i-s-c-o-l-l of Andover Conservation Commission, Andover, Massachusetts. Introductory comments, we wait for the Attorney General's study of Massachusetts energy needs and greatly support her decision to initiate said study.

We have grave concerns about the cumulative environmental effects of the Lynnfield lateral in Andover and the entire Merrimack Valley and along the entire pipeline route. The pipeline will damage at least 5 parcels of Chapter 97 permanently protected open space in Andover and damage tens of thousands of similarly protected acres across the state. They are protected by the Massachusetts Constitution, the oldest functioning constitution in the world.

Endangered species -- the entire Merrimack River in Andover is priority habitat for rare species and estimated habitat for rare wildlife. Parts of the east side of the Merrimack River including the river's flood plain in Upland is priority habitat for rare species in the lower junction area.

Water quality and pollution -- the Merrimack River is an interstate river to the gulf of Main which is now

Class B up from Class D after 4 decades of extremely expensive clean up. It is in danger of pollution from the churning up of historic contaminants, including mercury and other chemicals from more than 300 years of industry upstream. This is a violation of the Clean Water Act.

The drilling medium is hazardous and the waste unaccounted for. Noise pollution, air pollution and blow down -- the proposed compressor in Dracut across the Merrimack River will be the largest east of the Mississippi. The monthly or more frequently blow downs will roar with a great intensity. This noise pollution will disturb tens of thousands of Merrimack Valley residents including those in Andover.

The gases and other matter that are expelled will pollute the air in the Merrimack Valley, this is a violation of the Clean Air Act.

The wetlands -- the Andover Conservation Commission and all conservation commissions along the proposed route are charged by the state and local laws to protect wetlands, a public good. The pipeline will cross and damage substantial wetlands of 5 town-owned permanently protected preservations in town plus extensive wetlands and many private home sites. It will cross 2 major rivers, the Merrimack and the 5:17:05 and river fronts protected by local, state and federal laws. The damage to the steep slopes of Merrimack river crossing and the deep forestation will surely lead to erosion and water quality damage.

We urge FERC to take the cumulative effects of damage to the wetlands, protected 97 reservations, endangered species, river crossings, drinking water contamination, noise pollution, air pollution and public safety into account as you decide whether to grant a certificate of need and necessity, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Number 44?

MR. STEUCEK: Good evening, I'm Guy Steucek, that's S-t-e-u-c-e-k, 430 Marshal Road, Dracut. Thank you for lending me your ears. My farm in Dracut and Pelham, at one point in my career I did an environmental impact analysis for Itheological Associates in New York. I was responsible for data analysis of the environmental impact of the nuclear power plant at 3 mile island in Pennsylvania before operation and while it was operating after the accident, this work extended for 11 years.

So I appreciate your obligations to mitigate environmental impact of projects such as the NED Pipeline. I have one concern that I don't think has been addressed yet this evening so here it goes.

Much of the proposed pipeline will slice through mature forest, the 100 foot wide clear cut will leave an awful scar. Even FERC admits this in guidelines and mitigation statements. Moreover, this 50 foot corridor of open pipeline will be without forest trees forever. Mitigation will be minimal.

Although pipeline forest will never be permitted to heal, I would like to see FERC insist that the edges of these slices be sealed with vegetation to discourage the invasion of alien species which will harm the native forest and their inhabitants.

Now it is time for a demonstration. Remain in your seats, perhaps this is just comic relief, but while sitting in the chairs on the aisles you will notice that the arm rests lit lamps are very warm to the touch. If we were to release a dozen cats in here now they would all be sleeping on the illuminated arm rests because the lighting is so inefficient.

So what does this have to do with the pipeline? Basically it just shows that we have a long way to go in this brand spanking new building, 60 million dollar renovation we are still using illumination that's very inefficient and so I charge you to look at ways that we can conserve energy and use renewables prior to 5 billion dollars, we are going to pay for it any way, into renewables which is the wave of the future, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next we are at 45, is 45 here? 46? 46 -- 48? 47 okay.

MR. CHESEBROUGH: My name is Rob Chesebrough, C-h-e-s-e-b-r-o-u-g-h. Kinder Morgan is continually promoting co-location as the preferred route for NED. The FERC has conditionally approved the Constitution Pipeline and already Kinder Morgan is proposing co-locating the NED in the Constitution right-of-way.

Kinder Morgan claims they will restore the construction area to conditions similar to what was before construction. This cannot be accomplished if the right-of-way remains considered for co-location. The environmental impact of NED must consider that this corridor may never be allowed to return to the condition close to what it was previously as it would always be a Kinder Morgan preferred route.

Please investigate the cumulative impacts should a right-of-way undergo construction for a second, third or fourth time. Study the effects of multiple construction on all humans, wildlife, vegetation and water sources. Study the socio-economic effects of multiple constructions to towns with emphasis on population growth or loss, business growth or loss or tourism growth or loss.

Please investigate the cumulative environmental impacts to humans, wildlife vegetation and water resources should right-of-ways sustain back to back constructions lasting 2, 5 or 10 years. Study the effects of prolonged construction to all humans, wildlife, vegetation and water resources.

Study the socio-economic effects of prolonged construction in towns with emphasis on the population growth or loss, business growth or loss or tourism growth or loss.

The purpose and need section of Tennessee Gas resource report one discusses the basic market force of supply and demand including considerable downward pressure on energy prices. The alternative section of Tennessee's report, resource report 10 should discuss project alternatives, rather it discounts all methods of energy efficiency, conservation and removal sources.

I quote, "While these measures could impact the overall demand of electricity from fossil fuel generation, the energy conservation or renewable alternatives do not meet the purpose and the need of the project which will provide additional natural gas pipeline transportation capacity to its customers including the LDC's which will ultimately add additional natural gas supplies in the customers for the residential and commercial heating, drying, cooking and industrial uses.

Accordingly energy conservation and removal projects will not be an alternative to meet the purpose and needs of this project. Therefore, Tennessee believes that flooding New England with extra home heating fuel will lower electric rates however they discount that flooding the electricity market with energy conservation, energy and efficiency, wood power, solar power, geo-thermal power, coal, fuel, nuclear, hydro-electric power, electric generation, fuel cells, other energy sources and that would meet existing capacity available under a no build solution, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. 49? 49, okay 50?

MS. THEBERGE: Hello my name is Jean Theberge, T-h-e-b-e-r-g-e. I am a lifelong Methuen resident and member of the Methuen Pipeline Awareness. The Haverhill lateral is proposed to run several miles through Methuen. Early in July Methuen State Council unanimously approved a resolution opposing the pipeline. This project burdens hundreds of residents in its path with construction disruption to private property, mental and emotional stress and serious threat to residents and first responders in the event of a failure.

This pipeline project presents numerous disturbing concerns yet offers no merits. Many questions exist with no answers. Why was the lateral increased to 20 inch with 1460 PSI with no new customer commitments?

Are there documented customer commitments for this lateral? Where does the Haverhill lateral really end? This project tasked Methuen residents with bearing the burden to benefit Kinder Morgan. The route passes through Methuen impacting densely populated neighborhoods, wetlands, conservation land and ground water.

Options exist that must be examined, including repair to existing infrastructure before adding any new appropriately-size projects. This project does not in any way fit FERC's definition of serving the public convenience and necessity.

Export does not constitute public purpose. The common sense solution to this nonsensical project and these collected concerns is no approval by FERC, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are on 51, 51, 52?

MS. NIGRO: Good evening my name is Jean J-e-a-n Nigro N-i-g-r-o. I would like to address concerns about the pipeline and compressor station safety. There is established evidence that the transport of natural gas through pipelines is inherently unsafe. Since January of 2014 the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration or PHMSA indicates that there has been 1,093 pipeline incidents, 25 fatalities, 134 injuries and over 500 million dollars in property damage.

Close examination of PHMSA's incident reports for Kinder Morgan's gas transmission pipelines shows that in Texas alone between 2003 and 2014 Kinder Morgan experienced 36 significant incidents resulting in fatalities, hospitalizations, fires, explosions or spills. Throughout the United States since 2003, Kinder Morgan and its subsidiary pipelines have been responsible for at least 180 spills, evacuations, explosions, fire and fatalities in 24 states.

Kinder Morgan states in their FAQ for the town of Londonderry, New Hampshire that it is "committed to public safety, protection of the environment and operation of its facilities in compliance with all of the rules and regulations," but the statement does not line up with the facts.

The facts are these: In 2007 the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency fined Kinder Morgan for violations of the U.S. Clean Air Act after regulators discovered that the company had illegally mixed industrial solvents with unleaded gasoline and diesel, the company distributed 8 million gallons of contaminated fuel.

In 2010 the federal government fined Kinder Morgan a million dollars for repeatedly violating the Clean Air Act at its Port Manatee Terminal in Florida. The U.S. Department of Justice has found that among other crimes Kinder Morgan managers lied in permit applications, stating that the company will control its pollution when they knew that the control of it was not being used or even properly maintained. These are only two of a myriad of examples of not only Kinder Morgan's failure to maintain commitment to the environment in regard to public safety, but also to engage in criminal activity and deception that places the public at grave risk.

They are great at talking the talk with regard to safety but when it comes to walking the walk, they get a failing grade. So, FERC, what are you going to do to hold them accountable? What kind of inspections will you require before, during and after construction of this NED Pipeline to ensure that there is no harm to the environment, to the residents of Dracut and the other residents of communities along the line?

This company cannot be trusted to guard the health and safety of its neighbors. Permitting a company with a track record of neglect and abuse to move ahead in such a project with such high risk would be fool-hearted at best and criminal at worst, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you -- 53 has already left, we are at 54, is 54 here? 55? 56?

MR. BROX: Hi, I'm John Brox, B-r-o-x. I live on a farm in town here it's on a section of pipeline that is going through there and I have been talking to the reps you know I've been giving them permission to survey. Originally the pipeline was going to be on the opposite side of the easement then they changed it and it is going to be on the agricultural side, you know I will lose some farm, crop land and some mature woods.

They haven't been clear to me you know how it is going to be done or anything and restored but that being said this whole project from its sourcing in Pennsylvania through its route and everything is not a very good example of humans acting intelligently.

This is a clever, a very clever project. And this project might have had legs if it was 1950 when population densities were less environmental concerns were not well understood. I think this project should be nixed sooner than later, I think if Kinder Morgan was to need to move gas eastward it should be done in existing right-of-ways.

There is no way to quantify the negative impact of this project. You could do studies for years you would never quantify the negative effects. So if there was a mechanism, I'm asking you as fellow human beings

to maybe talk to the powers that be, people concerned, this project should be withdrawn. We shouldn't have to extend deadlines and this is off the reservation what they are trying to do here, it's way off.

But I appreciate you guys have been paying attention to everyone I have got to say I respect that and we have been going over similar territory but anyway that's about it, I think the project should be nixed and if there's a way to do it.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you 57 is 57 here? 57? 58?

MR. RUBY: Good evening my name is Tom Ruby, I'm a 32 year resident of Wheeler Road, a direct abutter to the proposed meter station and paid launcher station facility. I am very concerned about the gas emissions and the noise that I will have to be exposed to along with my neighbors in this quiet residential-type neighborhood.

The meter station is being proposed in two locations very close to my home which I talked to Kinder Morgan today about and one is behind me which I will see when I go out on my deck in my backyard within maybe 250 feet from my home.

This is going to be in with an approved and ready to be built, 33-home sub-division called the Ruby Farms. This location is also close to the center hill sportsman's club shooting range. The meter station pipes are going to be exposed above the ground and once it happens should a stray bullet from that gun range which I have lived -- I grew up on a farm in that neighborhood and I have seen shells from that gun shooting range you know, in that area. So you know that's where they are going to put that meter station, one of the locations that he told me about.

And then there's the potential with 30 - 33 homes surrounding the meter station a lot of complaints in the future from noise, gas emissions, just being around that type of thing. We are in a residential area and it is not zoned industrial, and the more I hear terms like triple meter station, paid launcher stations the more I get alarmed.

It's not something that should be put in a residential neighborhood. The other spot they told me about is just to the right of it so when I am sitting in my living room off to the side, that's the other location that they told me about and that's going to be on the side of a 73 home subdivision called Wheeler Village.

These are not good locations for this type of facility, they are going to be in large, future large residential neighborhoods which could be the potential for many, many complaints about the noise and the emissions you know along with the fact that Dracut does not need any more pipelines destroying our values and putting our safety in jeopardy, you know in harm.

I would hope you would consider the location to maybe a more remote, yet if it even has to be done, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are now at number 59?

MS. HAKKILA: I also have an eye problem so I have been trying to keep my nose straight but I'm not sure if I got it straight so I'm going to talk off of my head with the outline that I had before.

MR. TOMASI: Well if you would want someone to read it for you, we can have that done.

MS. HAKKILA: I just have notes, you will never be able to figure them out but I have no problem with that, I will write up later on and cover all of this. But the first thing I would like to say is that as far as the people that have been here before and have discussed the need for this, for the gas -- we do not have a need basically, we have many, many people that have talked to us about different parts of the project and I can't see with these laterals going in there trying to get customers away from other peoples that are customers there, that's all I can see on those, so those shouldn't even be counted as people that are coming in and using it because they are already using gas from somewhere else.

The transfer station is in a situation where our rural police station which we still owe a lot of money on and we are paying on it with our taxes and we agreed to have that done, is going to be just outside of the incineration zone. I call it the cremation zone. This is not a good idea, we will lose not only our police

station but we will lose our police officers that happen to be in there at the time because that goes out a third of a mile or so and people are going to be badly burned and some of them may die, some of them may not.

But we have another secondary location that is hot, hot, hot. Now the cremation zone, the firemen can't get in there, so even though we don't have enough fire department now, added fire department, they can't do anything because it is so hot that they are just going to get cremated, so they would have to stay out of there. They would have to help the people in the outer sections that are there and get them out of their houses or if they have been hurt or something, try to get them help or get them off to the hospitals.

Also a third of a mile from the transfer station, approximately a third of a mile, is a brand new town hall and that would have all kinds of damage from the heat because the heat isn't going to stop a wall a thousand feet out from the center from the transfer station so again we can't lose our -- have terrific damage if not fire completely, there are trees around there to our new town hall which is right next to our brand new library which we are still paying for so basically we will lose all of our town basic things, we could lose them if that came up.

Health-wise, I want to talk about pigging in these pipes that I call them to clean out. They have to put some kind of toxic waste in to the gas pardon me, I've been locating other gas lines too, into the gas in order for it to flow properly. While that is fine, now when they have to go clean it out, where is that going? Are they just going to blow it monthly out of there? That goes and scatters all over. Anybody that has asthma, has a problem they have more of a problem and it's going to contaminate everything else there.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up, do you have anything written down that you would like to provide me with later tonight?

MS. HAKKILA: Oh I will write it up because I didn't realize that the time has passed.

MR. TOMASI: If we finish up here you can continue on, we only have a few more people to go.

MS. HAKKILA: I just want to say one thing as I said when I started, I don't think this project should go through, I think it should be axed, but if it isn't going to be axed, we need more time and we need these other studies to come in to write up and send in comments because FERC, pardon me, excuse me sir, Kinder Morgan, they put off getting this information out in the first place and they slid it and slid it and slid it right into all of our summer vacation so now we can't even get our people together because the people are on vacation, they are traveling back and then they go back to school, so please extend the time.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, 60, is 60 here?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I didn't sign up but since 60 is not here can I speak?

MR. TOMASI: Well we still have people above 60, we have them up to 70.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well he's not here so I'll just speak.

MR. TOMASI: Well after we get through the next numbers, we will get to anyone who hasn't had the ability to speak yet, so we are at 62? Oh 61 is still here, no 62? 63? 65? 63 okay.

MR. FERRI: Hello my name is Steve Ferri and my home is located at 217 Trout Road in Dracut within a few hundred feet of the proposed Dracut pipeline and compression station and we have been here now for 4 and half hours, you pretty much know what I'm going to say because it's been said all night.

But I want to say one thing, I am a teacher at Lowell High School, which is a big urban school and has a lot of children, they are not citizens or even live in this country and they go to school here because they believe of a fair life in America, in the United States the government will protect us and protect them so I guess it would be extremely unfair of FERC to force us, the landowners and tax payers most impacted by this pipeline project to bear the burden for the private corporations for profit project with absolutely no benefit for us that I can see.

Instead the project will leave us with long-term environmental harm, lower property values and potential health risks so I would like to ask FERC to define the word need and the phrase public convenience and

necessity. Specifically please tell us what portion of capacity rights that are made available by a pipeline project have to be spoken for by potential customers in order for you to approve a pipeline proposal, thank you for listening.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, 64 has already left, 65?

MS. KOUFOGAZOS: Good evening Mr. Tomasi my name is Susan Koufogazos and I live here in Dracut. I grew up in Wilmington so I have a rather unique perspective and I understand the needs of both of the communities and specifically I grew up in the neighborhood called Hathaway Acres where the Benevento gravel pits abut.

So I know grave concern not only about that section and the gravel pits but about the Bronx Quarry which the compressor station and much of the pipeline would abut here in Dracut. If it has not been answered for the town of Wilmington, neither has it been answered for the town of Dracut as to what those impacts could be for the blasting and the shaking to the pipeline.

Several months ago I attended a meeting sponsored by State Rep. Colleen Garry where Kinder Morgan reps came and just as I have heard from literally dozens of other people at the scoping meeting and this evening, we were promised that although at that time what they represented to us was vague, that we would have firm information as the deadline approached.

We are at T minus and counting, just like that clock up there on your desk and we are no closer to having any firmer, definable information from that company than I felt we were last fall. You have the opportunity to extend the deadline to make sure that we have what was promised to us and I am asking you to do so.

We have a couple of days ago a situation in Wells County, Colorado that I looked up online and I was just looking for gas explosions and what the impacts could be. The images were horrific, hundreds of feet of flames in the area, scorched earth for miles and what struck me the most a two mile evacuation as a contingency by local officials.

While we can talk about incinerator or cremation zones, the two mile rate in this area would also put us into cities like Lowell. Please tell me how we can evacuate Lowell where a large percentage of its citizens don't even own vehicles. Please explain to me how we can evacuate Dracut if we have a compressor station on one of our major evacuation routes?

The Department of Transportation of the state of Massachusetts has made a sizeable investment in the rotary that connects Route 93, 110 and 113. I do not believe that they took a compressor station over an evacuation route for a crisis into their consideration and their design plan. This has got to be addressed.

You have hundreds of homes and farms that are abutted. A year ago market basket was all but closed, we relied upon those farms and I continue to and I will continue to but we can't do so if they are damaged by this project.

We need your help. Extend the deadline, give us that opportunity and ultimately I hope that after you have reviewed this information, you put down a do not need because we don't, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: 67?

MS. THOMANN: Good evening, thank you for coming here tonight to Dracut and thank you for listening. My name is Mary Thomann, T as in Train, h-o-m-a-n-n. My husband and I live at 39 Colonial Drive in Dracut. We live 2 blocks from where the compressor station is proposed to be built and we have lived here since 1996, we moved here from the city of Lowell and have been very happy here in Dracut. Can you still hear me?

Hello? Hello, can you hear me?

MR. TOMASI: It's been a long day.

MS. THOMANN: Okay I was just saying that my husband I have been here since 1996 and in June we received a letter from Tennessee Gas Pipeline as one of the residents who within one-half mile of the proposed compressor station so I wanted to devote my 3 minutes to the compressor station to one particular

fact and it is actually in the letter that we received, I think it has already been said. The estimate needed acreage of a compressor will be 10 acres and that is consistent for all line sites that is listed in the letter. The site is 10 acres.

Dracut is unique in that there is only a total property acreage dedicated to this of 29 acres. This is the next largest is twice as much, 64 acres so I just wanted to take my time to raise that question and ask that you ask this of Kinder Morgan just to preface compressor stations for the market section of NED that's Wright, New York to Dracut, Massachusetts range from 20,000 to 90,000 horsepower facilities. This is at least 10 times the horsepower of Kinder Morgan's existing compressor station in South Wick, Massachusetts.

Kinder Morgan prefers 50 to 75 acres for each one and I want to repeat that please. Kinder Morgan prefers 50 to 75 acres for each compressor station and Dracut's is 28. I'm just going to go through them, the town of Milford in Pennsylvania gets 86 acres for the 10 acre site, the town of Franklin Delaware, New York gets 117 acres, the town of Schoharie in New York 91 acres.

Another one in Schoharie gets 64 acres and there is a bullet where they actually say they purchased another 47 acres for this particular site so they would have a buffer area. Dracut does not have that buffer area. The town of Windsor, Berkshire County, Massachusetts gets 89 acres, the town of North Field, Franklin County, Massachusetts gets 242 acres, again only for the same site, 10 acre building.

And lastly the town of New Ipswich, New Hampshire, gets 165 acres for the same 10 acre site so why is it that Dracut gets such -- basically no buffer zone at all? Like many people here, I don't believe this is needed at all but please do ask why we don't get any buffer zone. All the other zones are 2 to 8 times more acreage, thank you again for listening.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next we are at 68?

MS. LIPOMI: Thank you. My name is Lisa Lipomi. I hold a degree in chemistry and a master's in chemical engineering. I am a certified master gardener and I am in the process of setting up a business, a small business in Dracut called Dracut Dam release which may or may not happen now.

I have worked for two chemical companies and one testing facility. I presently work for the Department of Defense. I have monitored manufacturing facilities, I have monitored gas pipelines in lieu of terrorist attacks during the heightened security alerts. I am not in the incineration zone but nearby and I have already submitted some of my comments about the compression station, metering stations to the e-comments at FERC.

I have lived in Dracut for 50 years and I can remember clearly driving down Route 113 and seeing all the contaminated well signs from the Exxon terminal. I am greatly concerned for the environmental impacts that it raises this proposal for Dracut and the surrounding towns. Methane gas is going to be produced on 7/24 compressor station. Methane gas is highly explosive and when combined with other substances it is poisonous.

In high concentrations it is deadly. These substances are going to be be disbursed in certain concentrations in our area. Other substances such as benzene, lead, toluene, formaldehyde increase and radioactive slush are some of the many hazardous and carcinogenic chemicals that area going to be present due to this proposal.

These substances will also compromise public health, safety and environmental quality in our area. We have no idea how long-term issues will leave our environment and our ecology with. Since the pipeline and the compression metering stations are being situated in a high-consequence area in a valley, not too many people have mentioned that, as for the last FERC's submittal in June.

The U.S. Department of Transportation Pipeline Hazardous Safety Administration states in its quick facts on high consequence areas. Consequences of inadvertent releases from pipelines can vary greatly depending on where the release occurs and the commodity involved in the release. Releases from pipelines can adversely affect human health, safety and cause environmental degradation and damage personal or commercial property.

Pipeline safety regulations use the concept of high consequence areas to identify specific towns and areas where the release can have the most significant adverse consequences. Another concern of mine is my water. Many of us have well water a lot of people have shallow wells. My area in town has only wells. I depend on my water for drinking, washing, storage, watering my crops and flowers, many people depend on it for their businesses and farms and also our environmental habitat depends on it solely.

Once a community water system is made toxic property values will plummet, home owners end up with homes they cannot sell at their original value, they will be forced to live in unsellable houses and continue to be exposed to a toxic environment.

We saw this result in the Exxon spill that we had at Route 113.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MS. LIPOMI: Okay.

MR. TOMASI: Do you have comments you want to submit?

MS. LIPOMI: Yes I do and I do want to make one more comment, we already have an issue of -- Road and the issue in Pelham and they have not been addressed since they are exempt from the air quality and safety regulations that every other company has to adhere to, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, we are at number 69, 69, how about 70, 70?

MR. MOLONEY: Dave Moloney, Hollis, New Hampshire. I believe I may be the last speaker, is that true?

MR. TOMASI: Well you are the last one signed up but there are people who might want to speak after you.

MR. MALONEY: Okay because I assure you I do not have more than three pages however it may be slightly over the time, and since you are going to have some people to speak maybe you will allow me the courtesy of a little bit of an extension.

On May 19th of this year near Santa Barbara, California people woke up to 100,000 gallons of oil spilled that was caused by a pipeline rupture where 82% of the pipeline thickness had been worn away. The fact that this inspection, 14 days prior had set the corrosion metal loss at 45%, that was not the big news for me. It was the fact that the spill may have gone much longer had passer-byers on Route 101 not smelled and then visually observed the 9 mile oil slick that had occurred.

Methane gas is colorless, odorless, except when it reaches distribution systems where it is given odorized additives. Unlike smelly liquid oil, fugitive methane from the gas industry can quietly and silently leak throughout the production and delivery cycle since the beginnings of the domestic shale gas revolution and they continue to do so.

We now have 2.2 million miles of pipeline in the United States and the gas industry says we need 450,000 more over the next 10 years. As Chair of the New Hampshire Pipeline Awareness Network I would like to draw the FERC's attention to the under-reported pipeline issue of methane gas, whose full lifecycle cost if properly calculated would completely undermine this entire FERC process of permitting and expediting pipeline approvals and would most certainly alter the alternative choices as a society that we make for presenting for our present and future energy needs.

U.S. EPA has released its final rule that by 2020 it will cut carbon pollution from power plants by 32% below 2005 levels. The target is expected to be met largely by the burning of natural gas instead of coal, but lead scientist Robert Howard of Cornell University says that converting to natural gas plants will actually aggravate climate change not make things better.

Howard says that EPA is on the wrong side of science. Cornell engineering Professor Anthony Ingraffea explains you don't get natural gas at a gas-fired power plant out of a bottle. It comes out of thousands of dirty wells, hundreds of thousands of such wells across the United States are now abandoned and closed but continue to leak enormous gas quantities yet they are no longer included in the EPA pre-housed gas emission inventories because they rarely are monitored says Princeton University scientist Mary Kane.

We all know that at the burn tip natural gas emits about one half of the CO₂ of coal. Coal accounts for

39% of the nation's electricity generation and the power sector accounts for one-third of the U.S. emissions therefore replace coal-fired power plants with gas-fired power plants and wella -- problem solved.

But the problem according to the researchers from Cornell University, Stanford University and NOAA's earth system research laboratory is that methane leaks while natural gas is extracted while it is processed and when it is transported, not just when it burns as heating fuel or as power generation.

The EPA claims the upstream methane emissions are small relative to the direct emissions from power plants and did not account for methane lifecycles in the Clean Power Plan goals.

Yet 2013 study from the National Academy of Science has estimated that the methane emissions could be getting under-estimated by as much as 30%. Greenpeace has calculated that leakage is above 2.8% would cancel any greenhouse gas advantages of gas over fossil fuels and in stark contrast to the EPA estimates, Robert Howard in his 2011 peer review publication the first of its kind of include methane emissions and the greenhouse gas footprint of shale gas production claims that methane from shale gas production escapes from venting and leaks over the lifetime of a well at a rate of 3.6 to 7.9%.

The EPA's methane's emission estimates are further flawed by the outdated use of bottom up measurement approaches which collect emissions emitted on the ground. In fact in the recent New York Times article the inventor of the device commonly used to measure methane gas from industrial sources said that due to calibration -- due to a calibration issue, those devices may be greatly under-estimating levels of escaped methane currently accepted by scientists, industry and regulators.

What is needed is a moderate top-down approach that estimates emissions from the air as taken above whatever subject of methane emissions. Now a study in the Environmental Research Letters Journal examining varied combinations of natural gas supply and climate policies finds that between 2013 and 2055 the use of natural gas can only reduce cumulative emissions from the electricity sector by no more than 9% and that under some scenarios it would actually boost emissions by 5% unlike the other studies that focused on methane leaks, this report looks at the economic effect of gas supplied as infrastructure has expanded and claims that even without gas leaks, natural gas does very little to reduce contributions from climate change.

MR. TOMASI: How much more do you have?

MR. MALONEY: One page.

MR. TOMASI: Do you mind coming up after someone who hasn't spoken yet.

MR. MALONEY: I'll summarize because there's a summary section. So in summary the problem of over-reliance with natural gas is the over -- the problem is the over-reliance on natural gas. It is the industry sorry -- let me just conclude this way. Climate change isn't about a belief system it is about science, climate science won't care whether we pulled a fast one on ourselves and discounted the true social cost of our carbon emissions.

The physics of climate disaster won't care that regulators like the FERC ignored the true cost of fugitive methane when it approved pipelines and the gas industry if it were forced to observe the real science and the true life-cycle costs of methane emissions, the industry and the complexion of the FERC agency that proves its projects would look dramatically different because the realized costs would be known to be unsustainable and finally in section 1508.25 of the FERC rules about segmentation it says that the action under its review should be viewed with other foreseeable or proposed agency actions, "when projects have similarities that provide a basis for evaluating their environmental consequences together. The effects of fugitive gas cannot be legally discounted by the FERC and their environmental consequences are shared across "time and geography" of all pipeline projects, irrespective of whether it chooses to ignore data or science, the EPA has an obligation to account for all greenhouse gas emissions from all of its sources and the EPA is obligated by our Commander in Chief to pass along such obligations to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission who must engage in a review of this matter and quantify its findings to the federal government", FERC do your job.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Is there anyone here who hasn't had a chance to speak and would like to speak, that would be you.

MS. CHANDONNET: Hi, I'm Jennifer Chandonnet, that's C-h-a-n-d-o-n-n-e-t. I'm from Pelham, New Hampshire and I would re-iterate a lot of what has been said here tonight but really what I would like to say is I have lived in Pelham for only about 2 years now, my husband and I and our 3 children built our house on a nice cul-de-sac and about 10 of our neighbors all have brand new houses that are in the incineration zone which is not something that we had intended on of course.

But what everybody here has said tonight is that you know, we don't want this pipeline, we don't see a need for the pipeline. We have -- in every business decision there is the risk-reward payoff. You have to weigh those risks that you have to take in order and weigh the reward that you are going to get for it and really what you are asking us to do -- or not you are asking us -- Kinder Morgan is asking us and we are asking you to help us with is we are being asked to take all of the risk with zero reward.

None of this gas is coming to this region. It might go to other regions in Massachusetts, at worst case it might be exported overseas, but it is not coming to Dracut, it is not coming to Pelham, New Hampshire it is not coming to Wyndham or Londonderry or any of the other towns in New Hampshire so it just seems to me that why are we being asked to take all of the risk when we get nothing for it and you know so I ask you to fight as our people who can you know, work for us to actually have a say in this, tell them no.

And one other thing that I would like to bring up, I had one of my former colleagues was here earlier, Peter Clark spoke. Both he and I have worked all of our careers in insurance and I work in commercial insurance, I deal with large businesses every day and their various liability needs and they say that their industry is safe, that may be the case but business has unintended consequences every day. If it didn't I wouldn't have a job so I just ask you to weigh that stuff you know when you are thinking about it, thanks.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Anyone else who hasn't spoken who would like to speak? Is there anyone else that would like to add to their comments or did not finish? Yeah, I will take a couple of questions if you want to come to the microphone.

MR. WHITBECK: It's brief and it is just something that I have thought about many times over the last few weeks as these scoping sessions have been taking place. I'm just curious as to why a FERC Commissioner isn't present at each and every one of these scoping sessions?

In light of the gravity of this situation and what they are asking all of these people to incur as the woman who just spoke described taking all of the risk with no reward?

MR. TOMASI: I think the answer to that question is typically Commissioners do not come out. It is my job to convey the concerns of the local citizenry to the Commissioners through my document as well as you know when the order is written to convey those concerns as well, that's part of my job to convey those concerns to the Commissioners and the Chairman.

You know we do have meetings you know after the project, you know when we issue the FEIS, we do have meetings with the Commissioner's staff, they want to know what these concerns and everyone's concerns are and we convey those concerns as best we can to the Commissioners and their staff.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I understand I mean you have a very difficult job and I watch you up here and see that you are listening pretty intently to all of these speakers, it just seems like the duty for their job should be to show some decency or at least one of them to show their face at at least one of these scoping sessions on each of this projects that they oversee, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MS. HAKKILA: Ina Hakkila, I-n-a H-a-k-k-i-l-a. My question is all the information that we have about the compressor station is that 22,000 horsepower. Now there is a law that once they get the permit to run it at 22,000 horsepower that they can go up. There's no other way that we can again set it and then I hear them talking about 44, 66 and 88,000 horsepower. What happens to that pipe and safety in that pipe? The pressure has to go up when the horsepower pushing that through there so can we get some information for us

to look at in their replies, what they sent out to us on how that affects the pressure in the pipe and also the flow, speed of the flow, because the speed of the flow gets noisier and noisier and noisier as it gets faster and faster and faster.

MR. TOMASI: I can't answer that comment on speed but that is something we can talk about in the document however I can say that would FERC, and I have to -- if FERC -- if the Commissioners do decide to approve a project and this particular compressor station would be at a certain horsepower. If they want to change that they have to come back from FERC to get additional approvals to change that as well as to the change the pressure of the pipe.

Also, pipes have a certain rating by the DOT, you can't go above that so you could increase it to a certain maximum pressure. So that will be identified in the document what the pressure is for the pipes and that's the maximum pressure that DOT will allow. We would identify the maximum DOT would allow and by DOT I mean the U.S. Department of Transportation, they are the ones who regulate actually safety of pipelines and we have the memorandum of understanding with the U.S. DOT to ensure that when a pipeline is constructed that we insure that they are constructed to current U.S. DOT standards so that hopefully answers your question a little bit.

They can't just really change it --

MS. HAKKILA: But it never comes back to the people again to see -- it doesn't go back into the people living near the pipeline as that pressure goes through and it goes through faster it gets noisier they have to live there, they never get a say in it again, they never know about it.

MR. TOMASI: Well they come back into us to increase the pressure or you know the compressor station size you would have to do the same process over again where we would have local citizens would have to be notified, we would issue another notice of intent and allow additional people -- we would have to notify them, you can't -- we don't allow companies just to do something without notifying people who are affected by the project.

MS. HAKKILA: I thought that was involved with a federal law that they could do that without --

MR. TOMASI: Not that I am aware of.

MS. HAKKILA: Okay somebody was saying that they changed it however, so, I don't know, but anyway that's something that I am going to look into, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Any other quick questions and then we will wrap this up, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well thank you guys for coming out and listening to all of us for hours I appreciate that, may I just have a round of applause for these guys. You guys are the things we need, our only change to stop this thing so thank you and towards that end you mentioned that there are 3600 comments that you have already seen come in, I was just wondering if it is realistic and how you guys plan to look at all of those and consider all of them and if there is anything that we can do to put in you know, to make sure that this is what you are looking for, this is what is going to be the most beneficial structure of comment or is going to guarantee that it is seen and taken seriously any sort of recommendation like that?

MR. TOMASI: Well again part of it is that you know I can't explain to you what your concerns are you have to tell me. We always tell you to be as specific as possible and frankly on this project I have never actually seen more specific comments than I have at the meetings in New York, New Hampshire and Massachusetts.

They are detailed and just really detailed comments, you can tell that people are really looking into detail about their concerns and they really got the reports and so it's not really your job to figure out -- your job is to tell me what your concerns are, express it and we actually have -- we are tracking every single comment that comes in and we will have to address it and you know as time goes on and we get more and more comments, we throw more and more people at it to make sure that we can get through all of the comments that we have, it's not a trivial process by any stretch, it is something that we have to do and we will do.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Great, excellent thank you so much. Rest up and good luck tomorrow.

MR. TOMASI: I think there's one more comment back there.

MR. WHITBECK: My name is David Whitbeck, W-h-i-t-b-e-c-k from Mason, New Hampshire.

I don't envy your job of trying to balance need, convenience with people, the interruption of their lives. Somehow you need to balance temporary jobs for construction workers with permanent loss of homes and property rights. Somehow you need to balance billions of dollars of profit for a corporation with the loss of property value for individuals who have worked all of their lives to pay their mortgage, I don't envy that.

But you are the folk, the screen, the balance point between all of that for the people of this country. It is not just Massachusetts, it's not just New Hampshire, people all across this country are facing similar situations with pipelines, compressor stations, whatever goes through that pipeline so we do depend on you. We ask you to please do your job thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Well that's not necessarily a comment but I will respond. Again my job is to go ahead and give the environmental impact statement. I ultimately do not make the decision on the project however we do look at alternatives. There are other personnel at FERC who look at things like the economic need, like the rates, like the tariff, issues about detailed questions about doing them -- there's another whole group that does the economic analysis that happens parallel to what we are doing here with this.

And my job again is to address the Commissioners to be sure that they see the comments that informs their decision and their decision-making and their analysis.

MR. WHITBECK: And also in there along with this corporate process, there are people, small businesses, farms, all along the route, do you deduct, do you factor in their losses to the equation?

MR. TOMASI: We do what's called a socio-economic analysis and that looks at both harm and any potential benefit of the project so we do look at all of those factors in our analysis, yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Since you mentioned the economic analysis, is there a possibility that the people who do the economic analysis would be willing to hold a public hearing in this area, they would have to hold six of them so that residents could possibly express their concerns on those issues in addition to the environmental concerns so that you get public input on both.

MR. TOMASI: I can certainly bring that back to the Commission, ultimately it's their decision. I can explain the concerns that you have, going to the record and see those concerns and I can't make a commitment for them.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We haven't put any of those out there but we have economic concerns, you know there is precedent and we need a little bit of guidance in understanding what those laws are about some of the decision criteria and that may fall outside of your area of responsibility so we need to be put in touch with those people who do have enough knowledge to guide us in that direction.

MR. TOMASI: I can certainly take that back to the Commission, but that is neither my area of expertise nor my responsibility.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I appreciate that, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: And again we are going to end, I want to thank you everyone for coming back today and staying so late. Those of you who are interested there will be in Lunenburg tomorrow evening and you are welcome to get a ticket to speak again, thank you.

(Concluded at 12:17 a.m.)

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF: : Project No.
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT : PF14-22-000

Lunenburg High School
1079 Massachusetts Avenue
Lunenburg, MA 01462

Wednesday, August 12, 2015

The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping Meeting, pursuant to notice, at 7:00 p.m., Eric Tomasi, the moderator.

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. TOMASI: Good evening everyone on behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission I want to thank you for coming out tonight. This is the scoping meeting for the Northeast Energy Direct Project and proposed by Tennessee Gas, Docket Number PF14-22.

My name for those of you who have not seen me a few more times in the past is Eric Tomasi and I am the Environmental Project Manager for the FERC and we are the lead agency.

And I work in the Office of Energy Projects at FERC and I am the technical lead both for air quality and noise and pipeline safety as well as the project manager for this particular project.

I do have several people here tonight with me and they are integral to the set up for tonight's meeting as well as they will be integral on the developing the Environmental Impact Statement. And they are here as follows, tonight we have Diane Greg, she's a FERC employee, she was at the front desk. We also have working with us a contractor working for a company called Cardon they are a third party contractor and tonight we have Darcy Metzler at the table with me, we have Oliver Puhl, Wayne Kicklighter, Peter Marcy, Jen Ward and Noland Elsaesser out at the front desk and want to thank him again for helping out tonight.

Again at any point I know it seems like my voice is changing as I speak a little bit, I'm playing with the microphone so those in the back can you hear me? Again if everybody will come in and sit down we are going to go ahead and start. If everyone can quiet down we can go ahead and begin.

While people are coming in those of you who do not know there are bathrooms here, they are outside to the left and if we continue and we go a little late tonight, like we did last night, if we go past 9, 9:30, 10:00 we will be able to take a break. So if everyone will quiet down we will continue.

Again I want to also point out that we do have a court reporter here tonight. The court reporter is transcribing the hearing for you tonight and this is so we can have an accurate record of tonight's meeting and comments. Eventually an electronic record will be put into our e-library system so that you could see every single thing that was said here tonight as well as any other data.

Now we do have a transcription contract with Ace, if for any reason you wish to have a copy of the transcript prior to it being I the public files you would have to go ahead and make arrangements with Ace.

Now a couple of brief comments like we had before, we have a few points and the purpose of this meeting. One thing I want to accomplish is I want to go ahead and summarize the Department for you and I want to go ahead and explain the role of FERC in their review of the project, outline how you can go ahead and participate in the process and allow you the opportunity to comment tonight.

Now as you see, important comments issues -- we have issues in our environmental analysis and impact statement. Those of you who are following the docket, that docket is huge with comments, we now have over 3600 comments on the record, that is a great deal of comments on any project I have ever seen at FERC so you have given me a lot of information and we will look through every single one of your com-

ment letters and we will address all of the issues that you give to us.

So that's one of the main purposes for tonight. Obviously not just to gather issues and analysis but also to gather new issues. You know we heard about and somebody asked me earlier tonight what were some of the really interesting things that FERC heard from last night's meeting and I so probably tell you I heard things that I had not yet heard. It's good to get new information for comment so that we can go ahead and try to address those issues later on.

Next I am going to go ahead and explain the FERC process so that you understand what our job is and what we are going to do for this entire process and lastly I want to hear from you, the public, so that we understand what your concerns are.

Now I do want to ask you to hold all of your questions until the end. I will try to do a quick question and answer session at the very end if we have the time. Last night we did answer questions and we would like to do that tonight, I think we are going to not go quiet as late tonight so I think we can have a little longer question and answer session if you wish.

Now how do you give us public input that's the second question, what else is here how other than coming out here tonight and speaking and of these about the concerns that you have -- well obviously you can go ahead and comment directly your comments are put on the record. Next you can go ahead and provide the written comments, you can just send them to me you can go ahead and take one of the forms from off the table and give it in tonight.

You can go to the people at the front desk, mail to them later, any way that you want to give them in. Next you go ahead and give your comments for our e-library system which is what you will do is go on to our e-library system which is ferc.gov and click on our e-comment system and you could go ahead and upload that letter through our system so that we will put it in the record.

Also you could use our quick comment system which is a quick little form which you can pull up there and make sure that your that you click on there and you make sure that your quick little comment goes on our record. Now also 38:40

So one thing I do want to point out about the quick comment system actually is you can't be anonymous. One thing that I want to point out is that all of these forums we go through all of the letters and we make sure that all of the addresses you give to us are put in the and in the quick comment form there there isn't a place for your address so if you want to put on an address you need to go and put your address in the comment and I'll explain to you what happens.

Now also there are other ways to comment as well after the environmental impact statement is issued.

After the draft environmental impact statement I would suspect probably May 2016 the way things are looking right now, based on their application that we will get in October we will be back for another set of -- we will be back probably for another set of meetings. All the different locations will have meetings, we will be back for comment meetings on the draft environmental impact statement so this is not the only opportunity for you to speak and verbal and written comments are the same, I want to make it clear that you know, I know people only have three minutes here to speak, maybe four, we'll see how many people signed up.

But this is not the only opportunity. Written comments are exactly the same, we give it the exact same weight as if it was a comment here tonight. So the last speaker, I want to go ahead and begin and make sure that my phone is turned off and it is, while the ringer is off so if folks will turn off their ringer so that when people are out there speaking they are not getting interrupted.

And then we will go to the next number, we will have a number on stage, I will call those numbers as time goes on and you are going to come to the podium here and put your comments on the record. Now I will allow the elected representatives to go first and they represent a large amount of people so they can go ahead and speak first on the record and make their public comments.

I would like to point out to try to summarize your comments. Just be as quick as possible because three

minutes, even four minutes goes by very, very quickly and so if you don't get through your comment make sure that you give me a copy of your letter or file a more complete set of comments later.

Don't interrupt the speaker, there are people here that are going to be pro-pipeline and there are people who are going to be here in opposition of the pipeline. I want you to respect all speakers. It is very important that everyone here can say what they want to say and be uninterrupted because your part is as you know -- the more you interrupt the speaker the less speakers we are going to be able to get to and you know, I think we are going to hear a lot and we have a good crowd here tonight and I want to see, I know last night we had a really good meeting and I am expecting another good meeting and I expect everyone to respect each other and don't interrupt your fellow citizens while they are speaking.

Now the one thing that I do want to say is that this is not a -- although I am going to answer some questions if I have anything to add. This is not a hearing by which we are going to be making a decision, this is a format for the public and I can answer questions on the process. I can't answer questions on the merits of the case which means I can't tell you what our current opinion is on the project because we don't have enough information yet to really form a hard opinion so there's a lot of information missing right now, a lot of information that we don't have and so I can't form any opinion at this point, because we just don't have enough information.

Now the next slide real quick I want to talk a little bit about FERC. I'll try not to be too long but I want to explain what FERC is and what we do. Now FERC is an independent agency and we regulate the interstate transportation of electricity, natural gas and oil. And what does an independent regulatory agency mean? Well basically it means the decisions and opinions are not reviewable by the President or by Congress. They are only reviewable by the court system.

Now we do review is we review proposals and organized -- of the pipeline for gas facilities, liquefied gas facilities, as well as licensing, inspection of hydro-electric projects. Now this actually explains why we are here tonight. The reason that we are here tonight is that a law called the National Environmental Policy Act, what that requires is that any agency before it approves an energy project get a permit or a licensing or approve something they have to make sure that they do a review under the National Environmental Policy Act, to identify all the potential impacts from that project, environmental, safety, socio-economic all of the issues that we need to identify in our environmental impact statement

. That's why we are here tonight so that we can get all the issues that you bring up to me and that we can address them in the docket.

Now there are a couple of things that we do, and I also mentioned that we regulate transportation of natural gas through interstate, we also regulate hydropower, electric rates and tariff rates, but we don't regulate the siting of power lines nor do we regulate pipelines.

Additionally we do not regulate expiration, production or gathering of natural gas, or local distribution, the list goes on, we don't regulate fracking, we don't regulate any sort of drilling whatsoever, when it comes to the exploration of gas. Having said that, even though we know what is regulated by the states, we do what is called a cumulative impact analysis, we focus on all the potential impacts, cumulative from the project.

So that's one of the things that I know a lot of people are concerned about direct, indirect and cumulative impacts and so those are the things that we are going to have to hear from you.

Now I keep talking about it's my job to issue and write the environmental impact statement. That's my job. Now the people who make the decisions on whether to approve this project to go forward or not are the Commissioners. Right now we have 5 Commissioners and they are the ones who make the decision, on if this project should go forward or not.

My job is to write the environmental impact statement and inform of that decision. Now there are other things that go on other than just the EIS process. There are other elements of FERC who look at the rates, economic analysis and tariffs with the impact of the tusslers in the area where there might be impacts. But

all of that stuff on the parallel while I am developing the environmental impact statement.

So even though you might not have specific environmental topics, you can comment on those other issues, put the comments on the docket and we will make sure that they get answered and presented to FERC so that they can address those comments. Now those comments on the non-environmental issues will not be address in the EIS but they will be taken into account when the Commission writes the report.

Now next obviously -- those of you who may not be aware of this, they did file it, they did go ahead and file on July 24th a new revised set of resource reports. As of this time we still have a lot of updates they need to give and one of the things that did do was they changed the size of the line from Wright, New York to Dracut from 36 inch to 30 inches as well as they reduced the gas from 2.2 billion cubic feet per day to 1.2 billion cubic feet per day. At this point they have only identified .05 PCF customers they have still identified who they will be running that gas to.

Now that was a couple of weeks back. Now in this area of course one of the things that they did do at the Lynnfield lateral they did go ahead and change the size of that 20 inches to 24 inches so that got a little bigger so that's something that and I'll talk a little bit about the maps here so that you can see the coverage of the maps. This is the general overview map. This is a similar map that went out and you received and you can see the east side of the project, the west side of the project you know this is the west side right there.

Now I am going to talk a little bit about where we are and the current status of the project. So right now as I said -- right now we are in a comment period for this project. We issued an NOI on June 30th and identified a commentary until August 31st and also identified several projects across New York, and Pennsylvania.

Now there will be one additional scoping meeting that will be identified. Hopefully in the next couple of days and we will have that contract locked in. It looks like the next meeting is going to be sometime in September which means we will probably will be extending the comment period for some period of time.

We are not exactly sure how long it is going to be, we don't have the deate of the last meeting confirmed so the comment period should be extended by at least two weeks so I wanted to make sure that you are aware of that.

Now another thing I want to point out is and I want to really emphasize this is just because the comment period is ending that doesn't mean that we aren't going to be accepting more comments before and after. We will address every single comment that we get whether we get it before or after the comment period.

Now the thing that is important to know is that if you filed your questions or your comments in the formal comment period, the comment Tennessee has to respond to your comments. They look at all the issues submitted by the public and they will address all of those issues in the response, okay. So that's something that you need to be aware of, that is the difference between the formal comment period and any other time you file a comment.

If you file a comment before the formal comment period we are still looking at that. We have so many comments in this docket we have to sift through every single one of those comments to make sure that those issues are addressed. So right now one thing I want to impress upon you is don't feel you have to rush, you can file your comment after the formal comment period and FERC will still address that, okay.

Now having said that I want to talk a bit about some of the comments that we have on the record and these are some of the popular concerns and before we go into some of these I want to point out that earlier we gave comment and especially when it comes to things like alternatives, we don't necessary look at the impact of the project as proposed. We look at alternative routes, alternatives -- system alternative and other things as well and the earlier you get us recommendations on another route that you might want or another location, the better we are able to get out there and start looking at other alternatives.

But like I said we have gotten a lot of comments so far, these are not all of the comments, I don't think I have room on my computer for all of the comments but these are some of the top concerns that we have on

the record, one of the comments is to turn to alternative energy as opposed to natural gas. We hear these concerns and we have to address those.

Obviously we have a lot of concerns about the potential gas being exported, obviously again especially in this area and especially in New Hampshire, there is a lot of concern about the disruption of the character and in this area specifically a little east of here there's a pipeline in a more densely populated areas, there are a lot of comments and concerns about pipeline going next to their homes and those are the things, we have a lot of comments about those and honestly a lot of comments about being in the path and a lot of concerns about the use of unconventional or fracked gas.

And you know private wells, aquifer damage, that's something that we get continuously across states, whether New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, New York, that's something continually people are concerned about and we understand that and of course those areas that do have a compressor station nearby they have a lot of concerns about compressor stations about the noise and emissions both from those stations that are actually gas fired and the one at Dracut which is an electric one, which still has emissions -- really you have seen all of this and so I understand that we will address all of these issues in the document.

And moving forward as I said, we have a large set of questions that we will be sending to the company based upon what they do and the like as well as concerns of both public and some of the agencies and the public giving us a lot of comments the last few months. We are going to be sending those questions to Kinder Morgan and telling them you have to answer those and so we will be getting that done.

And as I said their plan is to file their application in October and after that I want to point out that this is not the end of our process. Even after they file the application we have a couple of things we have to do, first we have to make sure that it is accurate, then we have to actually go ahead and go ahead and make sure that it has all the holes filled.

They have to fill the application, no matter how big the company is, any time they don't answer our questions we always have concerns, both internal staff as well as the public that the company did not address so even after the application is filed there will be an opportunity, I don't want to speculate, but we will keep asking questions until we feel that we have all the information we need to go ahead and start writing the draft environmental impact statement.

Once we get to that point we will be issuing a public schedule at which that will tell the public what the schedule is for filing the environmental impact statement and they we will issue our draft environmental impact statement. And there will be a comment period for your feedback and again back out here, to get your comments on the draft environment impact statement.

After that we will then address those comments in the draft statement we actually address them so if you file a comment after the EIS and in the draft EIS you will see your letter and then right next to it you will see our response, every single element that you identified in your letter as well as addressing the document itself. So we address each letter individually at that stage.

After that of course that EIS is my teams recommendation and then it goes to the Commissioners, the Commissioners then vote on that and they issue their determination yes or no to the project in a certificate or order and that is the final, that is the FERC's Commissioners final decision in the matter.

Now after those obviously there is something that you can do those of you who wish to, usually it can be landowners, towns, agencies, you can file an intervener status and then after a certain period after the application comes in if you filed for intervener status what that does for you and it is explained a little bit in the EOI is that it allows you to challenge the FERC's decision.

So if you are an intervener and the FERC would vote on a project and vote the way you did not like, you can challenge that and that reserves the right for you to go to court in the future as well. But that intervener status does have a responsibility. Any time that an intervener files something on the record, you have to serve that to every other party in the proceedings, which means you have to have hard copies or electronic versions of every single public intervener in the case.

Now electronically it is a little less of a burden for some people and if they wish to go ahead and do that they can and in comments past but it is an option for the people if they wish to do that they can.

I talked about this a little bit already -- I'm going to go ahead and skip past this but one thing I want to point out is that even after the Commission decision, that I talked about, when they talk about the Order that comes out, if the project would be approved by FERC, FERC doesn't just walk away from a project, we do actually have -- we will do inspections of the project, we will make sure that the buildings are left in the condition that they were promised and even after the project is done years later if there is an issue we still come back and look at the environmental restoration and make sure that they come back and fix it.

I have had pipelines come back years after with issues of restoration, we will make them go back and fix that. That's something that I wanted people to be aware of.

Now again I talked a little bit about the EIS, already but I didn't really talk about how we developed it. I want to talk about how we form it, one of the things that we have to do is we are guarded by science, as an important analytical document. We will look at -- we will attempt to do a thorough job, that's our job and the reason we have to do that is we take what's called a hard look, we look at it, we take a hard look at all of the environmental safety and socio-economic impacts the pipeline has and make sure that we fully identify with them.

The EIS is a disclosure document to the public as well as an information docket for the Commissioners. Again I talked a little bit about the alternatives and again both the process of the Order.

Now we are going to bring speakers up in a minute but I want to go ahead and very quickly let you know again that we have a lot of people here that oppose the pipeline and I want to definitely encourage you and implore you actually to not disrupt the speaker, let them have their three or four minutes and everyone will have the ability to speak. We will go ahead and get to everybody I have no issues that we have to end at 10 or whenever, we are going to go until we are done, we should get through everyone tonight.

Again the microphone is over here to my right, I would ask you to spell your name so that the court reporter can hear it, there will be a time limit, when the yellow light if you can hold this up, right there we have a little timekeeper thing here which when you have time to speak it will be green, when it turns yellow what that means is you have 30 seconds and when it becomes red, that means your time is up.

Again I will like to go ahead and make sure that you understand and with that we are going to go ahead and go to our speaker list.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's a process question in the audience.

MR. HEWITT: My name is Richard Hewitt I just want to be clear on this because I am not. When you finish your DEIS do you actually recommend a route or do you just prepare alternatives and secondly is the no build option within your purview?

MR. TOMASI: I understand I will answer questions later, right now I want to get the comments from the public. The first speaker is on behalf of Senator Warren, Jeremiah Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Hello, thank you, my name is Jeremiah Thompson that's J-e-r-e-m-i-a-h T-h-o-m-p-s-o-n. I am here from Senator Warren's office. I want to first of all thank FERC for holding these meetings, holding the scoping meetings across the Commonwealth, I think everyone is here to share their important opinions. It is really important we believe, that FERC takes into consideration the many important viewpoints that are here tonight and in the other meetings as they apply to this proposed project.

Energy costs are a real issue throughout New England however it is very critical that the pipelines that are put in place are safe and that the citizens of Massachusetts have adequate time for review and comment on the various aspects of the FERC licensing process. Because of that we urge FERC to please extend the public comment period past the date of August 31st. The reason for this is it would allow additional time for communities to review some of the revised environmental resource reports that were filed on July 24th by Kinder Morgan. In addition this extension would allow for the completion of Attorney General Maura Healey's on-going study of electricity reliability needs in Massachusetts which we feel is very important.

It is our hope that residents impacted by this project will be given ample time to consider all of the available information before this comment period is closed so that is one thing that we would ask. Again I thank you for holding these meetings and we look forward to hearing the comments tonight, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up we have Congresswoman Niki Tsongas, Russell Pandres.

MR. PANDRES: Hello my name is Russell Pandres, R-u-s-s-e-l-l P-a-n-d-r-e-s and I have a statement to read on behalf of Congresswoman Niki Tsongas.

First I would like to thank you for hosting this scoping meeting in my District today. I hope it is the first of several opportunities for the constituents that I represent to provide their input. I recognize FERC's challenging responsibility to ensure that our energy system is reliable and to minimize natural resource degradation in the fact of quickly changing energy environments.

Constituents and businesses across Massachusetts have had trouble absorbing the increasing costs of energy and there is an agreement that the best solution to New England's energy issues will be through careful long-term planning and significant public input.

Meetings like this begin to provide the public with that opportunity. I also appreciate the opportunity to continue my office's dialogue with FERC and to share directly with some of the foremost concerns brought to me by my constituents, hundreds of whom have contacted me about this proposal.

Concerns that I share and believe must be taken seriously by the review editors reviewing this proposal. As I am sure you will here tonight here concerns with impact this proposed pipeline will have on the environment and the surround ecology. My constituents and I have worked hard to preserve the diverse and historic Massachusetts landscape and I value this long-determined effort shared by so many of the communities that I represent so that future generations can enjoy the treasured landscapes well into the future.

We must protect our historic farmland as it is rooted in New England's character, heritage and economy. They are both are an important source of income for local families and integral to the New England landscape. Environmental protections should be held to the strictest of standards for this proposed project.

We know how precious and vital our wetlands, state and local conservational land, threatened and vulnerable species and watersheds are to our own quality of life and the ecology surrounding us. A lesson hard learned from New England's industrial past. We have made significant progress cleaning up our rivers and restoring habitats. To see this work regress would be devastating.

Questions such as does drilling a pipeline across rivers such as the Nashua River currently be studied for wild and scenic status by the Department of Interior agitate settled pollutants? How will construction and alternations to the hydrology of the head waters in the Quantico River impact our water resources?

How will farmers be compensated for loss of future crop production and how temporary is minimal impact? These questions should be thoroughly explored. Homeowners are understandably concerned of how the pipeline might affect individual property owners. A house is an investment for one's family and for future generations. As pipelines are sited near residences, how will homeowners be compensated for potential loss and property value even if their property is not directly impacted?

I have heard the very reasonable concern of property owners both directly and indirectly impacted by the construction route that of the pipeline that they see the value of their property decrease only to see the gas ultimately moving through the pipeline exported overseas with no benefits to communities serving as its host.

How is the community compensated for the loss in property value especially when they are not serviced by natural gas but are simply hosting a portion of the main line? How will FERC know that the company has made every effort to avoid utilizing eminent domain? How will the public be determined if there is the slightest potential to power -- how will public need be determined if there is the slightest potential to export the natural gas?

Residents are also concerned that the public safety risks for potential accidents with the outcome we must confront with honesty and transparency. While our own technology has improved dramatically in the last

few decades, can residents living near an unmanned compressor station feel at ease?

Will measures be taken to ensure that disruption of the ground with drilling, blasting and laying pipe, not negatively affect the wells that so many of my constituents depend on for drinking water? Will there be constant monitoring of the ground water in residential areas that depend on wells?

I have also heard concerns with the process with which the project has proceeded. Contact with local town officials best able to identify the local concerns has not gone as smoothly as desired. FERC and the local officials were not the first parties contacted but instead discover an energy company was proposing to build a maximum infrastructure project from their own constituents.

There have also been many concerns with the speed with which public meetings have been scheduled without providing complete resource reports in advance. For example the most recent had thousands of to be determined throughout the report. Excuse me -- as is the case with very large infrastructure projects, there will be constant changing information and this process is in the early stages, however I fail to see how my constituents can comment as informed citizens with so many unknowns.

At this showing I would like to ask that FERC consider reviewing the numerous natural gas pipeline projects pending or approved in the New England region in a holistic manner and ensure that we are not overbuilding our pipeline infrastructure for domestic need.

As a country we have made a commitment to building a renewable future and not reducing the competitiveness of solar, wind, hydropower and other alternative sources in favor of additional pipeline infrastructure. Accordingly would FERC consider a no build option instead of considering the option to repair our existing pipeline infrastructure to answer our region's energy needs.

Also noted is Massachusetts' Attorney General office is conducting a study to determine the regional pipeline infrastructure need to be released in October, 2015. I ask in advance that this will be given consideration in FERC's decision. I respectfully request consideration of these questions raised by my constituents, closely and carefully before deciding and I would like to request additional FERC scoping meetings to be held in the early months of fall in locations that have not yet had scoping meetings to give my constituents further opportunities to review and provide input on the project.

Thank you again FERC for hosting these scoping meetings and providing me with this opportunity to present the concerns that my constituents have brought to me. I look forward to responses and to continuing this dialogue, on behalf of the 3rd Congressional District, Sincerely Niki Tsongas, Member of Congress.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, Andrew Sheehan.

MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you very much. Andrew A-n-d-r-e-w Sheehan S-h-e-e-h-a-n and I'm the town administrator for the town of Townsend, Massachusetts and I speak to you this evening not only as a local public official but as one of the co-chairs of the Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition, the NMGPC. Our Coalition is composed of duly appointed representatives of Ashby, Andover, Dracut, Dunstable, Groton, Little Town, PVD, Pepperell, North Reading, Tewksbury, Townsend and Wilmington, Massachusetts as well as Brookline, New Hampshire.

Coalition members include selectmen, town managers, town administrators and other municipal staff. The Coalition's mission is to gather knowledge and work collaboratively to provide representation and information to relevant governmental and public bodies concerning the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline Project and the project's effects on our communities.

Over the past 14 months the member communities of the Coalition have been unified in their steadfast opposition to the Northeast Energy Direct Project. The overwhelming majority of member communities have joined the more than 70 towns and counties in Massachusetts, New Hampshire and New York in passing resolutions in opposition to the project.

In Townsend the special town meeting of July 31, 2014 voted unanimously to instruct its board of selectmen to oppose the project. The coalition is concerned that the project is moving too rapidly. On July 24th

Kinder Morgan released updated resource reports that remain willfully incomplete. By one count as has been stated earlier this evening there are more than 10,000 TBD's, to be determined. If the proponent cannot answer relevant questions than how can the affected communities and the FERC fully evaluate the impact of the project?

Coalition members share significant concerns about all aspects of the project including the impact of construction activities, impacts of operations on rare and endangered species habitat, protected open space subject to article 97 of the Massachusetts Constitution, water resources, forests and farm lands. We question the need for the capacity the project will provide, its impact on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions and historic and archeological resources.

We share with the homeowners of our towns the concern about falling real estate values and the subsequent impact on tax revenues. With the above noted comments in mind I hereby respectfully request that FERC delay the public or extend the public comment period until October, 2015 when the Massachusetts Attorney General Maura Healey will release her independent study on electricity, reliability and capacity needs of the pipeline and determine if the NED project is the most cost effective means of meeting the energy requirements of the Commonwealth.

We are keenly aware of the pitfalls and unintended consequences of large projects such as this one. We request that FERC schedule additional scoping meetings to be held after Labor Day, after Kinder Morgan provides complete information on the project, after all relevant bodies have had a chance to review the project information and after the Attorney General has issued her study.

We cannot fully comprehend the impacts of the project until the significant issues have been addressed. Thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight and thank you for coming to Lunenburg this evening.

MR. TOMASI: Next up we have Jamie Toale.

MR. TOALE: Jamie Toale, J-a-m-i-e T-o-a-l-e and I am the Chair of the Lunenburg Board of Selectmen. Welcome to Lunenburg. Thank you for letting me speak tonight and read the attached Proclamation signed by the Lunenburg Board of Selectmen into the public record.

This Proclamation stands in opposition to the proposed energy direct project and in opposition to the proposed Fitchburg lateral within Lunenburg borders, Proclamation:

Whereas Kinder Morgan has proposed a new 36 inch high-pressure gas pipeline through Massachusetts and New Hampshire as part of the Northeast Energy Direct Project hereinafter called the Project and whereas the Project also proposes a new 12 inch high-pressure 1460 PSI natural gas pipeline which it calls the Fitchburg lateral to be installed not in Fitchburg but in Lunenburg, Townsend and Mason, New Hampshire and

Whereas Lunenburg is already crossed by a Kinder Morgan Pipeline hereinafter called the south Lunenburg lateral which runs from Lancaster to the proposed southern terminus of the Fitchburg lateral and

Whereas the south Lunenburg lateral has already caused financial damage to Lunenburg citizens and

Whereas the completion of the project appears to create a connection between the proposed Fitchburg lateral and the south Lunenburg lateral and

Whereas said connection could provide Kinder Morgan with the opportunity to provide gas service to Worcester through Lunenburg, including a possible future addition of a compressor station in Lunenburg or other re-adaptation and re-use of the south Lunenburg lateral and

Whereas Kinder Morgan has been silent about its plans to create such a connection despite its proposal of a metering station in Lunenburg at the southern terminus of the proposed Fitchburg lateral in its resource report it filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and

Whereas the currently proposed pipeline route was chosen in private, closed process so there has been no chance for open public discussion or debate of alternative routing possibilities and trade-offs and whereas Kinder Morgan identified properties in Lunenburg that it intends the Fitchburg lateral to cross but declined

to provide the town of Lunenburg with detailed and current information on the exact route of this proposal and

Whereas landowners are being asked to permit surveying on their property or sign agreements to forfeit some of their property rights and

Whereas federal eminent domain powers may be used to forcibly take pipeline easements from unwilling landowners and

Whereas a high-pressured gas pipeline by its nature carries the potential to leak, rupture or devastating explosion, causing untold damage to property and lives and

Whereas said pipeline goes against current Massachusetts commitments to renewable energies and combating global climate change and

Whereas our energy challenges are better at rest through investing in energy conservation measures as well as green, renewable energy solutions and

Whereas a high-pressured gas pipeline by its nature carries the potential for leaks, rupture or devastating explosion causing untold damage to property and lives and

Whereas Lunenburg and other neighboring communities have adopted comprehensive master plans, zoning by-laws, wetland by-laws and other land use controls to provide for the orderly development of our communities and the conservation and protection of our communities for future generations to come as good stewards of the land should and

Whereas the elimination of environmental threats to our forests and streams in provident development is the fundamental purpose for the adoption of our land use controls and master plans and

Whereas Lunenburg and other neighboring communities have publically and privately set aside large tracts of land and restricted their development for conservation and open space purposes as part of their master plans.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Board of Selectmen in the Town of Lunenburg do hereby declare that it stands in opposition to the Kinder Morgan proposed energy direct project and to the Fitchburg lateral and stands in opposition to any effort to locate the proposed Fitchburg lateral within Lunenburg's quarters and further commits to participate in and provide comments to any meetings held under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC review process with regard to the proposed Fitchburg lateral to oppose Kinder Morgan's application and

Be it further resolved that the Board of Selectman of the Town of Lunenburg do hereby call upon our state and federal legislators and executive branch officers to enact legislation and take any such other action as our necessary to oppose such energy projects that go against our commitment to the public safety, our environment, our economic well-being and our citizen community, signed this 10th day of February, 2015, Lunenburg Board of Selectmen.

MR. TOMASI: Next up Jeff Kubick.

MR. KUBICK: Hi I'm Jeff Kubick, J-e-f-f K-u-b-i-c-k. I am the chairperson of the Groton Dunstable Regional School Committee. The 7 members of our School Committee represent the two towns of our regional school district, Groton and Dunstable located here in Northwest Middlesex County.

There are more than 2500 students attending the 5 schools throughout our district. I appear before you today to express our community's concern over the originally proposed route of the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline. While we share many of the concerns raised by others in our communities, our specific concerns relate to 703 Chick Pea Row in Groton which is directly on the original proposed Massachusetts pipeline path.

The land and buildings constructed there are owned by the Groton Dunstable Regional School District and hence are public property. The parcel is home to our high school campus which was completed in 2003 and is permitted for an additional school building should the need arise.

When the high school is in session there are about 865 students and 85 staff members on the property. After school students, staff and committee members are in the high school for extra-curricular programs, events and athletics. The property is used during the summer as well -- in fact my 3 daughters were there this evening for a summer track program.

The safety of our students, staff and general public is understandably foremost in our minds as we learned about the Northeast Energy Direct Project and the route. We believe that it is self-evident that the consequence of a pipeline leak, fire or explosion in close proximity to a public school to be calamitous. We request that the route be altered to pass further from our high school for many reasons.

As stated before the property serves as a public gathering place with frequent events, athletic events, fine art productions, community meetings that occur there throughout the year. Town base supports utilize our fields for practice and competitions.

Graduation takes place weather permitting within the oval of our track. The currently proposed route comes within 600 feet of the track mentioned above. Significant parts of our facilities are within the 950 foot hazard area radius for a 36 inch diameter pipeline.

The currently proposed route divides our main sake from our emergency secondary access required by fire and police departments to maintain public safety. The inability to use this emergency egress would limit us to a single access road approximately 20 feet wide. This would be inadequate should we need to evacuate the property or bring in multiple emergency vehicles due to a pipeline incident.

It is possible that the high school would serve as an emergency shelter for our town should there be a need. We have in the past used school buildings in emergency situations. Clearly this use would be infeasible if the high school parcel were impacted by an emergency due to the proposed pipeline.

Having the pipeline run through the property may reduce options for siting a new school building or expanding facilities on the property and therefore may increase the cost of any such expansion. The property was obtained and the high school built using funding from the Massachusetts School Building Authority, the MSBA. This program continues to reimburse our regional district for a portion of the capital project loans.

These loans have approximately another decade perhaps the payoff and dissolution of this relationship with MSBA.

And finally the pipeline route is proposed to dissect the conservation area on the parcel. This conservation land is intended to preserve wildlife corridors and habitat. To disturb this area and maintain a permanently cleared pathway would eliminate its use for wildlife preservation.

Our school committee has voted to deny the request by Kinder Morgan to survey our property for the pipeline. We believe that allowing a gas transmission pipeline to run across our school property would violate one of the most basic duties we have to keep our students and staff safe.

We hope you will consider our strong opposition to the pipeline route through Massachusetts as proposed, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much we have Jack Petropoulos.

MR. PETROPOULOS: Good evening thank you for having us. My name is spelled J-a-c-k P-e-t-r-o-p-o-u-l-o-s. I'm the Chair of the Board of Selectmen for the town of Groton, Massachusetts. Groton is on the initially proposed route no longer on the primary route.

On December 8th of last year the town of Groton was notified by Kinder Morgan in a letter to Secretary Bowes that Groton was no longer on the proposed path. Specifically in this letter Kinder Morgan said "By increasing the percentage of co-location for the proposed pipeline segment, the revised route will reduce the construction of new pipeline facilities in undeveloped portions of the market path, thus reducing the environmental impacts and avoiding habitat fragmentation.

In addition the proposed route change will enable Tennessee to avoid in certain cases areas of critical envi-

ronmental concern in Massachusetts.” Since that letter we have had no communication at all from Kinder Morgan to the town of Groton. A request for contact information from Ron McClain the vice-presidents of projects at the Pipeline’s Safety Trust Conference which I attended and so did he and a commitment to dialogue proved empty as no such contact was made by him to me.

Our town breathed a collective sigh of relief when this notice came out. No mention was made in this notice that former routes, the initial primary route were still considered viable and remained in contention. Indeed the map that you presented here showing the proposed route did not show Groton on path, but Groton remains on path as I understand it and is still a potential route for this pipeline.

There are certain documents that can be found that will indicate that Groton is still an alternative route, but the public is hard-pressed to find any of these easily available information in the press that would alert them to same.

The result is a public -- the result is that the public in Groton, and I am sure elsewhere is under the impression that the threat to their homes and land has passed. Rightly or wrongly this is the case and Groton’s public participation in the process has predictably waned.

I request that if FERC does see fit to move the path of the proposed pipeline to include the town of Groton we would like time to generate again, because we have had plenty of it before, the public awareness that can bring to you the kind of concerns that you seek in these public meetings.

We request that if the path moves to include Groton that the process be delayed by at least 6 months to afford us that opportunity. In the same letter Kinder Morgan stated that “One of the primary reasons that led to Tennessee’s decision to adopt a new path is that it will enable a very substantial portion of the proposed new pipeline construction to be located adjacent to and parallel with these existing utility corridors in the states of New York, Massachusetts and New Hampshire.”

It’s clear to me and presumably to Kinder Morgan and to FERC that there is far less environmental impact to running along already disturbed routes. But it is equally clear to me that there is far less economic impact by running along routes that are already disturbed and in which property values and usage patterns have already been affected by the impact of the existing corridors.

I would like to ask if FERC has or will study the assessed value of the land and the primary and secondary routes as part of an evaluation on the overall economic impact of bringing the pipeline through green field properties rather than already disturbed land.

Has FERC studied the impact for land usage in the primary and secondary routes? And my request is that such an evaluation be completed, published and that landowners and affected constituents be provided with the ability to evaluate that study and a forum be provided to discuss and affect suggested impact prior to any decision on route being made.

I have a number of other points that echo some already made for instance the proximity to our school that you will hear about and you have already heard about, drilling under the Nashua River and the disturbance of pollutants that are just part of the Nashua River at this part due to our unfortunate history, but these are the primary considerations that I would like for you to consider as FERC.

I have to tell you I appreciate your being here, everything I have ever seen or heard about you says that you are willing to listen and that you are interested in what we have to say and I hope that is true and I hope you take these comments and requests seriously, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next up is Carolyn Smart.

MS. SMART: Good evening I’m Carolyn Smart, I’m a member of the Townsend Board of Selectmen and its C-a-r-o-l-y-n S-m-a-r-t. The Townsend Board of Selectmen greatly appreciates the opportunity to share concerns about the proposed Northeast Energy Direct NED Project with you tonight.

Townsend has a major interest in that. In the original September pre-filing notice the main pipeline route and the proposed lateral cut through Townsend. A large compressor station is also planned to be sited somewhere along the 4 mile path of the pipeline I our town. In the revised route released in Decem-

ber of 2015 the main line pipe moved north to New Hampshire but the lateral is still proposed to bisect Townsend from north to south, affecting many private and public landowners.

In addition the Townsend Route is still listed as an alternative to the New Hampshire route and compressor station location. The Townsend Board of Selectmen believe the proposed NED Project as currently described is not necessary to meet the energy needs of New England. It would be an unwise use of our important conservation lands and natural resources and an inappropriate potential use of eminent domain for the benefit of a private corporation.

Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project would be an overbuilt and unnecessary solution to what might be a small temporary need for some additional energy sources to meet peak demands in wintertime months. There are already existing proposed projects that can meet that demand using existing infrastructure such as the off-shore LNG facilities or upgrades to existing gas pipelines along existing gas pipeline rights-of-way.

We applaud Governor Baker's continued insisting that upgrading existing pipeline infrastructure is the best way to meet any unmet needs for natural gas. Townsend like most of the communities along the proposed route is a place where our citizens highly value our natural resources, historical areas, open space and conservation land. People come to Townsend to enjoy Willow Brook and Pearl Hill state brooks. Pearl Hill state parks hike along our open base trails and fish, kayak and canoe are cold-water streams.

The proposed Fitchburg lateral bisects west Townsend, crossing significant ecological, historical and water resource areas including Willow Brook and Pearl Hill book state parks in the heart of the Squanacook area of critical environmental concern. The proposed main street crossing of the lateral occurs between 2 200 year old homes on a stretch of road that remains much as it has been since Townsend was first settled.

The destruction of historical and natural resources is unnecessary. Kinder Morgan has yet to explain why the Fitchburg lateral is needed. Indeed Kinder Morgan has yet to get a straight answer about the Fitchburg lateral. They call it the Fitchburg lateral even though it doesn't go to Fitchburg, it goes through Mason, New Hampshire, Townsend, it ends in Lunenburg at a Tennessee Gas pipeline.

UniTel which serves Fitchburg, Lunenburg and Townsend has not signed on for capacity and has said they do not need the capacity. Kinder Morgan claimed the lateral was to serve a national grid but national grid capacity agreement, DPU Docket 15-34 did not mention this lateral or any gas needs in central Massachusetts.

State Representative Sheila Harrington reported that Kinder Morgan had told her that someone in Townsend requested this lateral. This is not a distribution pipeline that someone can tap into. There is no user of gas anywhere near the proposed lateral.

Finally some thought for the Fitchburg lateral was planned to deliver gas to the proposed Northwest lateral and we were quite surprised that the Fitchburg lateral was not dropped from the Northwest lateral project to construct early in June. There doesn't appear to be any public need for this particular lateral yet Kinder Morgan is asking for eminent domain authority to take 14 miles of land and 3 towns across 2 states to build it that is not right.

Eminent domain authority should only be used very sparingly for projects that address a real public need. The proposed NED Project and the Fitchburg lateral in particular do not pass the threshold for a public need determination. The Townsend Board of Selectmen have been following the NED Project for more of the new year. We first became aware of the project in early 2014 when Kinder Morgan land agents talked to individual land owners at their homes before contacting the town about the proposed project.

It took months for Kinder Morgan presentation of information to the town. Following their presentation in June, 2014 the Board of Selectmen voted to not provide survey to any town land. On July 31, 2014 voters at a special town meeting voted unanimously to adopt a resolution in opposition of the pipeline.

Townsend is not the only community opposed to the pipeline. 55 communities in Massachusetts represent more than a half a million people based on the 2010 census have taken at least one vote in opposition

to the NED Proposal. While Townsend officials have shared our concerns with the project with FERC through letters from the Selectmen Conservation Commissions and throughout the Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Coalition it is unclear how much weight our comments have had with FERC.

We are very grateful for this opportunity to share some of our concerns with you directly and trust that you will take these concerns seriously in the project review. Again thank you for the opportunity to comment.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next up Cedwyn Morgan.

MR. MORGAN: Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to comment my name is spelled C-e-d-w-y-n and the last name is Morgan M-o-r-g-a-n. I am an elected member of the Ashby Board of Health for more than 20 years.

By way of preamble I would just say that this project is unnecessary. Enumerated by previous speakers there are numerous other sources of whatever additional gas is needed to meet our short-term needs without the destructive large capacity pipeline being constructed.

Most of the gas in this pipeline will be excess to our, to New England's needs and will be sold outside of New England. Given that it's almost criminal that eminent domain is being considered to support this project. The Commonwealth is virtually unanimously opposed to this project, the only people that comment in favor are those looking for a paycheck from them.

I will focus on Board of Health issues. Ashby is on one of the alternative routes for the pipeline and Ashby is one of the towns that voted unanimously to oppose the pipeline. The route selected through Massachusetts targets small towns it's sort of the Gulliver versus the Lilliputians. These towns often have no public water supply and rely on private wells.

The primary Board of Health concern in Ashby and most of these small towns is the protection of water supplies because every house has their own. All of these Board's has setbacks, monitoring requirements et cetera. There are no protections for the water supply in the construction of the proposed pipeline, there are no set-backs to private wells, there is no consideration of the aquifers. They can put the pipeline right across a private well if they feel like it, they can sever the line from the well to the house. Blasting and disruption of water supplies will alter hydrology, well yields and water quality.

The ambiguous disruption of wetlands will have the same effect. There are not even really setbacks to houses for the pipeline, they told me that they practice I think 25 feet at one of the informational meetings which was also a Board of Health concern, both for risk during construction, leaks from the pipelines, activities during maintenance and of course in the worst case explosion.

Finally there's no consideration of cultural or historic resources. The alternative route through Ashby goes right through downtown, the so-called incineration zone includes the elementary school, the town hall, both churches, the town common in Rindge, and virtually the entire historical district.

Finally I would like to reiterate the request of the previous speakers that FERC delay the deliberations until the Attorney General's report has been completed. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. I did want to answer your questions but other things came up during the elected officials speaking -- first regarding alternatives and those routes that are currently listed as alternative routes have not proposed, I want to assure everyone if for whatever reasons FERC looks at any of those routes and starts looking at them as a viable option to the current proposed route or we find another proposed route that we want to look at in much more depth, we are required to actually do the same thing all over again that we are doing tonight.

We are required to send out a notice to all the landowners as well as conditional meetings, so for those of you that are concerned that they are not getting any notice, if you were to start looking at those as a viable option you would derive from the process you would have notice, you would -- meeting in the community so that's one thing.

The other question I believe on alternatives regarding what we look at, overflow issues, the Commission does go in and look at for projects, that's something they do look at. We are required to look at that as

well, system alternatives as well as other route alternatives so we will -- if it is. So we will note that we received numerous times this occurred as well as using this with the project, that is something we will have to do that in depth with this particular project so I wanted a couple of things, I wanted to make sure to answer some of those concerns.

So, without further ado we will call the next speaker which was Carolyn Sellars.

MS. SELLARS: Carolyn C-a-r-o-l-y-n Sellars S-e-l-l-a-r-s, I live in Townsend. 18 months ago I learned that Kinder Morgan wanted to take land my family has protected for 100 years and then also cut indiscriminately through a community that I have worked for 3 decades to make a great place to live.

I soon learned that the issues surrounding this massive project were much bigger than my own backyard and hometown. I found a corporation who has not diversified for the 21st Century, instead is following mid-20th Century business models to maximize profits at the expense of not only of our community but even our earth.

I have learned that our current system provides a huge advantage to the power of money over the power of the people. There is indeed a built-in imbalance of the FERC process. Kinder Morgan not only has personnel with experience in the complex regulatory process, they have hired consultants, lobbyists and PR people to advocate their path.

Taking a picture of a clear need when the tooth is much more murky no wonder it sometimes seems like the process is on a fast track to approval and people are led to believe that it is a done deal. This is why we need you FERC to protect our interest. We need your help to make our citizens' voices and concerns heard.

Over the last 18 months two things have been quite apparent. First it's unclear how much new gas pipeline capacity if any we really need and two there are lots of corporations who are anxious to supply lots of natural gas to Massachusetts, New England and even the world.

In order to provide the best solution to what may or may not be a problem, FERC needs to combine the various proposals from Kinder Morgan, Spectra, Iroquois and Cortland natural gas into one regional environmental impact statement and one coordinated FERC process.

Added together these proposals could more than double the gas supply to New England at a time when we need to greatly reduce our consumption of fossil fuels. Even Kinder Morgan acknowledges in this resource reports that the alleged NED need be met by one of the competing projects. In a combined FERC process all of these projects would be analyzed together to see which one, if any or which combinations of projects would satisfy any demand with the least impact to the environment and affected landowners.

The FERC review of these combined projects needs to determine what amount of gas if any is needed to meet the threshold of allowing eminent domain takings and two what is the best way to meet that need while minimizing project impacts? My written comments provide more detail on an analysis needed but now is the time for FERC to take a step back and look at the larger picture of natural gas capacity in New England by combining the various proposals.

This consolidated review would help you ensure a reliable, efficient and sustainable energy for consumers is called for in emission, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Elaine Marz?

MS. MARZ: My name is Elaine Marz, M-r-a-z, E-l-a-i-n-e M-r-a-z. I am a resident of Lunenburg. When I attended my first open house I learned FERC follows a policy statement with criteria for making pipeline decisions. When I googled it I was shocked that these criteria were established 16 years ago in 1999.

Back then Bill Clinton was under impeachment and google had 8 employees. There were no hard drives, no WIFI, no smartphone. Since then U.S. gas production is up about 40%, solar generation is up about 4,000%. Alternative energy and efficiency technology has advanced dramatically and in 2007 the Supreme Court ruled the EPA can regulate greenhouse gases. How can we still be using a policy established in 1999?

We need criteria that match today's challenges but when you are stuck with this outdated policy for FERC's review of the many pipelines proposed for our region. Importantly this policy says in deciding whether a proposal is required by public convenience and necessity, the Commission will consider the effects of the project in all of the effect interests.

Here are three affected interests which must be addressed when assessing the NED Project. Number one, we are all threatened by climate change. Kinder Morgan sells this project based on expanding the market for natural gas and fossil fuel. There is an executive order requiring agencies to consider climate change in their decision-making.

FERC must address this impact explicitly using current data, analytics and modeling.

Two, American businesses and citizens want long-term secure and stable energy sources. Since 1999 gas exports have risen from nowhere to over 4 billion cubic feet a day enabling exports increases domestic prices and consumes a valuable asset which could otherwise be a future U.S. energy reserve.

The public has a right to participate in this discussion and FERC has a responsibility to address it fully.

Three, New Englander's value where and how they live. Massachusetts is the most energy efficient state in the country and we have proudly created laws and initiatives to make it that way. We don't believe Kinder Morgan's promises, we don't want their gas and we are not giving up our properties for their benefit.

FERC must consider the impact of hosting this unwanted solution on the sovereign right of the Commonwealth to determine its own energy future. On the public necessity side, Kinder Morgan relies on benefits of increased gas consumption for shale gas producers, distribution companies and power generators.

A pipeline has no value without gas moving through it. If you increase consumption comprises the project's benefits. The upstream and downstream impacts of the increased consumption must be considered as costs. This includes impacts at the well heads, at compressor stations and from fugitive emissions in the LBC system.

An analysis of these costs and impacts must be included in the scope of the DEIR. We know it is the Commission not you analysts who make the certificate decision but you are in a position to frame the argument to address these critical issues with important implications that stretch beyond our lifetimes.

This is what we ask you to do, this is what we need you to do, this is what we will insist.

MR. TOMASI: Number 3 and I believe number 4 could get ready.

MS. TERRASI: Hi I'm Paula Terrasi, P-a-u-l-a T-e-r-r-a-s-i. I have been involved in the community protection projects for many years, actually probably about 40 and I would like you to please start with the potential long-term impacts that will result if these easements to Article 97 properties are permitted, how this will impact future land protection efforts?

Many of our Article 97 properties took years to complete and countless hours and a significant amount of money, how will conservation organizations sell the idea of the protection of open spaces as a way to protect land in perpetuity if taking of Article 97 land for a pipeline are permitted?

I would like you to please scope the environmental impacts of horizontal, direct drilling. If the polymer lubricant used in this process is released, which happens, which is toxic to fish, invertebrates, amphibians and other wildlife, who will address and monitor the mitigation?

And please scope the impacts to the endangered species habitat with properties that have never been serving professionally, I have done this work in the past. Especially for compressor station sites, rare species are often identified on the sites where the developments are proposed when wildlife habitats are required.

At a minimum habitat evaluation in the survey should be completed at all compressor station sites. Include scoping impacts to the public health and environment if private and public wells are compromised. We were told at more than one open house by Kinder Morgan that bottled water would be provided if wells got compromised. If you can't drink the water could you bathe in it?

Heavy decibel action -- my sister lives in 1:49:15, I know the impacts to drinking contaminated water, that's what they are. What is the value of a home if it no longer has clean drinking water? How will home owners be compensated? Please scope the safety considerations being proposed to shut off valves along the pipeline route. Will shut-off valves be manually operated or controlled remotely? Explosion would be devastating with an explosion followed by a fire that burns a total person alive on site to visit and shut off the valve.

Can you please tell us -- please consider our future, 50 plus years of infrastructure for a natural gas pipeline means little chance we will meet the Global Warming Solutions Act. 50 plus years of infrastructure for this natural gas pipeline is a commitment to fossil fuels. What will a rise in ocean levels cost when our cities are flooded, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Kathy Kristofferson.

MS. KRISTOFFERSON: Good evening my name is Cathy Kristofferson. C-a-t-h-y K-r-i-s-t-o-f-f-e-r-s-o-n. I'm a Conservation Commissioner in the Town of Ashby for whom I speak this evening. We are a town of some 3,000 in the central part of the state, one town to the west of this hearing. As Cedwin mentioned earlier we unanimously resolved at last June's annual town meeting to stand in opposition of this project.

We remain convinced this fossil fuel overbuild is not the solution needed to our dubious inclinations of high energy cost or for the handful of peak days where competition between home heating and electricity generation drives prices temporarily high. There are much better sustainable solutions.

Let's be clear we do not need or want this pipeline. In the last winter adjacent pre-filing of the Conference Landowner Survey Access and it was reported that only 20 to 30% in New Hampshire and Massachusetts. That would make sanctioning unprecedented and eminent domain not needed.

So you must fully scope all of the environmental and socio-economic impacts, both the construction and operation of this pipeline and all of its requisite infrastructure will have on the region. The amount of downsizing of this project due to the lack of customer demand does not in any way decrease any of the impacts on us, only the pocketbooks of the corporations seeking to take from the public for their private gain.

This lack of what you define as need must not entire in your decision-making process. The Commonwealth citizens have a constitutionally guaranteed right to clean air and water, freedom from excessive and unnecessary noise and the natural scenic and historic qualities of their environment.

You must scope how blasting through lead, punching through wetlands, clear cutting swaths through tier forests, segmenting habitats, permanently altering the landscape of our natural environment everywhere, most particularly that which has been set aside in perpetuity, protected by our Constitution could possibly be in the public good.

More than 110 conservation parcels are still on the proposed route, 85 without protections including our shared Willow Brook state forest. It would seem forcing this pipeline upon us violates everything our Constitution seeks to guarantee.

You must supply your own rule that the public benefits of a pipeline must exceed the cost to society, the society need of NED as you have heard is simply way too high. How is it appropriate to risk any of our drinking water sources or our clean breathable air. As Conservation Commissioners we know restoration and replication are the mitigation answers to resources destroyed.

Our DET's recent study documents that more often than not these undertakings result in failure. The solution is not to destroy resources in the first place. The Conservation Commissioners are fairly wise to applicants coming before us with projects piece mail hoping we won't notice the full extent of their impact.

We must not allow Kinder Morgan the illegal segmentation on the NED Connecticut expansion project to continue, review them combined. Resource report tends no action alternative must be heavily weighted in your decision-making process because energy conservation and energy alternatives are where our clean system of our future lies not dirtied with fossil fuels of the past.

We urge you to be diligent and thorough in your environmental impact study on the --

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MS. KRISTOFFERSON: Okey doke.

MR. TOMASI: You can submit the written letter.

MS. KRISTOFFERSON: I certainly will.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MS. KRISTOFFERSON: And I will also leave you the article that Senator Elizabeth Warren published exactly one year ago total entitled “We Can Do Better than a Pipeline” and the Acadia Study for Energy Efficiency which shows among other things \$1.00 spent on energy efficiency yields \$4.79 in energy savings.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next Kenneth Berthiaume.

MR. BERTHIAUME: Good evening and welcome my name is Kenneth Berthiaume, K-e-n-n-e-t-h B-e-r-t-h-i-a-u-m-e. The following comments are focused primarily on reasonable alternatives that when in full consideration of impact now and certainly near-term will render the need for the Greenfield Pipeline unnecessary.

As stated in the July, 2015 resource report and alternatives, they energy efficient technologies, are not expected to eliminate the steadily increasing demand for energy or natural gas. ISO New England has recently stated that the 2014 energy consumption numbers are 2% lower than 2013 and the winter peak for those years is also lower, 4.2% and further indicate that EE and solar are having an impact and I quote, “When the EE savings are factored into the region’s load forecast, energy usage is expected to remain flat with an average annual growth rate of 0.0%”. This warrants a comprehensive analysis as Massachusetts has been ranked number 1 in energy efficiency in the United States for the last 4 years in a row.

As stated in resource report 10 wind power is not an option. Why has TGP dismissed this pre-zero fuel cost and zero emission source of energy? ISO New England references 4,000 megawatts of wind power in the que for 2015. From the Solar Energy Industries Association, solar power provided roughly one third of all new electric generated capacity in the United States in 2014 yet this is dismissed in resource report 10.

Energy storage, battery technology is not addressed at all in resource report 10 yet is currently available by a number of companies, one which offers this is a 20 year and short warrantee for grid scale batteries. Contrary to the statement listed in resource report 10, section 10.2.2 other systems -- Cortland natural gas transmission system has offered in their statement for the MASS DPU an existing alternative to supply the amount of natural gas requested by the LBC’s.

Under existing alternatives Massachusetts is already host to under-utilized and unused infrastructure, namely 3 LNG terminals. This gas endeavor is currently under-utilized and I quote, “on a sustainable basis has the vaporization capacity of approximately 7 hundred million cubic feet per day”, which is 200 million cubic feet per day more than the NED LBC’s.

Northeast Gateway report off the coast was commissioned in 2008, this past winter received its first shipment in 4 years. Neptune pulled off the coast -- unused to the Commission in 2010. The U.S. Coast Guard named the Maritime Administration and FERC all deemed these water ports to be a matter of public convenience and necessity yet within 5 short years these two ports have shown that they are clearly not necessary as they remain essentially unused.

In closing why would New England’s region and in particular Massachusetts need additional fossil fuel infrastructure which its residents will ultimately pay for over the next 20 years while directly confronting with compliance to the Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Maryann Harper.

MS. HARPER: My name is Maryann Harper, M-a-r-y-a-n-n H-a-r-p-e-r and I’m from Rindge, New Hampshire. Tonight my comments deal with the FERC process itself. The best predictor of future actions is past behavior and in this light I have been studying the Constitution Pipeline.

In approving Constitution no matter what the impact was, the Commission always answered we disagree - period, no explanation. When concerns were raised about environmental impacts, construction concerns, soil conditions, impacts to water quality, impacts to wildlife, the Commission answered, we disagree. Tonight I'm asking FERC to speak to local experts.

We all know that Kinder Morgan can pay to have a report say anything so I am asking FERC to give equal weight to the opinions of local conservation commissions in regards to environmental impacts. In regards to socio-economic impacts, again the Commission chose to disagree. Surrounding loss of property value we know that Kinder Morgan can get a report to say anything.

I am asking FERC to reach out to local realtors with 15 or more years of experience and ask them what they feel the impact to property values are and give that equal weight to Kinder Morgan's report.

Temporary jobs lasting 3 to 6 months in each stage took precedent over a lifetime of work on an owner's property. The Commission disagreed with the concerns raised. I am here tonight to say that I disagree and if FERC intends to disagree with all of the impacts and concerns raised, I would suggest that FERC back up their decision with factual information or are we all participating in a farce?

Now I understand that any building permit process or site plan review process for a project involves dotting your I's and crossing your T's and you are granted a permit, but there is a time and a place that no matter how you package a disaster in the making you must turn some projects down.

Projects that bring enormous disruption to the environment that have no benefits or cost is passed on to unwilling rate-payers, these projects require the utmost scrutiny and there are other options. The no-build alternative and improvements to existing infrastructure that FERC must seriously consider -- projects that aren't needed, projects that aren't wanted, we will have to pay for that don't believe in anyone's backyard.

Please FERC make history and deny this project, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Claire Miller?

MS. MILLER: My name is Claire Miller, C-l-a-i-r-e M-i-l-l-e-r. I'm the lead community organizer with Toxics Action Center and I traveled out here from Boston. Toxics Action Center is a New England-wide environmental and public health non-profit. Our mission is to work side-by-side with communities who are working to clean up and prevent pollution.

We were founded in 1987 after the Woburn cancer tragedy. We absolutely hands-down oppose this project in any form. First because eminent domain is for public good, it should be used for public schools, public libraries, not for private companies such as Kinder Morgan to make massive profits. The fact that the FERC includes exporting gas to foreign markets makes no sense.

Number two because Kinder Morgan is not a straight-shooter. The most recently resource report was filed just weeks ago on a Friday afternoon, right before everyone was going away on their summer plans. There are countless stories of landowners who sent letters rescinding permission for survey and then seedy folks crossing on to their land as if it is just fine. Kinder Morgan is not a straight shooter.

Number three because climate change is here and it is happening already. New science finds that gas is equally as bad as coal. As our trans-jjectory the union of concerned scientists predicts that Massachusetts wound up with a climate of Pennsylvania.

I intend to raise my family in Massachusetts and I would like my children to still know what cranberries are. Just to know what are native species are. I don't want to move to Pennsylvania. Building a new pipeline that will lock us in for at least a half century will make sure that that doesn't happen.

Number four because fracked gas is dangerous. The chemicals used to extract gas are trade secrets. Should an accident occur first responders literally do not know what they are facing, not to mention the fugitive leaks, especially from metering stations and compressor stations.

And fifthly -- fifth and most importantly because the people do not want it, because 72 towns have passed resolutions against it -- when Kinder Morgan moved the route over the last year they admitted it was in

part because of local opposition. They must not have known what New Hampshire is like. They thought it would be easier and Toxics Action Center is honored to be part of this movement and this is just the beginning, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, Paul Goodrich.

MR. GOODRICH: Paul Goodrich, P-a-u-l G-o-o-d-r-i-c-h. Hello, my name is Paul Goodrich and I am a union laborer and I would like to express my support for this project. It is no secret that New England faces an energy crisis. As rate payers we currently pay the highest prices in the country for natural gas. This not only hurts our family budgets, but local businesses will not hire or expand without having utility cost reliability.

Gas capacity and accessibility constraints threaten to slow production and will further hurt economic recovery. The unemployment rate in the Commonwealth across many sectors is still too high and we cannot afford to sit back and wait. I ask FERC to approve and support this project, let's get our region back on track and most importantly let's get people back to work building our energy future.

And on a side note, I've got a nephew who is 19 years old. He's a Navy vet and the last note that he wrote to his dad was that he was manning a well so when marines get show they fall down and he is there on the ground to help pick them up. If there is any way -- I'm sorry, I'm sorry for your farms and I'm sorry for all your stuff, it sucks, it sucks, I would just like my nephew to come home, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Francis Callahan?

MR. CALLAHAN: Hello for the record my name is Francis Callahan. F-r-a-n-c-i-s C-a-l-l-a-h-a-n. I'm the President of the Massachusetts Building Trades Council representing 74 local unions in the construction industry and 75,000 men and women who are the best trained, most highly skilled safest work force in the construction industry not just in Massachusetts but anywhere in the United States.

There has been some talk tonight about need. We heard conflicting reports but I will just go through a few things that tell me that there is clearly a need for this natural gas pipeline. The synergy report which was released in January and commissioned by the Patrick Administration, as a side note Governor Patrick was a skeptic on the need that's why they commissioned this report and they projected that in 2010 we will need between 600 and 800 billion cubic feet of additional natural gas in Massachusetts and by 2030 we will need between 600 and 900 billion cubic feet in Massachusetts.

The cost -- you just have to look at your energy bill here in Massachusetts to know that we have the highest energy costs anywhere in the region and in some parts of the country. I am reluctant to use this number because it is so high that people think it is made up but our natural gas costs are six times that of the state of New York.

There is another reason that I know we will have some need. We just began construction with the men and women that I just talked about, some of them in Salem as we convert our energy facility and energy production facilities from coal to a much cleaner and better burning natural gas and that is continuing.

We are also looking at the loss of assets in Massachusetts and in New England as we decommission the Martin Yankee Power Plant and other facilities around the region. I also want to talk a little bit about jobs and economic development.

As I mentioned we represent construction workers, people who work hard every day, get up very early, they bring their skills and sweat to the job. This project along will create 3,000 construction jobs, those will be union construction jobs again, the most highly skilled, best trained, safest work force in America and they will earn family-sustaining wages, union wages and benefits so that they can work safely, they can work productively, support their families, provide health insurance for their families, a good quality of life for their communities, and retire with dignity after a lifetime of work.

And those will be local workers, all up and down that corridor from western Massachusetts, central Massachusetts, and eastern Massachusetts and portions of New Hampshire when it goes through there. This also opens up additional jobs for economic development. I say this in my capacity as President of the

State Building Trades, I am involved with developers, with economic development councils, with different boards and commissions and one of the questions we always hear is we always hear that Massachusetts is a high cost state and we are but the one that really tops the charts is energy costs.

These contractors come in and they say we can't build here because of the energy costs, this is one way to bring that down and bring those good jobs to Massachusetts, I urge you to support the pipeline.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Nick Miller?

MR. MILLER: My name is Nick Miller, M-i-l-l-e-r. I don't believe that the NED Pipeline Project is needed. If approved by FERC the pipeline will likely become part of the massive overbuild of the natural gas pipeline capacity in New England, one that will surely lead to the export of gas from the region and export sales will then put upward pressure on our local natural gas prices.

But Kinder Morgan may be convinced that New England needs this pipeline, why is that? Because when FERC considers a pipeline proposal they use only a market based definition of need. If an energy company can produce long-term contracts for a portion of the capacity of a pipeline that's all that FERC requires when determining need.

For many reasons I believe that this is a faulty definition of need. It doesn't take into account the many other natural gas pipelines being proposed for New England. It doesn't take into account the corporate ties between the pipeline company and the gas companies willing to sign these contracts, and it doesn't take into account renewable energy options and additional peak shaving, increase the conservation and many other possibilities that could help to meet our energy needs here in New England.

But for the moment I am going to set aside my objections and accept FERC's distorted definition of need so for the next couple of minutes I will agree with FERC, signed contracts equals pipeline need. With this definition of need in mind let's now turn our attention to the so-called Fitchburg lateral.

Can someone at FERC please explain to me the need for this lateral? There is no apparent demand for any of the gas that the lateral might supply, the local gas distribution company at the end of the lateral has stated that they do not need additional capacity. No gas utility has approached the DPU with a required notification that they are interested in any of this gas, so please FERC explain it to me. Why is it that when we get to this lateral your definition of need suddenly evaporates?

If a market-based definition of need is used to justify the construction of the main NED Pipeline despite all of the damage and down sides that the pipeline will bring with it, how can Kinder Morgan then be allowed to simply add laterals to that pipeline willy nilly without there being a clear need for them?

When FERC gets to Mason on the pipeline map why do they suddenly abandon their market-based definition of need? Let's imagine for a minute that the Fitchburg lateral was a separate, stand-alone pipeline proposal. Because it runs from New Hampshire into Massachusetts it would still be an interstate pipeline under FERC's control but the project would not be in the pre-filing stage and there would not be any scoping meetings such as the one we are attending here tonight.

And why not -- because Kinder Morgan would never have applied to FERC for a certificate just for the Fitchburg lateral -- the pipeline company knows that this lateral would simply not meet FERC's definition of need. The project would be a non-starter so again I'm asking FERC to please help me out here, explain the need for this lateral and exactly how you determine that need because even when I try to play by your own rules I just don't get it, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, Emily Norton?

MS. NORTON: My name is Emily Norton, E-m-i-l-y Norton, N-o-r-t-o-n. I live in Townsend. History is filled with examples of perceived needs resulting in short-sided decisions that cause more harm than good. According to FERC need is determined by very limited criteria, primarily the number of contracts a pipeline company is able to negotiate.

Once FERC concludes a need for a pipeline it approves the pipeline construction despite the fact that the pipeline will forsake other critical needs. I ask you to use wiser criteria to determine need. We need a

clean, safe drinking water supply. We need a habitable climate that will continue to support earth's ecosystems and agriculture for our food supply.

We need freedom from our addiction to fossil fuels. These are true needs necessary for the survival of human civilization. We cannot survive without a habitable climate and adequate food supply and clean water whether you like it or not the decisions that you FERC make to approve more and more fossil fuel infrastructure are also decisions that you make to endanger our water and food supply and exacerbate climate change.

If you approve this pipeline proposal your decision will threaten the survival of our children and grandchildren. We need FERC to acknowledge the gravity of the decision that you will make. We need FERC to admit that its definition of need is outdated and short-sighted at best and dangerous at worst. We need FERC to update its definition of need. We need FERC to remember you are human beings first and cogs of a dysfunctional system second.

We need FERC to find the courage to say no to a project that is wrong for the people. I can't believe that I need to ask you people of FERC to value the human survival needs above the profits of a pipeline company. Yes, we need energy but we need you to decrease our use of fossil fuels while we increase the use of green renewable energy sources.

We need FERC to be a part of the solution not part of the problem.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, Mr. Hewitt:

MR. HEWITT: Richard Hewitt, R-i-c-h-a-r-d H-e-w-i-t-t. I'm from Groton. I would like to address the concerns about heavy metals and other toxins known to be in the sediment of the Nashua River, particularly the section of the river just upstream from the dam in Pepperell, Massachusetts where Kinder Morgan's original, now alternate route is proposed.

The Nashua River is currently under active consideration by the U.S. Forest Service for designation as a national treasure as a wild and scenic river. This would be a milestone achievement for a remarkable citizen-initiated environmental movement that was featured in National Geographic Magazine and earned the movement's founder, Maria Stauter, international recognition from the United Nations.

While I am speaking about one river tonight I believe my concerns may well apply to other rivers and streams in Massachusetts and New Hampshire because of our shared industrial past, when water-powered mills could be found in small and large towns across New England. In addition to power these mills also use these rivers to dump their industrial waste and this combined with the widespread use of rivers has opened urban and agriculture sewage resulting in heavy pollution of many rivers such as the Nashua.

Today on the news we witness in slow motion the train wreck that is occurring in southern Colorado and New Mexico's toxic spill in the Apolis River as it makes its way to the Gulf of Mexico. When efforts began in the late 60's to save the Nashua there was much muster like there is today only more frequent and on a daily basis.

Sometimes the river was famous for different colors on different days, red, blue, yellow, depending on the heavy metal and the dumping of chemicals and other contaminants into the river from the mills and sewers in Fitchburg and Londonderry. Locals knew you couldn't live within a half mile of the river during the summer because of the stench that you were getting from it and swimming and fishing were unthinkable.

Fast forward to today and the river's, the designation is a natural resource. Today the river is a recreational magnet for the region with boating, fishing, swimming and adjacent hiking and rail trails that in turn spawn local businesses. There is abundant wildlife on the river including beaver, otter, bobcat, bear, deer, fish, turkey, heron, ducks, osprey, endangered turtle and fish among the many others.

The areas on both side of the river where Kinder Morgan proposed to lay the pipeline is so rich in wildlife and that goes to the importance that both sides have been designated by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as areas of critical environmental concern.

As beautiful as the river is today heavy metals and contaminants of yesterday are still present in the fixed

sediment on the river's bottom, especially where it collects just below the Pepperell area. These heavy metals and other chemicals have collected there for decades, yet this is precisely where Kinder Morgan proposed its drilling.

The vibrations from heavy equipment drilling and excavation could very easily disturb the sediments lying on the bottom, potentially releasing these levels of chemicals into the water. We are all witnessing heavy environmental economic and agriculture damage as toxins release into the river like in Colorado and we don't want to see it repeated here or in any of the other similar rivers throughout Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

Okay I respectfully request that monitoring, that a determination of what toxins are in the river now and that there be continued monitoring during the construction process and if there is any release that steps are taken to stop the drilling until those things are rectified, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Veronica Kell?

MS. KELL: Veronica Kell, V-e-r-o-n-i-c-a K-e-l-l. I'm from Townsend, Massachusetts and I'm speaking for the Townsend Conservation Commission. The Townsend Conservation Commission stands in opposition to the proposed Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline and we are confident that FERC will take our concerns into consideration when reviewing this proposal.

Conservation Commissions in Massachusetts are charged with the responsibility of open space and natural resource protection in our communities. Tennessee's pipeline would cross all of the head waters of the Squanacook River, clearly at least a 100 foot wide construction corridor across each one of them. An undetermined number of trees would be cleared along the corridor and a 50 foot wide permanent easement without any tree canopy would be required.

Of the 27,560 linear feet of pipeline proposed in Townsend, 81% of the pipeline crosses the aquifer protection district, the source of Townsend's water supply. 20% of the high yield aquifer, 25% is in DEP water supply zone 2, 100% of the proposed pipeline route is in the Squanasic area of critical environmental concern, 52% of it is located in the priority habitat of the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act.

11% traverses through intact forest corridors. Much of the pipeline path is through Article 97 protected open space. Please analyze and quantify the long-term effect that the pipeline will have on these resources. Please explain how these effects will be mitigated by Tennessee Gas Pipeline.

Assurances that there will be no effect on surface or ground water of a 6 foot deep urban cut trench through outstanding resource waters are easy to make but the damage done can be irreparable. We have yet to be shown that there will be no negative impact on ground water when blasting a trench through bed rock. There are more than 50 homeowners along the proposed pipeline route who have private wells, all of the 65 plus homes along the path have private septic systems. How will drilling and blasting impact these wells and systems?

What are the effects on surface water temperatures with a permanent open canopy? How will opportunistic, invasive species filling in that void be treated other than with herbicides?

Townsend held a special town meeting in July, 2014 and unanimously opposed the pipeline. Townsend residents have long recognized what they had and know that it is worth protecting. FERC's statement of policy Docket Number PL99-3-000 states that certificate policy should be designed to foster competitive markets, protect captive customers and avoid unnecessary environmental and community impacts while serving increasing demands for natural gas. Please consider other existing supply options that will have less impact on the environment in determining whether to issue a certificate, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. 13? 14?

MS. ARGO: Sorry if that was 14 my apologies, I couldn't hear. Emily Argo. E-m-i-l-y A-r-g-o. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opposition to the Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline's proposed Northeast Direct Expansion and so-called Fitchburg and Lynnfield laterals in this forum.

I was born and raised in Townsend, Massachusetts. This is a town that values open space and has shown

its commitment to this through protecting lands through conservation measures. The installation of the Fitchburg lateral would irreparably damage many of the conserved areas in Townsend and place residents at risk. Kinder Morgan has been unable to demonstrate the need for this lateral and has not disclosed the customer requesting the construction of this lateral.

Please identify the need and evaluate the necessity of this lateral given that Kinder Morgan upgraded the pipeline to this terminus from the south in the past 7 years. Additionally, I request that FERC evaluate all alternatives to this pipeline and its laterals including the no build option. In addition to my residence in Townsend I am also a graduate student at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, examining residential water conservation practices and behaviors in the Ipswich River watershed.

The watershed is being heavily impacted by the Lynnfield lateral. Two of the towns the lateral passes through Wilmington and North Reading are towns where I have been focusing my research. These and almost all towns in the watershed initiate outflow water and restrictions every year to help protect the Ipswich River.

The Ipswich River is identified as one of the most endangered rivers in the United States in 2003 by American Rivers and since then the towns, their residents and conservation organizations have worked to protect the Ipswich River. Over 350,000 residents and businesses rely on the Ipswich for drinking water. The impact of this pipeline on the environment and hydrology of an already taxed system needs to be evaluated and not just the impacts on towns the pipeline would be constructed in but on the entire watershed.

The effects of a pipeline and associated laterals will not end at the town's boundaries. I ask that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission make sure that Kinder Morgan stringently evaluates the impacts of this proposed pipeline and the laterals on the air, the water, the flora and fauna and the communities within which they have been proposed and all towns within all watersheds impacted by the construction of this pipeline.

Kinder Morgan should fund an independent research team to conduct a study of baseline conditions at sites that adequately evaluate the state of the eco-system within each of the watersheds they would be impacting. They should also provide funding to continually evaluate these sites during and after construction should this pipeline be approved.

My final point is this it will be my generation that will be trying to remedy the effects of this pipeline on our natural resources. Fossil fuels have already been identified as the leading contributor of climate change. In fact many of my peers are already working tirelessly to remedy the damage caused to our natural resources by previous generations. Please evaluate how this pipeline system excuse me that Kinder Morgan has proposed will contribute to climate change, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, Stephanie Scherr?

MS. SCHERR: Stephanie Scherr, S-c-h-e-r-r, Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire. From student to teacher, I live in Fitzwilliam, New Hampshire and work closely with the town of Troy, Richmond and Winchester residents, selectmen, planning boards and environmental organizations and elected officials. Those of us opposing the Kinder Morgan NED Pipeline want you to halt these scoping hearings and restart the process giving landowners the full 60 days they are allowed.

Just a few weeks ago Kinder Morgan submitted an alternate route in Winchester, New Hampshire, where people descended upon the rural town like vultures to survey line and negotiate deals with uninformed landowners. When property owners asked them to leave or call the police, they returned to harass landowners another day.

Between both routes there are 97 affected and abutting landowners, not including these in our issues. Hugh McGovern who was here tonight is a Massachusetts resident who owns 335 acres of farm land in Pleasant Valley in Winchester, New Hampshire. Regardless of which route is taken Mr. McGovern's property is impacted and the pipeline will blast through Pulpit Falls conservation land and a large aquifer that serves Winchester and other towns.

This past Friday, August 7th the route changed again, this time in Richmond, New Hampshire, without notification to the town Kinder Morgan showed up on the front porch of homeowners at dinner time to let them know that the pipeline would now go through their homes.

In one case the resident was told that the pipeline route would go past the front lawn of their home and through the driveway and that they would no longer have access to their home. This new route suddenly deserted all of the property of a large company in town and understandably residents suspect a deal.

Just days ago Kinder Morgan announced more open houses. You would think Kinder Morgan had last winter, Kinder Morgan achieved a small local venue that distributes information that is not just limited but is deceptive. They show photos of compressor stations that are buildings the size of a backyard shed while the actual proposed compressor stations are the largest on the east coast. They offer maps that are dark and lack detail and some of them are intentionally dark.

Hayden Hills, Kinder Morgan's Blue Man Group had to use a flashlight to show residents attending their open house. We are unimpressed by FERC and Kinder Morgan stating that the pipeline has been down-sized to 30 inches when they stated from the beginning at it was 36 inches.

Their MO is to just to let large and then decrease to a lower size and let homeowners think that their concerns have been considered and appeased and then to increase or add pipeline or compression stations. The FERC gave its right to promote all the outdated, filthy energy technology people by sleazy dealers for slimy fossil fuel executive, yes Mr. Fore I mean you.

I have dedicated my life to environmental education and promoting clean energy alternatives. I want students to experience a sense of awe that comes from appreciating the grandeur of nature, I don't care that my time is up.

Our youth are hungry for a hopeful world, you are incapable of giving it to them they look at what you can offer in the world of renewables and they answer no, they know that their answer is clear, they eagerly look for the day when you go out of business.

I will do my best to educate them so if they are not able to do that I will be helping them. Seal the leaks in the existing pipeline and send Kinder Morgan back to Texas, rural lives matter.

MR. TOMASI: 18?

MS. SCHONGAR: Hi my name is Jennifer Schongar, J-e-n-n-i-f-e-r S-c-h-o-n-g-a-r and I live in Mason, New Hampshire. I am not directly affected by this pipeline but I am here to talk about the unconstitutional act of taking personal property through eminent domain for corporate gain.

Everyone who has looked at the numbers knows that high -- sorry, that the energy shortage in New England two winters ago was fabricated. ISO New England tried to implement a new winter reliability program and it failed horribly and we all paid for it through higher energy prices.

The root of the problem was that they refused to buy electricity from gas generators using stored LNG. The lower costs we experienced during a much harsher winter this past winter was a clear indication that there is no shortage of natural gas, that is a fact.

The Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline which is the large pipeline from Dracut, MASS up to Canada has asked to have its flow reversed which will send the natural gas that is supposedly for New England up to the export facility in Canada, that is a fact. Industry specialists have predicted that when this natural gas gets exported, the price of natural gas for us will go up 200 to 500% to compete with the price of natural gas in Europe that is a fact.

The town of Mason with this 12 inch high pressure lateral pipeline going through will get no benefit from this pipeline ever. Mason can't even afford to run internet wires above ground, there is no way it will ever be able to afford to run natural gas to individual houses that is a fact.

This pipeline and lateral will go through many state forests and conservation land, land that has been set aside to help mitigate the destruction that is happening to other parts of the world. You can effectively

mitigate the areas that are already there to mitigate other contaminated areas. That is a fact.

100% of the New Hampshire towns that are affected by this pipeline oppose this pipeline. That is a fact. Property values are already being hit hard by this pipeline, Kinder Morgan, with FERC's approval will be stealing thousands of dollars from each property owner as well as from the other residents in each town who now have to pay higher taxes because the properties directly affected will lose value just so Kinder Morgan, a private company can make a profit selling this natural gas overseas. That is a fact.

So I am here today to express my outrage at the unconstitutional actions that Kinder Morgan is proposing and FERC is considering. This isn't just happening in New England, this push to export natural gas is happening all over the U.S. right now. FERC needs to understand that the American people are outraged and we won't let this happen without a fight.

MR. TOMASI: Laura Lynch.

MS. LYNCH: My name is Laura Lynch, L-a-u-r-a L-y-n-c-h. I live in Temple, New Hampshire. The Pennsylvania Alliance for Clean Water and Air has just updated their list of the harmed, this is an ever-growing list of the individuals and families that have been harmed by fracking of fracked gas for oil production in the United States. It was recently updated on July 21, 2015.

If you think that this pipeline and compressor station will not bring harm to us you need to go ahead and read the list. There have been 16,447 families harmed and it is still growing. Just think, 16,447 families affected by pipelines, compressor stations in causes such as fires, explosions, soil and ground water contaminated with Benzene, mercury, lead and arsenic, fumes from the blow downs which are causing pollution in the air so bad that they cannot stay outside their homes, in their yards for any length of time due to the smell of methane.

At times the smell lasts for hours and the fumes cause nausea, nose-bleeds and breathing problems and that is just the short term. Jennifer Young of Northampton County, Pennsylvania states that she cannot do any yard work because she gets nauseous being outdoors too long. She also states that the noise from the 3,000 horsepower compressor station which is 700 feet away from her house is so loud that at night they cannot sleep with their windows open.

Her house is unsaleable. Can you imagine, this is a 3,000 horsepower compressor station and they are trying to tell us that a 40,000 horsepower compressor station will not be a problem to us. Here is a list of states that these 16,447 people are living with these issues. They are North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Texas, West Virginia, Colorado, Montana, California, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Wyoming, Ohio, New Mexico, New York, Missouri and Mississippi and if this is built it will also have Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Hampshire on it too.

A little note to the union guys, let me ask you this. If you have to think about your own family being affected by this would you be fighting us or joining us? What if your mother was suffering from cancer or your wife is pregnant and because of the air pollution or the poison in the water your child is born deformed or mentally challenged, is Kinder Morgan going to stand by you like you are standing by them?

If your child cannot go outside and play because of the pollution in the air caused by the blow downs and you find yourself rushing her or him to the ER because for some reason she or he cannot breathe, will Kinder Morgan stand by you like you stand by them?

What if this was in your back yard, would you still stand up for Kinder Morgan because they sure in hell would not stand by you. Ask the 16,477 families on this report if the gas companies across this country are standing up for them. No they are not, all they are thinking about is their profits. So before you fight us for this pipeline you should go to the website and read the list of the harms, show it to your wife or your child or a parent and let them tell you what they think then I want you to tell all of us here that the stories we are hearing are untrue and this pipeline and compressor station is safe.

60,477 families can't all be wrong who do you think we should believe, you or them? I read an article in the Lowell Sun this week, Kinder Morgan has promised that the ending project will be 107 union-made

and it will create as many as 3,000 jobs along its route.

MR. TOMASI: Your time has expired thank you. 15?

MR. TARBELL: Hi my name is Eddie Tarbell, E-d-d-i-e T-a-r-b-e-l-l- Jr. I am a union laborer of Local 39 of Fitchburg and I would like to express my support for this project. I would like to highlight that Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas have acted as responsible pipeline operators and neighbors of Massachusetts for decades.

They are leading in the effort in finding a solution to the high regional energy costs that are crippling our family budgets and closing businesses. Our family needs help and this company is stepping up and investing billions to aid our local economy. I urge FERC to approve and support this project, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you 16?

MS. CAMADAY: Hi, it's me again, Patricia P-a-t-r-i-c-i-a Camaday C-a-m-a-d-a-y. As you can see by the concerned citizens gathered here tonight that Kinder Morgan has succeeded in blurring state lines. We are simply the states of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, we are a united village.

In the last few weeks the Marcellus shale has been downgraded by 90% and I often wonder what will be the legacy of this pipeline project? A few temporary jobs, fire and domestic energy prices once the majority of the liquefied natural gas is exported to foreign markets, devastated forest and wetlands and a sickly populous, this is not the New England I want for our children but since you have asked how we can minimize, mitigate and compensate here's a short list of my favorite recommendations if and only if FERC Commissioners approve this unnecessary project.

Number 1: Kinder Morgan should pass a bond of 15 million dollars or more, the exact amount TBD for each town along the pipeline area so there is money immediately available if wells or aquifers are compromised in any way.

Number 2: Kinder Morgan should set a escrow account for the decommissioning of the pipeline, contributing millions of dollars a year, the exact amount TBD. The money should be held and used only for pipeline renewal.

Number 3: Kinder Morgan should be required to provide free health care for life to anyone who lives or works within 1 mile of the compressor stations in New Hampshire or Massachusetts.

And Number 4: The affected landowners should lease not an easement on their private land, the lease equal to the amount of property tax for the entire land parcel it affects paid yearly.

I will be electronically submitting additional recommendations to Docket PF14-22 but the exact number is TBD. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Number 20?

MR. MATTHEWS: Hello it's me again. My name is Sam Matthews, that's Sam as in Uncle and Matthews, M-a-t-t-h-e-w-s. I feel bad for the union guys here. We have talked to them, you are just like us. If you listen to these guys they can tell you that they have done a long line of good and we should appreciate it. They have built schools, they have built libraries and fire stations, its a long accumulation of good.

But now they are reduced to this, a gas delivery system that poisons us. I'm from New Ipswich in New Hampshire. I'll try not to make this solely about New Ipswich but just use it as an example. So we have proposed a gas delivery system in our town which has the following characteristics: It is to be built on a known brown-field site, highly contaminated with lead. It's a half a mile from an elementary school. It sits at the head of a stream flow into the town of Greenville's only water supply.

It is sited next to a nunnery. It is placed next to an organic farm. Thank goodness we have got to deal with Kinder Morgan, a self-proclaimed good neighbor. Just think how bad this could have been if it had been somebody who didn't like us, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, 21.

MR. OLIVIERI: Okay is my mic on? Luke Olivieri, L-u-k-e O-l-i-v-i-e-r-i. Commissioners, your on-the-

road endurance and diligence with which you assume your role as the decision makers in this issue helps you to earn well the salary that they provide. I trust that you take your job seriously in serving the public interest and protecting our common interests of air, water and land and also thanks for the mic but John Adams did not use a microphone and I certainly don't want to turn my back on my neighbors.

MR. TOMASI: If you don't speak into the microphone your comment won't be in the record.

MR. OLIVIERI: Okay what an exciting time to be alive. We are on the cusp of a massive energy transformation. Non-polluting solar, wind and tidal technologies are operating and can provide great jobs. Research at MIT in nanotechnology with input from UCLA professors will bring the next wave of super-efficient solar cells.

Under water turbines will be placed in Maine where President Roosevelt in 1936 came close to launching an electricity project using the continuous power of the tides. We are also witnesses the last gasp for fossil fuels, an industry that has burned us into climate crisis, often working hand in hand with government to trump on our hard-earned protections of nature.

Fortunately we have community rights ordinances with which to non-violently repeat, non-violently block any corporate project within our towns. Now, who knows who wrote this, "I hope that we shall crush in its birth the aristocracy of our money corporations which dare already to challenge our government to a trial by strength and bid defiance to the laws of our country." Does anybody know who wrote that? No? Close.

Thomas Jefferson wrote that at the inception of this country. Why? Because he knew that corporate greed was and is a massive danger, note 1418 miles of to be determined pipeline that would transport methane and deadly chemicals from Pennsylvania to Dracut only to be sold to Europe.

On Pennsylvania farms adjacent to leaking fracking wells that have toluene and benzene, calves are now being actually born without irises or pupils in their eyes. Note to children from Fitchburg and they are lying in cancer wards with vacant eyes because of blow off from nearby compressor stations.

Let know the clamoring call for a new green governance ring forth from this beautiful hamlet of Lunenburg to then be heard in the bespectacled halls of MIT and Harvard where our clean energy inventions are being born. South woods still to our nation's capital where law makers are constitutionally required to respond to the will of the people and then resound yet farther afield to a much greater power in Geneva and New York City.

The United Nations can be presented with an exposition of how this proposal like so many other projects now up and running away with profit and pollution would also threaten human health and wildlife reproduction including those pesky insects critical to pollination without which there are no vegetables or fruits.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MR. OLIVIERI: I have one more paragraph. Oil from BP Gulf spill will lie under the sand for decades. Mining happens against federal law in our national parks. I consider these callous activities to be crimes against humanity and a bad slap in the face for our grandkids. The atmosphere can no longer be used as a sewer so hopefully my friends will allow me to speak on their behalf just a tad, after all this huberous and criminal behavior of oil companies, we now have zero tolerance for a government of the corporation, by the corporation and for the corporation, we will not be bullied, we will be represented with honesty, we will congregate and fortify one another in protecting our precious and essential natural resources so that --

MR. TOMASI: I'm sorry sir your time is up.

MR. OLIVIERI: So that life itself shall not perish from the earth, thank you.

MR. BISBEE: Hello my name is Nathan Bisbee, N-a-t-h-a-n B-i-s-b-e-e. I am a highly skilled union laborer that has 7 licenses that I have to renew every year to be efficient and to make projects go smoothly. As a skilled construction craft laborer this project to me represents the promise of a home for my family, food on the table and an opportunity for me to extend my career in the construction industry for many years.

I urge FERC to approve and support this project, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up we have number 23? 24 get ready we are going to take a break when 25 is done.

MR. BUSWELL: Willis Buswell. W-i-l-l-i-s B-u-s-w-e-l-l. I am in support of Kinder Morgan's proposed Northeast Energy Direct Project. As a construction laborer this project represents the promise of good family supporting jobs for the region. As a consumer it insures a cheaper, cleaner and more reliable fuel source.

Laborers built pipelines across America safety and efficiently. We have access to to-notch training in Hopkington MASS to ensure that these projects are built on time and on budget. Kinder Morgan and especially specifically Tennessee Gas Pipeline is and always has been a responsible neighbor as a pipeline owner in this community and region for decades, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next number 24?

MR. SPAGNOLA: Hello my name is John, J-o-h-n Spagnola S-p-a-g-n-o-l-a. I would like to thank Lunenburg for inviting me tonight. I am a union laborer who lives and works in Massachusetts. I would like to express my full support for the NED Project. The purpose of Kinder Morgan, I urge FERC to approve the project so it can bring much needed reliable energy sources and good paying jobs to the region, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Number 25, 25 Alice -- okay number 26 Elizabeth Ainsley Campbell?

MS. CAMPBELL: Thank you. I'm a Lunenburg resident. I'm Elizabeth Ainsley Campbell, E-l-i-z-a-b-e-t-h second word, A-i-n-s-l-e-y Campbell, C-a-m-p-b-e-l-l. I am the Executive Director of the Nashua River Watershed Association an environmental non-profit that protects land and water resources. Our service area includes towns on the currently proposed route for NED Brookline, Mason, Milford, New Hampshire and Townsend and Lunenburg, MASS.

Our area also includes the Massachusetts towns that were on the originally proposed route, Ashby, Townsend, Pepperell, Groton and Dunstable. As originally proposed to our service area, NED's main pipeline would cross over 2 miles in 8 medium or high-yield aquifers, 21 protected conservation areas, 25 wetlands and 27 streams, 3 and miles of the Massachusetts bio-mapped areas, 6 primary habitats of rare species areas and 8 miles of Squanasic and Pinapala areas of environmental concern.

The currently proposed Fitchburg lateral also passed through over 6 miles of the Squanasic ACEC and our feeling is this pipeline poses the greatest risk to our ACEC designation by the Commonwealth. Furthermore as mentioned the several tributaries to the Sequana River crossed by the lateral are designated as outstanding resource waters pursuant to the Massachusetts River Sanctuary Act and the lateral will pass through as mentioned over 3.5 miles of the Willow Brook state forest, identified as an ecological extension service by the Mass. Audobon as a focus area to remain intact.

The currently proposed main route in New Hampshire crosses through the heart of the particular important 12,000 acre Badger Hill, Spalding Brook focus area and that's in the Mason four corners area. It is a focus area that was identified by the ecological services -- extension service as a top priority area to maintain undisturbed, un-fragmented for wildlife and habitat protection.

Despite the currently proposed co-location along the existing power line it would nonetheless result in doubling the size of those rights-of-way, much more direct loss of habitat, a wide corridor will increase the fragmenting impacts.

The Fitchburg lateral in Mason, New Hampshire would also create a green field of clear cut on the rural 1 and additional miles of important Badger Hills Spalding Brook focus area and the issue is forest fragmentation.

The NED proposed routes through our service area are unnecessary, unwise and that will result in significant, irreversible damage. We are a member of the Northeast Energy Solutions Coalition, our attorney, Mr. Devito about what you are doing by eliminating documents that can be found on www.energysolutions.org, evidence is lacking that justifies any of the routes and we believe the pipeline itself can be avoided if

all options are more fully explored, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are going to take a break now, we will be back here at 9:35.

MR. TOMASI: If everyone would take their seats and quiet down we will start.

MR. KOWESKY: My name is Rick R-i-c-k K-o-w-e-s-k-y. Thank you for having me here this evening.

My name is Rick Kowesky and I am a union laborer and I would like to express my support for this project. The hard-working men and women of the Laborer's International Union of North America build pipelines all across this country safely and efficiently. We have access to first class training and safety certification programs at our training facility in Hawthorne Mass., specifically designed for the construction of transmission and distribution pipelines.

This project will be built safe, on time and on budget with respect for the environment. I urge FERC to approve and support this project. The time to address the New England energy crisis is now, thank you for your time.

MR. TOMASI: Number 28? Not here, 29?

MR. MELANSON: My name is Joe Melanson, M-e-l-a-n-s-o-n. I'm a retired laborer. I have been in the construction industry for 43 years. I help build roads, I have done almost everything, I have worked underground, I have worked in Hawaii, I've worked here. I heard a lot of things today which I think a lot of people are misinformed. Number one is they don't cut through a river they go underneath a river, they tunnel it, it is like a lateral they go about 15 feet in the ground and then when they get to something that they have to go through, with technology today they go right underneath.

Laborers and operators are well trained and I'm kind of glad that you are having this meeting in this town because I'm a little confused. I heard people here today say that there was no need for the energy, we have plenty of energy, the cost is reasonable. This is the town that led the fight against UniTel when we had the ice storm and they are still taking these people to court.

This is a town that complains that the light bills and the fuel is way too high. They were over here saying oh it's okay, this and that, nobody wants to destroy anybody's property. If they go through they fix it up almost to the way it was and the Tennessee gas line that came here 5 years ago, I go by there I don't see any difference and the people were well compensated if they had to tear down a tree or that so I just don't get what's happening.

I do know one thing though there is a lot of money that was put up somewhere to pay for all of these signs, to pay for all of these badges, somebody put a lot of money up to start this pipeline and I don't know, it's not my job to find out but it is definitely my job to tell you before you leave pick up a copy of the Pittsburgh Sentinel it will tell you that the UniTel our supplier of energy for this town, Pittsburgh and a good part of the region is going to ask for an increase again. So I'm just telling you I am for the line because I like to see my brothers work, I know it's safe and I don't believe that we will bother the environment whatsoever.

Before I agreed to the same some people will even protect a tick that will give you lyme disease so we have a lot of internal problems in this area, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, number 30? Is number 30 here? 31? 32?

MR. PREMUS: Good evening I'm Vince Premus, P-r-e-m-u-s from Pepperell, MASS. -- 32 -- so I'm back again tonight to challenge the case for need from a different angle. So according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, 6 New England states consumed a total of 889 billion cubic feet of natural gas in 2013.

Their same data show that the region's inflow capacity is currently 1709 billion cubic feet per year. This is exclusive of the region's 3 LNG import facilities which sit virtually idle the last few years. Yet in the past they contributed additional capacity of up to 150 billion cubic feet per year.

So my first question is why, despite the natural gas inflow capacity that is nearly twice the region's de-

mand, as Gordon van Welie, CEO of ISO New England persistently claims that we must expand our pipeline infrastructure to keep electricity prices down and avoid the threat of rolling blackouts.

It is well known during a handful of days per year, generators in New England are not permitted to firm pipeline capacity they have been forced to sit idle. They do not permit the long-term contracts of their suppliers and thus they are lower on the priority list. What this means is that electricity price spikes in winter have much more to do with market practice than unwillingness to commit and pipeline constraints, especially given the same winter price spikes that have been observed in parts of the United States where supply and access is abundant.

You would add up all of the gas required to get through these so-called peak shaving intervals during the course of one year to estimate the total on the order of 5 to 10 billion cubic feet or about 1% of the region's annual demand, roughly the equivalent of one or two LNG tankers.

Now to the businessman looking to export natural gas to global markets, the massive over-built pipeline infrastructure looks like the perfect solution to this peak shaving problem. However, people's whose lives are about to be turned upside down by a force-able land taking, via eminent domain, some of the spaces you see here tonight and last night in Dracut -- this is unconscionable.

If ISO New England is truly fuel source agnostic with regard to power generation than the sword dangling over the heads of these working families demands that we ask is there another way. You bet your gas there is. Energy efficiency, demand response, recovery of gas lost to leaks and commercially available storage technology all add up to a resounding yes of this question.

Last night in Dracut you asked for help with your mission to seek a mitigation plan. There are a number of ways which we can mitigate this project and the first is to simply go right to ISO to facilitate the purchase of these one or two or three LNG tankers each winter. Make sure they correctly account for distributed generation and renewals when they arrive at their annual install capacity requirement and just simply hold these guys accountable.

Finish with this -- I implore you to consider the no build option as FERC reviews environmental impact, socio-economic impact and any other impact that is within your jurisdiction to consider. Again like I said last night I implore you to confirm what the numbers already show, the case for need is simply not made

MR. TOMASI: Number 33?

MS. CAMMER: Hi my name is Sarah Cammer, Sarah with an H C-a-m-m-e-r. I speak tonight for myself, a resident of Lunenburg and as a concerned independent PhD geo-scientist trained with public and federal dollars. I too have spent many years of hard work and hard labor working to improve our lives and our land and one of the things I did right after undergraduate is work cleaning up fossil-fuel contaminated sites and level B PPE, full face respirators in 105 degree weather, that's hard work too and I strongly recommend we improve our obligation to clean those things up and to avoid getting involve in those things in the first place.

But my promise tonight Eric is that I have read over 3,000 pages of the July 24th report. I am trained at this point to read such documents and I find it troubling to review so much in such a short time, it just isn't fair to expect land owners and towns without such training to review the whole reports in such a short time, there are a lot of people here who have done a great job.

However, I can't review the whole project, you can't review the whole project and no one at FERC can review the whole project because Kinder Morgan hasn't completed the report. I suggest that you extend the scoping period two months to see if Kinder Morgan eliminates 10,000 TBD's in its report so that everyone can see what they are entitled to as citizens of this country.

That said, in Lunenburg alone, I have already seen shortcomings in the 3,000 pages I reviewed. The lateral has no crime. Presently there is no justification for this location here, the reports tabulates number but fails to identify them. The report failed to identify important headwater streams crossed they are important for drinking water, fisheries and the rest of the state.

Based on the unions I have seen here and lateral already in Lunenburg I suggest the economic justifications of lowering the prices and creating jobs may be erroneous. The jobs forecasted in the previous lateral did not stay here. Lunenburg with a lateral has very high electric rates -- that has everything to do with the electric company here and not with the supply.

And FERC's careful skeptical review of economic plans presented by Kinder Morgan a close examination of every section of this project and how it relates to the previously structured in Massachusetts. Careful weighing of that with the environmental and consequently economic destruction to the state is a standard that I hold this Commission to.

Step back and examine the whole picture including climate change, greenhouse gases and don't let the greedy, destructive, pushy company push you to write the summary decision to give to the to give to decision-makers prematurely until all facts are provided in this case, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MR. ARGO: Dennis Argo, D-e-n-n-i-s A-r-g-o. The Townsend Conservation Land Trust thanks the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline Fitchburg lateral. We are concerned first and foremost that this proposed pipeline is within the squanastic area of political environmental concern. The squanastic ACEC is noted by the state of Massachusetts for its open spaces and habitat resources and for having highly significant drinking water resources present.

All residents of Townsend drink water drawn on from wells in the town. We are concerned about the effect this pipeline will have on our water supply, on wildlife habitat and our wilderness areas. Please analyze how this pipeline is consistent with state and local policy and regulates secluding that with ACEC's of water resources and master plan of the town of Townsend.

Second what is the need of this proposed lateral pipeline? Within the past 7 years the existing pipeline from the south to this same terminus was expanded, called the TGT Fitchburg Expansion Project with a certificate issued by FERC on October 27, 2008. Please delineate the new need that requires a new green field pipeline from the north in such a short timeframe.

Third, what alternatives, including the no build alternative have been considered for this pipeline lateral? If you look around this area what you see are solar panels on more and more rooftops, solar farms and open fields. Please analyze how other sources of energy, particularly renewables, as well as the repair of leaks in existing natural gas infrastructure and other currently proposed gas infrastructure projects and all of these in combination could meet the energy needs of central Massachusetts.

Please examine all alternatives to this proposed route and their viability. Lastly the by-laws of the Townsend Conservation Land Trust states that our purpose is to promote for the benefit of the general public the conservation of natural resources of the town of Townsend including water resources, marsh lands, swamps, wood land and open spaces and the plant and animal life therein.

This lateral crosses north to south a 43 acre parcel from a family expecting it would be maintained in its natural state. The now alternative main pipeline path crosses another two of our parcels. It is ironic that the open space quarter PCLT has worked so hard to build and protect can be commandeered by a private corporation. Please analyze and quantify the impact the pipeline has on a conservation organization.

Please ensure that our properties, our drinking water, our open space, our safety and health are not sacrificed solely for the convenience of Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline providing for their own profit a path for natural gas export while promising us low rates that never materialize, thank you Townsend Conservation Land Trust.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next number 35?

MR. FLETCHER: Yes my name is Garth Fletcher, that's G-a-r-t-h F-l-e-t-c-h-e-r, born in Boston, I have lived the last 45 years in Mason, New Hampshire. I am a little bit concerned by a degree of polarization which is inappropriate and unfortunate. I would like to speak to what you call the socio-economic issues.

I'm not a union member but I am a strong supporter of unions. The good union jobs that were won out of great hardship through the 40's, 50's and 60's and even into the '70's are what built our middle class, built our modern economy. The past 40 years the unions have been under unrelenting assault, legal, political, economic and fairly effective the membership has dropped from 30% down into the single digits.

It's not very surprising that our middle class has stagnated through the last few years. So yes, I get it jobs matter and union jobs really, really matter. I am glad that Kinder Morgan will use union labor. I doubt that is what they had in mind or that's would they would have preferred but it is encouraging to me that unions still have enough clout, they have demanded a fair share in profits from the project. So if the NED gets built, and I hope it will not. Let me repeat that I hope it will not, but if it does get built I will be happy the union laborers will be building it. Unfortunately it will only be in the hundreds of jobs and for a year or two.

However I am very concerned about the long-time effects of the NED Project on jobs. Our most famous regional project, the Boston big dig took 20 years and 20 billion dollars, state and national tax payers will be still paying on that debt 20 years from now. NED is smaller, only 5 and billion now, maybe 8 billion when it gets done, so it is less than half, maybe a third of the big dig but it still is a really, really big expenditure.

Those billions have to come from somewhere and it certainly won't be from Kinder Morgan shareholders or executives. I fear that a lot of that money is going to come from the cancellation of the clean energy projects and that cancellation and deferral could cost thousands of long-term jobs.

I think very few people realize really how big that is. So quoting from the 2014 Massachusetts Clean Energy Industry Report, Executive Summary which is the 4th annual report released by the Massachusetts Clean Energy Center on the size, scope and nature of the Commonwealth's clean energy industry.

Their headline is the Massachusetts Clean Energy industry continues to groom, growing 47% since 2010 to 88,372 clean energy workers and 5,985 firms. Clean energy firms have added more than 28,000 jobs since 2010, this is recorded in 2015. Employers expect to add another 11,700 jobs over the coming 12 months, a 13.3 annual growth rate.

The Massachusetts Clean Energy industry is expected to exceed 6,000 employers and 100,000 workers by early 2015 and to put it in scale with the rest of the Massachusetts economy, clean energy employment is now equal to 2.4% of all workers in the Commonwealth and is responsible for 2.5% of Massachusetts gross state product.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MR. FLETCHER: I'm sorry I will be quick if I may.

MR. TOMASI: How much longer do you have?

MR. FLETCHER: 30 seconds.

MR. TOMASI: Can you file your comments?

MR. FLETCHER: Let me just finish because I want to say that 10 billion dollars is 1 and a half or two NED projects per year in perpetuity and I think those jobs will be gone if NED gets approved so please don't. What I was hoping to do, well I'll put this in.

MR. TOMASI: Please file your comments, thank you. 36, is 36 here, Maryann? No. 37?

MS. HEWITT: Before I get on the clock can I just say I applaud the last speaker's sentiments I am a 20 year union person myself and a career counselor and clean jobs is the way to go. I'm Diane Hewitt from Groton, Massachusetts. This evening I want to look at the big picture of the NED Project through the lens of a terrible national tragedy, the 1986 Challenger Space Shuttle that exploded within minutes of take-off. While this may seem very far field from tonight's discussion I believe the Challenger disaster, which I teach to engineering students as a classic case study in professional ethics, offers a strong, cautionary tale as we consider the Kinder Morgan Project, let me explain.

The direct cause of the Challenger explosion was technical. The failure of O rings, but a Commission set up by the federal government to investigate the cause of the explosion concluded 1: That serious flaws in the decision-making process played an equal if not more important role in the disaster. Had there been an open and transparent communications system that went up and down the ranks they would have caught the rising doubts about the defective part.

Instead serious problems were silenced, issues were not communicated forward.

2: Decisions by top management appear to be done at the expense of flight safety and were in large part the result of political pressure and the need to satisfy a big customer, NASA.

3: Perhaps most critically they did not heed the very serious concerns of 6 mid-level engineers, the whistle blowers who just hours before take-off pleaded with the space center to abort the launch so how does the Challenger inform the NED Project?

In short many of the same conditions exist today. Like the Challenger this massive project is being rushed to launch. Why because it benefits pay out and satisfies a major customer, their shareholders. It continues to speed ahead on their timetable and to their distinct advantage and with an army of lobbyist and allegiance of profession PR folks they misrepresent or simple refuse to provide the facts, they minimize the risk and try their darndest to silence every thorny issue associated with the project.

Like the Challenger we have every reason to believe that decisions will be made at the expense of safety. Why? Because why else would they submit outdated maps, not respond to questions about emissions, not conduct promised studies on blasting near a quarry, minimize the size and scope of compressor station, only odorized pipelines when it is required by law, not have training protocols in place for first responders, the list goes on.

Let's be clear. Kinder Morgan's marginal safety record has been well documented by the Pipeline and Hazardous Safety Administration and by so many speakers here this evening and now are we really to believe that top level decisions about this pipeline would adhere to their slogan safety first? Like the Challenger disaster, FERC also appears to be a closed agency with no real way for anyone to effectively penetrate this deeply flawed bureaucratic system.

How does significant rising doubts matter when FERC has never denied a permit. But here's the big difference between Challenger and the NED Project, NASA had only the voices of 6 mid-level groups on the ground engineers asking them to abort the mission but FERC you have so many more to inform your decision.

You have 3600 written comments, you have 73 towns who have voted in active opposition, an entire Congressional delegations, our municipal coalitions and environmental groups who are all now speaking with one voice. You have had over 3,000 people who have attended these sessions. You have the staunch opposition of well over 60 elected officials from Senator Warren to town selectmen.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MS. HEWITT: One sentence and most importantly you have heard hundreds of articulate well-reasoned comments and questions from your boots on the ground, Massachusetts and New Hampshire residents. FERC we are your army of whistle-blowers we are the voices you need to stop this pipeline and approve the no-build alternative, listen to the people and please do your jobs.

MR. TOMASI: Okay that was 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, okay 44.

MR. KELLY: That would have been 5 or 6 speakers, I like that. Okay, ladies and gentlemen of the region and FERC my name is Kevin Kelly, K-e-v-i-n K-e-l-l-y. I'm the Chairman of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline working group committee for the town of Groton. I would like to begin my remarks with some data from this year to assist all of us with perspective.

I am the manager of the Groton electric light department so I work in electric distribution so this point of perspective is being given as the manager of the Groton manager of the Groton electric light department. I hear many people mention that they are willing to pay a little more to avoid another pipeline being brought

into New England while I would like to give some facts from this year as to what that little more entails. For one month for the rate payers of the town of Groton -- traditionally July is the warmest month of the summer and before the natural gas pipe experience in New England, had the highest energy costs. The average price of electric generation for all hours this last July was 2.6 cents. The average price of electric generation for all hours this past February was 12.3 cents. One of the reasons for this variance is the law requires that the region's heating needs that require natural gas are met before natural gas can be used for electric generation.

The variance due to an inadequate supply of natural gas was 9.6 cents per kilowatt hour between July last month and February of this year which many people have said today was a good month compared to last winter. This February we had the high cost due to electric demand with an inadequate supply of natural gas.

In February the people of Groton 6.7 million kilowatt hours so for the town of Groton, 647,000 dollars was the variance that the people of Groton had to cover between February's power price and July's power price where July is traditionally the highest price of the year.

In the town of Groton our average customer uses 865 kilowatt hours so the swing in power cost from February to July for the town of Groton was \$83.00 per household. Nearly 650,000 dollars for one month for one little town with the average person in the town contributing \$80.00 is unacceptable. And this is before the coal plant at Creeky Point is closed down in the near future.

As the Groton Electric manager I would like to say New England desperately needs natural gas. I don't care who builds it or the route but we need more natural gas transportation. Now as Chair of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Working Group Committee for the town of Groton, if the pipeline returns to its former route where Groton becomes primary again we would like FERC to address the safety impact to the town of Groton, the aquifer impact for the town of Groton, any impact of drilling under the National River and any impact Article 97 lands as well as issues caused by wetland crossings.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up thank you, we are on number 45?

MR. BROUSSEAU: Good evening my name is Mark, M-a-r-k Brousseau B-r-o-u-s-s-e-a-u and I'm the President of the Worcester-Fitchburg Building and Construction Trades Council. I represent more than 5,000 journeymen and apprentice trade craftsmen and women from Central MASS and from this region and I am here to speak tonight in support of the project, the pipeline project.

I also -- we have estimates of 3,000 jobs that this will provide for people in central Massachusetts and I understand that you know the economy is getting better and that the unemployment rates are dropping but I can tell you a lot of that is in the city of Boston. I represent construction workers in center Massachusetts and in this region and this is an economic opportunity to put a lot of people to work that have been out of work for a long time, so we look at this as economic development and we are in favor of this and we are in favor of the jobs for our people that have been out of work for a long time.

Also we do believe that there is a need for this pipeline for increased volume of natural gas to our region. We also believe what we have been told by Kinder Morgan and their analysts about the need for the economic development for the natural gas in this region and we also believe that by bringing a greater volume of natural gas to this region that the rates are going to drop because they are ridiculously high compared to other places in the country, so those are my comments, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next 46? 46? 47?

MR. JEFFREY: My name is Peter Jeffrey, J-e-f-f-r-e-y from Groton, Massachusetts. Thank you for your service to our country in your role as a FERC employee. I am coming here this week to better understand the great number of issues you have heard in these hearings and that you need to use to make your decision.

To that decision I have a few observations I feel warrant repetition, first what is an alternative route? There are a great number of similarities of being a primary alternate route in this application. Every one

of these arguments against this application apply to both the primary and alternate routes. Those routes endanger citizens, destroy precious environment, impose a tax to pay for a utility that the Payee may never have access to and take private property for financial gain of a private, for profit industrial giant. The only way that the alternative route and the primary route are different can be seen in this crowd tonight.

If this hearing was held last summer based on the initial application when the main line ran directly through most of the communities in this area this room would be full of outraged citizens, outraged residents similar to the meeting last night. By calling that route an alternate only the most dedicated opponents understand that your decision could easily make it again the primary route, thus you only see here tonight the most dedicated opponents to this application who have not been lulled to sleep with the false sense of security.

The question is not where this pipeline would go, the question is whether this pipeline is needed at all. Second, who says we need this pipeline? You have heard from a number of people today. You have heard at times that actually in great detail, what many people say including one of your FERC Commissioners, one of your bosses is illegal market priced manipulation in the forward facing auction, how can anyone be sure that the data used to justify the pipeline is not corrupted by greed and influence if even the senior FERC leader believed the result was invalid and should not be upheld.

It is up to you, FERC, to expose any possible corruption of this data. I pray you have the guts to do what is right and call for congressional hearings if needed to look at the actions taken by ISO New England, FERC and the industry when market pricing the separate energy in New England in a forward facing auction.

That forward auction is why large corporations see an opportunity for a huge financial gain by preying on the hopes of the residents of New England that a pipeline would lower the cost of energy and brings jobs in to the region.

Anyone with a basic understanding of economics would realize immediately that the gas that this pipeline would carry is much more valuable if it could reach the Canadian Maritimes. Therefore the idea that a pipeline would drastically reduce the cost of energy is fundamentally flawed. As for jobs, unless the region has a continuous, perpetual cycle of pipeline construction any incremental jobs this application would create will be very short-lived which we have seen in the proposed route construction schedule.

Also the idea that a large number of jobs will employ local workers is flawed. Last month our family traveled cross country and we visited an area with pipeline construction we found it filled with pickups carrying large welding machines pulling fifth wheel trailers all the license plates were either Texas, Louisiana, or Oklahoma. I invite the union employees here tonight to seriously ask their leaders how many jobs have they offered the local employees and how many will be filled by transient but more experienced, who require less training and therefore offer a lower cost?

It's up to you, the public servants and the citizens of this great country, conceived in this precious and historic region to stand up to a corporation with unlimited resources and confirm the flaws in this application and make the only logical decision to deny this application, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Is 48 here? 50? No 50 -- 51? 52 -- 51, 52 okay.

MS. BRODEN: Hi, my name is Maryann Broden, B-r-o-d-e-n. I am a resident from Mason, New Hampshire. I have gone to many FERC Kinder Morgan and pipeline meetings in different towns, Mason, New Ipswich, Temple, Milford, Nashua, New Hampshire and now Lunenburg, Massachusetts. I have heard concerns about the water, air and children in schools being affected along with a multitude of valid concerns.

My husband Robert Broden, Jr. asked two questions at the Nashua scoping meeting. That question was directed to you, he asked of these pipelines that have been submitted to request to be approved by you how many have been denied. Your reply --only one.

Then he asked how many have been approved, your reply you did not know. My husband and I have a

huge concern over this answer. It leaves only one to stand in a ratio of zero denied rate to a questionable overwhelming accepted rate.

My husband then called many of our government representatives from New Hampshire yesterday. He received a letter back from Kelly Ayotte, our new senator. It was a letter sent by our whole congressional delegation to senators and to representatives. It stated that two letters were sent to one the inspector general for the Department of Energy and one to the Chairman of FERC, Norman Bay requesting that FERC seriously look at this process.

I do not have the letter in front of me, it is with my husband since I just found out this meeting was tonight but it seriously asks FERC to apply accurate information upon this matter to apply the 16-304 article to make sure the stakeholders have plenty of opportunities to state our concerns. I noticed that the last scoping meeting was tonight that was written in the papers that were sent out today.

I then asked in what manner you will handle it. I'm glad that these letters were sent out. We need more government representatives to stand up for us. We need the United States to change this continued attack on our home, schools, wildlife, air and water.

Your committee has sent out a letter on page 5 and 6 referring to this bunch of letters that was sent this information. One page 5 and 6 it states the EIS process upon 5 it mentions the EIS will discuss impacts and I'm sure you know geology and soils, water resources and wetlands, vegetation and wildlife, culture, cultural resources, land use, sorry -- land use, recreation and individual resources, socio-economics, air quality and noise, communitive impacts and public safety.

All of these issues have been stated over and over again by us. You have heard all of these concerns more than us and yet judging by the history of Kinder Morgan and the FERC I wonder if even after you address our concerns we will not like your answers. I am requesting that FERC show us in a concrete way that our concerns will indeed be answered.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. 53? Is 53 here? Okay that was actually the last speaker who signed up is there anyone who has not signed up who would like to speak at this point? Anyone that would like to add to their -- what they put on the record already?

MR. HEWITT: Yeah Richard Hewitt again. I would just like to draw attention to the FERC standard of necessity and convenience. Those are two very different things and in my life I know what necessity is, those are things I need to do. What convenience is are things that would be nice to do. There is no necessity here, there is no need, there is a lot of convenience for Kinder Morgan, this is eminent domain for corporate gain and that is really unacceptable, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MR. FLETCHER: Garth Fletcher again I will just finish my paragraph. So I fear those few hundreds of short term jobs may cost much longer term jobs. Of course Kinder Morgan does not care about that but our local work force ought to so I would ask that FERC include an analysis which compares jobs and especially good jobs over the next 3, 5 and 10 years for two cases.

One -- that being built with funding to clean energy being decreased versus that not being built and the money continuing to be invested in clean energy, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Anyone else like to speak? If not you can ask me some questions depending on the questions, I will try and answer.

MR. MILLER: Nick Miller again. I have a theoretical question for you. If there were a theoretical energy company proposing to build a pipeline and they held some theoretical public information sessions at which they lied to the public with pictures and words and FERC was then notified of those lies by multiple attendees, would FERC take any action in this theoretical?

MR. TOMASI: I can't answer in the hypothetical. Are you suggesting if you have any accusations against Kinder Morgan put them in the record.

MR. MILLER: Oh they are there, there are 20 or 30 of them. I can send you a list.

MR. TOMASI: Again one of the things that we have heard yesterday and at other meetings that people are very concerned about you know, for instance they have denied access to their land or that they get letters from companies that are misleading or erroneous, that's something that I need to understand and I need to know.

MR. MILLER: Let me give you a real specific --

MR. TOMASI: We can explore, wait one second. If you have those letters, if you -- please file that on the record so that I can talk to my management about it, this is something that we take very seriously.

MR. MILLER: They have been there for more than a year.

MR. TOMASI: I know I understand that. But again I need to see that if it is something -- that's one of the reasons that we come out to these meetings because I need to understand and talk to the people who actually see these issues and get on the ground, some open houses, that was really early in the process that was what close to six months ago when we did the open houses, we went out to Kinder Morgan for their open houses, that's why we came out to do these meetings so we can hear about these issues and see them and understand them so I heard a lot of concerns about these particular issues, about misleading information from Kinder Morgan as well as access issues. That's something I want to talk to them about because it is something that concerns me greatly and that concerns all of FERC.

MR. MILLER: And the specific is Allen Fore who we all know and love was at the public information meeting this was before the open houses when they were going around to towns, he put up a picture of a small shingled out-building that was part of the 6,000 horsepower existing compressor station in Pelham.

It was not the compressor station it was an out-building that looked -- I googled earth it looks like it's about a quarter of the size of a compressor station and this is a 6,000. He put that up to give people an idea of what a compressor station would look like. When he did that the proposed compressor stations along the middle of the route were 80,000 and 90,000 horsepower stations, that's a lie, it's a lie told with a picture. It had nothing to do with the compressor stations that they are going to have to build for this pipeline. That was reported to you by multiple people.

It was reported by me, it was Garth gave a little more information about it, it happened over a year ago and it got reported over a year ago and there has been multiple ones since, so that's a specific case. It's a lie. That's not what they are going to build it doesn't give you an idea.

It's the equivalent of me holding up a 2 and 1/2 inch pipe to give you an idea of what a 36 inch pipe looks like and the math works, that's a 6,000 horsepower station against at that point again it was a 90,000.

That's what we get from Kinder Morgan at every meeting that I have been too, and specifically from Allen Fore, their main spokesman, that's not somebody who is misinformed on the side.

And there is a picture as big as what you have got up there of this picture that tells a lie and it was done to hundreds of people and it was done in multiple meetings.

MR. TOMASI: The additional open house that they talked about something on the topic, we need to make sure that the information that is put out to the public.

MS. KELL: Veronica Kell, Townsend, Massachusetts and I'm also on the board of the Townsend Conservation Land Trust. I haven't filed this yet but the letter is ready to go. We the land trust were asked for survey permission on this second round for the lateral with the property that is the town dump, it's not our property so the letter that we got requesting survey permissions for a property that was not ours.

We met with Phil Chipman with an attorney present to ask why were we doing this, you know why were you asking us for this property when it is not our property and he really had no clue. Eventually we did get the letter asking for survey permission for our property but quite frankly if you don't know the town's well enough to know what properties you are going through and who the owners are, should you really be putting a pipeline in?

It's really a little bit concerning I would say.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MS. GALET: My name is MJ Galet, G-a-l-e-t from Richmond, MASS. I have a fairly straight-forward question. It all comes down to need and that is what the sole basis for this pipeline. What does it take in percentage when Kinder Morgan has given how much this pipeline can hold and how much they have in contracts? What percentage of that pipeline needs to be filled for you to consider it a valid need to approve their application?

MR. TOMASI: Again I explained this earlier but I will repeat this. I don't actually make the final decision on the project, that's the Commissioners. My job is the environmental impact. They have to do that determination and that determination or their information on that will be outline in the order itself.

After I finish all of my process with the EIS and to draft an environmental impact statement -- after the final impact statement the Commission will issue what's called their order and that would actually contain all the analysis regarding need and also it would explain their rationale for why they decided to either approve or deny the project.

I can't speak for the Commissioners I can't speculate what they would do.

MS. GALET: There has to be some guideline, it can't be willy nilly dependent on the project because of how they feel about this project or whatever. Either there's a percentage that's large enough to validate the need for the pipeline or there's not. How can there be anything else?

MR. TOMASI: I don't know there's criteria data for that.

MS. GALET: Nobody does.

MS. ANADAY: Patricia P-a-t-r-i-c-i-a Camaday C-a-m-a-d-a-y. I would like to follow up on what Nick Miller shared with us about the disingenuous information being shared at the earlier open houses I guess we are calling them. It seems to me that since Kinder Morgan has just announced they will be coming back to do an encore performance of those that that would be a really good time to hold their feet to the fire on those very things that have been identified repeatedly, was misinformation and that they should be required to place in those meeting halls something of the size that they used to propagate the misinformation and to now correct the misinformation with the correct information, and that is my request, that you make that a request at these next open houses, thank you.

MS. DURYING: Hi Susan Durying, D-u-r-y-i-n-g. I am wondering how much progress has been made in your quest to get a venue for Cheshire County for a scoping meeting, how's that coming?

MR. TOMASI: Actually we are still working with the town that has been requested for us, hopefully in the next couple of days we will have information back from the town. This concern about the fire marshal -- we are working with him to try to make sure that it is going to be large enough to handle the crowd.

MS. DURYING: Do you have any idea how much notice the citizens will get?

MR. TOMASI: We all want people two weeks notice. One of the things that we do not want to do and I just know there's going to be times -- which Patricia mentioned as well. We don't want to do it the same weekend as the open house, that is going to cause confusion and we don't want to do that but we need to have it before or after.

MS. DURYING: And one other procedural question, I could be wrong but it seemed like there were a lot of government officials that were not speaking earlier, that were speaking as individuals even though they identified themselves as representing Conservation Commissions and what not and if that is the case I think that maybe you should do a better job before the meeting of getting people in the right line and signing up for the right times.

MR. TOMASI: I understand -- I hear you.

MS. PREMUS: My name is McKenna Premus, P-r-e-m-u-s. I have a question, so when the FERC Commissioners schedule the Final EIS draft statement, do they actually go out along the actual pipeline route?

MR. TOMASI: Well I'm the one who is responsible for the environmental impact statement. The Commissioners are responsible for the final decision and typically the Commissioners will not travel with me when I do that. We obviously inform the Commissioners that's part of my job -- is to make sure they understand the impacts the project is going to have. After I give them my FEIS and they are in their decision-making I will meet with the Commissioners themselves and their staff to make sure that they understand what the impacts are and answer any questions that they may have. It's obviously at their option if they wish to come out to work they can, they have never come out with me but I'm not the lowest staff in the room but I am a staff member, and they are several levels above me.

They can, if they wish to come out and tour any facilities that they wish.

MS. PREMUS: Do you think that should be a requirement them seeing people's land, if they are preparing the actual statement they should see the actual places where somebody -- the environment that is being impacted?

MR. TOMASI: I can't really speak to that, that is something that -- you know I am a staff member I work for them so I can't tell people what to do. It's is something that they can make a decision if they wish to see the project and come out in the field then the can do that.

MS. PREMUS: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Yep.

MS. HEWITT: Diane Hewitt again. To follow-up on McKenna's question, does that mean that the FERC administrators, not the Commissioner will actually walk or travel along the pipeline route?

MR. TOMASI: When you say the Commissioners, you mean me?

MS. HEWITT: I got you, yes and when --

MR. TOMASI: I haven't been out as much as I want to, I have had lots to do a lot of meetings, but we will be looking at this pipeline and alternative routes and I will be coming back, these will not be public meetings, it will be me and my staff coming along looking at the pipeline route as well as alternatives, yes we will do that.

MS. HEWITT: Okay great thank you. One of the things that -- well my question is one of the things that has been asked for repeatedly in these meetings is for additional scoping meetings. So I'm wondering who makes that decision, how quickly the decision will be made and how will that be communicated?

MR. TOMASI: The way it is going to be communicated is for instance, we have one more scoping meeting, we have that -- it is going to be in Cheshire County. There will be another notice similar to what you have gotten before -- about that particular meeting. When we do the draft environmental impact statement the notice that goes out with that will also identify meeting locations similar to these and in this particular meeting I would challenge you to find another project that FERC has done where we have done as many scoping meetings for a project of this size.

We have done a lot more meeting than possible -- than we normally do for a project this size simply because I pushed very strongly for a lot of meetings, having spent a little bit of time in Massachusetts I understand the tradition of having town meetings and everybody wanting to come and come together as a town and talk about projects as well as hear from the people opposing the projects and the government regulators.

I understood that so I pushed really hard. I know people want additional meetings you know and you will probably -- I would encourage you to read some of the requests that came in to the Chairman. He responded to some of those in writing to various town members as well as members of Congress explaining why we couldn't hold additional meetings.

MS. HEWITT: So there won't be any additional meetings?

MR. TOMASI: At this point Cheshire County will be the last meeting.

MS. HEWITT: Will be the last one. It would be great to tie in a tour of New England with a meeting sched-

uled.

MS. ERB: Good evening my name is Julianna Erb, J-u-l-i-a-n-n-a E-r-b, b as in boy. I am from Antrim, New Hampshire, that's 2 hours north of here okay. I have several points that I would like to bring up. This is why I don't speak in public.

MR. TOMASI: Take your time.

MS. ERB: Bald eagles, they just started returning to the area around the compressor station, how are you going to make sure they are not impacted? Okay the ISO New England, they are -- one of the things that I have heard is that they stated that we are currently running at 20 to 80% below 2008 levels, that's an understanding?

MR. TOMASI: Okay my job is to do the environmental work. I am not an expert in the least in issues when it comes to rates or tariffs or that sort of thing that is not my area of expertise.

MS. ERB: All right but no one has ever said that those 2008 levels are so if they were at 50% for example in 2008 and we are at 20 to 80% now, then I would say we have plenty of room in our pipeline and we don't need an expansion, okay. Also related to the last woman's question, is this a law that you need to have one meeting per county that is affected?

MR. TOMASI: Not that I am aware of no. In fact there is no law stating that we even have to have a meeting.

MS. ERB: Wow, that's really citizen empowerment. That blew my mind so much that I can't even remember the rest of the points that I had.

MR. TOMASI: Obviously we want to come out and get meetings that is why we have them, we want to get citizen's input but there is no requirement under the law that we have scoping meetings.

MS. ERB: I'm sure that all makes us sleep better at night.

MS. SULLIVAN: Hi, Colleen C-o-l-l-e-e-n Sullivan, S-u-l-l-i-v-a-n from Groton, Massachusetts. I have been trying to read all of the comments on your FERC website.

MR. TOMASI: Good luck with that.

MS. SULLIVAN: Seriously I know, yeah, I know there's over 3,000 of them and I have read probably 80% of the them. My problem is that some of them I can't access, sometimes your website just says no sorry, so what's the deal with that?

MR. TOMASI: Yeah, well that's an internal matter for FERC. Sometimes, like anything in IT, I have been getting an indication for the last few weeks that we have had issues and I apologize for that on behalf of FERC, that's something that shouldn't happen.

MS. SULLIVAN: Can I go back maybe later on and access it?

MR. TOMASI: Oh yeah, yeah they should be there, the actual system is down occasionally and so if you can't get it at one point come back a few hours later and hopefully they should have it fixed by then.

MS. SULLIVAN: Okay because sometimes -- so the other one --

MR. TOMASI: No, if you keep getting the same issue on a specific one then that's an issue and you should probably contact the secretary's office, there should be a little click on thing that you could click on that would state the problems.

Now one thing I would want to point out is not everything -- there are things filed as privileged.

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, I was going to ask you about that thank you.

MR. TOMASI: And right now there's not a lot of -- right now the things that are filed privileged by the company are as follows: we have mailing lists which is privileged, we have culture resource information which is privileged because for various reasons, you don't want people to know where culture resources are because somebody will steal it et cetera, et cetera, and locations of endangered species are privileged. There's also another level of protection it's called critical energy infrastructure of the Commission. That

level was developed after 9/11 and what it does is anything that could be schematics, detailed drawings of various facilities are filed under CII so that you know, people who might want to attack these facilities could not access them.

Right now unfortunately the only information we have on compressor station, on the detailed information on the compressor stations are filed as CII, that's something that we are going to be talking to the company about that if they can file public versions of those to the people living around the compressor station can actually see more detail about the facility location themselves.

Now also if you file and I mentioned this last night, I forgot to mention it tonight and I apologize. A lot of people may have information about cultural issues on their property or devastations, you can file individual letters as privileged if you don't want, if you are certain that this is information not going out to the public you can file that as privileged to insure that you know only FERC can see it.

Now I do want to point out that if something is filed as privileged I can't use it in the EIS because it is privileged, so we can use it to develop an answer or develop a reason to avoid something and say there is a site here or something we want to avoid on the property but we are not going to identify with any specific location information.

MS. SULLIVAN: That was good, thank you for that. My question was recently, it was either yesterday or the day before yesterday, maybe this morning, they all sort of run together, a notification from Niki Tsongas was submitted to FERC and I couldn't open it, it said this is private, does that happen often or was that just an error?

MR. TOMASI: I have been in the field too so I don't even know what right now?

MS. SULLIVAN: Do you have the refiled docket? Is it the docket change of her statement from last year ---

MR. TOMASI: No, but honestly the thing is it should be accessible, that's the point. That's the point even if it was a re-filing or something different it should be -- you should be able to read it.

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, exactly and that kind of surprised me and I thought oh Niki Tsongas is talking I want to read it and then nothing so yeah I just wondered if it happened with you or if I continue to have issues --

MR. TOMASI: Yeah you can notify the secretary, notify me and we will figure a way to make sure that those get in to the public because you should be able to read the comments.

MS. SULLIVAN: Yes, as crazy as it gets, we like to read the comments, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: And I congratulate you on 80% of the comments. Not many people can say that. There were some people behind me are you next?

MR. FLETCHER: I'll be brief, you asked me a question and I didn't know the answer. When you file something privileged that's accessible to you folks but not to Kinder Morgan?

MR. TOMASI: Yes if you file with us it is privileged. Kinder Morgan will have not access to it yes.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay they were worried about troubles with that.

MR. TOMASI: Kinder Morgan will not have access to that.

MR. FLETCHER: Okay thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Okay so I think we are going to take these last two questions and then we are going to go ahead and end the meeting okay.

MR. BERTHIAUME: I actually have an environmental question. When you put together the environmental impact statement how full looking is that based on what people are saying or companies are saying or is it based on what you project in 2018 or 2025 or 2030?

MR. TOMASI: Well that's looking again at something the Commissioners will look at when it comes to a need of the gas. I can tell you what we do in the environmental impact statement is from a cumulative impact we are supposed to look at past, present, reasonably foreseeable projects and so when we are doing

the cumulative analysis and this is not necessarily need based but that's what I can talk to you about at this point is you know that's the past occurrences have affected the existing environment and that is the basis that we look at.

And therefore we are looking at reasonably foreseeable we look at what projects do we know about, that are being constructed, what have we heard about going out with and it is not just pipelines it is any other industrial or you know, commercial or even residential property, there are variables that you can find information on we are going to be looking at it on the cumulative level and so that can go out -- you know because this particular project I think if it were to be approved you are looking several years out in the future for the truck -- many years and so of course what you are looking at first is all kinds of stuff like emissions what is their permanent impact, especially the operational issues, that's something they look at to the best that they can and looking out as far as you can.

MR. BERTHIAUME: What we are trying to get to is how do you know the energy infrastructure today if you look back 5 short years it is completely different than it was 5 years ago, project it 5 years in the future it is going to change again to the point that I made earlier we have two LNG terminals, one was commissioned in 2008 another one was built and commissioned in 2010 which is the Neptune.

In July of 2013, Judy Essuez had requested a suspension by the U.S. Maritime Administration because granted for 5 years because of over use so how does that -- it is related to the infrastructure and the way the energy generation in this country and the world is changing, how does that project in the factor with an EIS or does it?

MR. TOMASI: I don't think I really have the expertise to answer that part, I do the environmental work. Something that you have this on the record now and something that people who do look at that and make sure that this gets to them so that they can answer it appropriately, and I apologize for that.

MR. BERTHIAUME: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Sir?

MR. PREMUS: Vince Premus, Pepperell. First of all I want to say I appreciate your opening the floor to questions like this at the end. I'm sure when the last person is done speaking and you are able to say this is the last number and you are thinking I'm glad to be done for the evening, you don't have to do this so I appreciate that.

MR. TOMASI: Actually I like -- your impression is it is actually giving me something more to do.

MR. PREMUS: So the question I have is this and I am not going to keep you here until midnight but it may be more than just one but it is a thread so I know Eric you have mentioned a couple of times that your thing is the environmental impact statement, presumably that's your background and that's your responsibility that you're focus on. Now a number of folks in Dracut last night and well as the other scoping sessions and in here tonight, we have got some expertise over the last year and they may not be professionals in the industry but we have done a lot of homework, folks like the gentleman who was just up here Ken Berthiaume, there's Ken Hartledge from Pepperell, you know Peter Jeffrey from Groton, folks that have really researched the interaction between FERC, ISO New England -- I think you mentioned earlier that you are not quite clear how tariffs work -- you know, can't really answer the questions on the tariffs and how they work whatever -- but the fact is that the case for need is really predicated on trusting those entities to act in the interest of the rate payer.

Last night you remember -- if you do remember in Dracut, I mentioned a number of things like the forward capacity option, the gentleman mentioned that tonight where you had a 2 to 2 vote last year, the two Commissioners. Dan Clark said ISO New England, you messed up here, so if this is an environmental impact forum why does it sound like, from your viewpoint, from the Commissioners viewpoint, this is basically a done deal and you are here to try to figure out how to move this thing 50 feet one way or the other to make it fit in someone's back yard so that it doesn't set on their vegetable garden.

And I'm thinking before we get to that point there should be a forum for closer to when we can do the

homework and engage those Commissioners or through in an intermediary like yourself and say look I don't trust the process -- these are not things that you have to be a detective to figure out, they are there in the open press. You put it in front of them and say what gives, Chairman Fore, like it was a 2 to 2 vote last year and that whole for capacity option like I said last night traded a 3 billion dollar price for 2017-18 marking siting which means I don't think the people in this region understand that that is going to be a price tag and it is going to come sooner than later.

And then you are going to have guys like Kevin Kelly standing up then saying see everyone I told you we needed that pipeline because now you are looking for electricity that is 10 times more expensive in 2014 because we don't have natural gas, we don't have enough, so my question is.

And I would be prepared right now to fly down to D.C. and get with a Commissioner or two or all five, assuming there are 5 now, not just 4 and say to them what gives? So is there a scoping session sequence that is going to address that kind of stuff or are we going to say what a minute this isn't a done deal, we are going to examine the need and if there isn't and I don't want to hear from you later that they didn't ask me for one, so they didn't get one.

If there is a mechanism to make that happen I would like to see it and I know you can't tell your bosses what to do, but if you could bring back that request, call it a demand if you like, I would like that opportunity.

MR. TOMASI: That's something I can -- I have heard a lot about that, about those concerns, it is something I can bring back to not even my management in fact, my management they deal with this, it would be other divisions in FERC I can bring that back and just explain to them that the level of -- I'm really impressed at all of these meetings the level of detail that people have been given me, not just on the issues of the Northeast and ISO and the market issues, but on every issue and let them know that I think we found that the meetings have been really informative and people want to be able to talk to somebody about the other issues that I cannot address.

I can take that back but I can't guarantee anything of course but it is something I can certainly -- identify. Now of course keep on making sure that that those comments are in the docket, it is something that I can certainly make sure that they understand that they are there and let them know that these people are concerned about these issues and we need to make sure that they are there.

That's what I can do, I can do that. Now these issues they will be addressed and all of these, the market issues, there is a section dealing with it, I don't know whether you have read them but I encourage you to read some of them and see how some of these issues are address and some of the more recent orders.

Look at the Algonquin Project or that would be something that may be of use in the New England Project and see how others addressed the issue.

MR. PREMUS: Okay well that's my question I didn't want to leave it unasked because if there is a change to make something like that happen I would like to see it happen.

MR. TOMASI: I understand.

MR. PREMUS: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Again I want to thank everybody for coming out, we stayed late again but not too awfully and everyone have a safe drive home, thank you.

(Whereupon at 10:52 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
Office of Energy Projects
Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., LLC Docket No. PF14-22-000
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

Days Inn Schoharie
160 Holiday Way
Schoharie, NY 12157

Thursday, July 16, 2015

The evening public scoping meeting, pursuant to notice, convened at 7:03 p.m, before a Staff Panel:

ERIC TOMASI, Project Manager, FERC

With: JENNIFER HARRIS, Cardno

PROCEEDINGS

MR. TOMASI: Good evening, everyone. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission I want to thank everyone for coming here tonight. In case you do not know, this is a scoping meeting for the Northeast Energy Direct Project that is proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline. The Docket No. is PF14-22. My name is Eric Tomasi and I am the Environmental Project Manager for FERC and specifically for this project. I work in the Office of Energy Projects. I am also the technical lead in the Office of Energy Projects for air quality, noise and pipeline safety.

I have several people here with me tonight. I want to go ahead and point them out. You saw them when you came in. They were helping you sign in and giving information. They are a contractor for us. The contractor is Cardno, and the people working with me tonight are Jennifer Harris which is up in the front here. She will be working, helping with the slides. In the back when you came in was Loraine Woodman, Jonathan Hess, Doug Mooneyhan and Jennifer Ward. I want to thank them. They have been a great help this week.

There's a few other things. Cardno is our contractor and they will be helping us and assisting us in preparing the environmental impact statement. Now I will explain how that all works a little later, but we will go ahead and fully explain our process and the Environmental Impact Statement process later in my speech here.

A few points, the bathrooms for those of you who do not know are out in the hallway down to the left here behind me. If we have enough speakers that sign up we may take a break, both to give my stenographer a little break and myself a short break, and then we will restart. At this point we have around a little over twenty people signed up. After that, if any other people wish to speak after the first set of speakers are done, we will go ahead and let you come up.

Now the way this is going to work, for those of you who do not know is, I am going to give my speech here, then we will turn this around so people can speak directly to me at the front table. Now that will mean that some of you may not be able to hear what the speakers are saying because the speaker is in front of this and it will be directed towards me. There is no other way to do that. We will try to angle the podium so that you can hear it as much as possible.

Also, I mentioned a stenographer earlier. We do have a court reporter here and they are going to transcribe this meeting. This is so we can have an accurate record of the meeting and that record is going to be placed into the FERC's eLibrary System which I am going to explain a little later but that eLibrary System contained the whole public record for this proceeding, for this particular project. Now, FERC does have a transcription contract with Ace and if you wish to obtain a copy of the transcript before it's placed into the public files, you have to make arrangements directly with Ace.

Now tonight I want to talk a little bit about the following: There are a few things you see up on the slide but there's a few other things that I want to talk about. First, what I want to talk about tonight is I am going to summarize the project; I am going to go ahead and explain the role of FERC in the review of this project; and three, outline how the public may participate in the process and lastly allow you, the public, an opportunity to voice your concerns about the project in this particular forum.

Also, I will ask you to hold your questions until the end. The last few nights, even with the amount of people we've had in Rensselaer County, I was able to answer a few questions in the end and I will do that again tonight if time allows. For those of you who did not sign up, there is a sign up table at the very front where you walked in that will have a -- you will get a number card that will be the number of the speaker that you will be. So if you want to sign up to speak, please go back up and get a card.

Also, as you can see up here there are other issues and other reasons why we are here tonight. I mentioned the comments. That is the reason we are out here tonight. I have heard a lot of the concerns of this community through going through the record and seeing the comments that you have already placed into our record in our eLibrary System on this docket.

The main reason for comments is we need to gather the concerns and issues for the analysis in the environmental impact statement. We want you to identify the issues that are of concern to you because I say this over and over every time I go to these meetings; is that I will never know this area as well as you do. I live in Washington, DC. I don't live around here. You will know this area better than I ever will and that's why we come out here to get information from you about where the project is proposed to go and what your concerns about that are.

Another thing, even if other people you know or you have seen comments on the record that are similar to your comments, file them. Please just file them on record because you might have a different take or slightly different analysis or concern that your fellow neighbors may have. We want to know about that because we will go ahead and analyze every single comment that we get. So if you are not sure about the comment, just file it. It is better to get it on the record and let us know about it than be shy or not want to give that to us.

Also, as I mentioned earlier, I am going to talk a little bit about the FERC review process. Lastly tonight I will allow you to come up and you will speak on the record and it will be transcribed and put into our system.

Now, another thing I want to talk about is other public input opportunities. This is not your only way to comment. As you know and as I just described, we have a lot of comments on the record. As of Monday and I have been so busy I haven't looked at how many comments we have gotten in the last few days but as of Monday or Tuesday I should say before the meeting, we had over three thousand comments on the record for this project. That is obviously a very large amount of comments but we will look at every single one of those so that's why we come out here and get those comments and really allow you to see that we're listening to you. We want to get those comments from you so that we can address your concerns.

But there are multiple ways to get them. Obviously, you can speak tonight. That's one way. You can go ahead and file your comments on the record written. There are a couple ways to do that. One, you can file them just go ahead and mail them to us. No problem. Secondly you can go ahead and go through our eLibrary system -- which you can upload that letter.

If you do choose the former, which is to mail them, there are a couple ways you can do it. Just do it normally through the mail, you can also take one of the forms that we have up front of the room and you can go ahead and mail that back into us, or you can fill it out tonight and give it to me tonight and we will put that into the record for you.

I mentioned a little bit about the eLibrary System; that is where you go to FERC.gov. You go to eLibrary and you can upload a letter or any attachments, any studies, anything you wish into our eLibrary System under this docket. I think the biggest thing for you to realize is when you file something on the record, please make sure that it has the docket number for this project on it. The Docket No. is PF14-22 and that

should be on all correspondence that you file with us.

There is another really quick way you can go ahead and give me a comment other than a written letter or the comment letter up front or speaking tonight, on our FERC.gov website there is also something we have which is called Quick Comment. It's a real quick form that you fill out on our eLibrary System and it just allows you to make a really quick comment on the record just to tell us what your individual concerns are. There's not really a character limit, but you can flush out your comment as much as you want.

There are other opportunities as well. This is a process. I'm going to talk about the process a little later, but we will be back out again for additional meetings after we issue the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. After we issue the draft, which will be sent on the mailing list, we will be back out for additional comment meetings and what those are going to be is, that's your opportunity to tell me and my staff how we wrote the EIS and whether we did a good job. So that is your opportunity to do that.

Now, I guess one thing I want to talk about in all of these comments is mainly about the mailing list. Any time you file a comment please go ahead and include your address if you wish to be on this mailing list for this project. We have the mailing list sign up in the back where you came in. If you are a landowner or have already received the NOI, you are already on the list. Okay, you are already on the mailing list, that means you are going to get the EIS and get all the notices that we send out.

If you are not sure, please just go ahead and sign up so that we can make sure that you will get all those notices and the EIS when we issue them. When you file a comment, if you have your address on there we will include that, we will add you to our mailing list. So even if you do something like a quick comment, please go ahead and if you wish, include your address so we can get you on the mailing list so you can get all the notifications and all of the documents on this project.

This is one of the most important things. I know everybody wants to be able to speak tonight but there are some people who are a little shy with public speaking or not going to be able to completely give me all of their comments verbally tonight. That's why I want to emphasize very strongly that written comments are given exactly the same weight as verbal comments.

I can't emphasize that enough. Many times if you want to give us studies, if you want to give us voluminous reports or comments, you can't just come up here and do that in three, four or five minutes. You need to go ahead and file that on the record and it's given the same weight whether you are here or you couldn't make it and you file them.

I want to talk a little bit about the meeting decorum. One thing I would ask is for people to turn off their ringers on their mobile phones and the way this is going to work is we will call the numbers up and please come up to the microphone when your number is called. Again, we don't have additional speakers or microphones other than this one right here so people in the back might not be able to hear it when people come up to give their comments.

I would recommend that you summarize your points and if you have something printed out or written out you can give me that hard copy if you weren't able to finish, or even if you were able to finish I will still put that letter in the record for you. I ask don't interrupt the speaker because any disruption is going to restrict everyone else's ability to go ahead and speak.

There are people here that are against the pipeline, there are going to be people that are speaking that are for the pipeline. I want you to please respect your fellow citizen's ability to speak. Everyone's going to have their time to speak and even if you don't agree with the speaker, please be quiet, let them speak. Polite applause is fine. I have no issue with that. A little bit of cheering, that's great but please don't shout or jeer people while they are speaking.

I'm going to talk a little bit about FERC and who we are. Many of you already know this, but FERC is an independent agency. What that means is our decisions are not reviewed either by the President or by Congress. Our decisions are reviewed by the courts. That's what I mean by the term, independent agency. We regulate the interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas and oil; and FERC reviews and authorizes

construction of interstate natural gas pipelines like the Northeast Energy Direct Project; storage facilities as well as siting for liquefied natural gas terminals. We also go ahead and do licensing and inspections for hydroelectric facilities.

The reason we are here tonight is because as a Federal licensing agency we have a responsibility under the National Environmental Policy Act to take a hard look at the environmental impacts associated with every project that is under review by FERC. That is effectively why we are here tonight. The whole reason why we are here is because of our NEPA process.

Also, we do regulate other things. We do regulate the interstate transportation of natural gas, obviously; it's part of this project. We also regulate electric rates, oil rates, but we don't regulate the siting of power lines.

Lastly, I want to state that we do not regulate exploration, drilling, production or gathering of natural gas or oil, for that matter. Those are regulated by the states so we do not have any control over drilling or fracking, either activities at all. We only have jurisdiction over the transmission through interstate pipelines of natural gas.

Now, we do have five Commissioners that are the head of FERC. We have a Chairman, Norman Bay and we have four other commissioners. They are the final decision makers at FERC. I do not make any decisions on whether this project should move forward or not. That is wholly and solely the responsibility of our five commissioners. They vote whether the project will be approved or will not be approved. My job is to do the environmental review.

My job is to look at the project as the company has proposed it, look at the environmental impacts of that project as well as reasonable alternatives. I am going to talk a little bit about how we do that a little later but I want to make sure that you understand what my job is. Obviously, you can comment on anything that you wish, be it environmental or non-environmental but my job is to write the Environmental Impact Statement and do the environmental review.

I'm going to talk a little bit next about the actual project itself. Most of you are familiar with the project right now. It's currently about four hundred and twelve miles of pipeline and facilities in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut. Before us, the company has provided information on nine new compressor stations, fourteen meter stations and one modified existing compressor station in Pennsylvania. There are many laterals that are proposed, and loops.

When I say loops, loops are simply putting one pipeline next to another one by the same company. That's what I mean by looping. Those are being built in Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Hampshire. Now, those of you who might be following the Kinder Morgan website or any news reports about Kinder Morgan might have seen Kinder Morgan actually had a press release today. They actually are modifying the scope of the project.

Previously, Kinder Morgan has informed us that they were going to supply 2.2 billion cubic feet of gas through their Eastern portion, which is their Market portion, to Dracut up into Massachusetts, 2.2 billion cubic feet of natural gas; as well as that line would be a thirty-six inch diameter line running from Wright to Dracut, Massachusetts. They have modified their project in a press release. It's not been formally been filed with the Commission. Because I know people are aware of this I want to go ahead and discuss this.

They will be modifying the size of their pipeline from thirty-six inch to thirty, from Wright to Dracut, Massachusetts. So that's east of here. There's not going to be any changes that I'm aware of to the west of the Wright Compressor Station, west of Wright. In addition, that means that the volume of gas that they are going to be transporting on the Market Path is going to decrease from 2.2 to 1.3 billion cubic feet per day.

Right now, my understanding for the two compressor stations that are proposed for Schoharie County, there are no changes that I'm aware of at this point. However, I want to point out that Tennessee Gas has informed me that they will be filing updated resource reports within the next couple weeks and that will

include information on these modifications. So these modifications will be reflected in the next set, which we should get within the next couple of weeks.

This is obviously the portion in Pennsylvania and New York. I'm sorry if anyone can't see this. This isn't the biggest map in the world and it's not the biggest board to see; it is very difficult. But as you see, this is what's called most of the supply portion in Pennsylvania and in New York and you can see that there are two, obviously the pipeline and two compressor stations proposed for Schoharie County.

AUDIENCE: Are those in addition to the one proposed under the Constitution --

MR TOMASI: I want to ask, please hold all questions to the end, okay? Please.

AUDIENCE: It's just not clear. Are those two in addition?

MR. TOMASI: This is purely, this is the Northeast Energy Direct Project. Any other project would be in addition to this. So any other projects that people might be aware of that are being proposed in the area would be in addition to the facilities that you see on this map here.

Now this is the eastern portion that is proposed to go through Massachusetts and in New Hampshire. You will see the one loop in Connecticut down, there and many laterals in Massachusetts and a couple laterals in New Hampshire there. So that is in Eastern portions. So just to let you know, these are the maps that were in the notice of intent so those of you who got the notice should have these maps.

The company will be filing, as I said within the next couple weeks, updated resource reports and that will include new mapping. So I want to tell you a little bit about the current status. Obviously I told you about the fact that the company has modified, identified in a press release, they will be modifying some facilities. When they file the resource reports here in the next couple weeks we will see the full extent of those.

Where we are generally now, obviously the reason we are here is because we issued what is called a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and that actually opens up the comment period, the formal comment period. For this project the comment period does end on August 31st; however, I want to stress that we take comments throughout the entire process. We don't just look at your comments in the formal comment period. The three thousand comments or twenty-five hundred comments that were filed before the NOI went out, we are going to address those comments.

The comments that are going to be filed after the August 31st date, we are going to address those comments. The period of the formal comment period denotes a time when the company will have to respond to comments that are filed. So the company will have to respond to those comments that are filed within the formal comment period. They are required under our pre-filing rules to file within fourteen days.

But I also want to stress, too, that even though we look at comments throughout the entire process it does take time to analyze your comments, especially if you are giving me for instance alternatives or things that might require a great deal of analysis, the sooner we get those the better we are able to address your concerns. We really want your concerns and your comments as soon as possible so we can address them in a really robust fashion.

I mentioned a little bit ago that the company will be updating their resource reports. The full set of original ones were filed on March 13th. The next ones will be filed in the next couple weeks. You might have seen also that we issued what's called an Environmental Comment Letter to the company. I believe, I can't remember the exact date that we filed, that we sent those to the company, but that was a very lengthy and very detailed letter that also requested additional information on the project. Because we're in pre-filing, there was a lot of information that was not available at that point, so we asked the company, "You need to go ahead and fill in these blanks."

We also went ahead and referenced a lot of comment letters from towns and from other agencies that gave us letters, and we told the company they need to respond to these concerns. So in the next set of resource reports we want to see all of these data gaps filled. But then, even after they file here in the next couple of weeks, we are going to have additional questions.

So that's one of the reasons why I want your comments sooner rather than later, because if we get them

over the next few weeks within the comment period we are going to be able to analyze them and ask the company to respond. We will definitely tell them “You know we need to understand what these concerns are, respond to these very specific concerns” so we can include your concerns in the next set of environmental comments that we provide to the company.

This leads me to my next point. Identify public concerns. Now, as I told you before, we have a lot, lot, lot of comments on the project. This project might actually break the record for comments on any project that certainly I’ve ever worked on or that we’ve worked on in the last ten to fifteen years. Three thousand comments, twenty-five hundred comments before we get to the NOI is pretty unprecedented. But we went through all the comments that we got and we sort of, we reviewed them from the most commented to basically the least commented.

Some of the top comments, the number one comment that we actually got was a preference by the public or commenters to go ahead and develop alternative energy. The second one was concerns from the public regarding export. There were a lot of questions and a lot of concerns by people who questioned well, are these facilities going to change the nature or character of the rural area where I live in?

That is something -- all of these comments we are going to respond to and obviously -- this is more on the Eastern portion of the pipeline, but there was a lot of concerns about development through you know suburban or higher density areas. Of course, there’s a lot of questions and concerns about cumulative impacts as well as fracking or transporting gas from shale regions through New York State.

There were definitely a lot of concerns about aquifer damage, and of course compressor station noise and emissions. This is just a really quick summary of some of the concerns. There are many, many, many, many more concerns that we have gotten from the public other than these. These are just some of the top ones that we have received and a lot of them have come from this area.

So, you know, we are listening to what your concerns are and our job is to address those. So keep your comments coming just so you know that we understand what your comments are and we want to go ahead and get more of those. There are a couple things that people questioned in some of the earlier meetings that I want to talk about right now, discussing, a few things; which is eminent domain and easements.

Any time people hear the term eminent domain emotions run high and people get concerned. To let you know that if the Commission, if the Commissioners decide to approve this project then what would happen is if you have not negotiated an easement with the pipeline at that point then that certificate would convey the ability for them to take you to court under the eminent domain proceedings to obtain an easement. So that’s the way this works.

Also, when it comes to easements, I encourage you -- and I can’t tell you what to do, I’m not an attorney -- but I encourage you to read your easement contract very closely. If you have an attorney, that’s great but make sure because the easement is one of the things that protects you as the landowner to ensure that you can negotiate with the company to make sure that the things you want to happen on your property, because it’s still your property whether you get an easement, what can and cannot happen on your property. So just be careful and make sure that you read your easement and work on it and understand everything about it, okay.

Next, I am going to talk a little bit about the FERC process which is in the next slide. A lot of it might be a little redundant so I am going to go through it really quickly. Again, we are in what is called the pre-filing process, pre-filing state. We expect that the company right now, as you can see by the fact that they changed the project, is still in the process of developing their project. We expect an application from the company in October of this year.

Even after the application, you will still see questions from us to the company. Even after the application, there will still be data gaps and we will still ask additional questions of the company. Now, there is something that happens when they file their application which is, we issue what is called a Notice of Application and then that opens up a window for people who want to be an intervenor to actually apply for intervenor status.

Now what is an intervenor versus just a person who comments? Well, an intervenor, the main thing it allows you to do as an intervenor is it allows you to actually challenge the Commission's decision. So for instance, if the Commission were to approve the project, if you had intervenor status you could file what is called a rehearing order, rehearing request with the FERC and give reasons why the FERC's Commissioner's decision should be reevaluated. That preserves your right as an intervenor.

There are some responsibilities for you as an intervenor. When you file something on the docket, you have to serve all the other intervenor parties, that includes the company or any other intervenors in the process, so you would have to give them either paper or electronic service copies on them.

Lastly, when the application comes in, having intervenor status restricts my ability to talk to you freely. If you talk to me, I have to put every conversation on the record as an intervenor party. So those are the main issues when it comes to being an intervenor status. It does protect your specific rights so some people may wish to go ahead and apply for that.

I'm going to talk a little bit about what we do and working on the EIS and how we do our environmental review. As I said, once we are working on those data gaps we will send a data request to the company to fill those data gaps and we will start preparation of the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Once we feel that we have received all of the information that we need to start the draft Environmental Impact Statement, we will go ahead and issue what's called a Notice of Schedule, and that will outline the schedule for our completion of the final Environmental Impact Statement. It will have a date on that that will say, for instance, 'we will finish the final Environmental Impact Statement on this date.' So, that notice will go out to every person on the mailing list so you can see exactly the date we plan to finish the Environmental Impact Statement. If for some reason the schedule would change, we would issue another notice informing the public that the final Environmental Impact Statement would move to another date.

Again, after the EIS like I said previously, we will be coming back out here to do additional meetings, get additional comments from the public telling us how you think we did on the draft. I think one of the things that people need to understand is that we get information through this entire process from a wide variety of sources. We don't just get information from you as the public. We will do our own research if needed. We do ask the company to fill in data gaps. We talk to agencies.

I just had a meeting yesterday in Albany with many of the New York State agencies. They are an exceptional resource to get information about the environment and facilities around the State of New York. Also, we do get information from tribal+ representatives. I had a meeting this afternoon with the Northeastern Tribes. So we really try to reach out to all of these organizations to try to get as much information about the area where the project would go through so we can put together the best Environmental Impact Statement that actually has the most robust information in it. That allows us to look at, see what the impacts are going to be and recommend mitigation measures. So that's extremely important. So I want to basically explain to you how to do that process.

After we issue that draft, again there will be that comment period like I said, then we will issue what is called the final EIS, which we outlined in the scheduling notice. After the final EIS, that final EIS is a recommendation to our Commissioners as well as a disclosure document to the public.

Now the Commissioners, they make their decision based on multiple factors. The EIS is only one factor of many that they use to make a decision. So, as I stated earlier, my job is to write the EIS but the Commissioners, they are the ones who decide whether the project should move forward or not.

Again, the EIS is an analytical document. What that means is whether we get one comment on a specific issue or a thousand, it has the same weight, we will analyze it the same way. We will also take a hard look, and that is a legal standard, of all of the potential impacts that the project may have and we will recommend mitigation as I explained earlier to ensure that any potential impacts would be mitigated.

Now this is an Environmental Impact Statement, which means that there might be things that cannot be fully mitigated but we will disclose those impacts to the public as well as to the Commissioners, and then

they can decide whether they would still prefer to issue a Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience. Now, as I said, it's going to address all of the issues that have been brought up by you, the agencies or any other comments we have got on the record or issues that we specifically are concerned about. The staff comes up with a lot of things like alternatives or questions about specific issues that we want to make sure are contained and documented within the EIS.

Lastly, I said earlier if you're on the mailing list you will get a copy of both the draft EIS, the final EIS as well as any notices we send out. Now for the EIS we are currently sending out CD copies of the EIS, and if you want a hard copy the last page of the Notice of Intent had a little form to send back in to me to let me know that you want a hard copy. If you didn't get that NOI and you want to let me know otherwise, please let people at the table up from know that you want a hard copy so that we can put you on the hard copy list, okay.

Of course if you want to be on the mailing list please go ahead and sign up in the back.

Now, we are going to go ahead and start asking people to come up for comment. Again, please make sure your cell phones are turned off or turn them to silent. When you do come up, please go ahead and speak as clearly as you can into the microphone. Because this microphone is a little sensitive, if you move off to the left or the right, no one will hear you.

The main thing is we want to make sure that the court reporter can get your words recorded and transcribed properly, so speak clearly and as slow as you can so he can get all of your questions and comments into the record. Also, please when you come up, spell your name for the stenographer. We will have a time limit. We are going to give everyone four minutes to speak tonight, and when you come up to the microphone you will see on the table ahead of you --

(to Ms. Harris:) Could you hold that up so that everyone can see it?

MS. HARRIS: Yes.

MR. TOMASI: There will be a little spotlight up there. Now it will be green while you still have time to speak. It will turn yellow, which means you have thirty seconds left to speak and when it turns red, your time is up and I will ask you to stop. I will be telling you, and most of you will not be able to hear this because I don't have my microphone up front, when you reach the thirty-second point.

Hopefully, if this will go nice and smoothly and everyone will have the opportunity to speak, again after we call the last speaker I will allow the other people to come up and sort of continue their comments if they got cut off early, or at people that did not sign up to speak, they can come up at that time. Also, I will go ahead and answer questions, that will go ahead and answer questions. That will be a little difficult in this format since we only have one microphone, so at that point I will explain how we are going to do that.

Lastly, I want to make sure that you do not interrupt the speaker. I know there are going to be people as I said earlier that are on the pro side or that are on the con side. I want to make sure that everyone has the ability to speak for their four minutes. Everyone has that right here tonight and everyone is going to be given that opportunity. If everyone goes by these rules, I think it will go very smoothly. I think we will be able to get everybody here who wants to speak, they should be able to speak tonight.

So, we're going to go ahead and call our first speaker. Now I will go ahead and allow, I do allow elected representatives to speak first as they represent more than just themselves, so we are going to call I think one elected official first so give me one minute here to get this podium turned around and we will have the elected official come up.

(Rotating podium)

We just got a question about, they speak directly to the table because they are speaking to FERC, so they will speak directly to me at the front table.

MS. HARRIS: Gene Malone.

MR. MALONE: My name is Gene Malone. You're turning that on already? You asked for my name, turn

it off.

My name is Gene Malone, G-E-N-E M-A-L-O-N-E and I am the Supervisor from the Town of Schoharie. It is truly unfortunate that we must face you once again on an issue that you have no real concern about. We went through this same dog and pony show not long ago pertaining to the then- proposed Constitution pipeline which was rubber-stamped by your department even though our message was clear about not wanting another pipeline running through our county.

Our representatives at the next levels of government have failed us and as a result we have numerous residents involved in eminent domain proceedings with many residents living in fear of what is to be placed in the ground. Homes that have become worthless with respect to market value and resale all for the purpose of export and profit for big energy. While I understand that you individuals are just performing in a job title, you represent the worst of the worst in our government: An agency that could care less about the health and safety of the American people.

The idea that Big Energy has been exempt from the Clean Air and Water Act is ludicrous. Attribute it to politicians with their hands out for campaign dollars. Hopefully the pressure is being placed on elected officials both in Albany and in Washington concerning an environmental impact study pertaining to pipeline and compressor stations will change what has been in place for decades.

The medical community has some grave concerns about the health effects caused by both pipelines and blow-offs from compressor stations. The AMA has just recently passed a resolution calling for legislation to be adopted to conduct such an EIS. Once again, let me point out that I remain opposed to Schoharie County becoming a corridor for pipelines that generate no benefit to our residents and jeopardize their health and safety.

I am opposed to the threat of pipeline compromise such as what took place in the town of Blenheim not too long ago. The devaluation of properties, the health risk and safety concerns should send a clear message to those that have sent you here this evening. So please go back and tell those individuals that once again Schoharie County is saying no. Thank you.

(Applause)

MS. HARRIS: Speaker number one.

MR. STOKEM: You're going to turn it on before I do my name?

MS. HARRIS: No.

MR. STOKEM: Okay, my name is Ken Stokem. I am from Rensselaer County. I live at 1001 Maple Hill Road outside of Castleton-on-Hudson and I am here to reach out more to the folks of Schoharie County and Albany County than I am to FERC, because I haven't found anything at all that encourages me that FERC will be swayed or concerned about people, homeowners, farmers and landowners when it comes to putting in more and more gas pipelines.

Woody Allen once said 'Mankind faces a crossroads. One path leads to despair and utter hopelessness. The other path leads to total extinction.' With FERC, that's where we are at. There is no good path here. No way that FERC can help us. FERC may round off the edges of a proposal a bit, but they never do much to mitigate a pipeline.

In spite of that, I want to beseech FERC to correct one inequity that they can correct with relative ease. They skipped over Albany County. They didn't have any forum in Albany County. They had two in Rensselaer County right near, fairly close to where I live but none for Albany County, and I think that's a problem and that they cannot ignore that. They should not ignore Albany County.

Additionally, I want to demand that FERC hold to a minimum of a one-mile impact zone on each side of the NED providing at least a two-mile wide impact zone. FERC must evaluate whether that impact zone should be even wider when the NED runs along multiple pipelines. That impact zone should also be significantly greater in circumference by three miles around compressor stations since compressor stations are above ground, not buried and they are more vulnerable to leaking, vandalism and other hazards and

they are uncontained.

Everything I learn about pipelines informs me that FERC is an industry-captured, quasi-governmental regulatory body. Their purpose is to facilitate the industry that they should be regulating and it's not serving the purpose of the people. FERC expedites pipelines without regard to determining what the higher good should be for the impacted area and population. They do it without concern for what may be best for an uncertain future due to greenhouse gas climate change.

I emphatically urge you not to stop your resistance to the NED after you submit your written and verbal comments here tonight. If you want to dissuade the NED, you must become even more proactive. You must become aggressive in projecting your self-interest and at the least you must join with the organized local opposition in your area to the NED and you must join with regional opposition to the NED which is what I am bringing to you tonight.

You must commit a part of yourself, your time and even a few of your dollars to join with your neighbors to oppose the NED and tonight before you go, take time to sign up with me to be on the contact information sheet so that my county, Rensselaer County can join with Schoharie County and other counties to fight this. The Stop New York Fracked Gas Pipeline organization is the leading opposition in the eastern part of the capitol region and you folks are more in the western part of the capitol region and we need to get together.

Should there be an accident you don't want to be within a mile or two within this pipeline. You don't want to live with the aftermath of a pipeline rupture and its potential for incineration and devastation. Your opportunity to thwart this pipeline is to multiply your voices, join your neighbors, join your community and your elected officials at all levels of government, join our organization of Stop New York Fracked Gas Pipeline as well as any of your local organizations here and make sure you sign up with me.

I am taking down contact information, I also have a petition against the pipeline and a petition against the compressor stations so please do your best to do that and I'll do my best to see that our folks keep you in the loop of what we're doing and we will keep in the loop of what you're doing. I want to thank you all very much tonight to give me this opportunity to speak to you.

(Applause)

MS. STANTON: My name is Lisa Stanton, L-I-S-A S- T-A-N-T-O-N. I am a partner in Stanton Family Farms LLC on Route 145 in between Cobleskill and Middleburg. We are a medium-sized dairy farm and we happen to be one of the largest farms in Schoharie County. We have specific issues and concerns that are about pipelines crossing our land.

First of all, we are environmental stewards of the land. We take care of the land. Being a medium-sized dairy farm we are required to have a CAFO permit. CAFO stands for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation. This essentially means we take food to our animals, they don't fend for themselves. This is regulated by DEC, the Department of Environmental Conservation and Environmental Conservation Law.

This allows us to have a State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and this requires a certified nutrient management plan. This regulates when and where we can spread manure and crop rotation. Our certified nutrient management plan is set by standards based on the Natural Resource Conservation Service and all of these are set forth by the Environmental Protection Agency in accordance with the Clean Air and Water Act of 2003 and 2008.

What that means is on a daily basis there are many impacts on our farm. We have to hire a certified CAFO planner through the Schoharie County Department of Soil and Water Conservation to help keep up with all the requirements and all the paperwork. We have to map all of our tillable land, both our own land, the land that we own and the land that we rent. We have to collect soil samples of all this land three times a, every three years to determine nutritional values.

We create a detailed plan for when, where and how much manure can be spread on each field based on soil samples. The DEC regulations, et cetera, et cetera. We create a plan for manure storage and handling.

We are not allowed to spread on certain fields at certain times. DEC is also in the process of making those restrictions even more stringent. We create manure storage facilities such as lagoons and storage systems that have to be designed and approved by certified engineers at additional cost to us.

We have to determine if there is any additional fertilizer needed when planning crops based on the recommendations of all these organizations. We have to set up a continuous crop rotation system and monitoring system so the same crops are not planted in the same fields every year. We have to monitor all of our silos for runoff and fermentation. We have to design the septic systems to collect any passable runoff.

We have a vast record management system. We have logbooks for manure storage and spreading crop rotation. We have to record precipitation every day on the farm and our feed storage. So as you can see, we have a lot going on with the environment. We take care of the environment around us. In addition, we have an ample water aquifer that is about one hundred feet below the surface. We have five wells on the farm that feed all of our barns. It also feeds three houses, families.

We are very concerned that this pipeline, which would be the second crossing our farm, if it leaks we are in big trouble. It will affect all of our animals, all of our barns and all of the families, eight families that work on the farm. If we violate any of the regulations placed in front of us, we can face a fine of up to thirty-seven thousand, five hundred dollars a day. You need to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for your agency to issue a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. This is not convenient and it's not necessary for us. Thank you.

(Applause)

MS. K. STANTON: Kayla Stanton, K-A-Y-L-A S-T-A- N-T-O-N. I am the third generation on Stanton Family Farms LLC and I am incredibly concerned about my future on the family farm. I am currently a sophomore at SUNY Cobleskill studying dairy production and management, and I am also a member of the Schoharie County 4H Cobleskill/Richmondville, past Cobleskill/Richmondville FFA, and a past member of the New York State Junior Dairy Leader Association and many other dairy-related clubs.

With these clubs, I have traveled across the country and brought back many ideas to the family farm. One of these being part of the three hundred thousand dollar parlor expansion that we just completed. We have also built a new calf and heifer facility and another storage facility on the farm. Because of my parents, aunt and my grandfather working so hard to get the farm to where it is today we were able to get the Constitution Pipeline to give us a minor route variation in order for us to make the facilities I just mentioned before happen.

My goal after college is to come back to the farm. The New York State Sensate last year had released the Young Farmers of New York Plan which helps smooth the transfer of the family farms into the next generation and preserve the existing farmland. If this second pipeline is allowed to cross our farmland, where will I be allowed to expand the farm in the future? Just as my mom said before, we need to follow all of the regulations that are put before us.

If the NED is allowed to co-locate with the Constitution Pipeline, my future is in jeopardy. Even though we will be allowed to 'farm' over the pipeline, future expansion could be denied because we could not build over the pipeline. That also would restrict the new heifer barns if we need to expand such as we just did this year. Thank you for your time.

(Applause)

MS. HARRIS: Speaker number four, Richard.

MR. STANTON: Hello, my name is Richard Stanton, R-I-C-H-A-R-D. I am the owner/partner of Stanton Family Farm, which my father purchased in 1962. In 2005 we formed Stanton Family Farm LLC. My father, mother, one of my sisters, my wife and I are the working members of the family farm. Both of my children work on the farm and want a future on the farm. Our farm consists of four hundred milking cows, another four hundred young-stock.

We own about fifteen hundred acres and rent another thousand. We employ seven full time employees.

Our farm generates two million dollars in revenue to local business throughout Schoharie County. Your agency already approved the Constitution to run through the middle of our farm. We have fought long and hard to have minimal impact on the farm.

Now the possibility of a second pipeline? Could that be devastating? We follow good business practices including short and long-term goals for our farm. These goals include continued growth and expansion as you have heard. With one pipeline already slated to cover a mile and a half of our farmland, upwards of one hundred and thirty acres, our growth and our expansion plans need to be drastically scaled back, changed, updated, altered and now with the possibility of a second pipeline we are starting to shift into survival mode.

Please, seriously look at the impact of this pipeline we will have on you people that we are feeding. Thank you.

(Applause)

MS. SEFCIK: My name is Dianne Sefcik, D-I-A-N- N-E S-E-F-C-I-K. Some people decided to boycott this meeting. I've decided to come and speak. I have been involved in the hearings regarding the Constitution Pipeline and I don't have any faith in FERC because of the issues that we ran into and the green light that went on for the industry but here's my statement.

I'm going to speak to you today person to person. FERC after all isn't staffed by robots and automatons. It's staffed by people. I believe we are all accountable, individually and collectively. I am accountable and you are accountable. Consider the people who lined up to follow Hitler. Some certainly thought that they were patriots. Many were charmed or mesmerized although it's hard to imagine now how they were. I guess you just had to be there.

Others went along excusing themselves by saying they were following orders or even following the law. Many people were afraid. Afraid to be different, afraid to say not. Afraid to be tortured and punished or that their families would be tortured and punished or that they would be disappeared.

Let's imagine Hitler got a marketing makeover. What would he look like? How would he behave? Still a tyrant, still a bully, still greedy, still a psychopath. Still surrounded by yes-men and opportunists and other psychopaths. Still intent on getting what he wanted no matter what the cost in lives, in destruction of the Earth and property. Still recruiting brainwashed twelve-year-olds, all too willing to die for him, to snipe for him, to spy for him.

You can't appease a bully. Prime Minister Chamberlain, to his dying day, regretted the deal he made with Hitler, thinking it would stop a war. You may be sitting there thinking 'ho-hum just another protest'. I won't take it personally, just another sap of a taxpayer, a peon and not one of the new Arians. Well, you're just like me. You're a taxpayer, you're a peon. An ordinary American although some of may venture ever deeper into the propaganda pit and onto industry jobs, just like a lot of your peers and a lot of your predecessors.

FERC serves the oil and gas industry. Even though I pay your salary, you don't serve me. FERC EISs are a joke. You might as well use toilet paper. FERC is a colonizer using eminent domain for the emperors of industry. NED serves the oil and gas industry. NED will transport fracked gas at great cost to humans, animals and the environment to foreign markets to benefit the rich. NED is not needed by Americans. It is of no benefit to Americans. It would not serve Americans in this or any other region.

Use this opportunity to be a human being. Using all your resources and gifts,

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up, ma'am.

MS. SEFNIK: Not just the go along brain.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up, ma'am.

MS. SEFNIK: I have two sentences left. Consider the impacts to the people whose health, safety and welfare is at stake, whose property is at stake. Consider the impacts to the innocent life of the land. Stand

up to the bullies and the land-grabbing tyrants. Say yes only to renewable energy projects which would provide long-term employment

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am, your time is up.

MS. SEFNIK: for many Americans, not just transient jobs for a few. Say no to NED.

(Applause)

MS. RICE: Jeannette Rice, Rensselaerville, Albany County, J-E-A-N-N-E-T-T-E R-I-C-E. I'm providing the following comments as a repeated public service. First, I want to acknowledge the many good people here who are seeking jobs. I support you in your search. We need more jobs in New York State but not through expanding an aging pipeline grid that would cause harm to our families health and well-being. I encourage you to be open to jobs in renewable and sustainable energy resources for the healthy future of our New York State communities.

The land, life, liberty and happiness of those New York State Citizens who just want to live quietly, peacefully and healthily is being raped by the threat of land-takings for gas export. Please, do not disregard this destruction in favor of corporate greed.

Secondly to the five appointed commissioners of FERC. Commissioner Tony Clark, you've been active in North Dakota energy development and exportation expanding oil and gas infrastructure. Four representatives from FERC and five from the PSC had a meeting in New York City on November 5th, 2014 and determined that New York State did not need any more gas pipelines or electric transmission lines.

The proposed NED, which is parallel to most of the proposed Constitution Pipeline doesn't demonstrate public convenience and necessity. It's clearly a method to export. Please pack Kinder Morgan up and send them back to Texas. I see absolutely no benefit to New York State citizens. You do need to do a cumulative impact assessment of two pipelines running together.

What about the impact of the blast radius? I have attached a report in my comments. As I read this report, I imagine what it could possibly be like if I lived in one of the many housing developments near this pipeline. I am also concerned about the negative impact this pipeline will impose upon my friends' organic gardening farm and their family's health. I recall the increase in pipeline incidents, an aging system with many miles approaching fifty years old. I think of the thousands of gas line leaks found in the city of Boston last winter and remember explosions and loss of life in New York City.

I have attached a list of pipeline accidents in the US in the 21st Century. The list was too long to be downloaded completely on my server so I have documented it for you and surely you meaning all FERC members are aware that the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration cited Kinder Morgan for a series of safety violations over years, failing to maintain. You've got them on my report. I am just going to save time.

I wonder if you, meaning FERC members own a house within a mile of a compressor station and a thirty-six inch pipeline? Would you care, do you care if your property values went down? Would you care and appreciate the noise and toxic odors. Cheryl LaFluer, you're a known leader in the natural gas industry. As a grandmother, I wonder if you have children or nieces or nephews? I wonder what kind of a world you really want to leave tomorrow's generations? I wonder if you've read New York State's findings statements to the final S-guys released in June this year. That's documented.

The proposed NED causes proliferation of dangerous, destructive practice of fracking, a process not wanted in New York State. I wonder if you hear that we don't want that. More pipelines mean more fracking and more negative impacts on the health of the earth's clean recourses.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MS. RICE: I wonder if you're a climate change denier. Do you accept that ninety-nine percent of the world's scientists

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up.

MS. RICE: May I finish one statement, please?

MR. TOMASI: Just hurry.

MS. RICE: Thank you. Norman Bay, you are known as one of the ten most influential people in energy. If you really want to protect consumers you're advised to transition us from fossil fuels to sustainable renewable energy. Just as we transition from sea oil to land oil in the 1850's, it's beyond time to transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy and I've documented an aggressive plan that's been peer reviewed and scientifically documented. I will give you the rest of my comments. Thank you.

(Applause)

MS. HARRIS: Number seven, Michael.

MR. RICE: My name is Michael Rice, M-I-C-H-A-E-L R-I-C-E. No relation to the previous speaker. I live in New Scotland in Albany County. I bought the place I own, a 30-acre property, which used to be a farm a long time ago and now again is a farm in 1986. It has on it a historic stone house. Following my 1996 retirement as chief scientist and legal counsel to the Legislative Commission on Science and Technology, I pursued my longtime passion for the improvement of Earth, both in the sense of earth as soil using regenerative organic methods and in the sense of Earth as humanity's dwelling.

I assist my daughter in operating Nine Mile Farm. One of the glories of Albany County is the proximity of population centers and excellent farmland. Aside from the simple livability this implies, the existing farms and the potential for new ones will be an increasing benefit as water shortages in areas traditionally serving as produce suppliers such as California and Arizona dry up.

We need farms, we need organic farms that improve the soil rather than mine the soil. I rely on a half-acre pond fed by a spring and run off from five to seven acres of higher land on my land. The proposed pipeline would be within one hundred yards of my property. The threats to my home, farm and community are as follows: One, pollution of the water supply for my home and our farm, both during the construction phase and from even small leaks in the finished pipeline. Fracked gas will contain unknown proprietary substances and radioactive substances liberated in the fracking process.

Two, a substantial risk of pipeline explosion would bring down my house and any of the numerous other 8th century Dutch style stone houses along the pipeline route, all of them made of huge blocks of limestone laid up with nothing but local mud. We are fortunate the recent explosion in a booster station within a mile of our house was in relation to a small pipeline, not a thirty-six inch pipeline, not even a thirty-inch pipeline if that's what they are reducing it to. We are fortunate of course to not live within a mile of the proposed compressor station but I will skip over the obvious problem there.

Finally, I fear that the construction of the pipeline or the application for the pipelines, almost finished, is intended to exert a political pressure to undo the scientifically based decision to prohibit fracking in New York State

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time is up.

MR. RICE: on the basis that the infrastructure of the infrastructure.

MR. TOMASI: Sir, your time is up.

MS. RICE: I understand. Infrastructure investment. Otherwise the pipeline would have become a bridge to nowhere would be the argument.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, sir.

(Applause)

MS. HARRIS: Speaker number eight, Sue.

MS. CARILLO: As an official intervenor in the FERC Northeast Energy Direct Project

AUDIENCE: Can't hear you.

MS. CARILLO: As an official intervenor in the FERC Northeast Energy Direct Project under CP13499,

CP13502 and PF1422, the Constitution Pipeline Project, the Wright Compressor Station Project and the Northeast Energy Direct NED Tennessee Gas Pipeline and Compressor Stations, multiple compressor stations projects.

I am here to place on the record my full opposition to any and all pipelines or compressor stations authorized by FERC in the State of New York. Evidence that FERC must deny the Northeast Energy Direct Projects including the Constitution Pipeline, the Reit Compressor Station, all of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline proposed projects I am submitting into evidence FERC's blatant violations of the National Environmental Policy Act and let me just clarify for the people here listening to the lies that FERC continues to perpetuate, they are held accountable to statutory regulations set by the US Congress and the Council for Environmental Quality which is in the Executive Branch, our President.

So there is accountability. They are not independent and they do have checks and balances just like every other Federal agency. FERC has already failed to comply with the NEPA which they are mandated by Congress to comply with and they are mandated by the Executive Branch to comply with the Council of Environmental Quality guidance on how to meet the standards and the regulatory requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, a statutory, regulatory requirement of the US Congress.

In it's current environmental, FERC's current environmental assessment of the Reit Compressor Project and the Constitution Pipeline Projects, they did not even begin to deal with the environmental impacts of the Reit Compressor Station or the Constitution Pipeline. Now FERC intends to authorize more projects in the same areas, these are co-located, additional compressor stations in the Schoharie County area, the Albany County area and the surrounding areas. They are creating an extreme environmental hazard to residents, farmers and businesses.

Not just farmers are affected. There are tourism industry businesses that are affected. There are restaurant businesses that are affected. Nobody can survive these environmental hazards. They are going to cause multibillion dollar tourism industry and restaurant industry businesses to collapse. The economic consequences are immense. The environmental consequences are difficult to even comprehend.

Wherefore I am submitting into evidence at this official meeting as an official intervenor the following photographs of Schoharie Creek and Boston Spa Natural Springs. These photographs document that FERC's intentional violation of the National Environmental Policy Act a statutory, regulatory requirement of FERC, FERC is required to abide by the National Environmental Policy Act under the US Congress' statutory requirements. They did not abide by the NEPA in this latest approval or authorization of the Constitutional Pipeline or the Wright Compressor station by not including an analysis of the environmental impacts of these important waterways. The Schoharie Reservoir, the Schoharie Creek, the Boston Spa Springs, the natural springs.

These are not only important public drinking supplies and fishery habitats, they are dramatically impacted by this Reit Compressor Station that already exists and the additional facilities. They will be further impacted by the newly proposed pipelines. The Schoharie Reservoir and Schoharie Creek are not only directly impacted by these highly hazardous projects, but they are a vital source of drinking water to downstream residents in the Catskill Mountain Region,

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am, your time is up.

MS. CARRILLO: New York City and the upstream regions in Saratoga County.

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am, I am going to ask you to stop.

MS. CARRILLO: The population that is exposed.

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am, please stop.

MS. CARRILLO: The population that is exposed is close to nineteen million New York residents plus.

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am, I'm asking you to stop right now.

MS. CARRILLO: Plus millions of residents downstream.

MR. TOMASI: You can speak at the end.

MS. CARRILLO: Can you stand back from the podium. You're too physically close. You're getting aggressive and there's not a police officer in the room so if you feel you need

MR. TOMASI: Could you please let another person speak?

MS. CARRILLO: to call a police officer, go ahead.

MR. TOMASI: I said please let someone else speak.

MS. CARRILLO: Please stand back so I can move back to my seat. Stand back.

MR. TOMASI: Go ahead.

MS. CARRILLO: Do not get physically aggressive.

MR. TOMASI: I just walked up to you.

MS. CARRILLO: Stand back.

MR. TOMASI: Please go sit down.

MS. CARRILLO: Thank you.

(Applause)

MS. HARRIS: Speaker number nine, Robert McMorris.

MR. MCMORRIS: Thank you. I'm Bob McMorris.

MR. TOMASI: Please speak into the mic.

MR. MCMORRIS: Okay, I'm Bob McMorris, M-C-M-O- R-R-I-S. I was fortunate enough to grow up in Cobleskill and then again to come back and learn a little more in Richmondville. I will try to make a few comments here. It will only take me seventeen, eighteen minutes.

(Laughter)

I hope that some of these things are illustrative enough to bring back some of the great things that people have said tonight. Around and around go the pipes. These monstrous tubes from station to station. Yipes. That smell, that gas. Ripe. It's my neighbors who are here, my great neighbors are gone. Chased out by a distant corporation and it wasn't skypes.

Speaking of corporations, they have been showing that not to get into fracking and such. Some corporations have pleaded poverty and needing more money and more money. I got thinking in terms of the word corporation because in the middle of that is poor, cor-poor-ation. With that term poor, you can see that they really have amassed so much money that I know some of you have fought this considerably.

Pardon me. Let me note also here that in an essentially closing comment that perhaps if the pipeline corporations could really be competitive but even more than that, creative to for example compress the gas in say to take a lot of compression, compress the gas into cubes and then they could send them in the mail from Pennsylvania to the Middle East and they could reduce the impact of such an industry on innocent by-sitters.

MS. HARRIS: Speaker number ten, Glenn Sanders.

MR. SANDERS: Hello, my name is Glenn Sanders, G-L-E-N-N S-A-N-D-E-R-S. The American Medical Association adopted a policy this June in support of legislation requiring comprehensive health impact assessments for gas pipeline proposals. The AMA adopted this position because it felt existing regulatory approaches to health impact consideration including FERC's do not adequately protect public health and safety. The National Environmental Policy Act requires FERC to adequately protect public health and safety.

Your scope should include studying the AMA resolution including all of its sections and the rationale for it and reacting appropriately by consulting with and including prominent independent public health professionals in all phases of your health impact assessments.

The second topic for inclusion in your scope is a complete assessment of the alternatives to this pipeline represented by solar and wind energy. This assessment should include a determination of all direct and indirect costs and impacts particularly health and economic impacts of gas versus renewable energy as they would be used to satisfy the public convenience and necessity.

The particulars of the optimal renewable system should be determined through consultation with major corporate providers of these systems. FERC's approach to renewable alternatives and its review of the Constitution pipeline proposal was a cynical and brazen betrayal of its responsibilities under the NEPA.

Two examples of this egregious inadequacy are. One, the solar alternative was dismissed from further consideration in part because of its excessive cost. But the cost figure was derived solely from one five year old report, which overstated the current cost of solar energy by a factor of three. The cost comparison between solar and gas as the second example of inadequate review did not include the contribution of gas infrastructure to atmospheric composition and climate change and its subsequent environmental and health impacts.

When these inadequacies were pointed out during public comment, FERC ignored the issues. When the PACE University Environmental Litigation Clinic asked for a rehearing to consider these issues, FERC stalled and used shameful tricks to prevent the issue from being reviewed in Court.

I have talked with staffers of Senators Schumer and Gillibrand and with Congressman Gibson about FERC's outrageous skirting of serious questions concerning health impacts and alternative energy systems. They have written FERC, asking for a meaningful response. They were stonewalled. They are very angry. You might include that anger in the scope of your review. Thank you.

MS. HARRIS: Speaker number twelve, Dustin.

MR. TESSITORE: Hi, Dustin D-U-S-T-I-N T-E-S-S- I-T-O-R-E. I'm a member of Laborers Local 157 in Schenectady. I am also a representative in Schoharie County. I would never do anything to harm my community. Pipelines are a safe way to transport natural gas. I have a lot of experience working on pipelines in a safe way. The NED Project is being built on land where its impact will be minimal.

For me, every single one of my jobs is a so-called temporary job. The NED Project would create lots of job opportunities for highly skilled, trained and most importantly safe workers like myself. Thank you.

(Applause)

MS. HARRIS: Speaker number thirteen, Darren.

AUDIENCE: Can I make a suggestion, can you turn up the microphone so we can hear? We can hear you say thank you but that's about it.

MR. TOMASI: Well, I just got this microphone so. I mean, they are directing their comments towards me and please if you could speak into the microphone that would be good.

MR. HAGADORN: My name is Darin Hagadorn, D-A-R- I-N H-A-G-A-D-O-R-N.

AUDIENCE: We can't hear you. Give him your microphone, it seems to be much better.

MR. HAGADORN: H-A-G-A-D-O-R-N. I'm for the pipelines.

AUDIENCE: More complaints regarding microphone.

MR. TOMASI: Speak directly into the microphone, I want to make sure it's on.

MR. HAGADORN: Is it on? Okay. Well, I have worked a lot on the pipelines. I know they're safe. You guys know they're safe. You obviously have overseen a lot of them. The people up here today that say they're not safe, they all got here with a car that uses gas, their homes are heated by gas but yet they are all against them and they go on and on and on. So I will leave and just say I support it and there you go.

(Applause)

MS. HARRIS: Speaker number fourteen, Owen.

AUDIENCE: He left.

MS. HARRIS: Speaker number fifteen, Josh.

MR. SHAUL: You can start the clock. I would like everyone whether they are for or against to have every opportunity to speak tonight. My name is Josh Shaul, J-O-S- H S-H-A-U-L. First off I would like to thank the agricultural producers that are in the room for the job that they do. I would like to thank supervisor Malone for the job that he does and I would also like to thank FERC for the job that they do. We all have a job to do.

I couldn't do the job that the agricultural producers do because that is not my occupation, that's not what I do. I couldn't do the job the supervisor Malone does because it is not my job. That's not what I do as well as I could not do the job that FERC does because that is not my job. That's not what I do. I'm a resident of Schoharie County. I am also a member of Laborer's Local 157.

The design for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline will include avoiding and minimizing the impacts to critical and sensitive habitats and lands such as wetlands, threatened and endangered species, culturally sensitive areas and public lands. Through the use of civil, cultural and environmental surveys they will gather information to refine the pipeline design and in consultation with regulatory agencies, determine the most appropriate route to avoid and minimize impacts on critical habitats and lands. If unable to avoid critical and sensitive habitats and lands, the most appropriate crossing methods to minimize impacts will be utilized.

Pipeline construction in general results in temporary impacts to wildlife and to the environment. Construction planning and permitting includes considerations of the affects on wildlife and the environment. The Northeast Energy Direct pipeline would comply with all requirements imposed by FERC and other Federal and State agencies as well as its own industry-standard procedures to avoid and minimize the effects of construction on the environment.

Wildlife protection and environmental measures are further addressed during post-construction site restoration and right-of-way restoration activities to ensure compliance with all applicable conditions and requirements. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up, number sixteen Togalo Gibson.

MR. GIBSON: Good evening. My name is Togalo Gibson, T-O-G-A-L-O Gibson G-I-B-S-O-N and I'm here in support of the pipeline and it's going to bring jobs to our community. It's going to boost the economy and I'm just here to support the jobs for our Union. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up is number seventeen, Donna Elmendorf. Donna Elmendorf number seventeen. Is she here?

(No response)

MR. TOMASI: Next is number eighteen Debbie Krol.

MS. KROL: Deborah Krol, D-E-B-O-R-A-H K-R-O-L. I didn't have a chance to purchase the red t-shirt with the words FERC doesn't Work and I can't afford to be civil disobedient because if I am carted off to jail no one will care for my elderly father, but in spirit I agree with the protesters and understand these public hearings are a sham.

The FERC carries water for or I should say contaminates water and soil, destroys natural habitat and pollutes the air with collusion with the fossil fuel industry. I don't blame the union workers who want jobs and to provide for their families but I blame the polluters for continuing on this suicide mission of destruction for profit. You could do better. You could higher these good people and build a green economy that improves our health and the health of the environment.

(Applause)

MS. KROL: How long can we continue to exploit our natural resources in order to support the screwed up,

out of touch lifestyle of the billionaires? A class of people focused on wearing the right designer outfit, having the biggest mansion, the most expensive car or sailboat and the most prestigious shrink because with shallow, meaningless life concerns they are out of touch with reality and the true cost of their actions. We need a structural change. Like a return to democracy where Federal agencies actually work for the betterment of all the people and not some investors in climate-change denial. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next is number nineteen, Robert Kerley. After Robert is number twenty, Elliott Adams.

MR. KERLEY: Hi, Robert Kerley, K-E-R-L-E-Y. I'm a resident of Schoharie County. I'd agree with what several other speakers before me said that basically FERC is operating as a rubber stamp for the oil and gas industry and for oil and gas projects. What's going on here with these meetings is really almost like what the Community Development and Community Control people would have called pandering back in the 1960's. If you look at people like Sherry Aronstein, Milton Cultler, great activists and community development people like that. They would probably define it like this because it's basically this agency is working as a rubber stamp to do anything that the oil and gas industry wants.

A couple of issues with the Constitution Pipeline. I'm bothered by this idea that originally from what I remember in media reports that this project and the Constitution Pipeline Project were talked about in the pre-proposal stage a couple of years ago and it seems like the Constitution Pipeline was kind of put out as a patsy project to see if it politically could make it through this area and it did. And now this project has jumped in and that's some type of a nexus there. There is some type of connection. That's not being addressed here.

I've seen the word 'segmentation' used. Now, in a more technical sense I think the segmentation that I see with this project is that it's trying to go into building this infrastructure for some type of what I call a 'Grand Eastern Pipeline' which is to eventually connect up pipelines to bring the old pipeline infrastructure in what's now the Mountain East States, where they're fracking and even older pipeline infrastructure in the Southeast. Run that up into deepwater ports either in Main or in Canada and start getting LNG, liquefied natural gas out. It looks like this is all an export scheme here.

The entire purpose of natural gas regulation under FERC and for decades of previous acts has been to have a scheme to have natural gas benefit the people, the American people and it really looks like this is not doing that. This is basically one other part of a process to appease the oil and gas industry and to appease whatever they want to do in the international markets.

I was reading some stories by Thich Nhat Hanh today, the great Buddhist leader from Vietnam. There was a story of him speaking back in 1968 during the Vietnam War in the United States and basically he had responded to a man criticizing him by saying something to the effect of you have to water the roots of a tree rather than the leaves of a tree. Well this stuff right here is the leaves of the tree. This is nonsense, this is BS.

The real root of the issue here is that we have a rotten nation, a nation that is rotten o its core, we have an economy that's been rotten to its core since 1978 and there's a few union guys here trying to keep the Laborers Union going and the Operating Engineers and groups like that. Well, the real issue is that there's been a race to the bottom. What Robert Reichel and Bernie Sanders would call a race to the bottom and we've been decimated since 1980. This is all just nonsense.

This idea that this is somehow like a works progress thing or something. This isn't what this is about work. This is about the nation here. About the people. I guess I will close it up with that. But I ask you to consider this and to consider the bigger issues here that we need a full restructuring at the Congressional level probably at the Energy Department and at FERC and at many other Federal Systems that again to serve the people rather than the industry. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is number twenty Elliott Adams. After Elliott Adams is number twenty-one Pete Stearns.

MR. ADAMS: Elliott Adams, E-L-L-I-O-T-T A-D-A-M- S. I want to bring up two points of scoping. One is fragmentation and the other is exportation. As far as fragmentation is often overlooked and yet it can destroy entire animal populations. I think as we look at this problem we have to remember that the EIS should be addressing issues of future, not issues of the past with the renewable resources coming online, the future is not going to be about energy shortage. On the other hand it will be about mass species extinction.

So I think it's important that the EIS address the effect of forest fragmentation on not only mammals and birds, but also the migratory reptiles, migratory amphibians and even the migratory insects. I can see a temptation for FERC to say 'oh well, the Constitution pipeline has already gone through, the forest is already fragmented. If FERC feels they can do that, I would say they should reopen the EIS for the Constitution and look at the cumulative impacts of both gas lines. The next question is also I think it's important to look at the fact that as the fragmentation becomes wider, the effects become exponentially great. So it's like a cumulative impact.

The other issue is the issue of exportation. I know that the pipelines will say that this is not about exportation but actions speak stronger than words. Clearly these pipelines, both of them are about exportation. The EIS should look at the impact of higher prices on us because of exportation and also the issue of national security of energy security through exportation. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Next is number twenty-one, Pete Stearns. After Pete Stearns, is Mr. Stearns here?

AUDIENCE: Yes, he is.

MR. TOMASI: After Pete Stearns is Cynthia Campbell.

MR. STEARNS: Good evening ladies and gentleman of FERC and everyone here that came to attend this meeting. One thing is energy needs of our country is ever increasing. Infrastructure across the US does need to be built. We need to be energy independent. We should not be buying energy from unfriendly countries who use that money to harm our people. A lot of gas is burned off from oil wells when they are drilled because there is no infrastructure in place.

I know there are concerns from people who are directly affected by these pipelines. This is why this part of this process is so important. This helps mitigate any problems that may occur. I think the Alaskan Pipeline is an excellent example of how well pipelines have been done with minimal impact to the environment because we face the same things today, questions that were faced back then and that's been going on for forty/fifty years and there has been no explosions, the animals are all back and thriving.

We have many members who live in this area. Approximately one hundred and fifty retiree and active people and they provide for their families. The work is very important to them too. Because they live here, they are very concerned about doing this safe as well they are trained in safety and environmental issues.

I think sometimes we need to stop and think of the energy we use on an individual basis with the cars, the heat, the products. If we didn't need any energy we wouldn't even be sitting here today worried about where we are going to get it. Imagine if we had environmentalists and FERC hearings and all this stuff back in the Paleolithic age. We could have stopped the wheel and we could have stopped the fire and we could be back where we were. That's all I got. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Next is twenty-two, Cynthia Campbell.

MS. CAMPBELL: I'm Cynthia, C-Y-N-T-H-I-A C-A-M- P-B-EL-L. I'm here today concerned about

the environmental impact of building another dangerous conduit for an obsolete energy source. I have no doubt that my bother laborers here would do their very best to make it safe but at their best pipelines fragment forests and other ecosystems. They leak, they blow up, they pollute the area and the water and endanger human and agricultural live and wildlife.

I believe there is a serious moral and legal problem in exempting the energy industry from the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts. There is another serious legal and moral problem in allowing the taking of property of citizens, their homes, their health, their safety, their wellbeing and their livelihoods for the profit of a few.

New York State has banned hydrofracking, recognizing it is an unacceptable, risky practice. Why then build the infrastructure for an industry that ruins what it touches. Why not build the infrastructure for renewable energy, mass transportation and use our resources to benefit the citizens of this great country? Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Next up is number twenty-three, Kathleen Nolan. After Kathleen Nolan we're going to move to twenty-five, John Warner.

MS. NOLAN: Hi, Kathleen Nolan, K-A-T-H-L-E-E-N Nolan N-O-L-A-N. I'm a physician with training in ethics, epidemiology and research design and I've worked for the past almost five years on the health impacts of unconventional natural gas development. I'm here, I work as senior research director for Catskill Mountainkeeper.

Pipelines are a problem in themselves but along with them is the problems of compressor stations. Both offer both environmental and health impacts. Environmental and health impacts are linked but not identical. In relationship to natural gas transport, illness in animals and humans may be the first indication that we have of toxic leaks and contamination. We used to restrict environmental impacts not only for the animals but because we knew harms to the environment would harm humans but in this realm we often see the harms to the pets, farm animals and humans before we are seeing or able to document.

So the humans and the animals are becoming a bioassay. So the health impacts have to be looked at because they are actually a surrogate in many cases for the environmental impact. There is existing research only on compressor stations with pipelines that document many of the those health impacts, noise and lighting, diesel contaminants from the diesel-powered engines, the release of methane as a greenhouse gas and volatile organic compounds, formaldehyde and the others.

But I want to speak more about radon and if I run out time I would like a chance to come back about it. Radon in Marcellus shale is very high. Radon and its decay products I believe are a hazard for workers on the pipelines as they build up in these pipes. The prior research on radon I don't believe has adequately documented the levels of the radon, so I'd like to see some independent testing on that.

I think it's really important to address the cumulative impacts of the entire pipeline systems and the other pipelines for both environment and health and to have a stringent review since there is no benefit for the people whose properties these pipelines go on. If you have no benefit to the people who are hosting these pipelines, you correspondently should have no risk or very, very negligible risk. I don't think that's at all the case here and it's not fair to impose a risk when there is no benefit.

The Rensselaer County has indicated that it's going to be asking for stricter review from the Department of Environmental Conservation in New York. The Medical Society of the State of New York has issued a resolution saying calling for health reviews to be intensified. The AMA as well. These are the indications of people who have look at these issues very closely. I would like you to do that same level of the review.

One thought about the easement and the eminent domain issue that you brought up. The entire property would be put at risk by these developments, the pipelines or the compressor stations and often the easement value or the eminent domain value only addresses the corridor through which a pipeline goes. If this project does proceed that those values should be calculated for the entire property because for most of

these people they would consider it a total loss. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Next up is number twenty-five Mr. John Warner. After John Warner we have Dolores Brown.

MR. WARNER: John Warner, W-A-R-N-E-R. I'm not an engineer, I'm not a scientist but I know what I see. I live on a crick in Schoharie. I own sixty acres. The Schoharie water supply runs underneath this crick. It's called Louse Kill Crick. Twice now in the last ten years rocks bigger than I am have come down with a spring wash of the crick and have busted the water lines.

Now my question is if you can bust the water line that's buried underneath the crick, why wouldn't it bust the gas line which they want to run under the crick, which is within three hundred feet of my house? That is the one question that I have, I think that they should look into that. Another one is they say there's no explosions but I remember Blenheim and the deaths in Blenheim from a gas line. So I think whoever stated that there's not anything blowing up that they look into their history papers and take a look at it.

Most of the other things have already been discussed that I wanted to mention but I'm strongly against eminent domain. It's going to destroy your property value. Is there a percentage that anybody's come up with as to what it's going to do to the value of your property? And if it's ten percent or twenty percent can we take that to our town hall and have our taxes reduced? These are my concerns and I agree one hundred percent with all the people that have done the studies on the animals and wildlife and I think they should get the first crack at safety as well as the people. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, sir. Next, number twenty-seven. Dolores Brown. Number twenty-seven Dolores Brown? Okay, we're going to move on then. Dolores Brown is not here. After Dolores Brown is Lynn Basselan.

MS. BASSELAN: Yes, my name is Lynn L-Y-N-N Basselan B-A-S-S-EL-A-N. I'm going to be very brief. I'm a shareholder and I say no, absolutely no to this. The public domain is really so unethical, immoral. It definitely will hurt our Schoharie County and Schoharie County has had an explosion in the past at Blenum. We've suffered that already. How about another county having to deal with that? We don't want it twice.

So can you please go back to corporate and tell them that a shareholder if voting no, completely no on this? Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Number twenty-nine, Wanda Colyer.

MS. COLYER: It's Wanda W-A-N-D-A Colyer C-O-L- Y-E-R. I don't, you know a lot of the people that have spoken don't really represent my views. I am not, I can tell that they believe in global warming. I do not, okay and that's okay because we don't have to agree but I think one thing that we all agree on that this is really, really bad for our county.

We are currently being raped and plundered. We have stone companies that are ripping apart our mountains in Cobleskill, Middleburg and Schoharie. We have our children in the elementary school breathing this fine powdery dust that is going to affect them some time in the future if it's not affecting them now. WE have our pictures being swayed all over again from the explosions that these companies produce.

There is talk about expanding their commitment to raping and plundering our county. We have been asked to do windmills, we have been asked to do solar panels and now we are being asked to have the whole county be cut up with pipelines. We had the Blenum explosion where people were, you know, they just don't look at a crash, people were killed there. We have to stop the rape and plunder.

Yes, I'm saying not in our backyard but I think it's time for somebody else to take a turn. Put it somewhere else. I also think that you have absolutely no right to public domain here. If it's going to be a pub-

lic domain situation it should be the total benefit of the community like building a resort that we can get tax dollars from and that would enhance the community. We have no gain here. We are being raped and plundered and you need to stop doing it.

Give these people jobs, these people with the orange shirts but give them jobs somewhere else. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Number thirty, John Hudson.

MR. HUDSON: We have become energy independent because of the Marcellus Shale through here and Pennsylvania and things but it doesn't do any good to get energy independent if we can't get the pipelines to bring the gas. It's like here tonight, without the natural gas we don't have heat. We don't have anything.

I've worked for the Teamsters Union. These jobs are important to us. It helps the economy of all of the local towns and things that we go through. The scale is about counting your time and overtime. People can make two thousand to twenty-five hundred dollars a week plus our benefits. We need those jobs. The jobs, also we have the best-trained craft to come in and do this pipeline.

We put on training schools, craft schools, all of this pipe is x-rayed a thousand times. It is the most safest, convenient way to get natural gas to all the customers here. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, sir. Next we have thirty-one, Willard Hoteling or Hotaling.

MR. HOTALING: That's Willard Hotaling, W-I-L-L- A-R-D H-O-T-A-L-I-N-G. I'm not much of a speaker but I'm in the Laborer's Union too and I'm fifty-four years old. I live in Schoharie County and I love the valley. I'm just hoping the pipeline can work it out with the homeowners and everybody can benefit out of this. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: We have the last speaker, who asked to go last, Jim Buzon, Supervisor from the Town of Middleburg. Sir, come up.

MR. BUZON: Good evening. My name is James S. Buzon. I did come in last because I was late coming in here tonight. The reason being that I was working on our town comprehensive plan, which we have been working on for about a year now. The comprehensive plan is designed to try to keep our standard of living in Middleburg, our community, our environment, our resources, the way the town would like it to be.

We surveyed the people in the town of Middleburg. We got a lot of responses back for it. Clearly a pipeline coming through our town is not, in any way, conducive with our comprehensive plan and what the people want. We can spend hours on this. We can spend a year on this. The problem of it is you get a company, a goliath that comes through, and along with FERC basically is allowed to completely disregard any kind of a program or plan that a town institutes. It is able to violate our zoning laws and do anything it wants to the people that are there.

Our hardworking people that live in our community -- and I realize that we have a lot of people who live in our community who are Union workers who rely on jobs, okay -- and they should be allowed to work. They need jobs but they need constructive jobs that goes along with the way our community wants to be.

You know, our forefathers that came here -- and I can speak for that because my relatives did come over with the Palatines -- they worked hard to try to keep this valley beautiful. They worked hard to provide the resources that we have here, the natural resources that generations including myself and many of these people here are now enjoying could have. We're working hard to try to keep these resources here in our community today for our untold generations that have come after us.

The other thing that I want to mention is by having this come through we feel that basically this is going to be denied to them. It's a privilege that they should have and they are going to be denied.

I don't know the feelings of everybody in this room, it's kind of mixed. I can tell from that. But I can tell for one thing that the way the scoping is going I can't say I agree with. I received this documented, it was dated actually July 22; due to the July 4th weekend I received it on July 6th. Today is July 16th.

I look at the schedule of events for the scoping meetings and I see that both Foothills Performing Art Center Oneonta and the Days Inn here at the Schoharie are scheduled simultaneously, which means that anybody who cannot make this meeting tonight cannot make another meeting this close to their area. So I really feel as far as the scoping and the scheduling that FERC set up is really unfair, alright.

(Applause)

MR. BUZON: Basically, they should take a look at when these meetings are being presented in different places and allow so that if somebody can't make that meeting which includes four of my other board members tonight as they are also at other meetings and I should actually be at another meeting okay, could actually make a meeting that's close enough to them. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, sir. That was the last speaker. Would anyone else who might have not have been able to complete their thoughts or complete their speech come up and speak? Come on up.

SPEAKER: Thank you I appreciate that very much. I just want to address a final two Commissioners Phillip Mohler. He's worked on conservation, energy and waste and natural gas development and exportation via increased pipeline infrastructure doesn't support water conservation, air or soil conservation and produces toxic waste that the industry still hasn't found a way to safely dispose.

Water quality is very disturbing. According to an article in Bloomberg T. Boon Pickens owns about eighty- five percent of the water rights in the Texas Panhandle and he wants to control more. He has been known to say that after natural gas water will be the next commodity. He really doesn't care who's going to buy it but it will go to the highest bidder, probably Dallas so I have that documented for you. It's just absolutely unacceptable to think that the basic right to clean water will be sold off to the highest bidder as a result of pipelines and fracking. It's just not a project and a plan that should be supported.

Collette Honorable, she's worked as a consumer protection attorney and I'm asking her as well as the other members to hear the voices of the consumers in New York State. we don't want more natural gas. We don't want more pipelines. We don't want more compressors fouling our resources and making our children and family ill. We want to be protected.

She also has experience working on pipeline safety and reliability and if she really, if you Collette really want us to be safe and stop this project. Surely she must know that very little of this system, the pipeline system, only about seven percent is inspected and surely she must know that adding more on the pipe pile isn't going to make it safer or more reliable.

She has also worked on diversity of the energy supply and you may or may not be aware that the New York State Public service Commission released a sweeping reform in February of 2015 to decentralize power resources in New York State. The approval of any pipelines in New York State is contrary to this sweeping policy framework. This directive envisions many small renewable, sustainable power sources joining together to replace these bigger baseLoad power and the proposed NED Is contrary to this new policy.

So basically I want FERC to think out of their corporate gas and oil control box and reject this proposed pipeline and allow the citizens of New York to protect our resources and protect public health and provide jobs by allowing us to aggressively transition to renewable and sustainable energy resources. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you again. If anyone else wishes to come up and continue their, ma'am?

SPEAKER: Can I speak to FERC?

MR. TOMASI: Have you spoken yet, sir?

SPEAKER: No.

MR. TOMASI: If you wanted to come up and speak, yes. Again, please state your name for the court reporter.

MR. KARLEWICZ: My name is George Karlewicz, GEORGE KARLEWICZ. I live a half a mile from the Reit Compressor Station and some of the concerns, I don't have any real formal statement here, but some of the concerns we have up in that area were that the last time the pipeline came through the blasting was necessary in order to put the pipe at the proper depth that you guys required. That in turn affected some of the wells in the local areas because of the underground cave systems that are up there and sometimes that blasting has a way of changing underground water systems.

So we're wondering whether or not you are going to require testing of those wells prior and also after the pipeline is put through or even the compressor station if that goes through as well. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Do you have any other comments?

MR. KARLEWICZ: That was it.

MR. TOMASI: I will answer a couple of questions, you know, after everyone is done giving me their comments and then I can respond a little bit to his concerns and his questions. Anyone else have any? Ma'am you want to come up?

MS. NOLAN: Kathleen Nolan. This is a little technical and I'll submit something in writing in light of your comments about having early opportunity to look. The question of radon in the Marcellus Shoal gas has come up and it was addressed in the hearings on the Spectra Pipeline by the Federal Agency. But I believe, looking at the testimony in that case that the materials submitted were not really adequate for addressing the question of how much radon there is in the gas and how harmful it can be.

The samples that were obtained for testing, the testing was done independently but the samples that were done for testing were done in cooperation with industry and in the expert consultants report from industry the consultant indicated that if you control the gas flow through the pipeline you can determine whether or not radon or any other substance is flushed out.

So if the industry knows when testing is going to take place and then a sample is drawn and tested rigorously it can still be a sample that has a very low measurement even though at another time in that same pipeline there would be a sample with a higher measurement. So I think it's real important to get some independent testing of pipelines that come from similar regions. If this isn't running then obviously you can't test it but you can test the materials that will be coming through it by their concentrations in other pipelines.

The radon decays over a period of three days so if you measure the radon you may not see a problem downstream but the decay products have extremely long half-lives and are radioactive so I would ask that before proceeding with any permitting here that take the opportunity to really do a service for the questions that come up in relationship to all these pipelines and get some real data and make sure that there is not radon and radon decay products coming through these pipelines that anybody has to handle, particularly a problem if the workers are exposed to the interior of the pipelines.

If there are leaks there can be deposits on soils and nearby and if there are explosions and ruptures then you can have those materials going everywhere. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Is anyone else wishing to speak or make a comment? Sir?

MR. KERLEY: Robert Kerley, KERLEY. I'm continuing my comments. What I was trying to finish up saying is that ultimately the Energy Department and FERC are products of Congress from acts of Congress and I believe that the Energy Department and FERC are dysfunctional as are many other administrative agencies and the point I was trying to make is that ultimately I guess the reform or reshaping of

departments has to come through Congress and I certainly encourage the people to push Congress, push their Congress people and Senators to look at these administrative agencies.

I do not see why an administrative agency cannot call for agency rehabilitation and reform from the inside. I don't know the particulars of actual procedure or law for administrative agencies but I don't see why where can't be a general call for a reform of FERC and I say that because as I said before it's clearly a rubber stamp for the oil and gas industry and I don't think that can be stressed enough.

I wanted to say further that obviously environmental and health impacts are paramount to anything in the human world. There is almost a level of obfuscation here with this obsession with the EIS, what is a convenient command and control structure over is that the actual system itself. The actual oil and gas regulation in the nation is completely screwed up and dysfunctional.

The comments of people like me always seem to end up kind of in that backwater area and I don't like it. I don't like the obfuscation. I think we should be talking about how FERC is a shill for the oil and gas industry and absolutely nobody wants to just come right out and say it. That should be paramount first thing of what's going on in this process and in all of these hearings. This is a dysfunctional backwards, aggressive way of doing things that assumes pandering.

It assumes there will be this nice stuff happening here and then all projects will go through. Well that's wrong this stuff has to be addressed from the roots of the issues rather than from the dead branches of the issues, to use that Thich Nhat Hanh analogy that I was using earlier. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: If anyone else would want to come up and speak.

MS. STANTON: My name is Lisa Stanton and I did rush my comments before so I want to come up and add a little bit more to it. As I was saying we are regulated by many government agencies and as the pipeline comes through we are not allowed to farm on the acres. As my husband said, it is upwards of one hundred and thirty acres and more than a mile so we are not allowed to use those acres for two full calendar years during construction from what we have been told by the pipeline companies.

Since Constitution has already been granted their Certificate of Public Necessity they can start at any time as soon as DEC issues their permit, their final permit that they are waiting for so they really could start in 2015 the middle of this growing season, two calendar years would make that three growing seasons. With the collocation of NAD pipeline, it could be up to six growing seasons that we are affected and one hundred and thirty acres out of a thousand acres is a good ten percent of our crop acreage.

When we are not able to farm those acres we have to purchase additional feed to feed our animals at an additional expense that is not covered under any compensation that we may get by the pipeline company for an easement. They do talk crop damages but we have no idea what that is at this point because we refuse to sign an easement because the offers that they are making us are ludicrous and ridiculous and based on properties that were not comparable to ours at all.

So, I know a lot of people are asked to sacrifice for this pipeline but how many residences or businesses could be asked to sacrifice up to ten percent of the land that they farm for up to six calendar years? Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Did anyone else want to come up and add to their comments? Does anyone have any questions? Well I can answer one of the questions the gentleman had regarding pre and post testing for wells. We do actually look at that issue and one of the things that we would require, do require and have required in the past is if there is damage to a well, they need to either repair the well, redrill the well or provide alternate means to get people water.

So I would definitely encourage you that if there is damage due to construction from any previous pipeline or from previous construction of the compressor stations, contact FERC, contact me and I can get you in touch with people who can look at that issue and potentially resolve that issue. So we do not just walk

away once a pipeline is built. We actually maintain the environmental review and environmental controls during the life of the pipeline.

So we look at those issues and we want to make sure that any time any environmental issues crop up during it, even if it's erosion or anything like that, we will go back and tell the company they have to go back and fix that issue. We have another question over here.

AUDIENCE: Me?

MR. TOMASI: Yes. Could you come up to the mic so I can hear?

SPEAKER: I would like to respond to your comments and to your question about well testing. When the Tennessee gas pipeline went through Albany County, specifically the town of New Scotland was thirty years ago? Forty years ago? Many of the water wells were disrupted and complaints were made and people were ignored and I know of council people who had their water wells disrupted to the point where they had to replace their submersible pump once, twice, three times and they had to bear the cost. There was absolutely no help.

Albany County Legislature recently passed a county law stating that if this pipeline comes through and there is any blasting all water wells and homeowners within a one mile radius of the pipeline must receive notification that the blasting is going to occur and must have water well testing done before and after. Kind of sounds somewhat good but I'm disappointed that the county did n't come out with a resolution in opposition to the pipeline in support of sustainable renewable energy, so that's all I can tell you at this point. You can find that local law online, just go to Albany County Legislature and call them if you can't find it.

MR. TOMASI: I guess I can add a little bit, it wasn't necessarily a question but I can add a little bit to some of the issues regarding blasting. We do require typically blasting plans, where we do know where there is going to be blasting. Part of that will be not just noise and vibration issues that we will look at but we will look at any impacts from damage to aquifers to wells, to houses to structures. Those sort of issues.

So I would encourage that, I hope that the county will have put that specific resolution or that law, they would have informed us, but we are going to look into that and make sure that you know, we can address the county's concerns in the document. That's what I can add to that particular issue. Any other questions? Sir, you can come up.

SPEAKER: Yes, I guess I will ask the question. I mean, is there a process within FERC or within the energy department to internally address for reform or redress the issues that I was talking about? You know does anything, if I am correct and this process is completely wrong and mistaken for the people and for the Nation and the United States of America and it is dysfunctional, how is that fixed? Is there any process if people believe this procedure itself is actually flawed and mistaken? What can people say about that and what can you guys do?

MR. TOMASI: Well, first of all I am not a Commissioner. I am not a Chairman. I am a staff member. My job as I mentioned earlier is to write the Environmental Impact Statement. If you have concerns along those lines, all of you are citizens of the United States, you have the ability to write your elected representatives as well as the Commissioners to let them know your concerns along those lines. Any other questions? Sir, do you have a question?

SPEAKER: Yes. I have a concern. They would like to get an easement to make an approach road to their staging area on the pipeline. We have an organic farm. We have a pond as mentioned before which is our only water supply. There is no public water. We have gone five hundred feet drilling a dry well. Several neighbors have in the same formation attempted unsuccessfully to reach water.

Even just building that access road, we cannot tolerate for example their using herbicides to control the weeds on that access road. That would destroy the nature of our business. If the blasting nearby were to disrupt our water supply, our business is caput. It's done.

What is our recourse? What conditions do you put, you FERC, on the proponent to reimburse of the full

cost of the damage they do to our lives, to our livelihood and to our peace of mind? Are you simply going to let them do what they want on a narrow strip within our land regardless of whether they damage anything? Do you force them to abide by certain minimal standards? I really want to know.

MR. TOMASI: Well, I can address a couple of your concerns. I don't know your property. I don't know whether you are saying an access road that's being proposed to temporary workspace to where you are or something like that. I don't know at this point whether they proposed that to be a permanent or temporary road.

AUDIENCE: Two years.

MR. TOMASI: Two years. So it's a temporary road. I would encourage you to contact me and we can look at the actual, I can actually find it on the map. We can look at it and determine whether. We are in an ongoing review of all of their roads, all of their access roads both permanent and temporary as well as places like where you are, extra work space, those sort of things. We determine in the environmental document whether it is going to be determined if those are actually needed or not.

When it comes to herbicides or issues about property and compensation, those tend to be private negotiations between the landowner and the company. Now on the herbicide issue, if you provide that as a comment and let me know what you have, let me know that is an organic farm, that is something we would take into account and we could potentially and I can't guarantee anything at this point because we are still in the process of developing that document we can make sure that the company would not spray those for that temporary road on your land.

Now the issue of the water, again, any damage that the pipeline does to any other resources in the area like water, we require them to, we require them in general to put things back the way it was for temporary impacts. Any damage to the water, water sources, springs, wells, those sort of things they are required to fix those if they are damaged. That is something we would require and do require routinely in all of our projects. Are there any other questions because if not I am going to go ahead and end the meeting.

Again, we ran a little later than expected but I do want to thank everyone for coming out tonight. Again, I want to reiterate that I appreciate your comments. I now many people are concerned about this pipeline and I personally will do my best to ensure that the Environmental Impact Statement minimizes the impact to the best practicable. If you have any questions or comments feel free to contact me at FERC and I can answer any of your questions. Thank you again and have a good night.

(The Schoharie scoping meeting concluded at 9:27 p.m.)

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
IN THE MATTER OF:

Project No. NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT : PF14-22-000

Foothills Performing Arts Center
24 Market Street
Oneonta, New York 13820

Thursday, July 16, 2015

The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping Meeting, pursuant to notice, at 7:00 p.m., Paul Friedman, the moderator.

PROCEEDINGS

(7:00 p.m.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission spelled F-E-R-C, FERC, or Commission, I would like to welcome you here tonight to our public scoping meeting to make environmental comments on the Northeast Energy Direct project, proposed or NED, proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, we call them TGP or Tennessee. Some people call them Kinder Morgan because they are a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan. And this proposal in FERC docket number PF14-22.

My name is Paul Friedman, and I'm a staff member at the FERC based on Washington, D.C. and I'm part of the environmental project team work on the Tennessee Gas NED project.

Let me introduce the other team members who are here tonight. Next to me is Olivia DeSanto. In the back is Oliver Pratt and Wayne Kicklighter and Jennifer Ferris. They are all employees of a company called Cardeno. Cardeno is the FERC's environmental contractor for this particular project.

Let the record show this meeting began promptly at about 7:01 p.m. on Thursday, July 16th, 2015 in Oneonta, New York.

You may have noticed that to my right, your left, is a court reporter who is transcribing this meeting. This is so we can have an accurate record of tonight's comments. Eventually an electronic copy of the transcript of this meeting will be placed into the FERC's e-library system which contains the public record for this proceeding.

The FERC has a transcription contract with Ace Federal Reporters. If you wish to obtain a copy of the transcript prior to its placement in our public files, you must make arrangements directly with Ace. So you could talk to Larry here after the meeting if you want a copy of the transcript prior to it being placed in e-library.

The FERC is the lead federal agency for both the authorization of this project under the Natural Gas Act and for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA.

Under the NEPA, the FERC team will produce an environmental impact statement or EIS for this project. The FERC was originally created in 1920 by U.S. Congress. We were first known as the Federal Power Commission until Jimmy Carter came in and became president and we reorganized and renamed.

One of the industries we regulate is the interstate transportation of natural gas. FERC also regulates non-federal hydropower, electric rates for interstate transportation, and oil rates for interstate transportation, but we do not get involved with the siting of either power lines or oil pipelines. So, no, FERC is not involved in that thing called the Keystone Excel.

Also, the FERC does not regulate the exploration, production, or gathering of natural gas or the local distribution of natural gas. Those activities are regulated by the states. Therefore, comments about hydraulic

fracturing or fracking which is a method of exploration and production would be out of scope for our EIS because the FERC does not regulate that activity.

Our agency is directed by five commissioners. They are the decisionmakers. They are appointed by the President of the United States and approved by Congress.

The FERC staff like me, are civil servants. We, the FERC staff, do not make decisions. The Commissioners do that. But FERC staff does make recommendations to the Commissioners. You will find our recommendations for environmental issues at the back section of the EIS we produced for this project. So our recommendations are not a secret, they're public.

On June 30th, 2015 the FERC issued a notice of intent to produce an EIS for this project. That NOI announced the public scoping meetings that we're having right now. An it also explained how to file written comments with the Commission. The FERC prefers electronic filing of comments using our e-comment feature. You have to go to our website on the Internet at www.FERC.gov, click on documents and filings, and it will tell you how to file electronic comments. Or you can send in comments the old fashioned way with a letter mailed to the Secretary of the Commission at 888 First Street, Northeast, Washington, D.C. 20426.

In all cases, put the docket number PF14-22 on your correspondence and we treat electronic filings the same way we treat written letters, there's no differentiation about weighting them.

Tonight I'd like to accomplish the following things. I'd like to summarize the project very, very briefly, explain the role of the FERC in the review of the project, outline how the public may participate in process, and allow you, the public, an opportunity to voice your concerns about the project at this forum.

I ask that you reserve all questions until after my presentation. There is a table at the back of the auditorium, you passed it as you came in, manned by Cardeno where you can still sign up to be a speaker tonight if you have not already done so.

Let me emphasize that this is not a hearing on the merits of the proposal. No decisions will be made based on the concerns we hear tonight. These concerns are meant for our environmental review.

As I said earlier, this meeting provides you an opportunity to comment on the types of environmental issues that you would like to see covered in our EIS. The more specific your comments are about potential environmental impacts, the more useful it will be for the FERC staff to focus our attention on issues that are important to the public.

Statements for or against the project are not particularly useful and will not influence the analysis in our EIS.

Here are some ground rules about decorum during tonight's meeting. First and foremost, treat all speakers with respect whether you agree with them or not.

Please, no booing, no cheering, no applauding, and no yelling out.

If the audience becomes unruly, and I'm certain that will not be the case tonight, and there is a public safety issue, I reserve the right to close the meeting.

We will take speakers up until all speakers have had the opportunity to speak, or until the contract for this venue has a closing time, which tonight would be 11 p.m. Those not called who have signed up can still place their comments in to the public record by filing a letter with the Commission.

Each speaker will be limited to not more than three minutes. We have a little stop light here. It will be green for two and a half minutes, blinking yellow for 30 seconds, and then red at three minutes. At that time I'd like you to give up the microphone and allow the next speaker to have the floor.

All comments will be considered. The FERC gives written comments the same weight as verbal comments. I would like to clarify that the FERC did not conceive of this project nor are we promoting it. The project was designed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline, a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan. We call them the company or the applicant. The company came up with the location for their facilities and it is up to the

FERC staff to analyze the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of those facilities. The FERC is not an advocate for this project. FERC staff are advocates for the environmental review process.

Here are some facts about the background of the project. On October 2, 2014, the FERC accepted Tennessee Gas' request to initiate our pre-filing environmental review process for the NED project. During pre-filing the company is supposed to communicate with stakeholders to identify issues of concern, attempt to resolve those issues and perfect its formal application. No application has been filed at this time, but Tennessee Gas has indicated that they would like to file their application in October.

The purpose of the NED project is to provide about 1.3 billion cubic feet per day to markets in the north-east. The proposed facilities would consist of the following: about 412 miles of pipeline across portions of Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, nine associated laterals or loops totaling about 60 additional miles and then nine new compressor stations, 14 new meter stations, and one modified existing compressor station.

Today Tennessee Gas released a news release that stated that the mainline pipe between Wright and Draycut would be reduced to 30 inches in diameter and that horsepower would be reduced at several of the compressor stations. Details of the revised project will be filed with the FERC by Tennessee Gas in a new resource report one which will be filed in the near future by Tennessee Gas.

During pre-filing Tennessee Gas will file their draft resource reports as outlined in our regulations at Title 18 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 380. FERC will, of course, review those resource reports and issue data requests for data gaps that we find. In addition, since those resource reports are on the public record, any member of the public may file comments on them.

Right now we are in the scoping period. The formal comment period will end on August 31, 2015. However, we will continue to consider comments filed up until the time that FERC staff writes the EIS.

Based on comments received to date and our review of the draft resource reports, we have identified several environmental issues that we think the public is concerned about. This is not a complete list, it's just a brief summary from what we've gathered from looking at public comments. We think the public is concerned about impacts on land use including rural characteristics and conservation lands. We think the public is concerned about impacts on towns and residential areas. We think the public is concerned about impacts on ground water including aquifers and wells. And we think the public is concerned about air quality and noise from compressor stations.

Other opportunities exist for the public to comment even after Tennessee Gas files its formal application with the FERC. These post-application opportunities for comments include, one, in response to our notice of application and, two, in response to the issuance of our draft EIS. After the FERC issues its notice of application, parties who want to may request to be interveners in this proceeding. Being an intervener is a legal position. Interveners can request rehearing of a Commission decision. They also have the burden of serving all the parties on the service list. You do not have to be an intervener to have your environmental comments considered.

Also, you cannot intervene during the pre-filing period. You must wait until after Tennessee Gas files its formal application with the FERC.

After the application is filed, the FERC staff will identify data gaps and write environmental information requests. Once the FERC staff is convinced that the application is complete so that we fully understand the potential impacts the project may have on the environment, we will issue a notice of schedule for our EIS.

Based on the application and our own research the FERC staff will produce a draft EIS in accordance with the regulations of the Council of Environmental Quality or CEQ at Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 1500 to 1508 to satisfy the requirements of NEPA. That document will offer our independent analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the proposal and alternative. Generally the EIS will discuss

the current environment, identify potential project-related impacts on specific resources and present proposed measures to avoid, reduce, or mitigate adverse effects.

The FERC will address such resource topics as geology and soils, water and wetlands, vegetation and wildlife, cultural resource, socioeconomics, land use, air quality, noise, and safety.

We will also evaluate reasonable and feasible alternatives.

First, the FERC staff will produce a draft EIS that would be circulated for public comment. Copies of the DEIS would be sent to our environmental mailing list which includes elected officials, government agencies, environmental groups, and nongovernmental organizations, Indian tribes, local libraries and newspapers.

We address comments on the draft in a final EIS. The EIS is not a decision document. The Commission will consider the environmental impacts disclosed in the EIS together with other non-environmental issues such as markets and rates. The Commission developed a certificate policy statement that established criteria for determining whether or not there was a need for a project.

The Commission decision will be issued as a project order. If the Commission decides to authorize this project, they will give Tennessee Gas Pipeline a certificate of public convenience and necessity. If the Commission decides to authorize the project, the FERC staff will continue to make certain that the environmental conditions appended to the order are satisfied. Those conditions usually include a stipulation that the company obtain all other necessary federal permits and authorizations prior to construction such as a water quality certificate from the states or the endangered species signoff by Fish and Wildlife Service. The company must implement all of their measures they've committed to in their application and mitigation programs.

FERC staff and our contractor will monitor the project through construction, restoration, and the completion of the mitigation programs.

We will perform on-site inspections for compliance with the environmental conditions of the order.

That's the end of my presentation about the FERC process. Now is the time for public comments.

I will call up speakers individually in the order in which they signed up by number.

At this time I'd like numbers one through ten to come to the front two rows on my left, your right marked reserved. We'll be able to expedite speakers by having them come to the front and being ready to get to the microphone.

To move the meeting along in an expeditious manner, I will call up several numbers and those speakers should come up to the front row like we've just done.

When you come up to speak, speak clearly into the microphone, state your name and spell it out for the court reporter. If you represent an organization, tell us the name of your organization without using an acronym. If you are a landowner along the pipeline route, you can tell us where your property is located according to the mile marks or cross streets.

The first speaker we have tonight is number one.

MR. HIGGINS: Hello, my name is Dennis Higgins, D-e-n-n-i-s, H-i-g-g-i-n-s. It's FERC's mission to consider public convenience and necessity. FERC must ensure energy supplies are sufficient and consider pricing. Here's the public convenience and necessity part of Northeast Energy Direct. Kinder Morgan wants to move its gas. We here in New York don't need it. Massachusetts has already said they don't want it, nearly 50 town resolutions have been passed opposing NED.

Where is the gas going? We can connect the dots. Kinder Morgan's gas is headed for a proposed LNG terminal in Nova Scotia. With FERC approval Kinder Morgan will be able to seize New Yorkers' land, bulldoze our forests, trash our rivers and export their gas to China. This project's sole aim is to make money for Kinder Morgan and New Yorkers and New Englanders will suffer the health and environmental costs. There is no public convenience or necessity here.

Awarding this permit violates your mission. And here's a lesson in supply and demand. When the gas gets to Canada for export, our prices for gas go up.

Like others here I want to talk about jobs. I personally would not want a temporary job if it meant a neighbor had to lose his land to eminent domain.

I want to talk about FERC jobs too. I spoke with Dave Hannivick in your office of Energy Products. Dave prepares a statement, he called it a NEPA document which is meant to disclose the environmental impacts of a proposal. But something is really wrong here. Either Dave isn't writing up a proper EIS or you guys aren't reading it. Look what happened with the Constitution Pipeline in 2012 where thousands of people told you about the environmental harms, but you approved an unnecessary pipeline to the company with the worst environmental record in Pennsylvania and approved construction along the worst possible route.

For it's part Kinder Morgan has been fined by the U.S. government for stealing coal from customer stockpiles, lying to air pollution regulators, and mixing hazardous waste into gasoline. Kinder Morgan doesn't bother with maintenance and their pipelines are plagued by leaks and explosions including two large spills in residential neighborhoods of British Columbia.

Of course, you guys, that's the FERC itself, have been found guilty in federal court of violating the National Environmental Policy Act by allowing project segmentation as a way of avoiding cumulative impact analysis. FERC is accused of using illegal stalling tactics to keep lawsuits out of the courts while projects get built. Someone definitely ought to lose their job. Is it you guys, the Commissioners, or Dave?

Everyone in this room knows what's going to happen. FERC salaries are paid by the oil and gas companies and your environmental contractors are paid by gas companies. You approve every fracked gas project that's proposed. But we in New York want you to know something, and you're going to hear the same thing in Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline's NED project is not going to happen here.

(Applause.)

MR. DOWNEY: Dick Downey, Unity Go Area Landowners Association. Half the homes in the U.S. heat with gas. That's over 100 million homes, 54 percent of New England buildings are heated with gas. Electric generation is switching from coal to gas. It's 31 percent today and growing.

In New England 52 percent of the electricity comes from gas. Expect that to increase as nuclear plants age out. Because of the switch from coal to gas, carbon dioxide has been reduced in the United States to the lowest levels in 20 years, down to 1994 levels. All this with a growing population and a growing GDP. CNG cars and trucks -- truck fleets are on the rise. This option cuts automobile mileage in half and emits 30 percent less CO2 than gasoline.

Manufacturing is moving back to the United States. Costs of production and costs of feedstock are lower here. Twenty-four LNG terminals are in the planning or construction phase. Once built gas in the United States will offset Putin's chokehold on Europe. U.S. gas will reduce the use of coal in the Far East.

New England pays a premium for natural gas. Last year over \$5.00 in MCF. Currently New England gas comes from Canada and the Gulf Coast. Marcellus gas sells at less than half that price and comes from a field only a few hundred miles away.

All these factors plus the cost and convenience of natural gas creates a demand. Meeting that demand depends upon a delivery system. Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline is part of that delivery system. Let's build it. The sooner, the better. Better for our homes, businesses, factories and quality of life. Better for our local, state, and national government. And better for the world. Let's get this pipeline built now.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MINOR: My name is Eugene Minor and I live in Franklin, New York.

You, FERC, are required by law under the National Environmental Policy Act to consider cumulative impacts of projects reviewed by you. During the scoping hearings for the misnamed Constitution Pipeline, and during the hearings on the draft environmental impact statement for that same pipeline you were repeatedly called upon to consider such cumulative impacts.

Many comments observed that the construction of an open-access pipeline through the Marcellus and Utica shale region of New York could lead to hydrofracking in New York state. That threat has been temporarily blocked by the Cuomo administration but a future administration could easily alter that decision. Your final EIS did not examine the potential impact of a fracking build out that could accompany the Constitution Pipeline.

Furthermore, you were warned that permitting one massive industrial project like the Constitution Pipeline would change the rural agricultural region traversed by the pipeline from a green fields area to an already industrialized one. No sooner have you approved the first pipeline, then Tennessee Gas Pipeline has come along to propose another to run parallel to the first.

Tennessee Gas Pipeline has also proposed a 30,000 horse power compressor station for the town of Franklin. A compressor station that will spew carcinogenic pollutants into the air, breathed by citizens of Franklin, Otego, and Oneonta and wherever else the wind carries them.

Just yesterday medical daily reported a 27 percent increase in hospitalizations for cardiac and neurological conditions in Pennsylvania counties with large numbers of fracked wells, as well as increases in neurological conditions, cancer, and skin ailments.

FERC must revisit the conditional permit given to Constitution Pipeline and study the potential for health and environmental impacts of the expansion of gas extraction activities that will inevitably result from infrastructure expansion.

The evidence for that expansion is here today before us as you consider yet another application for another pipeline. The companies that want to build these pipelines boast on their websites that the gas will be sent to Canada for export. How does that serve the public convenience and necessity of the citizens of New York and the United States? Will making a few more Texans and their shareholders rich compensate for the loss of our clean air, water and soil, along with the agriculture and tourism that comprise our economy, I don't think so.

Reject Tennessee Gas Company's proposal and revisit your ill-considered approval of Constitution Pipeline. Do your job, respond to the substantive comments and issues raised at these hearings.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

I want to remind speakers when they come up to not only say their name out loud, but also to spell it for the court reporter. This should be speaker number four.

MS. ANDERSON: And five.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And five.

MR. ANDERSON: My name is Stuart Anderson, S-t-u-a-r-t A-n-d-e-r-s-o-n.

MS. TUBRIDY: And I'm Joan Tubridy, T-u-b-r-i-d-y.

MR. ANDERSON: We want to talk about the proposed compressor station in Franklin.

MS. TUBRIDY: We've heard lots of discussion in our community, some of it very heated, about what the compressor station will mean for our area and we would like to sum it up for you.

MR. ANDERSON: As we have just six minutes, we'll be quick about it. Joan will repeat the pro-pipeline arguments that we've heard.

MS. TUBRIDY: And Stu will offer the rebuttal. So here we go. The Franklin compressor station will be over a mile and a half from the Otego Elementary School. The train is much closer and much dirtier.

MR. ANDERSON: The train goes through in just a couple of minutes. But the compressor station will foul the air around the clock. A mile and a half is not far enough to be safe from air pollution when the predominant winds, according to NISERTA blow right from the compressor site to the village of Otego and the school.

MS. TUBRIDY: Yeah, but the EPA sets pollution limits.

MR. ANDERSON: But the Halliburton loophole exempts gas facilities from the Clean Air Act. Where there are limits the operators ignore them with the excuse that venting is an emergency procedure. The most imminent danger may be in these short-term three- or four-hour spikes as venting occurs.

MS. TUBRIDY: But compressor stations use filters, the air leaving is cleaner than the air going in.

MR. ANDERSON: The tobacco industry told us that smoking was safe. How many millions of people died while the long-term studies were being done to prove that they were lying.

Now the gas companies would have you believe that air pollution from compressor stations is safe. Will your kids be a statistic?

MS. TUBRIDY: Noise abatement measures are effective.

MR. ANDERSON: Very true. But the problem is not about noise, it's about air pollution.

MS. TUBRIDY: Well, the compressor station is in Franklin, so this is Franklin's problem.

MR. ANDERSON: The whole region will get the air pollution so it is a problem for Otego and Oneonta and Meredith residents as well.

MS. TUBRIDY: But the pipeline and compressor station will bring jobs.

MR. ANDERSON: Kinder Morgan confirms that. They say that the compressor station will employ two people. Other than temporary construction jobs, the pipeline will bring no jobs to our area. If you want long-term jobs, support the development of wind and solar and geothermal renewable resources.

MS. TUBRIDY: But we already have pipelines in our area.

MR. ANDERSON: Yes, we do, little eight-inch lines that do not have compressor stations in our vicinity.

The small pipeline blast in 1990 in Blenheim killed two, injured five, and left 40 residents homeless.

MS. TUBRIDY: But it's just one compressor station in the middle of nowhere, Stu.

MR. ANDERSON: (Laughing) the NED is piggybacking on Constitution which does not yet have a compressor station in its 124-mile run. When they decide to install one, the easiest place will be right alongside the Kinder Morgan facility in Franklin. This project segmentation scam was used in the Millennium Pipeline, laying the pipe first and then siting the compressors.

MS. TUBRIDY: But the compressor station will not run all the time.

MR. ANDERSON: The pipeline companies are not spending hundreds of millions of dollars on these things to just sit there. Especially after the export terminals get up and pumping, these things will only shut down for maintenance, which is probably worse because that's when they're venting raw gas.

MS. TUBRIDY: Our children are moving away because there are no jobs here.

MR. ANDERSON: The pipeline will bring no permanent jobs to the region. And the compressor station will scare away young families and our region's most financially desirable immigrants, retiring downstate professionals who love our safe, rural environment.

MS. TUBRIDY: There are many vocal citizens in favor of gas development in our area.

MR. ANDERSON: Many well-intentioned people have been fooled by promises of jobs an economic boom. Go visit Dimick. It's the same depressed place it was ten years ago. But remember to take a water bottle with you.

MS. TUBRIDY: The pipeline companies have been very supportive of our schools and our fire departments and EMS services.

MR. ANDERSON: The gas companies have come through our region trying to buy people's loyalty by throwing around gifts. But they won't add up to anything like the cost of the damages they'll bring to our property values around -- and the property values in Hancock, for example, have been down by as much as 50 percent.

MS. TUBRIDY: But gas turbines burn very cleanly. I've seen this on television.

MR. ANDERSON: I've seen a lot on television. But they still emit formaldehyde, benzene, toluene, and many other volatile organic compounds plus radio-active radon and lead and polonium particulates that are common in Marcellus shale gas from Pennsylvania. Many of these disastrous chemicals are linked to childhood leukemia.

Remember the Halliburton loophole, gas facilities are unregulated air pollution sources.

MS. TUBRIDY: We have visited compressor stations and found nothing to fear.

MR. ANDERSON: You can't see the air pollution, it is invisible. You can't smell the raw gas, it has not been scented yet. The workers on the site are all paid by the gas companies, do you think they would risk their jobs by telling the whole truth?

MS. TUBRIDY: This is a FERC issue, a Franklin issue, a state issue, so really, we can do nothing about it.

MR. ANDERSON: If you believe you are powerless, then you are powerless. But you can urge FERC to deny the Kinder Morgan NED application. If you have no faith in FERC, urge your local officials to send a letter to the DEC and the governor supporting a gas infrastructure moratorium.

MS. TUBRIDY: Thank you for your attention. And other than having a little fun here tonight, I have to say this whole process is a sham.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

It's now time for speaker number six and I'd like speakers ten through 15 to come to the front row. Speakers ten through 15 come down to the front row.

MS. NELSON-BOWNE: Hello. My name is Kaima Nelson-Bowne, N-e-l-s-o-n hyphen B-o-w-n-e. I live in the town of Franklin. I ask myself, where does my outrage about the proposed NED pipeline and the 30,000 horse power compressor stations to be built in Franklin and Wright start?

Not with the fact that the psyche and soul of our region will be scarred forever. Not with the fact that we will receive absolutely no benefit from this scarring both during its construction and thereafter. Not with the fact that our neighbors and we already are experiencing emotional and mental distress from the proposed pipelines. Not with the fact the tremendous damage will be incurred to our fragile roads, not with the fact that the gas will be piped away and sold for profits that do not benefit us. Not with the fact that there are no benefits to us at all. Not with the fact that Kinder Morgan doesn't even have the decency to contact the town of Franklin to discuss the proposed compressor station. Not with the fact that FERC has not yet completed Constitution Pipeline's EIS before beginning a second.

My outrage starts with the fact that FERC is now considering a second pipeline just inches away from the first. My outrage starts and ends with you, FERC. You are an independent agency who behaves as if being a pawn of the oil and gas industry. As a regulatory commission, you have an ethical responsibility to the citizens and the environments impacted by your decisions.

Governor Cuomo recently had the guts and the wisdom to stand up to these pressures and outlaw hydrofracking in New York state.

Please, FERC, throw away your rubber stamps. Complete in a supplemental environmental impact statement for Constitution Pipeline which includes cumulative impacts like the Northwest Energy Direct, or better yet, say no to NED.

Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number seven.

MS. MORIARTY: My name is Eleanor, E-l-e-a-n-o-r, Moriarty, M-o-r-i-a-r-t-y. And I'm here tonight representing the Delaware Otsego Audubon Society, the local chapter of the National Audubon Society. The comments I am presenting here are by our board, by our membership, and they've been authored by Andy Mason, our conservation chair.

There is strong evidence against any public need or benefit from this pipeline. FERC should insist on proof that this project is necessary, lacks alternatives and will provide benefits to the public before giving a privately owned, for-profit corporation the authority to take citizens' private property against their will.

We have major concern about the pipeline's impact on bird habitat. Many of the forest-dwelling birds in our region are in significant decline due in large part to fragmentation of woodlands. These forest-dwelling birds require large tracts of contiguous forest for successful breeding.

As these areas are broken into smaller pieces by development, agriculture, and other activities predators and nest parasites negatively impact nests and lowering breeding succession.

A pipeline right-of-way will significantly damage these forest areas resulting in loss of habitat. The path of the preferred route along the higher elevations of our region will take it through some of the largest and most important unbroken woodlands for birds. Continued maintenance of the right-of-way is to keep it clear means a perpetual corridor of threat to the forest birds.

It has been suggested that the pipeline right-of-ways could benefit bird species that often can survive and breed successfully through brush and edge habitat. However, there's an abundance of these areas in our area. And as a result, these birds really do have a relatively healthy population and in contrast to the steady declining forest species.

In addition to our concern over loss of important bird habitat, the pipeline possesses significant threats to wetlands, streams, vegetation and other wildlife. There should be full studies and impacts given prime consideration in assessing these projects.

These issues were raised during the Constitution Pipeline proceedings, they're well-known, not just by us, by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation among others. However, FERC essentially disregarded them and as they did all environmental concerns for that project. There's a stunning abdication of the responsibility and duties of a public agency. There is little to suggest that FERC's approach to this project will be any different. However, we and others do care about the environmental wildlife. So we continue to participate in this process knowing full well that this agency will again probably rubberstamp this company's plans and the public be damned.

On balance, we do not believe there is any overriding need for this pipeline and certainly that the environmental damage is unacceptable for such a questionable pipeline project.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number eight.

MS. BEVILACQUA: My name is Linda Bevilacqua, B as in boy e-v as in Victor, i-l-a-c-q-u-a.

Dear FERC, Shame on you. Shame on you for wasting our taxpayers' money. Shame on the government of the United States. Shame on you for humiliating well-intentioned people. Shame on you for putting profit before our health and safety. Shame on you for letting corporations take private land by eminent domain from hardworking people, many of whom have had their life savings invested in their paradise. Shame on you for appearing at these circus meetings after you've had a nice meal and a comfortable hotel room funded by us.

We are the ones running around spending gas money, putting miles on our cars, sacrificing our time and families, and our communities are being divided. Shame on you for not listening or caring about us. You'll approve this pipeline just like you do all the rest that come before you. FERC, shame on you.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Speaker number nine.

MS. GOGINS: My name is Heidi Gogins, G as in George o-g-i-n-s. I am a farm owner in Delaware County. And the only reason this pipeline isn't going through my farm is because I'm in the New York City watershed.

You want to know about environmental impacts. You know, I'm not good at following order. I mean, what I really want to say is if we lived in a democracy Kinder Morgan would have to appear before you to prove that there's no harm from this. We shouldn't be here.

(Applause.)

MS. GOGINS: But since you want to know about environmental impacts, methane is 86 times as potent a greenhouse gas as CO₂ over a 20-year period. Scientists have told us that in order to avoid catastrophic climate impacts, we must transition away from fossil fuel as quickly as possible. I don't know what part of this the United States Government doesn't understand except that they're getting paid by the gas corporations not to understand.

Building new gas infrastructure at this point in history is criminal.

(Applause.)

MS. GOGINS: It is stealing the lives of future generations who are going to have to live with the havoc that we are creating when we build these kinds of things. It's unconscionable. There's a sun up in the sky that has more power and more energy than we could ever possibly use and the only reason that we don't have renewable energy everywhere by now is that 20, 30 years ago when everybody knew that this was coming, the government refused to do anything and it's kind of a crime. Sorry.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Speaker number 10, please come up. We should already have speakers 11 through 15 in the front row, and if speakers 15 through 20 could also come down to the front row, we appreciate that.

MR. HUDIBURG: I want the public and FERC to know that I got here in a plug-in hybrid car from 40 miles away. I'll be going back on gas, but I came on electric. And I got that electric from a solar array that I recently installed on my roof.

The reason I bring this up is that transitioning to electric to renewables is much, much -- can be much quicker than FERC and the industry are willing to admit or recognize.

If I were to install too many splits in the house for heating and induction stove, I would be 100 percent electric.

So regulators and politicians are still not responding to the reality that increased methane releases from these pipelines and compressor stations lead to more, not less, global warming. FERC is not responding to the very obvious and needed remedy of minimizing conventional hydrocarbon build out in order to maximize renewable energy and energy efficiency.

FERC does not have a mandate to approve every pipeline that comes down the pike. Poisoning people with fossil fuel emissions from these pipeline compressor stations and LNG export terminals does not contribute to the public convenience or necessity. Our energy problems are not a shortage of energy but a tremendous overuse of hydrocarbons. Our public -- our true public convenience and necessity can be served by programs that will encourage the build out of vast numbers of energy-efficient buildings, build-

ing upgrades, and renewables. And, in fact, for now we need an overinvestment in renewables so that those who can afford it and have the available space can generate surplus electricity for the rest of us.

This would allow the creation of many more small businesses which politicians of both parties claim they love. This build out of a new kind of infrastructure will truly benefit the public good. With proper government policy and support, zero net energy buildings and even net positive buildings can be built. And presently unenergy efficient buildings can be renovated. Our new buildings can be the generators of our energy, not users. Many can transform themselves from buyers to sellers of electricity. We just need proper government policy.

Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Before you leave, can you state your name and spell it for the court reporter?

MR. HUDIBURG: Peter Hudiburg, last is H-u-d-i-b-u-r-g.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Number 11.

MS. WINKLER: My name is Suzy Winkler, S-u-z-y W-i-n- like Nancy k-l-e-r.

I used to think that FERC was broken. But I've come to the realization that I was wrong. I see now that FERC does exactly what it was designed to do, and that's to keep the public locked out of the regulatory process. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission was conceived and built as a fortress with impenetrable walls intended to ignore citizens and protect corporations.

Your agency has fortified a moat so deep and wide in its circular thinking that the oil and gas industry bankrolls the agency through its permit fees and is continuously bolstered by the revolving door of industry, elected officials, and its presidentially appointed commissioners.

As we citizens have become involved and forceful in our opposition to individual projects like the unconstitution pipeline and FERC's rubberstamp, FERC also evolved with another layer of protection, your tolling orders intended to block the public's ability to get into court and be heard.

In fact, the second Circuit Court of Appeals denied, Stop the Pipeline's Petition for a writ of mandamus saying that STP did not meet the requirements of mandamus and I believe that in doing so the court has enabled FERC's behavior.

Though we've learned from our predecessors, it's still taken three years for activists to get up to speed, to witness the lifecycle of the system for ourselves, to absorb the process, and to unearth FERC as an independent agency solidly under the thumb of the oil and gas industry. But now it's clear as day that the process is fixed.

The best thing that I can say tonight is that my eyes -- our eyes, are finally wide open, that our numbers are growing with every, single, filthy rubberstamp that you accept -- that you approve -- every project.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments. And I'm certain you want to let other members of your community also speak. So you must yield the floor to speaker number 12.

MS. WINKLER: I believe I have three minutes.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Your three minutes are up.

MS. WINKLER: Thank you.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number 12, would you please come up?

MS. MARSH: Hi, I'm Loddie Marsh, M-a-r-s-h. I want you to stop this pipeline invasion. It's an insidious and malignant process. FERC is a farce. Five appointees and all with ties to gas companies. FERC

doesn't follow its own rules. It breaks laws, it allows segmentation. It allowed properties on the Constitution Pipeline route to be taken eminent domain without the 401 water quality permit or Army Corps of Engineers signing permits to approve the pipeline.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's right.

MS. MARSH: I can't believe we have to jump through hoops which only perpetuate your shams. It's unconscionable that we have to beg not to have our air poisoned, not to have our water contaminated, or our forests destroyed with the removal of over 700,000 trees along with wetlands and birds, and animal habitats, and the loss of our property values.

FERC doesn't have any setbacks on pipelines allowing them to be next to our homes, our barns, our businesses, and even our children's schools. FERC does not work for us, the landowner. It gets paid by the fees gas companies pay for their service commission. A commission without integrity. Stop destroying our communities. Stop putting us at risk. Stop being a detriment to society. Even suggesting a second pipeline 25 feet from the first. What property value will be left?

Are you kidding me? Kinder Morgan has an atrocious safety record. Oh, let's go with them, FERC says. Let them steal our land again. The NED project is not for public good, it's for corporate greed. Stop this madness. The profit is not ours. The damage left behind is ours. Sign on to stopthepipeline.org and find out how you can stop them.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Speaker number 13.

MR. PIERCE: Charlie Pierce, C-h-a-r-l-i-e P-i-e-r-c-e from Otego.

I am strongly against both pipelines. According to laws, eminent domain is only for the good of many citizens within the United States. Anything to do with exporting is excluded. Eminent domain is not for the purpose of manipulating our well-paid government workers into allowing the rich to make billions from profits exporting America's energy for quick profits.

I have sat in some law classes. I understand there is already enough pipeline capacity to supply New England with its oil and natural gas needs. Stop using that capacity to export through Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and through Nova Scotia and Canada. We in New York state prize our drinking water here in the breadbasket of America. There are competitions on who has the best drinking water. We don't want another love canal or Blenheim of gangies.

My home in Otego is about one mile down hill in a straight line from the proposed compressor station on top of the hill. At least four of us living next to two round -- round up spread cornfields in Otego village now have cancer. I still hear it's cousin, agent orange, doesn't cause cancer. Some still defend smoking as harmless. Why would we want more carcinogens in our water, in our land, and in our air? The reason for even more pipeline capacity is to accommodate drilling here in our area. Nobody is fooling us about that.

We pay your good salary, benefits, and retirements in our democracy of, by and for the people. Like an avalanche our is being corrupted by big money. Any sixth grader can tell you corporations can't be drafted, can't sit on a jury, can't register to vote, can't be imprisoned, don't volunteer to carry an M-16 in the Middle East. I served my country in the '60s to stay safe and strengthen our democracy. Represent us, the people, no pipelines period.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Speaker number 14.

MR. REED: Hi. My name is Hazen Reed, R-e-e-d. I live less than a half a mile from this proposed project. I have been a professional marketing strategist for over 20 years. I help companies create messages that positively communicate their points of view.

I can recognize spin when I see it.

(Laughter.)

MR. REED: Spin is the use of disingenuous, deceptive, and highly manipulative tactics to persuade public opinion. The idea that natural gas is somehow better than other fossil fuels is nothing but industry propagated spin. Spin uses trickery and psychological manipulation to cover up something by directing your attention to something else.

Let's be clear. There are no clean fossil fuels.

(Applause.)

MR. REED: Of all the life forms on the planet, humans are the only species to fundamentally and permanently change the environment and alter life. Our use of fossil fuels is changing the earth into a deadly place. As many scientists, thought leaders, and now even the pope himself has said, "It threatens our very world."

We are gathered here tonight to honestly assess whether it is morally and economically right to authorize further increasing the use of fossil fuels.

There may be debate about how much impact we're having. But this is a matter of degrees. Double meaning intended. Whether the impact is limited or dramatic, the evidence is clear, we are altering life on that is planet.

Clear evidence exists that human activities are responsible for heating our air and killing our oceans. Burning fossil fuel is the single largest contributor to increase CO₂ in our atmosphere and the acidification of our oceans.

Many studies have shown that what we humans are doing to the biosphere today is without precedent in the geologic record dating back a millennium.

One quarter of all mammals are now heading toward extinction because of changes to their habitat to say nothing of frogs, birds, corals and other life forms on the planet. A 2009 nature report indicated that in order to survive rising temperatures caused by increased CO₂ levels, animals and plants would have to migrate north by as much as four feet. Not per decade, not per year, not per month, but per day.

We are destroying entire lines of genetic diversity. We are reshaping the very essence of life thanks to burning fossil fuels, and that includes natural gas. A sign in New York's Museum of Natural History reads: In pushing other species to extinction humanity is busy sawing off the limb on which it perches.

To say that natural gas is a bridge fuel is disingenuous, deceptive, and highly manipulative spin. The only clean energy is renewable energy, which, by the way also brings many good jobs and long-paying jobs.

We humans are special.

(Applause.)

MR. REED: We can change the world. We've done it already. The only question is will FERC allow this destruction to continue by authorizing yet another deadly and unneeded fossil fuel project.

Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Number 15. At this time I'd like numbers 20 through 25 to come to the front row.

MS. CRAGNOLIN: Thank you for hearing us. My name is Janis Cragnolin, C-r-a-g-n-o-l-i-n. And we're property owners within 1,000 feet of the property -- of where the proposed pipelines are going to go through. And now since there's two of them, that makes us within the kill zone and that's distressing.

This is a family property that we've had now for four generations and we'd like to keep it for at least four more.

I'd like to read something my 86-year-old mother, who would be here tonight speaking for herself, but she can't make it tonight so she asked me to read for her. We're here tonight, it doesn't matter what we're wearing whether it's orange, work, dress, we want the same. We want people -- we want the means to be able to provide a happy and healthy life for our families and ourselves. And that makes this issue a moral one.

FERC and the DEC want reasons why or why not a pipeline? Fracking has been banned in New York state because the research shows that there are dangers to the environment and health hazards to people and animals.

To have to consent to these pipelines here in New York state means it's okay to frack in Pennsylvania. Well, if it's not okay here, it's not okay there. We can't continue to promote that --

(Applause.)

MS. CRAGNOLIN: -- infrastructure. I'm not going to give you statistics, other people have them. But there's enough statistics available to deny these permits. And it's up to you to make that decision and we're counting on you. We don't want to be collateral damage for somebody else's profit. This is our home.

In Maryland it's been banned. In your backyard fracking has been banned. We want the same consideration here in New York state. No pipelines.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Number 16.

MS. LOEFFLER: Barbara Loeffler, L-o-e-f-f-l-e-r. I just want to say from my point of view FERC is the biggest joke that has ever been perpetuated on the taxpayers of this country.

(Applause.)

MS. LOEFFLER: You do nothing for us. People like myself who don't live exactly on the pipeline route are considered as if we're no one, that we'll never be affected by anything that happens up the hill from us. We all know what runs down hill. Don't we all know that.

(Laughter.)

MS. LOEFFLER: We would like to see FERC represent the people of this country, not the corporations of this country. Because in the end, they're not the ones who are paying you. We are. And we need you to do what's right for us.

I spent 30 years of my life trying to come to that is beautiful place and it is turned into a hell hole. My life has never been the same. My health has never been the same. I have a neighbor, because of the stress of these pipelines coming through his land, he died. He didn't live. And it's all because of the gas industry and what they want to do to us. And we will not accept it. We are the mouse that roared.

(Applause.)

MS. LOEFFLER: And we will get bigger and we will roar more.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Speaker number 17.

MS. TURECHEK: My name is Kristina Turechek, that's with a K, T-u-r-e-c-h-e-k. I live in Otsego County, Lawrence Township very close to Otego. The proposed NED compressor station in Franklin may well affect me and my family where we live and also where we work here in Oneonta, both of which are around ten miles away as the crow flies. Air pollution does go to 100 miles, way more. Thank you for taking my comments.

Here we are again, many of us do not trust you for myriad reasons. But it is our legal duty to tell you what we expect you will include in the scope of your research for this project. Almost all of which research we were surprised to learn the last time around with the Constitution Pipeline will be done by you, but is provided to you by the company whose project you will be ruling on. Furthermore, that company, among others provides the money for your commission to exist and to operate.

I'll make comments from your FY-2015 Congressional performance budgets request. Quote, "FERC recovers the full cost of its operations through annual charges and filing fees assessed on the industries it regulates." Also, "Federal statutes require the Commission to recover its operating costs from the entities it regulates." Does that sound like the fox in the hen house? It does to me.

Many times FERC uses the word "stakeholders." For example, page 28, you describe your training seminars as being attended by stakeholders such as state, local, and federal agency officials, natural gas company representatives, construction contractors, and consulting firm staff.

When it's convenient for you, like tonight, you might be pressed to say that we the people are stakeholders. You mean the people like those in Delaware and Schoharie Counties who recently have had their land taken by eminent domain? Their property value is lowered, life savings destroyed, the retirement or country home dreams shattered. Not to mention new fears of explosion and leaks created. Yes, we remember that fatal explosion of a small pipeline in Blenheim. All of this was done with no benefit to them, just so that a private company can build the Constitution Pipeline to take gas north for export. This is private profit made by shipping American resources out of America at the expense of American people and of the climate.

Who are the stakeholders here? In your scope of work, I ask that you assess the cumulative damage to the people and to the environment along the right-of-way that will accrue because of this second pipeline. The first one, Constitution, will cut through prime forests, wetlands, and farms risking erosion and damage from the inevitable flood waters that care not where they go, just down. The second can only make the damage worse.

Please bear in mind that there's no such thing as mitigation. If you are bulldozed, clear cut, and killed, can you be mitigated?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

MS. LOEFFLER: I ask you honestly consider public interest. I will give you this.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number 18.

MS. MALLOY: Laura Malloy, M-a-l-l-o-y. Here are my credentials for these comments. I earned a Ph.D. in physiology from the University of Virginia School of Medicine and a federal fellowship in pharmacology from the University of Vermont, College of Medicine. My work has been supported by the American Heart Association, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Science Foundation.

I am here to speak against Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct gas pipeline and most especially the compressor station proposed for Franklin, New York because the frequency with which we are confronted by major episodes of environmental contamination is growing. Deep Water Horizon, Fukushima, Tarsands Pipeline leak, Elk River chemical spill, Dan River coal ash spill, Texas Gulf Coast oil spill. What do these have in common with pipelines?

All of these are in one way or another the products of frenetic attempts to gain unsustainable or unsafe forms of energy. The compressor station will pressurize fracked gas taking us down the wrong path and exacerbating climate change. There is cost associated with that.

The compressor station will leak. They all do. In fact compressor stations are more likely to leak than the pipelines themselves. And compressor stations do explode. Such explosions and fires have taken place recently in neighboring Pennsylvania. It took me five minutes to find five examples, the most recent occurring last March. They have also occurred recently in West Virginia, Indiana, Utah, Oklahoma and in

January 2014, here in New York state five miles outside of Binghamton, in Windsor, and let's not forget, of course, Blenheim.

And when this station releases gas or flames into our air, the people here will breathe the materials used to extract the gas and the radiation collected with it. And there is cost associated with that. When hydrocarbon silicates, volatile organic materials, endocrine disrupters, and other toxicants associated with fossil fuel extraction are released into the air, they don't just cause immediate harm. At exceedingly low levels, nanomolar concentrations, petrochemical contaminants can cause not just acute illness, not just cancer, but birth defects and stunted brain development.

In March 2014 a research review titled, "The Neurobehavioral Effects of Developmental Toxicology" was published in the prestigious journal Lancet. I have the citation for you here.

It outlined how industrial chemicals injure the developing brain and are among the known causes for the rise in autism, ADHD, dyslexia, and other cognitive and emotional impairments. This most certainly affects the most vulnerable among us. I urge you to include in the scope of your evaluation a comprehensive review of the behavioral health effects caused by low levels of these materials released by pipelines and compressor stations.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number 19.

MS. McKINNEY: My name is Colleen McKinney, M-c-K-i-n-n-e-y. My home is in the town of Sidney. If built, the Constitution and NED Pipelines would run directly next to my property.

FERC already knows the negative environmental impacts the NED pipeline would have on us and our communities. They know this because we told them at scoping hearings and in thousands of comments we wrote regarding the Constitution Pipeline. I ask that the FERC take all of those comments into account that you think about those comments as you consider the NED.

FERC knows that we in the communities these pipelines would gouge through will assume all of the health and safety risks. We will pay the price of the increased erosion, water runoff and flood damage that will follow in the wake of clear cutting close to a million trees for these projects. We will deal with contaminated water, decreased property values and costly road and bridge damage. We will get no rewards.

I've learned something about FERC over the past three years. I've learned that FERC does not care about us, our livelihoods, our safety, or whether or not our towns thrive. FERC is not in the business of protecting us. They are in the business of approving pipelines, no matter what those pipelines might do to us. Why? Why is this?

Because their salaries are entirely paid by the oil and gas industry. It's true on FERC's website the agency proudly states that FERC is fully funded by, quote, "annual charges and filing fees assessed on the industries it regulates." If you were paid by big oil and gas, what incentive would you have to ever deny them what they want? The answer is none. You would do what they tell you, just like FERC does.

Adding insult to injury, FERC is approving and enabling this harm to our land and our communities so that multi-billion dollar companies can export American gas.

You've heard all that, so I'll skip this paragraph.

Exporting our country's presently abundant gas will raise energy prices here at home, soon significantly and permanently.

Kinder Morgan's plan is to gouge through out state, clear cut, and dig up our yards, farms, and forests and blast across streams and rivers to bury their huge export line. Where is the benefit to us? The NED pipeline will only compound the damages wrought on us by the Constitution Pipeline.

In order to build these pipelines Kinder Morgan needs a certificate of public convenience and necessity from FERC. But building export pipelines through upstate New York's communities so that wealthy

Texas-based gas corporations can get richer and American families get saddled with higher energy bills does not sound like a public convenience or necessity to me. It sounds like the rich getting richer at our expense. So what do we do? We say no. We tell FERC and the federal government they can't keep putting pipelines wherever they want. They can't keep forcing dangerous projects on us.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Please wrap up.

MS. MALLOY: We all have the right to prosper, but not at the expense of other human beings and most definitely not at the expense of our fellow Americans.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Number 20. At this time I'd like numbers 25 through 30 to come down to the front row.

MS. GARTI: Hi, my name is Ann Marie Garti, G-a-r-t-i. I'm a found member of an organization called Stop the Pipeline and an attorney for that group.

I'm here tonight to talk to you -- I'm going to talk slowly because it seems you have difficulty understanding us.

(Laughter.)

MS. GARTI: Three years ago this room was filled with people. It was vibrant, they were engaged. They were not cynical the way they are now. And I was concerned about the hundreds of thousands of trees and other things that were going to die as a result of this project. I didn't realize that the biggest death was going to be democracy itself.

You have killed the spirit that was here three years ago.

(Applause.)

MS. GARTI: People were engaged. People did what you said they should do at the start of this presentation. They wrote comments, thousands of comments. They put their heart and soul into it. We didn't write form letters. They wrote comments from their heart. And what happened was, at the beginning of February of 2014, FERC issued a DEIS where 24 percent of the property still had not been surveyed. And to this very day there is still not a complete project review that has taken place. Over a year -- almost a year and a half later, these properties still have not been surveyed. And that information still has not been given to the public.

That is a travesty. And you are the cause of it because you're concerned about your three minutes and not the substance. But it's not too late to redeem yourselves. And how you do that is you do what we have asked you to do before. You need to reopen the EIS for the Constitution Pipeline.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MS. GARTI: You need to finish the job that you never did. All of the comments for NED belong in CP13-499.

(Cheering.)

MS. GARTI: FERC needs to do a supplemental environmental impact statement for the Constitution that includes NED because NED is a reasonably foreseeable project. In fact NED had prefiled before the Commissioners made their decision. NED's impacts have to be considered in Constitution's EIS.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MS. GARTI: Is that clear? Ned's comments have to be considered in Constitution's EIS. The docket number is CP13-499. Thank you.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Speaker number 21.

MS. SOPER: Well, that's a tough act to follow. Micheal Stolzer and I are switching places. My name is Rachel Soper, S-o-p-e-r, and Michael is going to read for me.

MR. STOLZER: Your agency recently issued a certificate for the Constitution Pipeline. The conclusion in the FEIS was similar to all FERC-approved pipelines in that they are based on the following three assertions.

One, companies will follow the rules and regulations in the FEIS and agency permits.

Two, there would be adverse impacts, but they would be minimized and mitigated based on the company's proposed plans and procedures and best management practices.

Three FERC ensures that companies will comply with all rules and regulations through the Agency's third-party inspection oversight.

I sent in an 18-page comment to your agency that debunked each and every one of these assumptions. I sent you detailed records from the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection documenting that Williams consistently fails to adhere to its plans and procedures. Does not follow it's own best management practices, does not report the locations of streams, wetlands, and flood plains. And in 2013 had the worst environmental record of any company in the state of Pennsylvania.

This is a company that had three recent high-profile explosions inside a year, killing two workers and injuring over 100 others and whose negligence mandated the evacuation of entire towns. As a result Williams is currently under investigation by the U.S. Chemical and Safety Board. Williams is responsible for six compressor station explosions in the past three years in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey.

This is a company that has a lengthy history of known cathodic protection problems according to the PHMSA. This is the company that you just permitted to run through our back yards.

My comments also documented that FERC's third-party monitoring is a failure. I provided documentation from a New York DEC formal complaint followed by a consent order which cited 811 violations during the construction of the Millennium Pipeline in New York. Many of which resulted in adverse impacts of wetlands, water quality and the most egregious violations were a result of heavy rain events which cannot be successfully mitigated.

The same oversight failure occurred with your third-party monitoring during construction of the recent TGP 300 line in Pennsylvania and the Iroquois pipeline in New York. According to federal documents Iroquois was fined \$22 million in criminal and civil fines for violating federal environmental and safety laws which encompass, quote, "thousands of individual Clean Water Act violations." Thousands.

FERC's environment impact assessments, while appearing comprehensive on paper don't hold up in the real world. FERC's assurance that their third-party monitoring will ensure compliance is false. Monitors documenting violations is exactly that, monitors documenting violations.

MR. FRIEDMAN: All right. We need to wrap up now.

MR. STOLZER: Now, FERC is conducting an environmental review into Kinder Morgan's NED. You're asking landowners and the public to participate in the same flawed process with the same predictable results.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

MR. STOLZER: FERC's --

MR. FRIEDMAN: It time to yield the floor to the next speaker.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number 22.

MS. COLLIER: I'm Mary Ellen Collier, C-o-l-l-i-e-r. I'm here tonight because you invited me to address this hearing. Nearly half my 21-acre property in Franklin is within the buffer zone of the siting of the NED compressor station. I'm here to express my anger.

This compressor station endangers the value of my property, my only significant asset, and it endangers my health and the tranquility of my chosen home.

I am a citizen of the United States and I look to this Commission to respect my concerns and protect my wellbeing.

According to your website, one of your functions is to oversee environmental matters related to natural gas projects.

A fact sheet assembled by the group, Compressor Free Franklin, states that “pipeline construction will put at risk the village of Franklin’s water supply as well as private wells and springs along the aquifer.” My water is provided by our spring which lies close to the buffer zone. We have had that spring dry up in the late fall frequently in the years that we have lived here. All my neighbors will attest that the water fall at the head of Henry Edwards Road reduces to a dripping trickle most years. Some years we have been without water for over a month before sufficient rain fell. I don’t believe that an industrial site like a compressor station won’t have a negative impact on the reduction of the water table at my elevation in dry seasons.

The station should be sited in an area of less residential density or at a lower elevation near the river.

Other environmental concerns I have include noise and light pollution and toxic emissions.

The Compressor Free Franklin fact sheet also states that recent monitoring of compressor stations throughout the country has documented, in addition to methane, emissions of carbon dioxide, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds, benzene, toluene, and formaldehyde a known carcinogen.

Furthermore, compressor stations, turbine powered plant and compressors produce continuous noise and low frequency vibrations while in operation. Equipment breakdowns, routine maintenance and testing require rapid venting them up to 15,000 cubic feet of methane from a segment of the pipe causing a sound equivalent of a rocket blasting off.

I have followed new stories about gas pipeline infrastructure for more than five years, since our area was first targeted for these pipelines. And I know that news comes out daily that corroborates these claims and report station fires and accidents often with photo and video documentation.

Who will want to buy my property with these conditions evident within a fraction of a mile? No one. I don’t even want to live that close to a compressor station. It’s evident that the value of my property will fall and I’ll have difficult selling when the time comes.

The recent report of a 50 percent devaluation of homes near the Hancock compressor station supports my concerns as well. If my property devalues to that extent, I’ll be upside down on my mortgage.

Your website also states that FERC regulates transmission and sale of natural gas for resale and interstate commerce.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Please wrap up.

MS. COLLIER: I’ll submit the rest of my comments.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Number 23.

MS. RYAN: My name is Kate Ryan, R-y-a-n. I live in Delaware County, town of Meredith. In the 1800s Leo Tolstoy wrote a story about a man who had a big furnace to heat his house. To keep it going the man had to use a lot of wood. In fact, he used so much wood that he ended up cutting down all of his trees. Then he started to burn his fences. Finally he used the wood of his own house and eventually he burned up his whole house.

Our country, by continuing to allow the production and use of fossil fuel to provide our energy is slowly destroying the entire county. This is affecting all of us and it will affect generations to come. I hope all the people at FERC think about Tolstoy’s story as you make decisions about pipelines and transmission stations.

I hope you'll act in a way to give the children of today and the children of tomorrow a chance to live in a safe environment. I hope you'll deny any activity that continues the use of fossil fuel which includes the building of this and all pipelines.

(Applause.) (Cheering).

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Speaker number 24.

MR. COLLIER: My name is Thomas Collier, C-o-l-l-i-e-r. And I am an affected heir, owner, potentially breathing the toxic fumes out of this proposed compressor station in Franklin. I'm also an affected water owner, drinking from a spring within 3,000 feet of this proposed pipeline that could be blasted through rock, fracturing the underground spring.

And I'm also an affected landowner, living within 3,000 feet of this proposed compressor station in Franklin. Our property values will be decreased, my ability to refinance my mortgage could be jeopardized.

There's no need for this pipeline or this compressor station or the gas that goes through it in New England or anywhere in that area. This gas is destined for export. We all know that. Right now it's illegal to export, that's why they're lobbying to get permission to export this fossil fuel.

I feel anger, disgust, fear, and anxiety. Not so much joy until this goes away. But most of all I feel a profound sadness for all parties involved in this unneeded disaster. Do not approve this pipeline or compressor station.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Twenty-five. At this time I'd like number 30 through 35 to be in the front row.

MR. BEVILACQUA: Okay. Hi, my name is Epifanio Bevilacqua, E-p-i-f-a-n-i-o Bevilacqua, B-e-v-i-l-a-c-q-u-a. I live in Franklin where the compressor station is coming in to town.

I'm also a LUNA holding union book.

(Applause.)

MR. BEVILACQUA: And my LUNA brothers and sisters are here. I want clean jobs for my LUNA brothers and sisters. Not like asbestos. And I talked to my foreman last week. He has asbestosis and he's dealing with oxygen to breathe. Let's make it a better world. They want to spend all this money, spend it for solar, hydro, and windmills. Let's do it right the first time around.

You guys made me an activist and a lobbyist lately. And I was an organizer to begin and my union members know that and they're here tonight also. We need to stop you guys from doing this. And it has to stop now. And you're pitting every town against each other and communities. We were told that Otego was through Franklin if the air quality goes bad. They should sue FERC for issuing the permit.

(Cheering.) (Applause.)

MR. BEVILACQUA: Not Franklin or Treadwell. You're putting the burden on a lot of different counties. So we need to lobby everybody, and we need to get signatures, and we need to tell them no way, no how you're coming through with this anymore. And we have to tell them, you're going to be the one that's going to be sued, not the people here. We have to start filing lawsuits against FERC. They're the one -- they're the corporate who give the original permit.

(Cheering.) (Applause.)

MR. BEVILACQUA: And you guys all know it, you've been around here for five, six years with me. You know where we've been. We've been to Pennsylvania. We have people from Maryland, Washington, and all over. It's the same thing every place you go. And every time you give a permit. You don't care about the people, you don't care about generations to come.

EPA was on television. It was CSPAN. They admitted that this is genocide. So why are we here tonight?

We shouldn't even be here. We should be going already to renewables. No, we make a report card, oh, we're only going to go about 10, 15 percent. We need to go 95 percent or 100 percent renewable.

Thank you.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Speaker number 26.

MS. SCHECTER: Hi, my name is Allegra Schecter, A-l-l-e-g-r-a S-c-h-e-c-t-e-r. Through the years I have testified several times at FERC scoping hearings. I spoke passionately on the serious environmental problems that would be created by the Constitution Pipeline on the important issues that were not addressed in the draft EIS, and on the lethal threat of highly pressurizing a 50-year-old segment of the Dominion Pipeline for the New Market project. My numerous spoken and submitted written comments have always been respectful and painstakingly researched by me on a broad spectrum of environmental concerns. As if you really cared.

(Laughter.)

MS. SCHECTER: The stated purpose of the NED pipeline is to bring gas to New England, but Massachusetts residents have already shown there is no true demand for the gas. The real reason Kinder Morgan wants it built is to send the gas north to a proposed LNG export terminal in Nova Scotia. Their goal is to sell this fracked gas overseas at a higher price than they can get in the states and thus make a higher profit. It has nothing at all to do with providing cheap gas for us here in the northeast and eventually it will actually raise the price of gas here in America. We will get the polluted air, ground and water, and they will get the money.

Most of us have told FERC many times about the catastrophic effects on New York's ecosystems that Constitution's path would cause by clear cutting steep slopes. Placing Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct pipeline alongside Constitution will only compound and magnify these disasters.

Why should we bother going through the effort of listing them all over again? The fact that you scheduled both local hearings on the same date and the same time says to me not only do you not care what we have to say, you don't even care that we know that you don't care.

(Laughter.) (Applause.)

MS. SCHECTER: The masks are off and the truth is known. After you have your obligatory public hearing, the Commissioners will do their obligatory job and approve this pipeline. These hearings are a waste of time, my time and yours. You are not really interested in what I have to say. When all is said and done, FERC will approve the NED pipeline, the same as it has approved Constitution. And then you will take our land again through eminent domain for another corporation's bottom line and say it is for the public convenience and necessity. I am through playing your game. It's time for the FERC was replaced by an entity more accountable to the people, not big energy.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number 27.

MR. MOTT: My name is Dwight, like President Eisenhower, Mott, M-o-t-t, like the applesauce.

I am not going to be near as eloquent as the people who have preceded me and probably those who will follow. But folks gave me the advice to be sincere and so here I go bearing my soul to you.

Tonight I stand here as an affected homeowner. And I want to correct you. I'm not a landowner. I'm a homeowner. A U.S. citizen who has been stripped of my inalienable, constitutional rights by you and your bosses.

Eighteen months ago while living and work in Africa, I purchased sight unseen seven and a half acres in

Delaware County. After 13 years working, serving abroad, I looked forward to returning to the U.S. for a while, carving out an off-grid homestead in the same foothills my grandfather's grandfather's grandfather first settled. Starting a small business and reconnecting with my roots and the beautiful place I've always called home my entire life.

I also looked forward to finding a safe quiet piece of forest where I could start to heal from a handful of traumas I experienced while overseas. Within days of arriving back in the U.S. last July, the first letter from Kinder Morgan arrived in the mail for me. It wasn't long after that that I found out the folks who sold me my property had granted an easement to Williams Partners without disclosing it to me.

It's hard to describe the amount of stress and trauma one experiences when they find themselves smack dab in the center of your sacrifice zone. You heard about one of my neighbors.

Everyone's experience is different. But I'm here to tell you, suffering from PTSD adds a whole new dimension. Every time I receive a letter from you or Kinder Morgan, I immediately flash back to looking down the barrel of a gun being pointed at my head after I've been pistol whipped and the voice saying, stop what you're doing, stay out of our way or else.

Every time I step into the right-of-way that goes across my property, 300 feet of my 450-foot deep property, I have to flash back to Bogota holding the body -- the lifeless body of a child who had just been gang raped for making contact with me to try and get some help. Don't rape me anymore. Say no to this. Do your job. Do your constitutional, required job, give me my due process. And if you're not going to do it, let me get into court to do it.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Comment number -- speaker number 28.

MR. SCHUE: Good evening. My name is Keith Schue, it's Keith, K-e-i-t-h S-c-h-u-e. I'm an engineer. I also have a background in conservation having worked for the Nature Conservancy for five years before moving here to beautiful upstate New York.

There's no way to talk about the NED pipeline without also talking about the Constitution Pipeline. One is right next to the other and the impacts are cumulative. They cannot be reviewed independently.

With all due respect, I have to say that I'm appalled by FERC's decision to approve the Constitution Pipeline. If built the Constitution Pipeline will not only shackle us to climate-killing fossil fuels for decades to come, it was also authorized to be built in the worst possible way in the worst possible location and using the worst construction techniques. Constitution's alignment rips through, blasts through pristine forests, fields, streams, and wetlands of the northern Catskills.

It will fragment wildlife corridors and permanently diminish the ecological integrity of this beautiful state in which we live. As Yoko Ono boldly said in the New York Times last week, "A scar upon the land, a wound that never heals."

The construction methods supported in FERC's EIS on Constitution directly defy responsible well-articulated comments by the New York State Department of Environment conservation. I'm going to include those comments tonight.

DEC specifically said that trenching through these waters and wetlands is not okay and that if the project is built horizontal directional drilling should occur instead with a minimum of six feet depth below water channels to minimize surface impacts and to avoid eventual washout, scouring, and exposure due to channel migration.

FERC ignored those recommendations with an EIS that supports shallow trenching nearly all of those 277 water crossings. But FERC ignored federal recommendations too. For the record I am submitting an advisory from the Federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration titled, "Pipeline Safety, Potential for Damage to Pipeline Facilities Caused by Flooding, River Scour, and River Channel Migration." Basically this says the same thing that DEC also told you which is don't do it like this.

So here we are with NED a pipeline proposed right next door. If you approve NED all of these terrible impacts will double. Each of those 277 waterways and wetlands will be cut through, blasted through again. And let's be clear, NED's not even proposing to share the same right-of-way. It proposes to expand that right-of-way which means that environmental fragmentation will be even worse. More forest spots will fall below the threshold for viable internal bird habitat and many of the same landowners who are victimized by eminent domain for Constitution will be victimized all over again.

And understand that this is -- I understand that this is a scoping meeting, so as far as that goes, FERC needs to consider the cumulative impacts of Constitution when reviewing NED. You also need to back up and perform a supplemental EIS of Constitution that takes NED into account.

Finally I'd like to say something about compressor stations. I think we all know that the idea of the 124-mile long Constitution Pipeline being built without any compressor station along its length was an imaginary proposition and that whether Constitution --

MR. FRIEDMAN: You need to wrap up now.

MR. SCHUE: -- yes, I will. And that whether Constitution, NED or both pipelines get built, the compressor station in Franklin and others were probably part of the gas industry's big picture plans all along.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

MR. SCHUE: FERC needs to put a stop to these piecemeal segmentations in consideration of the gas infrastructure.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number 29.

MR. TAGGART: Thank you. Jeff Taggart, J-e-f-f T-a-g-g-a-r-t. My main -- my most pressing concern is the emissions from the compressor stations and whether if and when the compressor station does come, would it be better to have no compressor station and a little bit larger pipeline? So the volume would be made up of pipeline instead of compressor station. Because I think the emissions, you know, the noise -- I don't think the noise is a factor. Emissions is a big question on the compressors.

And where the unfortunate part is, I'm from Delaware County in Franklin and we're between supply and demand. And there's millions of people that want to supply and unfortunately we're where we're at. And electric is going to be worse than the gas pipelines.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Speaker number 30.

MR. HULBERT: My name is Phil Hulbert, P-h-i-l H-u-l-b-e-r-t. In my remarks I'll be addressing the impacts of the NED pipeline project from two perspectives, one personal and one, if time permits, more broadly.

My wife and I own land that is scheduled to be crossed by the Constitution Pipeline project and by the NED project. We are among the landowners who did not sign easement agreements with Constitution. Thus, those easements were obtained by --

(Applause.)

MR. HULBERT: -- court order because FERC authorized that action by issuing a conditional certificate of public convenience and necessity. Among our concerns expressed to FERC in writing, we indicated that land we had specifically purchased as a forested buffer next to our home would be clear cut. FERC staff, in responding to our comment, noted that only some of that land would be clear cut due to Constitution Pipeline, so some trees would remain. Perhaps we are supposed to be grateful the Constitution Pipeline

would not take all of the trees off that land.

Upon attending the recent open house gatherings for the NED project hosted in Schoharie and Davenport, we learned that the proposed route of the NED pipeline will be closer to our house than the Constitution route and will remove more of the remaining trees.

While FERC staff may choose to examine Constitution and NED as separate and distinct projects, land-owners will not be so fortunate. We must deal with the potential or real cumulative impacts of two major construction projects in a short period of time. Each project would permanently affect our property, would impose restrictions on our ability to use our property, though we would still retain the obligation to pay property taxes as if it were not damaged property, but each project would provide no tangible benefit to us. The very thought of authorizing two different major pipeline projects to be constructed in a short period of time over much the same currently unspoiled terrain in rural portions of New York state is outrageous. Land that will have barely healed from Constitution Pipeline project will be ripped open by the NED project. Streams and rivers, many of which are protected trout streams in New York will be exposed to multiple rounds of construction-related sedimentation due to open trench crossing techniques and woodland deforestation or clear cutting.

Logic and recent experience with pipeline construction in New York point toward violations of water quality standards, some of which are intended to protect river and stream ecosystems from the harmful effects of sedimentation.

In closing, I wish to remind you and your colleagues at FERC that you are public servants, not servants of the natural gas industry. Do the right thing this time, FERC.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Number 31. Speaker number 31?

(No response.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number 32.

(No response.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number 33.

MR. STOLZER: My name is Michael Stolzer, M-i-c-h-a-e-l S-t-o-l-z-e-r. I didn't prepare a statement because every time I tried I found myself getting extraordinarily agitated. I will refrain from using -- I will do my best to refrain from using every profanity you've ever heard. I'm absolutely disgusted by this -- this entire charade.

You know, I was concerned, you know, if I get up here and start ranting, I'm going to look like I'm crazy, but it occurs to me that you're the ones who are crazy.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. STOLZER: You're out of your minds. Science agrees that methane is a serious problem and you just ignore it. And it's beyond my comprehension.

What I saw as far as your handling of the Constitution Pipeline just is -- disgust is the only word that I can use. It's a rigged game. You know, I feel like I'm at the Delaware County Fair and there are some guys trying to get a dollar out of me so I can try to get a basketball through a hoop that it won't fit through.

(Laughter.)

MR. STOLZER: You're a bunch of -- you're just a bunch of cons. And I'm sick of you all.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Number 33 is next, and I hope that 35 through 40 are sitting in the front row waiting to go.

MS. STACK: My name is Ann Stack, S-t-a-c-k. My husband, Bob, and I are landowners who have been violated through the farce of eminent domain. Thank you, FERC. And now this next pipeline wants to come right along side of it.

And I say we're landowners, and like someone else who spoke recently, we should be home owners, but the pipelines want to go directly through where we had come -- we came from Reno, Nevada to build a home on our land and instead we now have the ugly little flags from the surveyors that eminent domain permitted, you know, gave the right to these people to come on our land and violate our land. And I know it's just the beginning.

And so I feel so frustrated that an agency like FERC is -- I mean, I feel like I could be standing here talking to the corporations because you seem to be just a representative of them. And so I'll go on the record telling you what we have done, our small, small statement that we've made, and yet it's a big one too. I want to invite everyone here to consider doing it themselves, whether you're a landowner or just a concerned American citizen, but thanks to you guys and your decisions, and our inability to build our home where we wanted it, instead, we've raised an American flag. We put in a beautiful 20-foot tall flag pole and the American flag. But there's a little twist to how we're presenting it. Because, as you may know, an upside down flag is a universal sign of distress. And so that is how the flag is now --

(Applause.)

MS. STACK: -- flying over our land that you people are stealing from us under this abuse of eminent domain for the public good. What a farce.

So when passersby come along -- and, you know, there are so many people even in this community, this has been going on for three years, that are really ignorant about what's taking place. I mean, I don't know if they don't read the newspapers, they're not directly affected, they're not activists that have been fighting fracking right along, but many people really don't have a clue. People right down the road from our land. So in front of our flag we have placed a prominent sign so passersby won't think we're trying to insult the American flag. It's a cry, it's a plea for everyone to become aware of what's happening to us, the raping of us and our land. Our sign says, "Upside down flag equals sign of distress. Gas corporations taking our land for their profit and greed." And that's, thanks you to, FERC.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Number 34.

MS. ROFF: Hi, my name is Jessica Roff. That's J-e-s-s-i-c-a R-o-f-f as in Frank. I work for Catskill Mountain Keeper. I want to talk about the cumulative impacts of all gas infrastructure that you all need to be considering together because we are literally being strangled from every direction with gas infrastructure.

This especially includes cumulative health impacts, because let's remember that even when compressor stations operate as they are intended, they make people sick from dangerous emissions.

While we're talking about public health, we must also talk about emergency response and preparedness which is never talked about and never a part of your evaluation. This should be a threshold question and not an after thought. Even the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration has essentially said that the system is broken. They funded a study showing that for emergencies such as pipeline explosions and leaks there is no standardization of safety monitoring equipment, no established communication systems, no clear chain of command.

Not to mention the fact that along most pipeline routes in New York state, the first responders are actually mostly volunteer corps. This means that they have limited resources and limited training, largely because of the fact that pipeline explosions and leaks are considered to be low-frequency, high-impact incidents. Unfortunately they are no longer a low-frequency incident. They're happening more and more with every passing day that more and more high-pressure, large-scale pipelines are being built, more are leaking, more are exploding, more are causing massive harm. In fact, just as I was sitting here waiting to get up

here and testify I read about another leak in Canada in Alberta, the largest oil leak in the history of Alberta happened yesterday. The news just got out today. Five million liters leaked into water in Alberta, Canada. So as you continue to rubberstamp company after company with terrible safety records to build pipeline after pipeline, and compressor station after compressor station you are continuing to add to the destruction of our communities of our land, of our livelihoods and of our lives. It's time to stop the madness and stop the national gas -- take natural gas takeover of New York state. If we treat safety and emergency response and preparedness as a threshold question, there is no way to say anything other than no to all of this build out.

You know what you should do and what you can do? You can shock all of us, you can do your jobs. For once, you cannot rubberstamp this process. You cannot rubberstamp this actual project. And instead, you can protect the people of the United States and of New York state and not the oil and gas industry because they don't need it and we actually do.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Thirty-five. Number 35. Also, 40 through 45 should be in the front row.

MR. GILLINGHAM: Wes Gillingham. I'm the program director of Catskill Mountain Keeper. It's W-e-s G-i-l-l-i-n-g-h-a-m.

As my colleague just mentioned cumulative impacts, I'm thinking of your presentation. Your presentation included things that you look at in this process. And you mentioned cumulative impacts, but then you go on to say, don't mention fracking because fracking has nothing to do with this. That is a bold-faced lie --

(Shouts from audience.)

MR. GILLINGHAM: -- that borders on ridiculous legal loopholes that you hide behind. FERC should be looking and analyzing the impacts to the Marcellus shale fields in Pennsylvania and West Virginia if you open up new markets through the Constitution Pipeline, the NED pipeline, the Aim Pipeline, the Dominion project, the pipeline invasion that is happening to New York state as part of cumulative impacts, you're a federal agency, you need to look at multi-state issues. You are creating a multi-state travesty by allowing these pipeline to go through.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. GILLINGHAM: The New York State Medical Society and the American Medical Association has asked for legislation that would make a comprehensive health impact assessment a necessity for any new pipelines. Why are they asking for that? Because across the country this process is not working. And a comprehensive health impact assessment is a legitimate way recognized around the world for a way to analyze a proposal and to see what those impacts are to communities and the region.

You are clearly, clearly not doing that. You've sat here now for hours listening to testimony of people who have this going through their backyard, people who drove hours to get here, because they are outraged that you're allowing these pipelines to go forward.

You give three minutes of testimony for a process that takes years. Three minutes of public testimony asking what you should be looking at.

(Laughter.)

MR. GILLINGHAM: I think that's a good zinger to end on.

(Laughter.)

MR. GILLINGHAM: This is outrageous. And I just want to mention one last thing. I was reminded of it when the man from Franklin came up here. Normal operating procedure, normal operating procedure at the compressor station in Hancock included emptying nine miles of pipeline and impacting the people that lived right there with benzene, toluene, and other toxic, volatile, organic compounds from that pipeline and it was a normal operating procedure. They were exposed to that at really high levels and we

have documentation to prove that. We will be submitting that. But, you know what, the people that were evacuated when that happened, it wasn't because they were going to be breathing toxic fumes that would impact their health, it was because the noise levels were too loud.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

I want to make a point of clarification. Yes, you only have three minutes to speak at this public hearing, however, you may submit as many and as long written comments and details as you desire.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: We have.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Number 36.

MR. HUTCHISON: David Hutchison, H-u-t-c-h-i-s-o-n. I'm got a masters degree in geology, Ph.D. in geology, taught for 32 years. I'm on the Environmental Board for the City Oneonta and I'm also a member of the board of Otsego 2000, both of which have been very actively involved in the issues that we're dealing with here.

At the beginning you made comments that you were going to be looking at the -- FERC was going to look at land use, which is fine; effect on towns and cities, fine; groundwater which is fine; air quality, which is fine. But I wonder really, are they going to be looking at global warming? And that is the biggest elephant in the room. And methane, methane, methane, CO₄ is anywhere from 30 to 40 to 50 times worse than carbon dioxide as a global warming.

If you want, and I hope this is something that the environmental group will be looking at, the people that have done major work on this collected lots of data, have published in major journals, two professors from Cornell, and I want to get them on the record here. Robert Horowitz, H-o-r-o-w-i-t-h also Anthony Ingraffea, I-n-g-r-a-f-f-e-a. These two professors have gathered the data, have published highly credible documentation. And they are saying, conclusions of their works that natural gas methane, by the time you mine it -- drill it, excuse me, and get the methane that's lost with the drilling, by the time you transport it, use it, et cetera, et cetera, methane, natural gas is no better than dirty, lousy, rotten coal. So the idea that we are going to be encouraging --

(Applause.)

MR. HUTCHISON: -- more fracking to get methane to ship overseas to be used wherever on the surface of the earth it's being used, it's still going to affect global warming. So it's something you must look at. It wasn't mentioned. Maybe it was just inadvertently missed. How can you not look at global warming?

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number 37.

MR. MARCHESE: Yes, good evening. My name is Frank Marchese, M-a-r-c-h-e-s-e. I apologize if my comments are a little bit scattered. I was nearly accosted by a lunatic in an orange shirt from this room outside the doors. He's been removed from the premises. I was also nearly accosted by a film crew from California that I guess drove here tonight for the meeting.

But, you know, I first of all want to thank FERC for having these hearings. I also attended in Albany both on Tuesday and Wednesday night and we attended a lot of the hearings for Constitution. So thank you.

I'm embarrassed by the behavior of the people in this room that are attacking you consistently throughout the night. The audacity in this room is really unbelievable. There's a process in place in this state and in this country. If you don't like it, I suggest you move to Canada.

What you folks did, what you perpetrated, and I mean, perpetrated in December of 2014 was the biggest lie and the biggest farce ever perpetrated on the people of this state. You took an interim health commissioner with data from the 1980s and you bird dogged the governor into a decision that impacted 25,000 jobs in the southern tier; 25,000 jobs.

(Applause.)

MR. MARCHESE: I travel all around this state for these hearings. Okay. You should hear yourself, folks. If you opened a Wal-Mart Super Center, you'd all be cheering for that too for 100 part-time jobs. Yet you pissed away 25,000 good-paying jobs in this area. And, sir, you can shake your head all you want, all the experts are in this room, but there's a process in place. The New York State DEC has a process and FERC has a process. If you don't like it, move to Canada. See how their process works for you.

(Shouts from audience.)

MR. MARCHESE: It's my home also, ma'am. My members live here, my members own homes here, my members have families here. You're talking like we all live in a vacuum here. You're not the only ones that live in these counties. We live in Albany, we live in Schoharie, we live in Otsego and we live in Broom. So let's cut the nonsense here about you're the folks that live here. We live here also.

You come up here and talking like there's no consequences to your actions. You forced our governor and Dr. Zucker, who lied about his family, which he does not have, the premise of the governor's decision was based on Dr. Zucker's recommendation that his family and his children would not live near a fracked area. Well, Dr. Zucker is not married and he doesn't have children. Let that be a mirror image of what that process is all about. It's a lie, you perpetrated a lie. And you should be very proud of yourself when you leave here tonight and drive by empty storefronts and foreclosed on homes. It's a disgrace and your behavior tonight is a disgrace. God bless America.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Number 38.

MS. SHIMBERG: That's a hard one to follow. My name is Kathy Shimberg, K-a-t-h-y S-h-i-m-b-e-r-g. I live in Otsego County. Not terribly far away from where the pipeline and compressor station would be.

You probably have gathered by now from everybody who has spoken that we feel betrayed by FERC. I haven't got my comment very well organized, I will try and submit them in writing later. But as far as we can tell, FERC is ignoring cumulative impacts by way of unlawful segmentation among other things. On the Constitution Pipeline we submitted massive numbers of comments including comments to the DEIS, many of which seem to have been ignored in the Constitution's FEIS.

As far as we can tell, FERC never denies an industrial build out. Possibly is it paid by the industry itself? Environmental impacts are not sufficiently included or regulated. We have cited a lot of them. They don't seem to have made sufficient impact on FERC or on the companies themselves. Mitigation in quotes, we think is a sham and doublespeak. As others have said, it is impossible to mitigate some of the hazardous aspects, some of the destruction, and environmental impacts should include human, animal, and plant health.

People are suffering from eminent domain including anxiety, mental health, which is part of health. Eminent domain taking of people's homes and land often from a desk in a distant city without real awareness of the lay of the land, the structures on it, ecological features not apparent from the air, or from previous reports or desktop modeling, quote/unquote, or incorrect maps. That's an outrage and injustice and not for public convenience and necessity.

In our area here, which is just a pass through en route to export for monetary gain for the drilling and pipeline and transport and construction company owners at our expense.

Property tax reductions due to property value reductions don't benefit either the homeowners, property owners, or local community and its businesses or the town tax base. People who will need to sell and leave for their health and their kids' health will lose value in selling and potential homebuyers are often refused mortgages and homeowners' insurance companies refuse to insure due to high risk or else will charge unaffordably high premiums which are unaffordable.

People's lives are totally disrupted along with their health and happiness. This is not democracy.

FERC is complicit in affirming this takeover by letting industry and corporate greed displace our citizens, ruin our environment, destroy local beauty and livability, thriving communities --

MR. FRIEDMAN: I'm sorry, but your time is up.

MS. SHIMBERG: Oh, just a half a sentence more. Thriving in many ways and continue to endanger the climate, planet, and all species on earth, life as we know and value it.

Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And, of course if you have more detailed comments, you may submit them in writing. Number 39 is up. And I'd like number 40 through 45 to be in the front row ready to speak.

MR. BUTWELL: Hi, my name is Fred Butwell. I'm a 43-year resident of New York state is is my entire family. I'm a union member.

I'm proud of everything Frank Marchese just said. I would just like to reiterate it. If -- just my thought, if we just shut of every gas pipeline in this state, about a week everybody wouldn't be able to cook their food, they wouldn't be able to drive their car, they wouldn't be able to buy clothes. They'd be begging us to turn them all back on. I know that for a fact. A lot of people in here a hypocrites so it's really aggravating to even sit here and listen to them.

But one thing I do know is our laborers are trained to work safely, drug free, on the work site to do this work properly and to get this done in a timely fashion and it's energy we do need. And proud to be a union member. And thank you and God bless America.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Number 40.

MR. REICH: Hello, my name is Richard Reich, R-e-i-c-h. I am from Cooperstown, New York and I have been a union laborer for over 26 years and am in favor of this pipeline.

This project will create many well-needed manhours for our members who live, pay taxes, and raise their families here. Our local unions will be able to provide skilled, trained, experienced pipeline professionals who have safely built gas lines in New York state for over 60 years. This project when completed will add to the gas line infrastructure of New York and help empower our economy and our energy future. It will also allow us to provide a reliable fuel source to our homes and businesses that we so desperately need.

Kinder Morgan has proved that they are able to build, operate, and maintain pipelines in this country for over 60 years. And I also believe that while we work towards creating other clean, renewable energy, which we are all in favor of, that we must complete this project to keep up with the massive demand for fuel sources to power our homes and businesses.

Kinder Morgan has also already signed an agreement with the Laborers International Union to use our skilled, trained, workforce which we have diligently worked to prepare for by providing our members with many hours of pipeline safety classes which includes all aspects of pipeline installation to prepare them for any scenarios that they may encounter on the job. This includes how to eliminate or reduce any chance of possible environmental accidents and how to quickly and safely deal with them in the rare event that something were to happen.

Kinder Morgan is one of the largest and most experienced energy companies in North America. They own interest in and operate approximately 80,000 miles of pipeline and over 180 terminals and compressors. They also employ approximately 11,500 people through the U.S.

Kinder Morgan is committed to operating their assets in a safe, ethical, and transparent manner. They also ensure public safety, safe line pipeline operation through employee training, regular testing, and right-of-way aerial and foot patrols.

Kinder Morgan is also active in the community and regularly purchases land for communities such as ours to be permanent wildlife habitats. Other project benefits would be new power generation markets where service is currently unavailable, as well as replacing declining historical gas services. It will also ease costly bottlenecks and lower gas and electric prices for consumers.

Kinder Morgan has also fun programs that promote the academic and artistic interests of young people in the many towns across northeast where Kinder Morgan operates.

In closing, I would like to say that an estimated 21 million jobs will be created to local -- or \$21 million will be created to local taxing bodies in New York state. And estimated 3,000 construction-related jobs as well as economic benefits to surrounding areas during construction such as hospitals, retail, et cetera.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you so much for your comments.

MR. REICH: Thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Speaker number 41.

(No response.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Number 42.

(No response.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Number 43?

MS. TENNIS: Hi, my name is Abby Tennis, that's A-b-b-y T-e-n-n-i-s. I just want to talk a little bit about fossil fuels and how they're limited.

So there are only three fossil fuels in the world, coal, natural gas, and oil. And we've used up more than half of them already on the face of the earth whether or not they are easy or safe to access. And that's been over a couple of hundred years. We really only have a couple of hundred years left of fossil fuels. So it's really short-sighted and a poor use of our resources to be investing our money, our time, our labor, not to mention risking our health and our water to build new infrastructure for fossil fuels that are on their way out. This organization needs to be looking at climate change and also impacts on human health, water quality, air quality.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

FEMALE PARTICIPANT: Number 44, please.

MS. MULLANEY: My name is Casey Mullaney, C-a-s-e-y M-u-l-l-a-n-e-y. And I live in Delaware County, New York.

I'm opposed to the pipeline. Like many New Yorkers I'm also opposed to hydrofracking. We've made it extremely and abundantly clear that fracking is the wrong choice for New York. So why are we proposing infrastructure that only serves as a handmaiden to this destructive technology? We already know that this gas will be shipped out of state. They want to sell it overseas. Why should our land and roads and communities be destroyed and our water polluted to make a profit for private outside investors?

Proponents of this project say that it will create jobs. I'm a farm worker and a housekeeper at a bed and breakfast, both locally owned Delaware County businesses. Our economy is dependent on agriculture and tourism. The pipeline would destroy our livelihoods for the sake of a few short-term, temporary jobs. It's not a fair trade.

I'm tired of living under colonial rule in Delaware County. I'm tired of the gas companies treating us like a nuisance to be swept away and silenced so they can steal our land and natural resources. It is our towns, our communities, and our children who will pay the health, social, and economic price for this project.

We said no to the Constitution Pipeline. Deny the application. We don't want this pipeline either.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

Number 45 and 46 through 50 should be in the front row ready to speak. Forty-five?

MR. HUSTON: Hello. My name is William Huston, H-u-s-t-on. And thank you for holding this sham hearing. Whenever you say the thing about, you know, you can continue to file written comments, I like the part when you say, and those comments will have equal weight as your spoken comments, i.e., nothing. Because we've seen it. We've seen it before.

I'm really curious as to the psyche of people that can sit here and hear this day after day. How many hearings that you do go to? Dozens. Because I've seen you at other hearings. I saw you two days ago. How can you keep hearing this?

One thing that we really would like to see is whistleblowers. We want to see people working for FERC that something clicks, something that somebody, some teary-eyed person talking about their land being stolen or a hundred people. I don't know what it's going to take, but would it be -- I imagine that this is possible that you and maybe the FERC commissioners, maybe they'll watch the video of this and maybe, just maybe some day there's going to be a change inside FERC and somebody -- we're going to be able to reach somebody. Because we feel like that this mike really isn't connected. It's really not going anywhere.

And you're going to find out really soon that -- I want to be very careful about how I say this, because I am 100 percent committed to nonviolence. And I am very much motivated by the We are Seneca Lake Movement because they have a very high commitment to nonviolence. But within that structure of nonviolence, we are going to do any means necessary to stop you --

(Applause.)

MR. HUSTON: -- and to shut down FERC. Because you are a criminal agency. You are violating the law dozens of ways. You are violating the orders of the courts. You are a rogue, criminal agency and we are going to shut you down.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Number 46. And 46 through 50 should be sitting in the front row.

MS. BARR: I'm going to time myself here. Lisa Barr. I live in Oneonta, although I wish a safe travel to all the boys from Newberg. They have a four-hour drive. They don't live here. So, sir, why did you allow them to violate this public hearing?

This is supposed to be for us to talk about our local impact. Not that it's that important, and I'll get to that. I asked you to review and make part of your record for this hearing on this pipeline all previous hearings, scopings, or otherwise for the Stop the Constitution Pipeline. And all the hearings in Pennsylvania when the industry failed to respond and jeopardize not just the people who live there, but the people they employ to protect them, the first responders. I worry about the fine young man in uniform back there because I hope they retire before the fracking begins. Because they're not going to be able to handle the explosions that this irresponsible industry is going to perpetrate. You know, they have so many blowups. And if you go -- you can go online and see any of the public hearings when they've had incidents. And it's terrible the way this is not a responsible industry.

All FERC employees should go to a public library and download this weeks intercept article by Glen Greenwald about the safe drop box for whistleblowers. Your agency unfortunately is a fraud by design funded by the very industry it purports to regulate. FERC is the very definition of a captured regulatory agency.

This pipeline is also a violation of the Geneva Convention by its financial links to the contractors employed by the fracking industry such as Halliburton and the soldier of fortune company also named Black Water or XE. It is the militarization of the interior U.S. and nothing less and we have evidence that these spy agencies are also working with our local law enforcement which is another betrayal.

My thoughts are a little bit disorganized because we didn't get much notice for this hearing and I have eye injury. So I'm just going to speak.

I'm a good American. My dad fought in World War II, my opinion, the only good battle that this country has ever fought. He was in the battle of Syragow Straights in Letee Gulf. He was a VFW post commander. I'm the winner of a Voice of Democracy competition.

When you hold a hearing like this in the dog days of summer with so little notice, it shows a lack of respect for U.S. citizens living along the path or needing to engage in commercial or social travel within the pipeline's so-called "burn zone." Less importantly, you are violating landowner rights. I say it's less important because George Washington and his gang of slaveholders made it possible for all of us to have our names on property deeds for lands stolen from Native Americans.

To FERC and all in this room pro and con it's time to grow up. We don't live in a democracy. The military has taken over our government. I ask all FERC employees to -- at some point I think that all of your links, all of your e-mails will be exposed where you've been dealing with these military contractors by wiki leaks.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you so much for your comments.

MS. BARR: Yeah, I bet.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Number 47.

MR. SANTIAGO: Hello, my name is Josh Santiago, S-a-n-t-i-a-g-o. And I'm going to opt out of using the microphone.

I worked at Franklin Central School District and I taught the dramatic arts. So I hope you can all hear me. Franklin is a town where the compressor is proposed to be built and when my students can't agree I like this exercise, it's my favorite exercise.

Who is for the pipeline and compressor?

Who is against it?

(Shouts from participants.)

MR. SANTIAGO: Democracy is not dead. Nor can it die because then we will die. And thank you, FERC for having this hearing. And I just did your job for you. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comment.

Number 48.

MR. KITCHEN: I'm from Johnstown. My name is Bill Kitchen. That's kitchen like the room, Bill like McKibben. Thank god for Bill McKibben.

It was, I think, about 25 years ago that Bill McKibben wrote "The End of Nature". It was the first book written for a general audience about climate change. So much of what he wrote has come true so much quicker than even the experts thought it would. I think just a night or two ago on the news you see people getting swept away and killed in Kentucky, not too long ago there were reports of in India people dying from the heat waves. A year or two ago we had an elderly woman on a small creek in Four Plain get swept away and found a few days later dead in the Mohawk River. It's kind of like what's going to be the climate catastrophe on the news this evening. And you just expect it. You know it's coming.

And all the experts that said this was going to happen were right. Now those experts are telling us that methane is no better, probably worse.

The last speaker talked about democracy. And hopefully democracy is not dead. But I think we have to remember that at election time. To my knowledge every one of the FERC commissioners, Republican and Democrat has been either appointed or reappointed by President Obama. This is Obama's FERC. And

they're doing exactly what he wants them to do. He's the fracking commander in chief. He's the lead cheerleader for fracking. Hillary Clinton is the same. As Secretary of State she pushed fracking around the world. So I think we need to keep those things in mind. You know, Obama is marginally better than Bush or Romney, truthfully.

And here in New York Governor Cuomo has talked about climate change and he's against fracking. But we'll find out when these infrastructures get approved, if they get approved by DEC, where the governor really stands. Because if these infrastructures get approved, the governor and New York state are very much in favor of fracking just so long as it happens somewhere else which is kind of turning the golden rule on its head.

And I just got a letter from Barack Obama, it's sort of a form letter to anybody that writes him about climate change. But it ends with the sentence, "When our children's children look us in the eye and ask if we did all we could to leave them a safer, more stable world, I want to be able to say, yes, we did." And frankly I think he's kidding himself and I think this entire issue is going to be his Vietnam. So I think he's

--

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for your comments.

MR. KITCHEN: It's a shame in the remainder of this time.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Number 49.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: Why do you limit us to three minutes? Why do you limit us to three minutes when we were invaded from out-of-town people?

POPE FRANCIS: Hello. I signed up as Pope Francis because I hoped he might make it tonight and address us about the suffering that global warming is causing and will cause.

You're the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, you need to regulate finite commodities like coal, oil, and gas. The prices for finite commodities can be manipulated. Inexhaustible sources don't need you. They need you to get out of the way.

Married to another inexhaustible resource the innovation and creativity of American citizens. We're about to embark on a very exciting time, inexhaustible sources of energy is a very exciting idea. I look forward to many unionized and worker-owned companies installing solar and wind energy across New York and the world.

Our energy used to come from coal in part. We remember where the government was when coal miner fought for their jobs and safety. They sided with the wealthy mine owners.

Inexhaustible free sources of energy will just cut the thieves and their flunkies out of the equation.

Thank you.

(Applause.) (Cheering.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you for you comments.

That was the last speaker who had signed up on our list. Are there any people who did not have an opportunity to speak earlier who would wish to speak now?

(No response.)

MR. FRIEDMAN: You need to raise your hand. Well, if I don't see any hands up, what that means is that we're going to conclude this meeting.

On behalf of the FERC, I would like to thank you all for coming here tonight to help us focus the environmental review process on those issues of concern to you.

Let the record show that this meeting ended at 9:26. Thank you all.

(Whereupon, at 9:26 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

UNITES STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
IN RE: NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT

HEARING HELD AT: GREENFIELD MIDDLE SCHOOL
141 Davis Street
Greenfield, Massachusetts

July 29, 2015 6:30 P.M.

Sharon Waskiewicz
Court Reporter

MR. PECONOM: Good evening everybody. Can everyone hear me in the back? Yes, okay. It's a big crowd night. I will try hard to project. When it comes time for public comments, I'll ask you to do the same.

My name is John Peconom on behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, I would like to thank all of you for attending this evening's public comment meeting on the proposed Northeast Direct Pipeline Project.

A few notes before we begin. As I said before, we are at capacity. If you leave, someone will come in and take your spot, so keep that in mind. If you need to run out for just a second, let somebody in the back know and they will save your spot for you.

I want everyone who made the effort to come out tonight to have the opportunity to listen to the speakers this evening.

So I am not going to be able to hear you because of the fans that are blowing to keep this place cool, so I will do the best that I can. If you have a comment or concern, please let somebody in the back know and they will get the information to me. Oh, there are empty seats upstairs. I did hear that. And down here in the front as well. I was told we were at capacity. I'm not going to argue with the engineers here responsible for the building.

So let me begin, please. I had a request from a gentleman that tonight, when you leave, your green fans, if you don't take them home, put them in the back in the bins. Keep Greenfield clean. I'll support that message. There is restrooms in the back and to the left.

Once again, my name is John Peconom. I will be leading tonight's meeting. I am a member of the commission's staff, I'm also a project manager and a biologist. With me tonight is James Martin. Jim is the branch chief with the commission and is one of the managers responsible for the review of this project.

We are fortunate to have Jim with us here tonight and I encourage you to talk with him at the breaks, which we'll take every hour and a half. Also with me tonight is Jennie Salinski and Jennifer Harris. In the back the commission staff is represented by Doug Moodihan, Charles Brown, Laurie Coleman and Jason Dickie. Feel free at any time during the course of this evening to go back there and talk to them one on one.

Tonight we have a stenographer recording this meeting. Ms. Waskiewicz is responsible for documenting this meeting. She will prepare a record of this meeting which will be place in the administration's record. The placement of the record will take one or two weeks. If you would like a copy of this record sooner, please see Ms. Waskiewicz during the break or after the meeting.

Greenfield Community Television is also here streaming and broadcasting live. This meeting will also be available online tomorrow. Northampton WHMP radio station is also recording tonight's meeting.

This evening I will describe the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, who they are, their responsibilities, and what they do and don't do. I will also outline the commission's environmental review process,

pre-filing, the environmental contents of an application, the application review process, the environmental impact statement, and the commission's decision process. I will also outline the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company's proposed Northeast Energy Pipeline project.

Once I've provided you with this information, I will then open up the public comment portion of this meeting. Last night your neighbors to the west expressed a lot of concern about providing comments given the 6,000 plus pages of information that Tennessee Gas filed with the commission on Friday.

If that wasn't bad enough, the systems electronics, the e-library system has been experiencing technical difficulties, for those of you who tried to access information in preparation for this meeting. I understand that this may be very frustrating and many people have questioned about the appropriateness of this meeting tonight.

Public comment meetings, such as this, are important to the commission's review. Because the public comment portion of this meeting is so important and there are a lot of people interested in speaking, I'd like to spend a few minutes now and I'll touch on it again later, there are several ways the commission accepts comments.

The list of speakers who would like to give comments is now I believe over 100. We will stay as long as we can to hear your comments but I recognize that many of you may not be able to stay, you have families and lives. Last night we got through about 15 speakers an hour, so that gives you an idea of where you are and when we might get to you.

All of that said, this is not your only opportunity to comment. This meeting was never meant to be your only opportunity to comment. In addition to accepting verbal comments this evening, we also accept written comments via U.S. mail and the internet at www.FERC.gov. Written and electronically submitted comments are given the same weight as verbal comments. I will repeat: Written and electronically submitted comments are given the same weight as verbal comments. Those of you who will make it to the end of the meeting, which I suspect will go well past 11, I congratulate you. Those of you who need to go, I understand. I just want to reiterate to you the fact we do accept your comments in other forms.

I realize that many people have prepared comments and may be thinking of their comments right now. Please keep a few things in mind. Because so many people are interested in speaking I am going to have to enforce a strict three minute time limit for public speakers. I want everyone to have the opportunity to speak. Therefore I ask you to try very hard to summarize your comments.

I am also going to ask that you not interrupt a speaker. I understand that many of you may feel very passionate about this project, but please refrain from heckling or booing or any other such things. Also please keep in mind that time lost to excessive cheering is time lost to the speaker and time limits will be enforced.

I think all of you are familiar with Tennessee's proposed project, the Northeast Direct Project or the NED project. Tennessee Gas is proposing to construct and operate a natural gas pipeline system that runs from Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Hampshire.

This system will transport approximately 1.3 billion cubic feet a day of natural gas. Operation of this pipeline system will require the construction of several above-ground facilities including compressor stations, meter stations and other pipeline related -- maintenance related facilities.

Just a couple of -- and I know they are hard to see from the back -- a couple of maps illustrating this proposed project. More information about Tennessee's project can be found in their draft resource reports, which I'll talk about in just a minute.

So Tennessee Gas would like to build a pipeline project. Like any other project, they need a permit. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission is the lead federal agency responsible for issuing such permits. We are not the only permitting agency but we are the lead federal permitting agency.

We are now in the pre-filing process. This project is not an official project. There is no official proceeding; there is no project to intervene on. The pre-filing process is a pre-project pre-application process that

commission staff designed in order to increase stakeholder involvement, to raise awareness of issues, to gather information about affected areas sooner rather than later.

We are a few months into this -- in the early processes, in the early part of the pre-filing process. A pre-filing process begins when a company expresses interest in building such a project. The company then hosts open houses, which I believe that many of you have attended, and it provides information to the public about their proposal.

They then begin to provide FERC with information about their project. Draft resource reports is what we call them. A resource report is a report of information about a specific resource. There are 13 resource reports and many of you may have read them. This is the information that came in last Friday.

The company prepares these resource reports and we are able to review these resource reports because of meetings like this. The company has an idea, they come and talk to you about it, now we want to hear what you have to say about this project.

As I said earlier, I'm a biologist and Jim is a biologist. Jennie is an environmental protection specialist. We are the people that read and write these documents. And I'll talk about the documents we read and write in a little bit.

This meeting is in a pre-filing process to better understand the issues, the community, the area, the environment here in Greenfield. We hold these meeting so you can educate us about the project. As staff, we walk into this, we do research on these projects to better understand the resources that are affected, but you people live here every day.

Many of you were born here and many of you spent your entire lives here. Your information is extremely valuable to our review process. We take the information you provide us and make sure that is included in the company's resource reports and in their application. That way, when we go to do our environmental review, it's a very informed and comprehensive review.

Many of you have written letters and you give us comments here tonight. We take this information and turn it into comments on the resource reports or requests for additional environmental information.

People often ask me why they don't get a letter back from the commission, and I wish we had the resources to write everyone a letter back, that way you would know your comments were being heard. But how we respond to your comments is we take them and then we turn them around and make sure the company addresses those issues.

They need to prove that this project meets all the environmental requirements and all the permitting requirements. The pre-filing process concludes when a company chooses or not chooses to file an application. If they file an application, we then begin our post-application review.

Before I talk about the post-application review, I just want to point out some of the issues that we've learned so far. Here are some of the things we have learned about this project.

Last night we were there for four hours learning more about this project. And when I say, "this project," I mean the resources affected by this project. As you can see here, this is six bullets. I have five pages of notes, basically single-spaced from last night. This is not meant to be everything that we've learned, but if we put everything up here, there would probably be about 30 to 40 slides. There's a lot of information FERC shares with us and continues to do so. I just want to provide you with an example of some of the things we have heard from the community so far.

Now we can go on to the application. Once an application is filed, we begin our official review. We review the application for completeness. If it is incomplete, we will delay our processing of that application. We deem it complete by making sure they have all the information we requested be put into that application. If it is incomplete, we'll issue data requests or requests for additional environment information. That application is available to the public.

The concern that many of you have is regarding the environment. In that application is an environmental report. That environmental report is made up of source reports that represent the major environmental

resources; water bodies, wetlands, soils, geology, air quality, noise, land use, alternatives, vegetation, wildlife, migratory birds, endangered species, ground water, and I think several other resources. There is a team of probably 15 to 20 people that will look at that information and begin to prepare an environmental impact statement.

Our review is summarized in the environmental impact statement. After we review their application and deemed it complete, we request any additional environmental information that we need and we will prepare the draft for the environmental impact statement. That draft environmental impact statement will be issued to the public for their review.

We will come back to you or somewhere in this area and present that draft environmental impact statement and ask for your comment on that document. That document will summarize the affected environment; it will summarize the way the company will build the project or could build the project.

It will describe what we think the impact will be to the environment. It will describe the measures that a company has proposed to minimize or avoid those impacts. If we think those measures are insufficient, there will also be recommendations from us to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impact.

The environmental impact statement will also address alternatives. Many folks have expressed an interest in alternatives. We will have a thorough analysis in the environmental impact statement. After we receive your comments on the draft environmental impact statement, we will then prepare a final environmental impact statement.

The final environmental impact statement will be used by the commission in its decision process. The commission is charged with balancing the costs of a project with the benefits provided by the project. Part of that analysis includes an environmental review. The environmental impact statement that we will prepare is the information they used in that decision making process.

I want to talk a little bit more about environmental impact statements because you are going to hear that term or EIS or draft EIS or final EIS used a lot tonight. As I said before, it is a summary of our analysis, not a review of the project.

The effect on the environment, and I'll use soils for an example, would describe the soils likely to be impacted by this project. There may be special soils in this area that we don't know about and you need to inform us of that. That's where the information we get tonight will be helpful.

We then tell you of the impact or what we think the impact would be of that project on the resource. And as I said before there will be measures described to avoid or minimize the impact.

A project of this size, an EIS, is going to take a long time to process and prepare. There is a lot of information, people have expressed a lot of concerns last night and in other meetings that have been held about this project.

Ours, as I said before, is not the only permit. There are other permits that need to be obtained. The endangered species, Section 7 consultation needs to be completed. That is the Fish & Wildlife Service consultation. There's a permit issued by the U.S. Army Corp., review engineers. This project is subject to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act. The Massachusetts citing board is also involved. There are several other state and federal agencies involved in this project.

That concludes my comments and brief presentation about the project and the FERC review process. What I'd like to do now is talk a little bit about how we are going to run the public comment portion of this meeting.

We have a list here of elected and government officials who I'm going to permit to go first in recognition of the folks that they represent, all the meetings they have to attend. And once we've concluded with those speakers, and it looks like there is about 25 of them, we will then begin calling numbers.

Everyone who is interested in speaking should have a number, one, two, three, four. When you hear your number, please come up. If your number is following that number, please be ready to come up.

Government officials, elected officials will be given four minutes to speak and public speakers will be given three minutes to speak. There is a light here, green, yellow and red that represents the time that you have. The yellow will come on 30 seconds before your time is up. The red will come on when three minutes is expired.

When three minutes has expired, I will ask you to conclude your comments. I'll give you maybe five, ten seconds additional to wrap them up. I hope you wrap them up before that. I don't want to cut anybody off, but I want everybody heard. But if you are going to go on longer than that, I'm going to have to cut you off to give everyone a chance to speak.

As I said before, we're currently at 100 people or more. I'm not sure of what the final count is yet, and we're going to be here for a while.

Once we get to the public speakers -- and throughout the course of this meeting I'd ask everyone to conduct themselves with professionalism and respect and civility here for the speakers. There are going to be a lot of opinions expressed tonight. Some of them you'll agree with and some of them you won't agree with. I just ask everyone to be kind. As you can tell, I'm not a professional public speaker, and I do this a lot.

The folks that come here feel very passionately about it and they are going to do their best. I would like you to extend them courtesy, and I'm sure you all will.

With that I'll ask the first speaker to come up.

Mr. Keith Barnicle.

MR. BARNICLE: All right. Good evening. My name is Keith Barnicle. I'm here on behalf of my boss, Congressman Jim McGovern. Unfortunately Jim's schedule is keeping him in Washington, D.C. this evening. I know how much he would like to be here for this important event this evening.

He and I wish to thank you for being here tonight, taking time out of your busy schedules to submit your comments on this important project. The following is a statement from Congressman Jim McGovern.

Dear Secretary Bose, I want to thank the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for holding this scoping meeting to request comments on environmental issues regarding the Planned Northeast Energy Direct Project.

I regret that the House of Representatives is in session and I am prevented from attending this scoping meeting in person. However, I appreciate FERC's willingness to accept my comments in written form.

I have heard from countless constituents about their desire to extend the deadline for public scoping comments beyond August 31, 2015 in order to ensure that all available information is considered.

In addition, the extension will allow for greater exploration of alternatives to this project, which will allow for the most comprehensive review possible.

I applaud the efforts of Massachusetts State Attorney General Maura Healy who has recently undertaken a comprehensive study of the electric reliability needs in the New England region through 2030. Attorney General Healy's office has stated that the report is expected to be completed in October 2015.

This report will provide important information that deserves consideration with regard to the entirety of the Northeast Energy Direct Project. As currently proposed the NED project crosses miles of pristine land that had been protected by state and federal dollars.

It is my strong belief that land that has been protected from development and perpetuity by public dollars, it should be protected from the construction of a pipeline which would run directly through it.

It is critically important to me that this federally regulated process is concluded in an open and transparent way. I will continue to advocate on behalf of my constituents of the 2nd Congressional District in Massachusetts in order to ensure that concerns are heard loud and clear.

I will be submitting a more detailed scoping comment for the record prior to the August 31, 2015 deadline. Sincerely, James P. McGovern, Member of Congress.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. And I would like to thank you for being a good example and spelling your name and speaking very loudly into the microphone. You did great. Thank you very much.

Miss Cynthia Brubaker.

MS. BRUBAKER: Cynthia, C-Y-N-T-H-I-A, Brubaker, B-R-U-B-A-K-E-R. I'm here speaking for a Representative Ellen Story who represents Amherst, Pelham and Granby. I would like to read her comments.

I regret that I cannot attend tonight's scoping meeting on the perspective Northeast Energy Direct Project. The State House of Representatives is in session so I must be in Boston to attend to legislative business. Please accept this letter as my testimony.

I have strong reservations about the environmental impact of the proposed gas pipeline. The materials that Kinder Morgan have provided to my office and to the public do not address these concerns adequately. I have heard many objections about environmental effects from many constituents and even more from the people who live in the vicinity of the perspective pipeline.

In particular I have heard a very pervasive case from a hydro-geologist who lives in a town adjacent to my district, that we must study thoroughly the consequences of creating new, man-made pathways along this route because it alters the geomorphic structures of several unconnected watersheds.

This project cannot move forward until the consequences on the trophic interactions, nutrient dynamics, and contaminant pathways are vented.

The environmental review of this project should be a question for scientists, photographers and land stewards, not corporate spokespersons, bureaucrats and lawyers. Please enforce a thorough review of this under-vested project.

Sincerely yours, Representative Ellen Story.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

Mr. Christopher Cappucci.

MR. CAPPUCCI: I'm Christopher Cappucci. I represent Greenfield. I'm reading a joint statement, a joint statement prepared by Senate Stan Rosenberg.

MR. PECONOM: Make sure you spell your name for the court reporter too, please.

MR. CAPPUCCI: I'll give her a card.

Reading a joint statement on behalf of Senate President Stan Rosenberg, Senator Benjamin Downing, Representative Gaylen Cureidi, Representative Steven Cooleg, Representative Suzanna Ripley, and my own boss, representative Paul Martin.

We are unable to attend the hearing tonight due to legislation sessions in Boston but we wish to comment on the matter before FERC due to the critical importance of this regulatory process in evaluating the environmental impact of this proposed project on the communities that we represent.

First and foremost we believe that first you should suspend the current environmental process and withdraw the Notice of Intent that was issued on June 30, 2015.

It was only days ago, on Friday, July 24, 2015, that the latest resource reports for the Northeast Energy Direct Project were filed for public comment and reviewed as part of this process. These documents are massive with thousands of pages of highly technical and important environmental information about this project.

Despite the lateness of the filing of these reports, they are incomplete and omit critical information that is necessary for a thorough and accurate review of the impact of this proposed project in our community. In this short time it is simply impossible for citizens, organizations and experts to properly analyze and comment on the environmental and economic impact of this project.

In order to have a credible and respected regulatory process, we believe that it is incumbent upon FERC to postpone this scoping process. We believe that it should be restarted with the issuance of a new Notice

of Intent extending the public comment series for at least 60 days in light of the July 24th resource reports. A new schedule of scoping hearings should be issued to allow for meaningful public comment during this period.

Without a restarting of this process, we believe that our constituents, who would be affected by this process, will be unable to offer full and meaningful testimony and comments on a project which threatens the environmental health and quality of life in our region.

We respectfully ask that you approve this request before proceeding further. Thanks, John.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

I need everyone's patience for just one minute. We want to make sure with all the fans and the ambient noise, it is a difficult thing for our reporter to catch everyone's comments. And that's the main purpose of tonight's meeting so we are just going to try and fix these technical issues very quickly here and we will continue.

All right. I think we resolved the technical difficulties. So we'll get back to the speakers.

Mr. David Wolfram.

MS. NESS: David and I are going to switch. My name is Carolyn Ness, N-E-S-S. I'm the chair of the Board of Selectmen and the Board of Health in the Town of Deerfield. Thank you for holding this local scoping session. We really appreciate not having to travel.

The Town of Deerfield will be submitting written comments to FERC that lists our concerns by the August deadline. However, the Town of Deerfield is formally requesting tonight that the FERC grant an extension to the EIS scoping process which includes extension to the August 31, 2015, deadline for written comments.

Because of the volume of material delivered for review on Friday, July 24th, it would allow us to have a proper review. The Town of Deerfield is also especially concerned about the lack of horizontal drilling information that will occur under the railroad, under Interstate 91, under the Deerfield River, under the rail yard, and under the Connecticut River.

The Town of Deerfield also formally request tonight a no-action alternative analysis in EIS scope or a delay in the FERC scoping process that will allow the Attorney General's office to submit their study evaluating the need for the proposed pipeline capacity that should be completed by October.

The information we have received has been perpetually changing and incomplete. The Town of Deerfield's concerns are wide ranging from the setback from the transmission lines to the corrosion threats from the electromagnetic fields to many pre and post construction concerns of water testing, radon testing, erosion control, storm water, run off, access roads, invasive plants and emergency response. Please take the time to have the Town of Deerfield's concerns fully addressed.

We also formally request tonight that FERC notify the Town of Deerfield of all actions they will do and not do regarding the Kinder Morgan pipeline.

Thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, madam.

Mr. David Wolfram.

MR. WOLFRAM: Good evening. My name is David Wolfram, W-O-L-F-R-A-M. I am a member of the Board of Selectmen for the Town of Deerfield as well as the Board of Health. I'm here tonight to address some of the concerns the Town of Deerfield has with the pipeline. We will be submitting these in a formal form by the August 31st date.

There are seven items. The first is economic. The pipeline's presence could cause destruction or erosion of home values within the Town of Deerfield. The pipeline's presence could cause difficulties in financing and refinancing of these properties. The pipeline's presence could cause difficulties obtaining homeowner's insurance.

The second is water resources. Pipeline construction could cause damage to wetlands. The pipeline could cause alteration of surface water drainage patterns. The pipeline could be a source of contamination to water supplies. Construction could cause a reduction of well capacities for bedrock wells. Placement could result in alteration of ground water flow patterns.

Construction could impact geology and ground water flow. Installation of pipeline -- threatens the pipeline integrity. Lack of proper bedding will impact pipe integrity. Depth of pipeline could prohibit farming or recreational use.

Public safety, the Town of Deerfield does not have resources to protect against vandalism or terror threats to this pipeline. Deerfield does not have manpower or equipment to address pipeline accidents. Deerfield does have a concern with regional response preparedness.

The pipeline's proximity to the Deerfield rail yard could affect or alter remediation effects that are currently in place at that site. And we also wish to have you look at and reverse 911 funding.

Open space for recreation and conserved lands, pipelines will cross bodies of water and recreational areas, the Deerfield River and Connecticut River, which borders both in Deerfield. The pipeline will affect recreation and re-tree areas, for example, the Rolling Hill area.

The pipeline will cross a significant portion of the Deerfield farmland causing loss of tillable land and potential long-term repercussions to farming in the Deerfield area. The pipeline installation could affect further conservation efforts in Deerfield.

The pipeline will pass through private and public conserved and preserved land. As most of you know Deerfield is a very historic area. Historically, the pipeline will pass adjacent to the historic Deerfield and could affect tourist potential. The pipeline could cause disturbances to several historic homes and potentially disturb one historic cemetery. No provisions are related to the planning for or the conservation of potential neolithic or other archaeological sites.

Lastly, construction. Heavy equipment during construction could damage the town roads. Blasting adjacent to the power lines could threaten transmission line integrity. Construction could have detrimental effect on farms and businesses along the construction route.

Lastly, critical nature of construction could mandate and should mandate an independent third-party monitor and certification.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Mr. Jack Spandaver?

MR. SPANBAUER: It's Jack Spanbauer, S-P-A-N-B-A-U-E-R. I'm chairman of the Northfield select board.

The Town of Northfield would like to submit this report, for the record, detailing Northfield's specific environmental concerns regarding the proposed route of the pipeline through Northfield. It's 40 pages, not including appendixes, so there's not time to relate all of our concerns now. But we ask FERC to address all these concerns we have presented in our report. Our report is also available online on the town's web site.

Northfield feels very strongly that the proposed pipeline route will do much harm to the environment and natural resources of Northfield. We voted against the project at a town election by a large six to one margin and we voted against it unanimously at a town meeting.

We also feel that the no-action alternative or alternative route have not been objectively evaluated and ask FERC to look at them in detail as part of the EIS scope. And we ask FERC to wait for the Attorney General Healy's report before making any decisions.

We also ask that FERC require the project to go through the Mass Environmental Policy Act Process and the Wetlands Protection Act Process.

Our state regulators are very familiar with the natural resources of Northfield and would protect the inter-

est and environment of Northfield as they have in past projects. We anticipate providing additional comments after Kinder Morgan's submittal of only four days ago.

I do want to say one thing. Appendix F, the pipeline plans are totally unreadable and undecipherable. They have been reduced from two feet by three feet plans to eight and a half by eleven and we do not have the resolution to even blow up small portions of the plan to be able to read what the heck is going on.

So we would like to submit this and thank you very much. Thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you. Miss Tracy Rogers.

MS. ROGERS: Thank you for this opportunity to speak and for holding these proceedings locally so we may participate. My name is Tracy Rogers, T-R-A-C-Y, R-O-G-E-R-S. I'm a selectman in the Town of Northfield to which the pipeline is slated to traverse, in which a 41,000 to 80,000 horsepower compressor station is slated to be built.

I'd like to share some of my concerns about the Northeast Energy Direct proposal, both as a selectman and as a professional emergency planner. In the area of fire protection I'm concerned about firefighting capabilities in relation to fighting a fire caused by an incident at the pipeline or the compressor station.

Fire departments in most of the towns crossed by the pipeline rely on a volunteer fire force. This creates difficulty in scrambling a sufficient number of firefighters even in routine house fires. Because these firefighters have day jobs, they often don't have time to participate in trainings and exercises to keep up their skills.

Purchasing large pieces of firefighting apparatus to fight routine fires for these small rural towns is proportionately more expensive than in larger cities because the same base level equipment is needed regardless of population size but the tax base in a rural town is smaller.

For these reasons the town of Northfield requests that FERC require that Kinder Morgan provide a multi-year training and exercise plan for local first responders and provide a list of specialized apparatus and equipment and personal protective equipment that local fire departments can have available, provide a list of substances that will potentially be transmitted through the pipeline.

Disclose whether shut-off valves will be operated remotely or if they will require Kinder Morgan to call a local representative out to physically operate them.

In the area of policing and security, I'm concerned about the kind of security measures that will be taken in relation to the pipeline and compressor station. Unlike rural fire departments, rural police departments do not rely on volunteer labor but they do have small forces. Many of our towns do not provide 24/7 coverage.

For this reason the town of Northfield requests that FERC require Kinder Morgan to describe what security measures it will take to prevent terrorism or vandalism events and disclose whether compressor stations will be manned or remotely monitored.

In the area of emergency planning and training, I'm concerned about the kind of emergency planning process that will be conducted before construction and in the long term. With the lack of local public safety resources mentioned above, it is imperative that a good emergency operation plan be in place and regularly exercised.

Regional emergency planning committees and public health coalitions are interval partners in assisting local responders in preparing for emergencies. I ask that any planning efforts undertaken by Kinder Morgan receive local and regional input as often these plans are written in a bubble and do not work in the local communities.

According to the pipeline and Hazmat Safety Administration since 1995 there have been 103 pipeline incidents involving gas transmission lines in the United States resulting in 43 fatalities and 185 injuries. While this number is statistically low, it does illustrate that accidents happen with a pipeline.

We request that FERC does all it can to ensure that the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline does not add to

those statistics. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

Mr. Brian Noble?

MR. NOBLE: Thank you. Brian Noble, N-O-B-L-E, Town Administrator, Town of Northfield. I would like to spend a few minutes with you on water resources and Wetlands within -- (technical difficulty).

Thank you. Northfield has eight Department of Environmental Protection designated public water supplies. The proposed pipeline line will impact four of those supplies, the two largest, Northfield Water District and East Northfield Water Company. Both watersheds will be impacted by the pipeline.

The Northfield Mountain Hydroelectric project has two public water supplies that serve the recreation facilities. A significant threat to water quality of these public water supplies is posed by the construction and the operation of the proposed pipeline.

We request that the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection be contacted regarding these water supplies and the threats represented by the proposed construction and their recommendations adhered to.

We need the route of the proposed pipelines to be relocated away from the public water supply so that they no longer impact the water sheds, critical to the protection of our drinking water supply.

There can be no contamination now or in the future of Northfield's drinking water. The town believes that rerouting the proposed pipeline is the only way to ensure our drinking water supplies will not be harmed. We are equally as concerned about private water supplies because changes to the hydrology, geology and topography to this fragile area could cause adverse affects to private bedrock wells by the construction and the operation.

Pre- and post-construction testing and monitoring are essential to ensure continued safe water supplies to the nearby residences. These water supplies must be preserved and protected both from diversion of the flow and from contamination from construction or operation of pipeline.

We request that Kinder Morgan conduct baseline periodic studies both pre- and post-construction and during the operation to note any change in the water quality.

We are concerned about the groundwater flow patterns that may be changed by the construction of the pipeline or the operation of it. There has to be some hydrological testing and monitoring to guarantee a continuous water flow.

The proposed pipeline route passes through multiple water recharge areas for both private and public water supplies. We request that baseline studies, at Kinder Morgan's expense, be done prior to any construction and that periodic studies be done post-construction and compared to the original testing.

We are concerned equally about the impacts to our wetlands. The proposed pipeline will pass through numerous jurisdictional wetland resource areas subject to the protection of the Massachusetts Wetland Protection Act.

We require a full survey of all land near the proposed pipeline along with a complete inventory of rare and endangered species, vernal pools and other wetlands.

As with all the other projects in Massachusetts, the project must comply or should comply with the Wetland Protection Act, file a Notice of Intent, and obtain an order of condition for construction and operation of the pipeline.

The long-term impacts from the proposed pipeline project on our wetlands and protected species must be a prime concern and measures be taken to guarantee the ensured long-term viability.

We have two brooks in the area, Four Mile Brook and Miller's Brook, that are both cold water fishery streams. The proposed pipeline closely parallels the brook for nearly three miles and crosses it on one of the other tributaries. There is a significant threat to the water quality in the area.

Thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Joanne Magee?

MS. MAGEE: I'm Joanne Magee, M-A-G-E-E. I am a member of the Northfield Open Space Committee. The proposed locations of the compressor pipeline route in Northfield will adversely impact abutting conservation lands and a network of hiking trails.

I want to tell you about the damage that this siting will cause to Northfield's Brush Mountain Conservation area, our town forest, and to the New England National Scenic Trail, recently designated by congress in 2009 and one of only twelve in the United States.

Ten years ago in a town meeting I asked residents to support our first conservation project, Brush Mountain Conservation area, a 46-acre woodland parcel that protects the trail head for the historic Manadnock trail, 220-mile long distance path that goes from Long Island up to New Hampshire.

It protects the original homestead of Calvin Swan, a trained black man, well-respected member of the community, a carpenter and sawmill owner and a founder of two antislavery organizations in Franklin County.

It protects the continuous wildlife habitat designated by a forest community by the Massachusetts Division of Fish and Wildlife. At that town meeting residents pledged money to purchase the property. Donations and grants ranging from \$315 from the Girl Scout Troop hike-a-thon to \$70,000 from the state for a self-help grant, helped to pay for this.

It included contributions from the Appalachian Mountain Clubs in the North Quabbin Regional Landscape Partnership. These donations, both from private people and foundations and money from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the United States government are specifically for land protection, land preservation, and cannot be used for anything else.

Removing any permanently protected land from conservation not only breaks the trust of donors but it presents legal issues about reimbursement. Brush Mountain is a keystone project for an evolving economy in a town based on recreational activities. Since purchasing that land we have protected another piece of property, the Richardson property that provides another trail head, and we have protected our town forests with forest legacy funds.

Brush Mountain and the town forest are now the hub for recreational trails in Northfield. More than 10,000 hikers now travel the New England National Scenic trail. Who would want to hike next to a noisy compressor station? Would you approve a compressor station on the Appalachian trail or route the pipeline to weave back and forth across the Appalachian trail?

My comments, I have extra copies with more detail for you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am.

Miss Meg Burch?

MS. BURCH: My name is Meg Burch, B-U-R-C-H. I'm the chair of the Conway ad hoc pipeline task force and a member of the Board of Health for the Town of Conway.

I'd like to state that this testimony is incomplete as is the draft and environmental report and project scope update released by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company and Kinder Morgan late last week.

The Conway Select board and Board of Health have both submitted letters to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission requesting that the deadline for written comments be extended given the less than timely release of these revised reports, the new information contained in the reports, including the location of a main line and remote blow off valve in Conway, a 2.6 acre temporary work space not identified previously, the lack of complete information related to the horizontal directional drilling portion of the project that will begin in Conway and go under the Deerfield River.

Given the pending energy need analysis that's being conducted by the state's attorney general, the quan-

tity of new information and the level of detailed data still, quote, to be determined in the resource reports, these scoping areas are premature and need to be extended.

The Town of Conway lies in the foothills of the Berkshires just west of the Connecticut River Valley, a region rich in agriculture and history.

Conway shares boundaries with seven other towns, three of which are also directly impacted by the proposed Northeast Direct Pipeline Project. Conway is the first hill town northbound on Route 116, one of seven designated scenic highways in Western Massachusetts.

The proposed pipeline project will specifically and significantly impact the Town of Conway, its citizens and our region. 3.41 miles of the proposed pipeline is routed across the northern end of the Town of Conway.

Specific comments will follow in written format, but a few areas of concern are as follows: We are concerned of the impact of this project on the quality of water in our wells and streams. We are concerned about the impact to environmentally sensitive areas including vernal pools, cold water fisheries, streams, core habitats, priority habitats for rare species, prime farmland and permanently protected open space.

Noise is a concern, noise during construction, noise during operation of the mainline valve and remote blow off in areas characterized by hills and river valleys where sound travels and echoes.

The impact of planned as well as unplanned gas releases on the air quality, environment, and health of residents is a concern. The impacts to roadways, bridges, and related infrastructures, given the enormity of this project, is a concern. The proximity of the national gas pipeline to high tension power lines is a concern.

Emergency access and response is a concern as residents could be cut off from fire and EMS as the route bisects a major roadway in town.

As I prepare this brief statement and consider the impact of this project on my town and our region, the word that comes to mind is unconscionable, defined by Merriam Webster as unscrupulous, excessive and unreasonable. This project must be delayed to allow for a fair and just assessment of the need as well as a thorough exploration of how best to avoid, that would be the no action alternative, to minimize or mitigate the impact of this project. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Holebrook?

MR. MOORE: My name is Jim Moore. I'm on the select board in Conway and also a member of the pipeline task force.

There are a lot of details that have been given and some of the things I have to say are a little more general. One of the things I want to start with is, our country has laws and regulations regarding the control and truth in advertising. This is by a federal agency, as you are a federal agency too.

When it comes to Wall Street, giant banks and corporations and the energy industry, how is that truth in advertising working out? We see BP bragging about the money it just spent to restore the gulf better than ever. The truth is, BP was forced to spend the money. And for those suffering, it's a continual squeeze, as we read in many of our journals. And the gulf will not be better than ever in the next several lifetimes if even then.

And there's the classy looking woman in the business suit telling us how great and safe is the business of fracking and how good it is for all of us. She calls it, we're colored, red, white, and blue. She is waving that patriotic flag so we will say, Oh, yeah, let's do this.

When information tells us that from the chemicals and from the fracking there are all kinds of side effects that are affecting all of us in a great, great way. We are hurting the earth.

The truth is those who are paying for this advertising are greed-driven bureaucrats who's only allegiance is to their ill-gotten gain and the only loyalty is to those like themselves who conspire to take everything

that they can get no matter what the consequences.

What they seem to fail to recognize is that when there is no more clean water and no more clean air and no more food supply that isn't poisoned. As an extension of their greed, it will not just be the poor and the vulnerable who will die. It will be their children and their children's children.

You, those of you sitting here before us, right here tonight, have the opportunity to begin to make a difference. And I appeal to you to take that opportunity and begin that process by saying no to the energy industry that wants to put a pipeline through here and wants to continue fracturing the earth and poisoning it.

Kinder Morgan and those like Kinder Morgan only care about the money. They want to run a pipeline through here, basically, to ship energy overseas. Those of us here in Massachusetts are not going to benefit at all from that.

I am sure that they know that and you know that and I beg you to please use your authority to help us here in the western part and in the country because this affects all of us. It's bigger than just a pipeline through our backyards.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Miss Linda Dunlady?

MS. DUNLADY: I'm Linda Dunlady, D-U-N-L-A-D-Y, from the Franklin Regional Council of Governments.

I can't read and look at you.

The Franklin Regional Council of Government is a municipal services organization and the regional planning agency for the 26 communities of Franklin County, eight of which will be directly impacted and the rest of our region indirectly impacted by this project.

The town has significant concerns about the natural and cultural resource impact of the pipeline project. The short and long-term impacts to our region will be profound. We request that FERC thoroughly evaluate the need for this pipeline.

Even with the recently proposed reduction in pipeline size, 30 inches, this pipeline project has only 38 percent of capacity committed. If the larger 36-inch pipeline were committed, only 23 percent is committed. In the absence of the demonstration of need, FERC lacks authority to approve this project.

We also request that other alternatives to meet electricity generation and natural gas demand in New England be fully explored, including energy conservation, renewable energy production, LNG storage, expansion of existing gas pipelines and improved operational efficiencies by other pipelines that can result in recapture of this gas.

We ask that alternative routes be analyzed that could have less impact on environmental resources. The cause will submit additional written more detailed study requests in coordination with the regional planning agencies impacted in Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

These study requests will focus on protection of water resources, air quality, public safety, critical habitat areas, minimizing noise impact, mitigating impact on infrastructures, to private and public property, avoiding impacts on permanently protected open space and historic and archeological resources and addressing economic impacts on tourism and natural resource businesses and the fiscal impact to our town.

The study requests will be submitted or directly related to the general headings listed in the first Notice of Intent and will provide the level of information needed for FERC to fully evaluate the environmental land use and socioeconomic impact of this proposed project.

The information submitted by the company as part of the pre-filing stage has not been sufficiently detailed to allow for meaningful public comment. It is our hope that by asking for specific studies, FERC will develop a record of decision that includes adequate detail on this proposed pipeline project.

We respectfully request that after the scoping commentary is closed that FERC advise us on what information will be included in the draft environmental impact statement and finally we, too, ask that you extend your commentary period past August 31st. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Mr. Walter Ramsey?

MR. RAMSEY: Walter Ramsey, R-A-M-S-E-Y. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am the town planner and conservation agent for the Town of Montague.

I've compiled a list of community concerns, requests drawing from municipal plans including the Montague Open Space and Recreation Plan, the National Hazard Mitigation Plan of Montague and the Montague Comprehensive Plan.

I ask that FERC respect the community's goals identified in these documents which I have since synthesized into this testimony.

On the economic impacts: There are approximately 15 homes within 500 feet of the pipeline in Montague. The town is concerned about reduction in home values, difficulty with homeowners obtaining refinancing, and homeowners insurance.

On the water resources topic: The pipeline bisects the Hannigan Brook Water Supply protection area that supplies water to over 5,000 households in the Turner's Falls water district. And the route impacts at least two wetlands and crosses two major rivers in Montague, the Connecticut and Miller's River.

Because of these reasons the town is concerned about the contamination of public water supplies and damage to wetlands and water bodies. We request that the Mass Wetlands Protection Act, the River Front Protection Act, and the Mass Environmental Protection Act be fully applied to this project.

Regarding open space and recreation: The Montague plains are a unique and pristine national pine bearing ecosystem. The plain is used extensively for recreation including passive recreation like hiking, bird watching, and cross country skiing.

The proposed route includes approximately one mile of new right-of-way over land held in the public trust for the Mass Department of Fish and Wildlife. Plus the town is very concerned about the change of use for that one mile of Article 97 protected land as well as the impacts on hunting, recreational trail use and habitat on the Montague plains.

Regarding public safety: Montague's two independent fire districts do not have the manpower or equipment to address pipeline accidents. The Montague plains are a wildfire hazard area. Historically there have been devastating wildfires on the Montague plains where such an occurrence happens naturally.

Montague's National Hazard Mitigation plan identifies wildfires on the plains as one of the most significant hazards for Montague as it would threaten directly the villages of Lake Pleasant, Miller's Falls, as well as the airport industrial park.

Regarding historical impacts: Montague, like surrounding towns, is rich in Native American history. The project is in very close proximity to the Turner's Falls cultural landscape district, which was designated by the National Park Service. We urge FERC to require a bigger archeological survey and to work closely with the affected tribes in the area.

Regarding construction: The town is concerned that heavy equipment during construction is going to damage town roads. We are also very concerned about the proximity of the pipeline to power lines. We feel that the critical nature of construction should mandate independent third-party monitoring and certification.

Lastly, the Montague planning office is in full support of the specific study requests that are being made by the Franklin Regional Council for Government on behalf of the affected towns in Franklin Country. And Montague will be preparing their own written testimony.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Miss Nina Keller?

MS. KELLER: Nina Keller, K-E-L-L-E-R, I'm the chair of the Wendell Board of Health. I keep looking at you people from the government. You look like regular people. I know that you have hearts and families like we do. You've been told tonight from our legislators, our select boards, do you know how many towns have voted against this proposal? This pipeline is not going to happen in this region.

Are you aware that the people of this area stopped the Montague reactor from being built? This area is very environmentally savvy. The people are educated and we know what we're talking about. We're advising you to really think of the public interest.

When I met my first FERC representative at an earlier meeting, I asked him, what is the definition of public interest? He said it had do with money. Because Kinder Morgan, Enron, Kinder Morgan is a very large corporation and they'll be hiring a lot of wonderful workers who will then improve the economy regionally. So I am asking you to put into your report the definition of public interest.

I say Enron because we doubt the integrity of Kinder Morgan. And someone else mentioned their health and safety records where people have died on their work crews. They've had fires and explosions and leaks.

The Board of Health, we take our responsibilities very seriously and we're mandated to protect public water, health and safety. And there is no way that the Board of Health will approve. The conservation commissions are not allowed to approve the passage of this pipeline of natural gas, they call it?

This is not natural. This is fracked gas. This is a moral issue that you're dealing with. Because fracked gas is imported from really far away, and we know what's happening in the southwest and Texas with fracked gas communities and their water being toxic. It's not going to happen here.

So as public servants, which we all are, we have to represent the people. We are telling you it's not going to happen here and what we want and what we need is you, as a regulatory commission, to inspire yourselves to look into alternatives and conservation and sustainability and stop wasting taxpayers time and money on this ridiculous issue. It's not going to happen here.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am.

Mr. Ted Cady?

MR. CADY: My name is Ted Cady. I'm the chair of the Town of Warwick's planning board (inaudible).

FERC is to be commended. The FERC staff have done an a good job of reviewing the mountains of information in a timely way and are commended for this. The applicant has not been able to deliver before you should extend the scoping period. Kinder Morgan has received approval from less than 50 percent of the landowners to cross their property.

This makes surveying difficult, archeological surveying impossible, wetland vegetation analysis and wetland delineation very difficult and identification of rare and endangered species impossible.

It is hard to evaluate their resource reports when the information is to be determined. The burden on them is to reduce the information in a timely way. In this they have failed. Waiting until the last minute to submit data should not be used by an applicant as a way to shortcut the process, speed up the process, or avoid review.

Within three days of the scoping session in Greenfield, Kinder Morgan has produced thousands of pages. Is it unreasonable to expect a review before the scoping session by local concerned citizens?

It would be very difficult for those concerned to seek and obtain professional review of particular sections within the current time frame for comment. Again, fairness requires an extension.

The Northfield compressor station noise abatement: Previously Warwick requested that FERC require the compressor station to meet the Massachusetts noise abatement general law which is based on ambient noise level. We still recommend this and suggest requiring the ambient noise level be determined in a

timely way so that adequate design time is allowed to incorporate the needed sound reduction into the plan for the compressor station.

Northfield compressor station lighting: Previously requested that the dark skies that the area is noted for and taken advantage of by groups and individuals (inaudible) be honored by careful design of the lighting at the compressor station and other stations as well.

Minimizing escaping light needs to be designed into the compressor station early on to minimize the burden on designers and contractors.

Organic certification: What is the impact of the pipeline passing through organic farm fields, agricultural field's impact? When I think of my fields, the (inaudible) in that area will be reduced for some years afterwards. Kinder Morgan has publically said they will restore fields. How do they propose to prevent a drop in field productivity? Based on my own fields I suspect the problem comes in part from soil compaction and in part for the most productive topsoil being mixed with less productive topsoil and subsoil.

In our region soils vary from rich bottom land soils to thinner more sensitive soils in higher elevations. The impact of pipeline on the productivity of soils and type of soil needs to be addressed for the soil types on the grounds the pipeline will cross and measures and lessens the impact or short-term fertility loss stated.

Freeze/thaw cycle impact on the pipe: Freeze/thaw cycles in our area have been known to heave pipes and cause them to leak. How will this be handled?

Inversion impact: Inversions where cold air is trapped in the Connecticut valley or hill town valleys are very common in our area's winter. What will be the impact of pumping station blow downs and other releases of natural gas from meeting stations and whatnot when there are inversions? Would such releases be dangerous or harmful during times of inversion? If such emissions have a reasonable probability of being dangerous, how can the danger be minimized?

Electrical generation CO2 impact: Kinder Morgan representatives have stated that the pipeline will result in lower CO2 emissions than currently exist in Massachusetts. This needs to be documented because currently, the electrical supply in Massachusetts has quite a low profile.

MR. PECONOM: Excuse me sir, your time has expired, can you wrap up?

MR. CADY: Global warming impact: Kinder Morgan is planning (inaudible) is an important part of selling the project. Kinder Morgan has made some claims they should be willing to support.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

Mr. Lawrence Pruyne?

MR. PRUYNE: My name is Lawrence, P-R-U-Y-N-E, and I'm a select board member in the Town of Warwick.

I didn't prepare a statement today because I want to talk about who this pipeline threatens, and it threatens my wife.

And the reason it threatens my wife is that she likes to garden. She likes to go out in the garden and dig around and shovel the chips and stuff. She has got arthritis in her hands and gardening keeps them nimble, which she needs because she teaches piano to little kids.

Anyway, the reason this pipeline threatens her is because the Marcellus shale fields are known to have high concentrations of strontium. That's a radioactive element.

Now, there have been measurements done on village water that have come back from the wells that have been drilled there and measurement of the gases that have been generated in the Marcellus shale fields and they have been found to be high in concentrations of strontium, strontium 90, barium, radium 226, and radium 228.

Now, there may be other radioactive elements that I missed but those are just the ones I found on a very quick search on the web.

Now the reason that threatens my wife is because it comes from the ground in Pennsylvania and goes into the pipeline and arrives at the compressor station in Northfield.

Now, Kinder Morgan has stated that periodically, as a maintenance procedure to preserve the proper pressure in the pipeline, they need to vent that pipeline. Now, traces of those radioactive components are in the gas, it's in that line, along with the volatile organic compounds that are also very toxic to us.

When they vent the line at the Northfield compressor station, that gas is going to drift right up out of the Connecticut Valley going up along the road that connects Northfield with Warwick. And then that gas is going to drift over my town. And we live near the center of town right near the baseball field and fire station and those compounds may, in fact, settle in my garden where my wife is working.

I just don't know what I would do if something happened to her. If there are radioactive compounds periodically settling into our garden, where she's working they may end up causing her cancer. So please, take that into consideration and ask Kinder Morgan to prove that these things will not enter the air, which I don't think they can prove, and don't kill my wife.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Ms. Barbara Francis?

MS. FRANCIS: Barbara Francis, B-A-R-B-A-R-A, F-R-A-N-C-I-S. I'm on the finance committee.

If you saw the movie about the bomb last night, you saw the process from a scientific idea through a period of government support to a group of people that could actually put the thing together and to deployment of the bomb, the nuclear bomb.

And the end of it was showing how the Navy wanted one too and they were willing to sacrifice three warships in order to prove Navy men were strong enough to resist radiation.

The first warship they put out was kind of a test. It wasn't manned. It sunk. The second one had people on it and they lived through it but they were contaminated. And the third one they decided perhaps not to do.

We live at sort of the end of the age of oil, the ragged bleeding end of it. And projects like this starting with fracking and ending with shipping to Europe, more transportation. We are doing things backwards. The raging of fires in Alaska and the developing permafrost, those are our problems.

Not, "Do we have enough gas"? We can't use, what, an outdoor grill or something? That's all I have to contribute. I hope you take it to heart.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am, Marion Kelner.

MS. KELNER: Hello. I'm Marion Kelner, K-E-L-N-E-R, Town of Greenfield, Precinct 1.

I'd like to say that the American economy since its inception has been built on the taking of land and the exploitation of the resources. It started with taking the land from the Native Americans here and from the animals and the ecosystems.

During the industrial revolution, big business went overseas and in collusion with the government there extracted natural resources to be sent here to support the economy leaving behind, as it did with the Native Americans, fractured societies and a devastated environment.

I think the corporations now are so emboldened in society that we mistake them for actual people. They are now bringing the same philosophy to this country and want to extract resources here to send overseas, in the opposite direction, leaving behind fractured societies, such as would occur in Western Massachusetts, and a devastated environment. In each of these cases it's wrong and should not happen here.

My next point is about NIMBY, not in my backyard. I happen to be a proponent of NIMBY. I think if someone doesn't want something in their backyard, they should not be forced to have it. So I am calling on each you or Kinder Morgan or anyone thinking of this proposal that they come forward and make a commitment that they want this in their backyard.

I would like to hear each person say, yes, you can take my land; you could put the compressor next to my house, and then maybe there would be a grain of seriousness to this proposal. That these people thinking it is a benefit, so they will suffer and not other people being assigned to suffer.

And lastly, in some ways as I'm thinking about this I feel, as I imagine, Native Americans did feel when they saw a wave of destruction coming toward them. And no matter how eloquent they were, no matter how wise they were, no matter the consequences that they saw, somewhere they felt they might be talking to someone who appeared to be listening but, in fact, already made up their mind.

I am hoping this predetermined proclivity to sort of approving this is not the case. And I'm hoping you will approve a project that honors the earth and animals and that absolutely will reject this one that will cause nothing but destruction for all of us.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am.

Mr. Steve August.

MR. AUGUST: Good evening. My name is Steve August, A-U-G-U-S-T. I am here tonight as a lawyer with the Massachusetts Energy Facility Siting Board. With me tonight is Ian Cueman, who is also a technical analyst with the siting board. I would like to take a moment to explain what the Massachusetts siting board does and its role in this proceeding.

One of our principal functions is to review proposals for the construction of new energy facilities in Massachusetts including large power plants, electric transmission lines, natural gas pipelines that lie entirely within the Commonwealth.

The siting board does not, however, have the authority to approve or reject interstate natural gas pipeline facilities such as the one proposed by Kinder Morgan in this case.

Instead such authority rests with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in Washington D.C. This siting board is not a part of FERC, which is an agency of the federal government. The siting board is a state agency and will hold a public comment hearing in Greenfield at the Greenfield Community College next Wednesday, August 5th, at 7 o'clock on the proposed pipeline.

In addition we will be holding public comment hearings next week Monday night, August 3rd at 7 o'clock at the Dracut Senior High School auditorium, next Tuesday August 4th at 7 o'clock at the Taconic High School auditorium in Pittsfield, next Thursday, August 6th at seven o'clock at the Lindenberg High School auditorium and, again, next Wednesday here in Greenfield at the Community College.

After the conclusion of the siting board's public hearing and an additional public comment period, the siting board will file written comments regarding the proposed project with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

The board's comments are intended to identify difficulties and problems with the project associated primarily with environmental issues. In addition the siting board may advocate for the imposition of conditions on Kinder Morgan in order to mitigate environmental impact that the pipeline would impose on abutters and the local communities.

The siting board's comments to FERC will be based in part upon a review of the pre-filing documents that Kinder Morgan submitted to FERC and upon the public comments that we receive at these hearings that we're holding next week. We also would like to invite the public to send in written comments which we would like to receive two Fridays after the public hearings are held.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Joe Graveline?

MR. GRAVELINE: My name is Joe Graveline. Joe, as in Joseph. Graveline is spelled G-R-A-V-E-L-I-N-E. I'm speaking today on behalf of the Northfield Historic Commission.

Recently Northfield worked very hard to put together a master plan to help the economy of Northfield, to help us get a sense of who we are. One of the things we agreed upon in the master plan is the utilization of historic cultural tours and recreation as being one of the major sources to bring the economy of Northfield up to a standard that might start to take care of the people of Northfield properly.

Now, it's understood that Western Massachusetts is economically depressed. It seems to be looked at as an Achilles heal from the corporations when they want to deal with us. I think it's very important for FERC to understand, we are here because we chose to be here and not because we're captured here.

Northfield has one of the oldest and longest histories in the United States of America. The landscape in Northfield has been utilized by the first people for over ten thousand years. People have utilized this land state for cultural/ceremonial practices and still do to date.

Brush Mountain, which is where the compressor station is located, is a very special, sacred place. It was called the Bald Mountains. It had been burned for thousands of years in order to keep the line of sight available to the indigenous people so that they could utilize the ceremonial stone landscapes that they created there.

The Federal 106 process got challenged recently with the Spectra pipeline. The Spectra pipeline set a very low bar for the 106 compliance. That needs to be addressed this time around. You need to understand that as they were working on this Spectra pipeline, it was absolutely impossible to keep ahead of the equipment. That cannot happen this time around.

The Spectra pipeline in Connecticut and New York was a short line compared to this project. We need to delay this process so we can identify and put into place protective measures for the ceremonial stone landscapes that exist here.

There was a Department of Interior decision of eligibility made on December 11, 2008 that indicated this was a historic, ceremonial stone landscape district.

That legal document should be reviewed by FERC. It's a very, very complete document. It encompasses everything within a 20-mile radius of the Turner's Falls airport.

One of the things that the indigenous people need to still access and get to the ceremonial landscapes are dark skies. These landscapes allow them to have their connection with their ancestors and their ancient spiritual leaders through the night skies.

One of the things that is concerning me as the Northfield historic commissioner is the north/south ridge where the compressor station is going to be built. That was created 450 million years ago as Mangia crushed together to create this area.

The seismic activity of blasting that area is going to put at risk an awful lot of ceremonial landscapes. I ask you, again, to delay the process so we can properly address some of these things.

I will file to FERC a written assessment of these things on behalf of the Northfield Historic Commission. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Miss Melissa Hoffer.

MS. HOFFER: Good evening. My name is Melissa Hoffer. M-E-L-I-S-S-A, H-O-F-F-E-R. I'm chief of the Energy Environment Bureau of the Attorney General's Office. We extend our thanks to FERC officials and everyone here tonight.

The Attorney General's Office filed early on our notice of intent to participate in the pre-filing process. We have been monitoring the Northeast Energy Direct Project quite closely. And we expect to provide formal comments on the scoping and also on the draft environmental impact statement.

Our office currently is undertaking an independent study, which we will be working on with the analysis group, of the New England region's reliability needs for the next 15 years. Our study is also going to be focusing on the solutions to any problems that we identify consistent with the region's climate goals.

We look forward to publishing our results this year and sharing them with FERC and other interested par-

ties.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Mr. Gregory Brodski?

Mr. Brodski is our last speaker in the group. When he has concluded, we will take a short break and then move to the public speakers.

MR. BRODSKI: I am Brodski, B-R-O-D-S-K-I. I am the co-chairman of the Warwick Conservation Commission. Protected lands of the Town of Warwick is one of the most large and broken wildlife habitats in Massachusetts.

Just one example, the Warwick Conservation Commission finds and certifies several new vernal pools each year. Did you study the natural resources before proposing the pipeline route? Obviously not.

There are wetlands in a half mile zone from the route as shown on the latest map provided. The example with the compressor station, even more stark. The super powerful compressor station proposed to be slated next to protected land of our neighboring town of Northfield and only one mile apart from the Warwick State Forest.

There are critical compressor station impacts put on birds, insects and other natural resources within a five mile radius. What the conservations commission strongly believes is on a draft environmental impact statement input level, all sources in five-mile radius from the route should be documented. Without this study no objective environmental statement report is possible.

We also believe that contractors employed for such a study should file notice of intent with local conservation commission.

I would like to give just one example of one objective reporting which made me very concerned. In the report filed with FERC last week, Volume 9, page 945, one can read. I will read it.

Area stone sources included tracking wildlife, birds and insects and distant aircraft were measured. Such kinds of measurements allowed the contractor to measure the noise level in the Town of Northfield at 57.4 decibels, which is eight times higher than other rural communities.

I don't think this measurement is really objective and reflects real situations in the Town of Northfield. I think that the FERC decision should be based on real facts and not on distant aircraft information.

And I would like to stress that FERC's decision is not about the pipeline. It's not about the economical benefits our region can probably get from them. FERC decides on the life quality of people who have chosen to be in rural areas. FERC decides on the existence of one of the very few unbroken wildlife habitats in Massachusetts.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

We'll take a ten-minute break and then reconvene with the public speakers. I encourage you to take this time to talk to us individually.

Ten minutes. Thank you.

(Recess taken)

MR. PECONOM: A quick reminder, when you come up to speak, please remember to state your name and spell it for the record. Remember you have three minutes to speak and I will cut you off a little after three. And please be respectful. Thank you very much.

Number one, please come up.

MR. KILPATRICK: William Kilpatrick, K-I-L-P-A-T-R-I-C-K, Northfield.

Northfield was incorporated in 1723 as a right-to-form community which is reflected on the byway signs with a tractor and a barn. Maybe for its 300th anniversary in eight years it might display a pipeline and compressor and air and water pollution from the proposed compressor and pipeline which might be deadly

to domestic farm animals and farm crops because of a right to pollute community.

Not that long ago the Northfield Inn and the Northfield Chateau were Northfield's tourist attractions. Now Northfield will have a gas compressor and a pipeline to promote tourism.

The Declaration of Independence says I have certain rights, right to life, liberty, pursuit of happiness; not noise, light, and air and water pollution 24/7, 365 nonstop.

Eminent domain is allegedly for the greater good, not necessarily the greater good of Massachusetts or New England, like the towns that were sacrificed 80 years ago to create the Quabbin Reservoir. But in my opinion, the greater good is of Europe and the corporate -- a corrupt and greedy corporation run by millionaires wanting to become multimillionaires, multimillionaires wanting to become billionaires and billionaires wanting to become multibillionaires.

Why are we sending tens of thousands of troops overseas to protect the homeland and then let greedy corporations take or ruin personal assets and ruin people's lives without a thought to collateral damage?

My wife and I are in our 70s. Our assets are essentially our home and land, which will be worthless after our water quantity and quality are destroyed, poisoned.

My home and property, which depends on well water, is crossed on the north and east side by Miller's Brook, which is a cold water fishery. My home, along with my neighbors on Gulf Road, are in the middle of a Northfield water supply protection district. The same water protection district that will be invaded by the pipeline and compressor uphill from our home and Main Street in Northfield.

Some of the animals seen from our home over the last 13 years, from the smallest chipmunks, gray and black squirrels, salamanders, woodchucks, bobcats, foxes, coyotes, to the largest, deer, bears including a mom with three cubs, moose, birds too numerous to specify including turkeys, woodpeckers, turkey vultures resting in a tree, various hawks.

The proposed pipeline compressor shouldn't be the first solution but a last solution after all other solutions have been tried first.

By the way, has anybody checked with the military at Westfield Airbase that having a compressor and a pipeline built in their low-flying flight path over Northfield is problem maybe during a blow down? Who knows?

It's been strongly recommended to have water, soil, and air tested before and during construction and subsequent activation of the compressor and pipeline to establish a baseline for comparison purposes. Just as important, if not more so, have all the members of your household been tested accordingly to establish a baseline? Remember collateral damage, elders and children most susceptible.

Thank you for your time.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Number two.

MS. SANTOTIETRO: Good evening. My name is Laura Santotietro. Tonight I'm here on behalf of the laborer's union to show support on -- we're here to show our support for this crucial project. It is estimated there is over 3,000 construction jobs for this project that it is going to generate.

So once again, I'm asking that FERC support this project, approve this project. It is critical, this is something we need. And we can't emphasize enough how important this project is. So I thank you for your time.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am number three.

MR. ANDREWS: Hi. My name is Tom Andrews, A-N-D-R-E-W-S. I am a resident of Berkshire County. I am a business manager to the Laborer's International Union of North America that represent 500 construction workers in the Pioneer Valley. I am also an executive board member of the Massachusetts Building and Trades Council and we represent 75,000 construction workers across the state.

I'm here to support the Northeast Direct Project. The new gas line will create new jobs across the state of Massachusetts. Installing the new line will create thousands of construction jobs across the state.

After the transmission line is installed there will be 20 years of installing new distribution lines to institutions, college campuses, homes, and manufacturing companies.

If we can lower energy costs in the state, we can hopefully start bringing in more manufacturing companies and in return create more permanent jobs within the state.

Kinder Morgan has signed a memorandum of understanding with the laborer's union in the Massachusetts Building and Trades Council.

In the contract it states they will use local construction workers in this area. Our training facilities are the best in the area and we, the unions, provide the best qualified workers for this project. In return this will make a safe project.

We would like to also bring new people into our apprenticeship program allowing us to train new members and allowing new members to start a career with the trade's union.

I believe the transportation of gas underground is a safer way to move energy rather than hauling oil over the highways. Every couple of months you read about a train derailment or a tractor trailer that has exploded from human error. With gas lines underground, there's less chance for human error.

Also with the new transmission lines, this will help bring down the cost of gas to the residents of Western Massachusetts. Our neighbors to the west of us, New York State, pays half the cost for heating their homes then we did in the past year. Why should I pay more for the same gas that New York does?

All the gas is coming from the same shell. As a Berkshire County customer I believe I should have the opportunity to heat my house for less. I don't believe natural gas is the only answer to the energy crisis in the country. I believe we should continue to install windmills, solar panels, and geothermal wells for our energy needs. But I also believe that natural gas is a major component to our energy needs.

I believe that we can install and maintain this pipeline in a safe way and I believe Kinder Morgan has a safe track record. I know all construction companies aren't perfect but it is how you address the issues in the end.

In closing I would like to again say that I support the Northeast Direct Project. As a business manager of the Local and as a resident of Massachusetts and as a customer to Berkshire Gas, I would like to have my energy costs lowered in the state of Massachusetts.

Thank you for your time.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Number 4.

MS. SURLON: Hi. Thelsea Surlon. T-H-E-L-S-E-A, S-U-R-L-O-N. I live in Charlemont, Massachusetts and I support this pipeline. We need new infrastructure. My generation, I'm sorry, but we need more jobs. We need economic growth. We need something, because Western Massachusetts is crumbling before our feet.

I love the environment just as much as everybody else. Okay? I understand that. But we need something different, something new, new ideas, new infrastructure. I support this pipeline and I live here too.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

Number five.

MR. MORIARTY: My name is Bob Moriarty, M-O-R-I-A-R-T-Y. Eight years ago I took a gas system and shut it off. I had them come and pull the meters, the regulator, and capped the line. This year I wanted to put a state of the art gas hot water system, on demand, and a state of the art, 99 percent efficient heating system in it. I can't do it because I can't get a permit to get the meter again.

What you have is what I call energy hogs like the University of Massachusetts and various large institutions that have basically gobbled up the supply of natural gas in this area.

If we don't expand the pipeline, the natural laws of selection are going to develop from this. That is you, as the homeowner, are going to be out of luck on trying to put a state of the art energy system in your house that will work heating with natural gas.

I'm a little surprised out here that the politicians who are so open to the environment and yet everybody that is against this pipeline that I talk to is heating with wood. I have a wood/coal stove that I could use as a system if I couldn't get this in, and I will use it, but I much prefer the modern gas heating system.

I already know from a previous house, my summer bills are like \$28 a month whereas the electric bill on this house that I have converted is nearly 200. I hope, if the opportunity comes, that we will expand the infrastructure in the New England area.

I think it's ridiculous that people point to us and say it is going to another country. We are the largest natural gas producer in the country and if we don't use it, and can understand passing it on. I, myself feel that we should be heating with natural gas. It's clean super efficient and it cost less than wood, in my case, on one of my houses.

Hopefully our politicians will wake up on this and just not side with a movement trying to say that it's not going to affect us. Do remember, delivering energy is a lot safer in a pipeline. If you'll check what happened at the border with the Canadian government with the runaway train.

You are going to get the same effect and the same risk. And yes, anything made can possibly break down and there can be leaks, but they are much easier to control. I only hope that the politicians will listen and the little guy will get a break and still be able to heat with natural gas, a great source of heat.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Number 6.

MR. TRANGHESE: And I live in Wilbraham, Mass. I am with the labor local 999 the laborer's union I represent 500 members many of whom live in or work in this area. Our members are highly skilled in our training centers in Hopkinton, Mass and Hartford, Connecticut.

They hold OSHAs, OSHA 30S, they have CPR. And they also have to go to a 40-hour operator's training course. So all the members or workers that will be on this project will be certified in pipeline installation.

And why is that important? Because we will be supplying those workers for this job. They are skilled and they are trained and we want them to go home to their families every day. And these are good paying jobs, jobs that are going to remain here. These are not import jobs.

The workers live here. They are going to spend their money here. And our members support this project and we hope you will too.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Number 7.

MR. DIEMAND: My name is Kris Diemand. Kris with a K, K-R-I-S. Diemand, D-I-E-M-A-N-D.

I'm a local laborer union out of 596. I would like to express my support for this project. It's no secret that New England faces an energy crisis. As rate payers, we currently pay the highest prices in the county for natural gas. This not only hurts our family's budgets, but local businesses will not hire or expand without having utility costs with reliability.

Gas capacity and accessibility constraints threaten to slow production and will further hurt our economy recovery. The unemployment in the Commonwealth across many sectors is still too high and we can't afford to sit back and wait.

I ask FERC to approve and support this project. Let's get our region on track and most importantly let's get our people back to working and building our energy future.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Number 8.

MR. FISHER: Forgive me for crouching down but this way I think you can hear me. Good evening. First of all, I would really like to thank you for coming here, for your forbearance on this hot evening. And you folks will probably be here after I've left. I would like to thank you for doing so.

My name is John Fisher, F-I-S-H-E-R. Myself and my wife Seber, S-E-B-E-R, N. Fisher, live in Plainfield approximately 100 yards of the proposed path of the Kinder Morgan pipeline. I realize this might be immediately perceived as a NIMBY issue. In fact, when it was first proposed I actually spent a good deal of time trying to figure out if it was possible that the benefits, jobs, whatever, the benefits of this pipeline -- and I take it with the risk that would also clearly be involved, weighing them together. If there was a chance this was a good idea, if this was a necessary idea.

Unfortunately I've come to realize, the more I look at that, what is said and what Kinder Morgan has shared with us and more importantly what they haven't shared with us. The TVDs and the reports. There are 3,000 TVD's in the initial draft. All this really lead me to question whether this hearing is premature. The whole process is premature at this time.

And now, Friday, they come out with the second version. I must confess, I haven't had time to make my way through this one. It took a long enough to get through the first one. So again, there are a number of things that really need to be addressed. I think it's important that we take the time and effort do this.

And specifically what I would like to propose is really three things. Number one: That a new series of spoken hearings be scheduled at a date sufficiently in the future to allow those of us who might be at risk of substantial harm from the construction and operation of the proposed pipeline to adequately investigate what is being proposed, what risks might be involved, and if the pipeline is constructed, how those risks might be mitigated. Minimally, they should allow, among things, the Attorney General's report, which is due in October.

Number two: That groups looking to question the pipeline be allowed as much access to the process as some of those that are presently involved.

Number three: That towns such as -- I see it. Closing remarks.

That towns such as, for example, my neighbors in Windsor, have a chance to have a hearing where they live so that they can have chance to talk about the implications of this on them.

I thank you for your time.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

No. 9.

MR. YOUNG: Good evening. My name is Richard Young. I come to this meeting as a private citizen representing no one but myself. My home address is in Fairfax, Virginia but I own a summer cottage in Northfield, Massachusetts. I am a retired patent and trademark attorney. I have an engineering degree from Renseler and a law degree from Georgetown University.

My comments today focus on the campus of Northfield Mount Herman School in the town of Gill. The school is usually called NMH. It was founded in Northfield in 1879. Today it is a well-known co-ed boarding school serving 650 students in grades nine through twelve.

NMH takes pride in its beautiful setting and its idyllic view of the river valley. I am concerned that the compressor station proposed in Northfield will mar the view from the campus. This will be true during the daylight hours but the intrusion will be even greater at night when for security purposes the compressor station will be highly illuminated as is customary in the industry.

Figure one is a photograph of the view from the school chapel. To demonstrate a worst case possibility I have added to the photograph, first, an inset photograph of an 80,000-horsepower compressor station at a natural gas processing facility in Haven, Kansas.

And number two, I have added a red rectangle on the ridge line showing the location and approximate height of the Kansas compressor station if it were to be built in Northfield.

Figure two is similar to figure one except it shows a smaller compressor station in Galleon, Alabama. Figures three and four show that the Northfield compressor station site is directly on a line of sight from the NMH chapel. These figures present satellite topographic and profile imagery from Goggle Earth.

If construction of the compressor station were to be approved, I urge that the following mitigation measures be utilized.

Number one: Grading the site to lower the elevation of the compressor station. Two: Constructing walls or providing other screening needs. Three: Orienting the buildings on the side to minimize the area of the building walls that will face and be visible from the campus. And four: Minimizing nighttime illumination.

Thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. I believe it's number ten. Did I skip nine? No. Thank you. Number 10.

MR. ROGERS: Good evening. My name is Aaron Rogers, A-A-R-O-N, R-O-G-E-R-S.

I'm with the local 596 union hall. Originally when I first was planning to come up here, I had something planned. I was fortunate enough over the last few hours to talk to a bunch of people outside, including the raging nannies, and I got to really go over a few things.

In hearing a lot of the previous speakers, I started hearing a lot about history, the history of this state. And it really got me thinking about a different history of this state. The textiles mills, Holyoke, the paper city. We started out with water power, we switched to electricity, things that created constant change and progress within this state.

It seems to me that we find ourselves in another crossroads here debating all these different issues. I hear, not in my backyard. I've heard a lot of talk about endangered species and it came to mind one species I am worried about, the human species. And it's a concern I think everyone here shares.

When I think of "not in my backyard," I think of the previous speakers, the girl I was sitting with that is soon to get married. She is worried about her job.

When I hear "not in my backyard", I hope I have the opportunity to have my own backyard. I'm not going to have that backyard if projects like this don't go through. I want to be allowed the opportunity to have my health insurance, to be able to send my kids to college, to be able to have that garden that I someday might be able to cultivate with my hands and grow old with.

The history of this state, there's been progress; there's been change. It has gone through different phases of power. I agree, we need to do it safely. As one of our previous speakers said, we're trained. The OSHA standards now, the training that we go through, we are changing and we are getting better.

We talk about accidents where people died on Enron sites. Unfortunately these people do a hard and tough job and it's dangerous. People have died. There might have well been people that died in the very building we're still in now.

The laborers and construction workers, they come in and work hard and work all day. All we're asking is for the opportunity to continue working. To be allowed the opportunity to be able have that backyard.

I heard a lot of angst against Enron and BP. And lot of people are fervently against these corporations. I just have one question. If we're so fervent, like myself, I turn on my lights, like many people here do and I fill up my gas tank, like many people here do. Ask yourself how fervent you are when you are supporting the same companies who do that.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Number 11.

MR. ELWELL: My name is Will Elwell, E-L-W-E-L-L. I'm opposed to the pipeline. I understand that FERC is here to listen to environmental concerns and that's what I'm here to talk about. I want to talk about water. I live in Ashfield and I live about half a mile from the proposed site for the pipeline coming through our town.

On my property I have a spring. The water comes out of the ground and we provide water for people who want to accept that water. That spring has been designated as an emergency water source for the town.

This is a bottle of that water and I submit it to you as an example of clean, fresh water. Just as important as springs, springs are where water comes right out of the ground. And we harness that water and make it available to the public. There are also dug wells that go down anywhere from 100 to 300 feet. You're welcome to drink that water if you like.

So we have drilled wells and we also have brooks and streams and rivers. And just as important as the water is the quality of the air. And we have to protect that quality of air. Just as important as the air is the quality of noise. We have to protect and keep the noise level in control.

Just as important as that is the quality of light. With these compressor stations nobody is ever going to see the stars again.

One thing I request, well a number of things I request from FERC, is from you I haven't heard anything about creating a baseline and monitoring these important aspects of our environment. No baseline has been established. I would like you to establish a baseline on that water and monitor that water. Don't let Kinder Morgan monitor it but get an independent company to monitor it.

Not only that water, but you have to monitor the wells, the springs, the streams and rivers I would say five miles within that pipeline. Not only monitor that independently but control it. If there was a problem, you have to have a way to stop production or transport of gas. There is nothing like that established.

If you allow these guys permission to start up, they are not going to stop. You have to have a way to stop them.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Number 12.

MS. FISHER: My name is David Fisher, D-A-V-I-D, F-I-S-H-E-R, from Conway. Members of FERC, after 18 years of incredibly hard work, my wife and I have built an organic farm here in Conway. It's a beautiful and healthy environment in which to raise our two children. They thrive here and reiterate on a regular basis how much they love our farm and hope to live here for the rest of their lives.

Perhaps you have children yourselves and can relate to the deep joy and satisfaction of providing a safe and nurturing environment for them. But it is not just a nourishing home for our family. Our farm is visited by hundreds of customers every week who come for their produce, meat and eggs and simply enjoy the beauty of the place.

The children swim in the South River and they pick berries by the fistful. This is a safe place that our customers trust. Our community is deeply invested in our farm. Our farm is unique and at the same time it is representative of so much of what happens here in Franklin County.

We are but one farm among dozens that feed, nourish, and inspire people on a daily basis. But what makes this area most amazing to us is the depth of appreciation and care for it that nearly all of its residents seem to share. Franklin County is indeed the answer to my lifelong quest for hope in humanity.

Our dear friends and mentors farming in north central Pennsylvania might have described themselves in a very similar situation just a few years ago. But by 2008 gas wells were erected in their community by the dozens.

Life and noise and confusion and constant truck traffic transformed their pristine rural landscape to an industrial, natural gas, hydro-fracking extraction center. Within a couple of years she was stricken with a massive cancer and required a hysterectomy to save her life. Two years later he contracted a rare form of

vasculitis which has crippled him forever.

For all their life's work towards building a farm of the highest ecological integrity, they are left poisoned, crippled and surrounded by a toxic industrial landscape.

Now Kinder Morgan is looking to bring these same toxic chemicals to Franklin County. I am deeply concerned about all the issues being discussed tonight but one that is particularly disturbing to me involves the pressure release valves located every five to twenty miles along the pipeline route. There is one such valve located on the route map, just at the top of the hill, less than a mile above our farm.

These valves serve to blow off gas in the pipeline to regulate pressure. Along with the gas is the standard range of hydro-fracking chemicals. When released the gas and chemicals will travel with prevailing wind, which would bring the mixture directly over our farm.

I understand that fracking chemicals are heavy and readily settle out, which means my wife and I, our two young children, all the crops and animals on our farm, all the children who visit our farm every week, and the families that eat our produce would all be getting regular exposure to proven carcinogenic hydro-fracking chemicals.

Look, it has been clearly established that there is no increased need for natural gas in Massachusetts that cannot be addressed by maintenance and conservation measures and alternatives.

The energy pipeline is solely for the benefit of corporate profit. Members of FERC, you are human beings in positions of power. I implore you to take your responsibilities seriously and protect the lives of your fellow citizens across the country and right here in Franklin County. Thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Number 13.

MR. DANIELL: Good evening. My name is Peter Daniell, D-A-N-I-E-L-L. Please note that this oral statement is a partial reading of the Leverett Select Board's statement to FERC passed by unanimous vote yesterday. The original and entire letter has been filed with this commission.

And it reads in part: Wherefore this Leverett Select Board requests that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, not accept the Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, Inc., TGP, filing until it's resource reports are complete. Currently TGP's resource reports as updated and filed with this commission still have approximately 10,215 instances of information or conditions marked, quote, unquote, to be determined.

Where the health and safety of our communities are concerned these emissions create an unacceptable level of uncertainty, ambiguity and risk and therefore this commission should forthwith service notice on TGP that its resource reports as filed are rejected as incomplete and further that said reports may be re-filed when complete i.e. with no, quote, unquote, to be determined evasion, within a reasonable period of time.

In light of the forgoing we hold it imperative that FERC not close the scoping period until 60 days after TGP files new, complete resource reports.

Moreover, there is no urgent need to rush this matter forward as state leaders have made clear to dispassionately and disinterestedly determined the New England regional natural gas energy needs, the office of the Massachusetts Attorney General under Attorney General Maura T. Healey is currently conducting a regional gas catastrophe study.

Attorney Healey has stated, quote, as the state makes long-term decisions about additional gas catastrophe investments, we should understand the facts, what the future demand is and which cost effective energy and efficiency resources can be deployed to meet that demand.

We request that in addition to not accepting TGP's filing that FERC conduct a comprehensive study on the potential impact on public health, on public safety, and the scoping consequences of leaks including methane leaks from the pipeline and the likely cost of mitigation.

With regard to public health all residents of the town of Leverett rely on water from private wells. The

aquifer upon which these wells draw is largely recharged by sources derived from the Connecticut River, the Deerfield River and other sources, all areas where TGP's pipeline is proposed to run.

Continued access to clean and safe drinking water is essential. Therefore we request that FERC conduct a separate study on the impact of the proposed pipeline on the aquifer as relevant to our town and all the neighboring towns along and near the proposed route.

Additionally we request that FERC conduct a study as to the consequences of mitigation, cost, and evacuation plans regarding pipeline and/or possible compressor station explosion. We request that FERC use all means necessary to determine the punitive effect over time of the impact of this proposed pipeline on our forest, wetlands, lakes, ponds, farmlands and homes, our drinking water, air, and environment, including how those effects will be monitored.

Thank you for your time.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir.

Number 14.

MR. DARNLEY: Good evening. My name's Bill Darnley, D-A-R-N-L-E-Y. I'm a member of Laborer's Local 596. I live in Turner's Falls and yes, I do support the pipeline for the obvious reason of the construction jobs. 3,000 jobs is a lot of jobs. I don't believe that anyone not in our industry can truly comprehend what that means to us.

But also when I moved up here 12 years ago and I first started to drive around and look around, all I'd see around this area is empty warehouses, empty manufacturing, empty mills. A whole lot of empty. Nothing is going on there. hard enough in Massachusetts with our high cost of living, our higher wages, to draw manufacturing type jobs to our area. It's harder in Western Massachusetts. One thing that doesn't help at all is very high overhead. And high overhead consists of electricity also. If you are using electricity, you need natural gas and you can't get it, you're at a competitive disadvantage when you're competing against other states, other towns, other areas in this country to try to draw in business to put people to work on a full-time, regular basis at worthwhile jobs.

We crank out kids ever year in the local technical schools. They need somewhere to go. They need somewhere to work. Bringing back manufacturing is a good start for that. And one of the ways to do that is to make it more economically viable for people to invest in this area.

I like the coffee shops and the restaurants on Main Street and all the little due-dad places as much as anybody when I'm out on the weekend mopping around. For anybody who wants to pay a mortgage, own a nice car, go on vacation live a lifestyle that they deserve, this is as best.

I believe that putting this pipeline in and allowing us access to those resources and companies that may want to come to this area will put us on a more level playing field with other areas as we compete for them.

That is one of the reasons I am for the pipeline. Thank you have very much

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Number 15.

MR. BERGHIAUME: Good evening. My name is Kenneth Berghiaume, K-E-N-N-E-T-H, B-E-R-G-H-I-A-U-M-E. And I would first like to start by briefly summarizing what I presented at last night's scoping session in Pittsfield.

ISO New England stated that energy efficiency is having an impact. And I quote, when the EE savings are compacted into the region's forecast, energy usage is expected to remain flat with an average annual growth rate of 0.0 percent. End quote. Yet, it is dismissed in Resource Report 10.

ISO New England references 4,000 megawatts of wind power in the 2015 que, another discrepancy in Resource 10.

Solar provided roughly one third of all new electric generation capacity in the U.S. in 2014. Yet it is also dismissed in Resource Report 10. There is starting to be a theme here, if you haven't guessed.

Battery technology is not addressed in Resource Report 10 at all, yet it is here today and viable. Energy efficiency, wind, solar, and energy storage in terms of battery capabilities, require accurate and full consideration and analysis.

Contrary to the statement listed in, you guessed it, Resource Report 10, Portland National Gas Transmission System, in their statement to the Mass Department of Public Utilities, have offered an existing alternative to supply the amount of natural gas requested by the LTCs. To quote, PNGTS is working with interested parties and is participating in regional initiatives to potentially expand its total system capacity up to 600,000 dekatherms per day by the simple addition of compression in 100,000 dekatherm per day increments. The service could start as early as November 2018. End quote.

Existing alternatives: New England, particularly Massachusetts, is already host to under utilized and unused infrastructure; namely, pre LNG terminals. District gas in Everett is currently under utilized. Northeast Gateway Deepwater Port received it's first shipment in four years this past winter. And Neptune Deep Water Port, both off the coast of Gloucester, has been unused commissioning since 2010.

In closing why does New England need more under utilized and obsolete infrastructure that it's residents will ultimately pay for over the next 20 years while directly conflicting with compliance to the Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act?

It is further requested that FERC restart the scoping process due to the lateness, incompleteness and inaccuracies so quickly found within the resource reports. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Number 16.

MR. SLUTER: Howdy. Happy day. My name is Dale Sluter, S-L-U-T-E-R. I'm a native of this valley and so has my family been for generations. I love this valley. It's very, very precious. I had a gift of having a grandmother who would bring in nature and sensitize me to what nature was. So throughout all my life I've had very, very special experiences in this valley that have given me the feeling that nature is my mother. I love it. I love what it is.

And this morning I went to one of our beautiful rivers here, the Green River, and I was sitting by it for three hours. During that time I got the very strong impression to come to this meeting and to speak on behalf of mother nature.

I feel deeply what is. And the rush of energy that went through me from the forces of nature, I wish I could give it with all my heart. I wish other people could feel this. This valley has something very, very special. And it's drawn very, very special people here too, to listen and to learn and to share the balance that we as humanity, that we understand that our mother is going to be hurt by cutting her open and putting a false thing in her body.

My love and piece to all of you. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Number 17.

MR. MARK: Thank you. My name is Jonathan Mark, Jonathan, J-O-N-A-T-H-A-N, M-A-R-K.

I'm a publisher for Fly By News, which is flybynews.com that's been around since 1999. I also published three documentary films. One is called: Moss Brook and TGP, No Fracking way. Another one is called: Beyond Moss Brook, No Fracking Way, when they changed the preferred route to my land.

And then I did a short film on Pulpit Falls, which is in Winchester, New Hampshire, which is a real sacred waterfall place that I just discovered because of this pipeline. But the electrical lines go over it and it's in danger. I received a letter from Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company about their demands to survey my land for their interstate pipeline expansion project. I did not co-operate with them.

They claimed they would petition FERC and the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities for eminent domain. After considering their proposal I realized that this project was fraudulent and not in the public interest and especially harmful to our Commonwealth and to Massachusetts and to New Hampshire.

The proposed five billion project is supposed to deliver fracked gas from Pennsylvania's shale fields. The

goal for cheaper energy in the short term is misleading. Will they account for the carbon greenhouse gases emitted into our atmosphere, not confirmed as contributing to climate change? Will they account for falling real estate values and can they thoroughly clean up water ways and accidents? The short term reductions on cost is manufactured or made up but will not be realized in the long run since the harm created by such a project is almost unimaginable.

It would be end up destroying communities and lead toward extreme climate change. This will be specially harmful to cities like Boston, New York City, Miami, areas of Louisiana at risk for rising ocean levels and extreme storms.

In 2012 the International Energy Agency, IEA, released its annual flagship publication: The World Energy Outlook. The IEA made that historic statement in the executive summary that said: No more than one third of proven reserves of fossil fuel can be consumed prior to 2050 if the world is to achieve the two degree centigrade goal, which is the internationally recognized limit to average global warming in order to prevent catastrophic climate change.

I will rephrase that. Over two thirds of today's proven reserves of fossil fuel needs to still be in the ground in 2050 in order to prevent catastrophic levels of climate change. The five billion dollar investment for such an infrastructure, if used for solar, could contain a 3,000 megawatt facility like what was proposed for Project Nigeria. In New England, it's Kinder Morgan.

I'm going to close now and leave you with this report and also one of my films. But please think about the unborn, nature, and our lives. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Number 18.

MS: YOUNGBLOOD: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. My name is Leigh Youngblood. That's L-E-I-G-H, Y-O-U-N-G-B-L-O-O-D.

I'm a Berkshire Gas customer and I'm the director of Mount Grace Land Conservation Trust. Mount Grace owns land in the facilitate numerous projects affected by the NED. I'm here to address the high cost of impacts to public land, private conservation land, and property rights, and to ask whether the relative value of having this pipeline is so great that we should sacrifice the interconnected mosaic of conservation land strategically amassed through more than 100 years of effort.

Massachusetts is comprised of five million acres; 6.5 million residents live on 1 million of those acres and about 1 million has been protected. According to at least three independent analyses, Massachusetts should dedicate half the remainder to wildlife habitat, forestry and farms.

We should not be sanctioning projects that undo past commitments when so much remains to be done to protect the ecological, cultural, and economic integrity of our state.

As currently proposed this single scheme will adversely affect 15 conserved farms, five state forests, five state wildlife areas, five sections of national scenic trails, nine conserved drinking water supplies, 11 land trust properties, 18 municipal conservation areas, five sporting clubs, and the Silvio O. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge. More than 110 conservation and recreation parcels would be impacted, 85 of these have Article 97 protection under the Massachusetts Constitution.

State lands are public resources established by voluntary contract with landowners and many cases, as indicated, federal, state, municipal charitable and conservation funds. In one example at least 50 charitable donations were were made for the purpose of conserving a specific track.

The public trust and public charitable trust, established by those charitable gifts, extend both the harms and a legal duty to defend to those donors, expanding the impact of this project.

FERC's policy statement 993 is clear where it states, quote: The strength of the benefits showing will need to be proportional to the applicant's proposed exercise of eminent domain. And vague assertions of public benefit will not be sufficient.

A large percentage of the NED is proposed to cross conservation lands. This requires a supermajority

approval in both houses of our legislator pursuant to Article 97. This is unlikely to happen considering the overwhelming public opposition. It follows that a similarly extraordinary showing of benefit would be required before granting Kinder Morgan federal eminent domain authority to be exercised against the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This pipeline proposal does not pass the cost/benefit showings test. I urge FERC to require and carefully weigh a full and complete accounting of the adverse impact to public and private property rights.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 19.

MR. CORRENTE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I'm here tonight to support my fellow workers in this area for this gas pipeline, to build this pipeline.

My name is Lennie Corrente, C-O-R-R-E-N-T-E. I fully support this pipeline. This pipeline will be built by the men and women of this area, community workers. We are on community standard wages where we can support families with good benefits and good wages.

This project will be built and it's a job. But these jobs are really not jobs for us. This is our career. We build these projects and this is our career. This is how we build our career in construction. A lot of people don't understand this, but this is our career.

And as neighbors, we are going to build this right and safe. It's going to be built on time and on budget. This project will be built with apprentices from all over the area, men and women from all over the area, veterans from all over the area. Right now we have a program called the hardhats to helmets program, where we return combat veterans and veterans to work.

Please don't tell me we don't care about this land and this environment. As a veteran, we fought for this land and provided the freedom. We paid for our freedom with life liberty and sacrifice. I thank you all. Goodnight.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Number 20.

MS. WESSEL: My name is Rosemary Rosemary Wessel. It's spelled R-O-S-E-M-A-R-Y, W-E-S-S-E-L.

Kinder Morgan finally released their long-awaited draft environmental report on Friday, July 24th. That's five days ago. And you've heard from others the statistics on these reports. But 6,571 pages of new information to be digested and still with enormous gaps in information.

One of the most alarming of which is the horizontal directional drill plan which consists of four pages, which is a cover letter, two sheets marked: This page left blank intentionally, and one sentence stating that they will submit information later.

So this sort of level of information is really hard for us to make comments on. There have been numerous calls to FERC about the scoping process by scores of individuals like myself and by numerous elected officials but yet we're continuing on with the scoping process.

We could spend eternity debating whether or not the timing of the release of this information was deliberate and capricious on the part of Kinder Morgan. We can spend another eternity debating whether or not FERC is cow-towing to Kinder Morgan's preferred application timeline.

But regardless of these arguments, the fact still stands that given the timeline of this immense document dump by Kinder Morgan, there is the largest body of stakeholders, the people that are receiving the short end of the stick.

By filing these massive new reports in an entirely rescaled project, Kinder Morgan has rendered the current scoping schedule null and void. We call on FERC to do the right thing.

Cancel the current round of scoping, restart the process with a new notice of intent, schedule a new round of scoping meetings that also include towns affected by compressor stations. They have been largely left out of this process. And at the very least, at least one location convenient to the 11 towns east of Dracut that are affected by lateral routes which are not slated to be larger than the were before even though the

main pipeline is slated to be smaller, and start a new full 60-day comment period.

We also call on FERC to prevent illegal segmentation of the Ned project and the Connecticut expansion which share at least two of the few customers that they do have.

Based on precedents set by the ruling of Delaware river keepers versus FERC, you must review this over-all Northeast expansion by Kinder Morgan as a single project to remain within the laws.

Thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 21.

MR. OGDEN. My name is Don Ogden, O-G-D-E-N. I'm the conservative cohost of the show broadcasting from Florence, Mass and here in Greenfield. I want to welcome you to Western Mass.

Your former chairperson, LaFleur, is quoted as saying: We don't do warming. As in global warming. I'm not sure you guys get it because there is a climate crisis out there. Methane leaks from the entire frack infrastructure is making it worst. And methane, as you may well know, is anywhere from 20 to 80 times worse than CO2 emissions. You can't address the environment without addressing the climate and methane leaks, okay?

Your job is to determine how much the new gas infrastructure will affect the climate. You are supposed to be regulators and not enablers for the fossil fuel industry.

History will remember what you do with this project, either help protect the climate that supports all of us or helping the industry destroy it. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Number 22.

MR. ANDREWS: Good evening. My name is Colcon Andrews, C-O-L-C-O-N, A-N-D-R-E-W-S. I'm the field representative for laborer's local 596.

I'm here tonight to speak in favor of the Northeast Direct Project, a project that will provide the residents and businesses of this great area long-overdue relief from their extremely high energy costs.

Although I do strongly believe in the use of renewal energy sources, one thing we must admit is that the rate in which solar and wind sources of energy are being produced still falls severely short of the necessary speed to accommodate the ever expanding energy market in the northeast.

I do believe that natural gas is the bridge between the dirty fossil fuels of today and the renewable energy sources of tomorrow. That's why I strongly and wholeheartedly believe that Kinder Morgan has provided a solution to a complex and difficult issue.

Kinder Morgan has long been a good partner in the energy sector in Massachusetts for many years providing thousands of residents and businesses a cheaper and more energy efficient way to heat their homes and buildings. There's no reason to think that this good faith they have displayed for many years will change for any reason.

I stand here before you here tonight asking you to approve and support the Northeast Project and allow Kinder Morgan to provide the people of Berkshire, Franklin and Hampden counties specifically, also the entire northeast region with an efficient reliable form of energy.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Number 22? I'm sorry. Number 23. 23? 24?

MR. BLUVER: Good evening. My name is Mark Bluver. The last name is B-L-U-V-E-R.

I speak to you tonight in two capacities. One, I'm a resident of Franklin County. I live in Shelburne. And two, I've had the privilege of representing six different families -- I'm an attorney -- who have denied access to their property from a request from Kinder Morgan. Two of the families that I represent are family farms. One is located on the Shelburne side of the Deerfield River and they trace their heritage back to the French and Indian war. They have been farming; they are now in their 9th generation.

It's difficult for me to speak about the possible impacts of this project because the information about where the pipeline proposed would cross the Deerfield is invisible to us. All information concerning horizontal drilling is invisible to us. The other family farm that I represent just celebrated its 100th anniversary in one of the most well-known fruit farms, Clarkdale, in Franklin County.

As originally proposed the pipeline was going to go through hundreds of peach trees over 40 or 50 acres. Through our efforts, we were able to persuade the pipeline proponent that they should consider moving and they have indicated that they would move to another part of the property. The problem is that property is still farmland.

Now, I've listened this evening, carefully, to the legislators who spoke. I've listened to these men and women who spoke from the union, and I don't think that the task in front of you is particularly easy. But it does seem to me that there's a historical choice that's being made right now and the pipeline, at this point in time, seems to be on the wrong side of history.

Nobody denies that these men and woman who work for these local unions did good jobs. But they need jobs that are sustainable and jobs that will cherish this community that we all live in.

Let me add my voice to the legislators, Rosemary, the woman from the Conservation Law Fund. It's impossible to comment rationally on a proposal that is just presented to us five days ago. It's not workable.

The senator from Massachusetts and the senate on the state side, Senator Rosenberg has written to your boss and said, put the brakes on.

I can't, for the life of me, as a rational human being, understand what the rush is. We don't have information. We don't have complete information. There should be a moratorium and people should be allowed to analyze what's ultimately, if it's approved, a potential environmental disaster for this beautiful region that we all call home.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. I note now that it is 9:45 and we'll take a short break for the benefit of our stenographer.

5

(Recess taken)

7

MR. PECONOM: Number 25.

MS. SOVLMAN: Good evening. My name is Irvine Sovlman, I-R-V-I-N-E SOVLMAN. I live in Northampton, Massachusetts.

I care deeply about environmental justice, which demands that all public policy -- which demands that all public policy be based on mutual respect and justice for all people. So I ask you to include in your environmental impact statement a comprehensive study of the environmental justice impact of this project and specific ways to avoid, minimize, and mitigate those impacts.

Here in Massachusetts we take these issues very seriously. According to Executive Order 552, issued last year by Governor Duval Patrick, and I quote: Environmental justice means that all people have a right to be protected from environmental pollution and to live in and enjoy a clean and healthy environment regardless of race, income, national origin, or English language proficiency. End quote.

The detailed policies and programs in our state include a call for aggressively advancing clean and renewable energy as a way to help decrease our demand for fossil fuels as well as reducing pollutants that harm public health, degrade environmental quality, and contribute to global warming.

The federal government, of which you are a part, also emphasizes the importance of environmental justice which it defines as quote: The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies. End quote.

Indeed, Executive Order 12898, issued by Bill Clinton in 1994 states, quote: Each federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission.

So once you determine all of the potential environmental impacts of this project, I believe the best option for avoiding them will be to not to build this pipeline at all. Failing that, please include in your EIS a detailed study of how to minimize and mitigate these risks to our most vulnerable populations.

The definition of environmental justice requires meaningful involvement, which the EPA says -- means -- One: People have an opportunity to participate in decisions about activities that may affect their environment and/or health.

Two: The public's contribution can influence the regulatory agency's decision.

Three: Their concerns will be considered in a decision making process.

And four: The decision makers seek out and facilitate the involvement of those potentially affected.

How are you going to meet that requirement for the Massachusetts environmental justice communities, for the low income minority, the travel communities, and those with low English language proficiency, and offer them real opportunities for meaningful involvement in this process, the folks who aren't here with us tonight.

I look forward to seeing the results of your comprehensive environmental justice investigation when you issue the draft EIS for this project.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 26.

MS. THEBERGE: Hello. Can you hear me okay? All right. My name is Susan, Theberge, T-H-E-B-E-R-G-E. I work with Climate Action Now, 350 Mass in Springfield, Climate Justice Coalition.

My requests are based on the environmental justice policy of the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs of the state of Massachusetts and our state environmental justice policy.

First request: I request that you include in your environmental impact statement a mapping and comprehensive documentation of all environmental justice neighborhoods impacted by this project.

Two: I request that you address all the known and potential increased risks including first, methane, a powerful contributor to climate change. Two, all documented and potential toxic substances used in the production and transmission of fracked gas; and three, all risks associated with compressor stations.

I request that you thoroughly address all the known and potential risks of the Kinder Morgan fracked gas pipeline on all environmental justice communities in our state. These are the communities that bear the greatest brunt of the climate catastrophe.

On another note, I want to say that I stand in solidarity with the need for more jobs, good jobs in this area, and I want to say there's a growing documentation of the abundance of long-term job growth that we can achieve by investing in renewable, sustainable energy. So let's agree on that and work for that.

I want to close on a personal note. I have a one-year-old granddaughter. When I look in her eyes, I see the trust and the love that she has for me and the other adults in her life. I cannot look her in the eye without recommitting to doing anything and everything I can do to stop this fracked gas pipeline and all new fossil fuel infrastructure.

This is not about, not in my backyard, this is about the whole infrastructure and to protect and conserve our beautiful home.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am.

Number 27.

MR. VERNON: Good evening. Andrew Vernon, V-E-R-N-O-N. I'm a resident of Northfield, Massachusetts, and I speak on behalf of the greater Northfield Watershed Association.

As you know and have heard many times tonight, we would like to add that we think that we were given very little time to go over these reports. We would also like to request to extend the scoping period and also, specifically, to make sure the meetings are held in town where the compressor stations are going in. There's a whole set or hosts of risks there.

Our aim at the Watershed Association is not to suggest that the proposed project be moved around a certain vernal pool or historical site, but our aim is to suggest that the entire proposal is ill-conceived for many reasons.

The Watershed Association found, at the one quick glance through the reports, many protocols involving construction and road maintenance of the proposed pipeline. Those protocols look better on paper than in the light of common practice of this company.

The fact that the environmental inspectors are employed and trained by Tennessee is not lost on us. Although I trust most individuals, I do not trust a corporation that's in a rush to sell product.

The Watershed Association also finds, sorely lacking in the report, transparency about the compressor station. We notice that most information is deferred to final drafts of the report.

In Northfield the proposed station is perched above several water sources, as you have heard earlier. The watersheds work as a funnel toward the center of town. What might happen after the bulldozers are gone, after, if we are lucky, our roads are repaired? Spilled and settling emissions will enter our water supplies through porous glacial fill. The secret is already out; towns with compressor stations suffer health effects. How could a town-wide disaster like that be mitigated? Remember, there can be no business or permanent jobs in a waterless town.

Our written submittal details several more concerns about the placement of the proposed station, so I will not be more specific here.

The justification for this placement was faulty from the start. Just because the power lines lie on the ridge of our town does not automatically mean this is a good spot for a proposed compressor station.

In addition to the risks to local homes and most of our watersheds, this is sacred land for other reasons, some of which you have heard mentioned tonight. It's continuous forests. It's got large wetland habitats, areas of historical value, a national hiking trail, and lands protected by conservation restrictions, all on one mountain.

The Greater Northfield Watershed Association holds that rapidly expanding renewable energy market combined with improvements in conservation and existing infrastructure could meet these regional needs.

Please deny this pipeline and let's put that four billion dollars into public projects for the future instead of more fossil fuel infrastructure and industrialization of rural New England.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Number 28. And this will be our last speaker before the break.

MS LEMOINE. Hi. My name is Barbara Lemoine, L-E-M-O-I-N-E. I'm speaking as a resident of Northfield. I've lived in Northfield for 25 years and I've been a resident of Franklin County for over 35 years.

Kinder Morgan is slow at providing information and scheduling required meetings. There are repeated changes to the proposed project. There is an air of secrecy rather than transparency in their actions. Rather than trying to project the image of being a good neighbor, the opposite image is emerging.

Because of their self-serving stance, it is imperative that third-party geologists, archaeologists, wildlife experts and other subject matter experts be hired to protect and safeguard local interests. Towns should have the right to approve those experts, which will be hired at Kinder Morgan's expense.

How will residents within a specified radius of no less than two miles from the perimeters of the pipeline corridor be made whole if experiencing a decrease in property values, increase in insurance, and any health issues caused by the proposed pipeline.

Will adverse impact to property include wells, structures, livestock, driveways, septic systems, soil erosion, and evasive plans? Will arbitration be the decision of local agencies to be identified or created during the preliminary phase? Documentation should be done prior to the commencement of any work, by a disinterested third party hired at Kinder Morgan's expense, and approved by the Northfield select board. And what about the impact on recreational use? Protected land should remain unblemished and accessible to the public.

Historic, native American, and important geological sites are in the vicinity of the proposed project. The pipeline corridor should bypass these important sites. Archeologists and other experts should identify sites prior to construction, mitigate adverse consequences to these sites, and continue supervision during the construction.

I'm going to skip and I'm going to close.

Please have Kinder Morgan disclose the amount and percentage of the gas which would be traveling through and used in the northeast, state by state, and the amount that will be exported. A fee should be assessed for a ten percent variance and members sited.

If the need in the Northeast is artificially inflated, then the adverse impact on Western Mass will exceed any benefit.

I use gas for cooking only. I am assessed a \$50 fee each year if I do not meet the minimum usage. Rather than encourage users to waste their resource to avoid fees, emphasis should focus on encouraging clean energy, concentration on resources and information on non-fossil fuel.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am.

At this point we'll break for ten minutes and reconvene then. Thank you.

7

(Recess taken)

9

MR. PECONOM: If speaker 29 is ready, I'd ask that speakers get ready.

MS. RIBERIO: My name is Karen Riberio, R-I-B-E-R-I-O. We've already heard how burning fossil fuels can raise the global temperature by more than two degrees centigrade. I'd like to explain another way that fossil fuels make humans obsolete.

One gallon of gas is the powerful equivalent of 54.3 horses. And one horse equals the labor of ten people; therefore, one gallon of gas displaces the labor value of 543 people.

We understand in our souls our dependency on the land and the brilliant intelligence of nature's myriad ecosystem operating in graceful harmony. Yet do we think to slow down and reduce and recycle -- or to reduce our fossil fuel consumption is to lose.

Well, unless we all work together to live sustainably, we will continue to let corporations rule our planet and we will continue to advocate our humanity to their profits.

I'd like to ask you to consider two important resources. The first is a plan by the Solutions Project. This plan is a 100 percent renewable energy, zero fossil fuel plan for all 50 states and 139 nations using existing technology.

Would you please carefully consider this plan for Massachusetts before considering this pipeline.

The second consideration I'd like to request is the careful review of the rights of nature enacted by the state's college in Pennsylvania, which coincidentally, like the Pioneer Valley is also known as the happy valley.

Here are a few excerpts of their legal bill of rights that would have our happy valley in all communities if they would adopt.

It shall be unlawful for any person or corporation or any director, officer, owner, or manager of a corporation to use the corporation to engage in the creation of fossil fuel, nuclear or other non-sustainable energy production and delivery infrastructures such as pipeline, processing facilities, compressor or transportation facilities of any sort that would violate the right for a sustainable energy future for our area.

I'm going to skip the next one.

Corporations in violation of this prohibition against natural gas extraction or seeking to engage in natural gas extraction shall not have the rights of persons afforded by the United States and state constitutions. Nor shall those corporations be afforded the protection of commerce or contract clauses within the United States constitution or corresponding sections of state constitution.

And corporations engaged in the extraction of natural gas shall not present the authority or power to enforce state or federal preemptive law against the people of our area or to challenge or overturn municipal ordinances or charter provisions adopted by our area council.

Thank you for your consideration.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am.

Number 30.

MS. METCALF: Hi. My name is Karen Metcalf, M-E-T-C-A-L-F.

Like others who are speaking today, I ask FERC to allow at least 60 days for public review of Kinder Morgan's new resource reports which are voluminous and still incomplete. A failure to reschedule suggests that the scoping hearings was just for show and FERC is not acting in good faith. FERC has often been seen as not acting in good faith, but here is an opportunity to do so.

I ask for the commission to fully consider in preparing its environmental impact statement on the NED pipeline. Its responsibilities under the National Environment Policy Act, Provision 40, CFR 1508, especially .7, about the cumulative impact of a project; point 8, about the indirect effects on ecosystems; and .27, about the requirement to consider a project in the context of the intensity of its effect.

I also ask the commission to fully consider the impact of the increased greenhouse gas emissions from the construction and operation of this pipeline with operation with regard to Massachusetts Global Warming Solutions Act of 2008, which requires reduction in GGEs by 25 percent by 2020 and 80 percent by 2050.

This is particularly urgent in the light of a new report by James Hansen and 16 other climate scientists. They have found that the melting of sea ice worldwide is proceeding much more rapidly than earlier models had suggested. The paper is being rushed into print because of its urgency.

One of the first peer reviewers at the University of Chicago, geoscientist David Archer, says that the paper is a masterwork on scholarly synthesis, modelling virtuosity and insight with profound implications.

One of those implications is the rise in ocean levels by ten feet before the end of the century. This will put Boston, New York and countless other cities underwater.

We conclude that continued high emissions will make multi sea level rise practically unavoidable and likely to occur this century. Social disruption and economic consequences of such large sea level rise could be devastating.

It is not difficult to imagine the conflicts arising from forced migrations and economic collapse. It might make the planet ungovernable threatening the fabric of civilization.

The anthropologists have analyzed the reasons some human societies have collapsed leaving no survivors. He has identified five factors, the first is unsustainable human resources, the second is climate change, and the fifth is whether the society in question has a governing that is able to perceive the imminent dangers.

I ask the commission to act in good faith. In the past FERC has seen climate change as outside its purview. I ask the commission at this scoping hearing to broaden your scope.

MR. PERCONOM: Thank you, ma'am.

Number 31.

MS. PERKINS: My name is Hannah H-A-N-N-A-H, P-E-R-K-I-N-S. I am a student at Hampshire College in Amherst and a resident of Massachusetts. I am 22 years old.

I have my entire future ahead of me. I want to live out that future in a world that is not constantly dealing with floods, droughts, record breaking heat, crop failures, and rising sea levels. In this country and all across the world, do not suffer even more for something they did not cause.

I want to some day have my own garden that is productive and healthy, not torn apart by floods and pests. I want to continue drinking water that is clean and breathing air that is pure, not infused with toxic chemicals. These are the effects that climate change will have on our world if we build this pipeline and others. Natural gas is not in natural in any way and it is not a good fuel. Due to the high amounts of methane that is released when natural gas gets burned, natural gas and the pipelines that carry it, exacerbate climate change immensely.

According to the newest IPCC reports, methane is 34 times more potent than carbon dioxide. I urge you to look into the climate change impact of methane from this pipeline.

Climate change is the biggest and most urgent issue of our time. The longer we wait to take action and the longer we keep relying on fossil fuels like natural gas, the more perilous our world will become.

The planet is already warming and the temperatures will continue to rise to unlivable conditions if we keep extracting and transporting natural gas.

As a college student it feels almost pointless to be preparing for a future that right now is unstable at best. We need to use the legislation already in place from the Global Warming Solutions Act to end all new fossil fuel infrastructure.

There are many alternatives to this pipeline including more renewable energy and energy efficiency which would have much less of an impact on the environment and on climate change.

I'm tired of waiting for this transition to happen. I want a future that is healthy, sustainable and just, for myself, all my peers, and all those across the globe who do not have a choice in this fight.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am Number 32.

MS. LINK: Hi. My name is Mary Link, M-A-R-Y, L-I-N-K. I appreciate you're being here and holding on so long. I'm on the board of Women's Hill Quaker Conference Center, which is at the top of a hill at the end of a one Mile Road in Deerfield.

If you can imagine a gorgeous beautiful hilltop with birds singing, woodpeckers pecking away, lots of wildlife, a place where you can go to retreat cabins, have a beautiful wedding, renew your spirit. There's another energy so important to humans, the energy of the human spirit.

Our Quaker Retreat Center is a place that people come from from all over to renew their spirit. And it's a place that is possible for that to happen because of the beautiful environment of our 110 acre hilltop.

If this pipeline goes forward, it will cross the road to our center three times following the pipeline. That would probably put us out of business just during construction. We would not be able -- you know, the noise from construction, the egress getting there, it would damage the Women's Hill Conference Center's ability to function in a huge way.

We are an abutter. The last place that it crosses the road is on our property line edge. We refused surveying. We're against this pipeline. It would take out the buffer zone of trees that go along our border and protect us from the power line as it is.

Here's a vernal pool right next to that edge. There are wetlands all over the hill. There's a well and a retreat cabin very close. There's a public water supply that we provide. We have endangered species.

There's a railroad crossing and a quarry that does blasting as one of our neighbors. I'd like to know what the impact blasting would have that close to the pipeline. There would be a huge impact on emergency

access and response. There is other egress. If there was a leak or an explosion, we could have a couple hundred people on the hill for a conference or a wedding, who would have to flee through the woods. There would be no other way out.

It's a refuge for wildlife. It's a recreational retreat and renewal place. It's not replaceable. Please help us protect this incredible place and this resource. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am.

Number 34 or 33.

MR. BURTON: Before you start the clock, I would just like to say, I don't know from where all of you come to travel to be here, but welcome to our part of heaven. We hope you enjoy yourselves while you're here and thank you for hearing us tonight.

My name is Mark Burton and I live in Ashfield, Mass. I'm a member of Trout Unlimited, the Greater Boston chapter of Trout Unlimited, and I represent them tonight. We have over 1,100 members.

Myself and others come out here for days and vacations and spend their money out here. My concern tonight is the certain adverse impact that the NED project will have on our local ecology, specifically the impact on cold water resources and the habitat region of the brook trout. According to the brook trout joint venture report on the status of the species, analysis reveals that in only five percent of historical habitats is there a fully sustaining brook trout population that exists and a reduced but sustaining population in nine percent of the historical habitats.

Personally, all of these intact populations reside right here in Western Mass where this project is going to go through. Clearly there is much at stake here for the habitat of the brook trout and what we ask FERC tonight is that you include in the scope of the EIS a full review of the impact on the trout habitat and the necessary mitigation and mediation measures that will undoubtedly be required to be taken in order to minimize and hopefully mitigate adverse impact of the project.

Short of postponing this review process so that we would have time to adequately review the draft resource report, we respectfully request of FERC to include the following: A full evaluation of the direct and indirect and cumulative impact of the proposed pipeline on native and wild trout populations and their watersheds.

This would include the impact which deforestation of thousands of acres will have on the water temperature and the affected watersheds and at the level of first order tributaries due to the large rivers, a comprehensive analysis of alternative pipeline routes and a construction methods that avoids or minimize the impact to native and wild trout populations in their watersheds should be conducted as a part of the EIS process.

There should be an assessment of quality -- and efforts to mitigate the potential for erosion and impacts from construction on the proposed pipeline on trout, streams, water quality and aquatic life.

Stream restoration and mitigation plans must be prepared for each stream crossing it using the best available science to ensure that the streams are restored to their original condition and long-term impacts avoided. Types of crossings should be determined on a site by site basis based on field conditions rather than just a desktop analysis.

While this construction project is clearly adverse to trout habitat and contribute to its long-term degradation and potential exploitation of wild and native trout populations, your diligence in ensuring that its effects are mitigated or mediated or eliminated is of critical importance.

Thank you for hearing my testimony and I will provide more testimony for your records.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

Number 34. And can I ask 35 to 40 to come on up.

MS. SELKIRK: Good evening. My name is Lisa Selkirk, S-E-L-K-I-R-K from Amherst.

The purpose of my comments is to provide the commission with more information about the scope of

the opposition to the pipeline in this area. You may know the counties in Massachusetts are divided into towns, and towns -- there are a few cities -- but towns are largely responsible for local government and we have heard from many towns tonight about the incredible efforts made by towns to conserve lands and deal with health issues and so on. They are really on the front line on dealing with every nature, every aspect of local government and local life.

And 55 of these town have actually voted -- I mean towns have meetings as all part of the democratic process and there are representatives of this town that have come to meetings and city council, and 55 of these towns have voted in opposition to the pipeline.

These signs here represent these towns and the efforts that have been made to deal with this encroaching pipeline. I am going to read you the names of these towns just to give you some sense: Becket, Cheshire, Dalton, Hancock, Lanesborough, Lenox, North Adams, Pittsfield, Peru, Richmond, Washington, Windsor and, Williamstown.

In Hampshire County, Amherst, Chesterfield, Huntington, Middlefield, Northampton, Pelham, Plainfield and Worthington. In Franklin County, Ashfield, Buckland, Conway, Deerfield, Irving, Gill, Greenfield, Leverett, Montague, Northfield, Orange, Shelburne, Sunderland, Warwick and Wendal.

In Worcester County, Athol, Berlin, Dalton, Royalton, Templeton. Middlesex County: Dracut, Barnstable, Groton, Tingsboro, Essex County and Methuen. So yes.

These are the democratic bodies in these towns, representatives of these towns who have voted against the pipeline.

MR. PECONOM: Than you, ma'am. Number 35.

MS. ELAN: Ariel Elan, A-R-I-E-L, E-L-A-N, a resident Montague, Massachusetts.

I joined senate president Stan Rosenberg and thousands of others to affirm this scoping schedule is unacceptable. Please restart the entire process as requested.

Right now 143 miles of pipeline from New York to Dracut, Mass would be laid right next to high voltage power lines. About five miles of this odd partnership crosses across the Montague plains, a treasured natural resource managed by the state to preserve wildlife species.

As our town planner and conservation agents explained to you earlier this evening, the plains is a pristine pine barrens that is critically vulnerable to fire.

FERC staff and commissioners, my community needs you to provide specific information on the technical issues or risks of burying a 36 inch, high pressure, natural gas transmission line so close to high voltage electricity.

It is known that normal operation of power lines can damage metal pipe. A major hazard is corrosion of the pipeline that can cause gas to leak or even a massive explosion. There would go the plains and almost certainly human lives as well. The simple solution, don't let them co-locate the pipeline next to power lines.

But if you let the company pursue this option, then, you, FERC, must provide us with field tested research. Show us the data around the world everywhere this size of pressure and construction of pipeline runs parallel to the sizes and designs and voltages of electric lines in places where the climate, weather, geology, hydrology, soil and over conditions are similar to what we have here.

At a public meeting of our council's government, we were told by an engineer with 34 years experience that he would put this type of pipeline at least 1,000 feet away from any high voltage power lines. What does TGP say about this? Unless I missed something, the company's resource reports say nothing about the design distance between this pipeline and power lines.

Resource report one includes some measurements of power line corridors that we can mix and match with the pipeline corridor to get a ballpark range of what TGP has in mind.

It looks like NED, in some spots, would be buried just 70, that is 7-0, feet away from power lines. The

widest separation that we can calculate would be 230 feet, not 1,000 feet, as the engineer recommended, 70 to 230 feet.

FERC, your report back to us must document everything that has happened at every location where pipelines like NED are buried this close to power lines. Where have there been accidents due to gas/electric proximity? What were the outcomes? What failures were caught and repaired before causing an accident?

FERC you owe us every record on this matter so that our communities can evaluate this safety risk for ourselves.

Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 37? 37? 38?

MR. RIDDLE: Hello. My name is Chris Riddle, R-I-D-D-L-E, Massachusetts. I'm a retired architect and my remarks come from 40 years in that business.

I would ask FERC to study the effect that accelerating investments in energy conservation and renewable will have on the demands for natural gas for buildings in Massachusetts.

Over my career I've seen a fundamental change in how buildings are built and renovated. There is already a substantial reduction in energy demands here. With wide public policy and investment it will continue and will nullify the case for a vast expenditure for transporting and irresponsibly extracted fossil fuel.

Residential energy consumption in Massachusetts has dropped in the 15 years of this century, years that coincide with the way homes are constructed and designed over that same period.

According to the federal energy information agency, residential energy use was three percent less in the last five years in this period, in Massachusetts, then it was in the first five years despite a three and a half percent increase in population.

This reduction is due to many factors, among them excellent public regulatory improvement, primarily in building codes, a new sophistication in the building profession about the science of energy conservation in buildings, a substantial reduction in market price in solar panels, a Massachusetts requirement that all state-funded public buildings receive lead certification, the 30 percent federal investment tax credit for solar panels and other renewables, nations leading incentive programs like net metering and solar renewable energy certificates to further encourage investment. The Mass Save program to help homeowners with energy conservation projects, and the Green Community Act which among other things encourages towns and cities to help their citizens obtain solar panels at competitive prices.

Let me share a personal story. My wife and I live in a house that we built in 1989. It was reasonably well-insulated by 1989 standards but it would probably not meet the energy codes we have in effect now.

We have just made some investments. We got rid of our old furnace and hot water heater and replaced them with two, highly efficient electrical appliances, a heat pump for heating and cooling and a heat pump hot water heater.

We added a garage, something we will need as we grow older, then solar panels on the roof. 9.6 kilowatts of panels are providing all the energy we need and more. It wasn't cheap, but the array cost half of what it would cost ten years ago. And we won't need fossil fuels anymore. We certainly won't need any natural gas.

Many other families are doing the math and making same decision we did. More and more will do so in the future. Please take the time to take this phenomena into account and study what continuing investment in conservation and renewables will do to reduce the regions demand for natural gas.

Thank you, very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Number 39? Number 39? Number 40.

MR. PERKINS: Thank you. Rudy, Perkins, R-U-D-Y, P-E-R-K-I-N-S, from Amherst, Mass.

I'll focus my scoping comments this evening on some of the alternatives to the pipeline. The commission

needs to address EIS. The commission will need to take a much closer look at alternatives than we got in TGP's Resource Report 10, a much closer look.

For example TGP essentially dismisses the wind alternative arguing that wind is non-dispatchable and intermittent. But as the commission knows ISO New England recently put in a proposal before your commission for an automated, do not exceed dispatch of wind using computer telemetry and short look ahead local wind forecasting. So much for wind as no longer a nondispatched resource.

The intermittency question for wind or solar for that matter can be addressed by these forms of new dispatch but also the many inter-regional transmission upgrades now under way in New England, or planned, that will help us move renewable energy from one location to where it's in surplus to another where it is deficient from moment to moment.

Also inter-regional transmission, like TDIs, Lake Champlaine, 1,000 megawatt underwater HBGC transmission line for Canadian hydroelectric that just got DOE recommendation for approval, planned for a 2019 completion, that will transmit electricity into our New England grid.

And most importantly the revolution in energy storage, that is coming in this time horizon, spurred in part by the California public utility commission's recent initiative to get 1.3 gigawatts of storage developed there by 2020. That's pushing the whole storage industry along.

LNG: TGP's Resource Report 10 acknowledges that liquified natural gas has the, quote, potential to meet the project's objectives. You've got LNG, imported district gas, certainly no hippy environmentalist organization, basically saying the same thing.

We've got two LNG import terminals just off the Massachusetts coast almost never being used. And my own gas company, Berkshire gas, built a natural gas, liquified natural gas storage facility, planning to put in five tanks and they only put in two. So they left 60 percent of the LNG storage off the table. We have got all of this under utilized LNG infrastructure having the potential to meet project objectives as we move towards a renewable economy.

We are planning our energy future here for the next 50 years, given the lifespan of such a pipeline. We need to be advancing these sorts of energy alternatives for the future, that our children need, instead of the archaic energy systems from the last century that we need to leave behind. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Number 41? Number 41? Number 42?

MS. RYAN: Hi. Thank you for the opportunity to speak again. My name is Polly Ryan, P-o-l-l-y R-y-a-n, and I'm from Plainfield.

My comments tonight are from an impacted landowner's point of view, and they address my experience of the FERC process. My hope is to convey that the process is designed to be in the public's inconvenience and not for our necessity.

In February of 2014, I received a letter from Kinder Morgan requesting to survey my land. I did not receive any details from them otherwise until they invited me to an open house a year later. Fortunately, my community came together and educated itself on the NED project.

We asked Kinder Morgan to do a presentation in our town. Many of us were left with unanswered questions. I attended five open houses and, on questions like health and safety, was shuffled around the room to different experts, only in the end to still not have my questions answered.

What I have learned on my own is that my property value may be depreciated. Some mortgage contracts do not allow explosives on liened lands. I may be able to -- I may be liable for fires and accidents from pipeline explosions. Kinder Morgan plans to only compensate me \$1,800. I'll continue to pay taxes on the easement. I can't use the easement to grow trees anymore. And I may have to finance this pipeline with a tariff on my utility bill.

All in all, my one and only asset and the home I built with my own two hands is rendered worthless. I'll have to abandon it because of health and safety issues penniless.

On the other hand, Kinder Morgan hugely benefits from gas sales in Europe. It won't even cost them to build a pipeline. And FERC has provided them every necessity needed to meet their permit and construction deadlines. I suppose that is because your institution is financed by gas permit fees.

Natural gas is not a bridge fuel to renewables. The gas industry will exploit our entire U.S. gas resources over the next ten years for profit if FERC permits it. Natural gas is the gas industry's drug to riches, and FERC is their enabler.

It is not in our national interest to support this boom and bust business. Our future generations need this gas here in the U.S. So I ask tonight that you please do your job by evaluating the true public necessity and conveniences and please stop enabling this industry to, in the end, frack us all.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 43. 43? 44. 44? 45?

MS. RELOJ: Hi, there. Can everybody hear me? My name is Heather Relej. I live in Deerfield, Mass. My last name is spelled R-e-l-o-j. This is my son, John Relej, R-e-l-o-j. He's eight.

I'm here to tell you that I don't understand how FERC can FERC because Kinder Morgan is not submitting complete information in their 79 volumes that do not allow you to FERC.

And I'm also asking you to slow down. They need to slow down. We, as a community, and all the affected communities cannot extrapolate information if it is not there, if it is listed as TBD.

If this little boy went to school and submitted a report on a Friday afternoon to his teacher with entire swaths of important scientific data lacking, with simply TBD or nothing there or incorrect maps, he would get an incomplete, he would get a lecture, he would get a talking to at home, and he might even possibly fail.

So I submit to you that Kinder Morgan must submit to you better information in a timely fashion that allows the general public, as well as governing bodies, to assess that information and to allow us all, you guys, the other FERCers, and the entire nation, to make informed decisions based on having actual data supported by fact. That's just the beginning.

How will the species in the NHESP, National Heritage of Endangered Species Program be upheld and protected in situ if the proposed pipeline force, fracks, dynamites, and fills those lands, rivers, watersheds, and every other area, including certified and uncertified vernal pools located on public, private, and protected lands slated to be included in the Northeast Direct pipeline? How will that happen? How will they be protected? How will our children be protected?

We have Cat 3, 4, 5, hurricanes that come barreling down the East Coast. And guess what? It floods our valley. It floods it from one side to the other. How do you maintain a well in a flood when all the utilities are down and you can't physically access the site? There's no communication, and we're in a disaster zone. How do they look at a well under a river under those conditions? Please, please ask them to answer that question. And I would like reporting on how they maintain the wells after a disaster, man-made or natural, of epic proportions hits our valley. Seismically, it's expected. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 44.

MS. DOWD-HURLBURT: Good evening. My name is Jeanne Dowd-Hurlburt, H-u-r-l-b-u-r-t.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I'm a resident of the Greenfield, Massachusetts. I'm a proud mother. And I moved here after a career as a senior economist with the United States Department of Labor, federal government.

I've never been prouder of the people that I live with, the salt of the earth. They love their environment. And I have a strong bond, as well.

Okay. I just wanted to tell you, I would like to preface this with please don't take it personally. I try to cross-reference all the facts. But the FERC is an independent, self-funding agency profiting from the industry it regulates. It appears to me to be a blatant conflict of interest.

FERC has a history of rubber-stamping pipeline initiatives, regardless of the outcry from numerous social,

environment, local, and state officials and the general public.

Here I will give you and cite only a few examples of the revolving door of energy company to FERC executives and vice versa in rubber-stamping pipeline projects.

Washington Post, FERC okays controversial pipeline and approved the pipeline through the world and state park, which was listed in the National Register of Historical Places, and approved the Central New York Oil & Gas Company that cut down more than 200,000 -- 200,000 mature trees, 600 acres and 100 waterways. The headline said FERC ignored the EPA recommendations from the United States EPA agency, as well calls from state elected officials and more than 22,000 members of the public.

Number two, President Bush appointed James Kelleher as industry insider and member of Dick Cheney's Energy Task Force as the commissioner of FERC. James Kelleher invited Enron to give input to produce the energy policy.

Number three, Nora Brownell, a Spectra Energy board member, was appointed FERC commissioner. FERC approved Algonquin pipeline. This goes on and on, but my time is ending.

My question today is: How can we believe and trust the FERC to fairly listen and judge our concerns when there is a revolving door between FERC and energy executives? As well, how can we trust the FERC to hear our concerns, to act appropriately, given the conflict of interest model where FERC profits from the energy companies they are supposed to regulate? Thank you for your time.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 45. 44? 47. Thank you.

MS. DARROW: My name is Cassandra Darrow C-a-s-s-a-n-d-r-a D-a-r-r-o-w. I'm an undergraduate at Yale University studying history, environmental science, and social justice and a farmer at Amherst.

Our current climactic trajectory as a result of carbon emission is too grim to begin expanding infrastructure for so-called bridge fuels. Climate scientists assert that we must stop emitting carbon outright by 2035, or else surmount the threshold which currently has withheld the climate feedback loop in which global warming will continue regardless of any decrease in anthropogenic emission. I would like FERC to assess why, then, are we perpetuating an infrastructure which facilitates our dependence on fossil fuels?

All right. I am here to remind FERC today that this is not an isolated decision we have to make about one pipeline. This pipeline is part of a system, an old market-driven way of thought which we have inherited since fossil fuels replaced the economic function of slavery during the Industrial Revolution. This pipeline, it's a hefty inheritance, and you all have to decide whether you want to bequeath this inheritance upon my and subsequent generations.

All right. I am asking also that you consider climate and environmental implications as they intersect with racial justice. I do not pretend to speak for people of color, but it is imperative that, as we weigh this decision, we show up for racial justice.

Let me explain. Kinder Morgan and other -- and others are using a specific economic reasoning to argue the benefits of the pipeline. But the rules of economics have historically been written by those who benefit from them. This type of economic thinking yields racist outcomes, even if people are not particularly prejudiced.

The forces pushing this pipeline already have the economic power which stems from a combination of wealth, income, status, and occupation, access to education and health care connections and geographic and social mobility. It is thus easy for the benefactors of this economic and market theory to be blind to the social injury caused by the fossil fuel industry, including natural gas extraction, transportation combustion. I urge FERC not to be blind.

When the oil and gas industry establishes wells and extraction sites, the companies choose areas that, due to economic and social factors, have limited political power. This tendency has been well documented in California, where 80 percent of the more than 350,000 children who live within a mile of an oil and gas well are children of color.

Canonsburg, Pennsylvania, a town in the Marcellus Shale Plate, which is where the gas coursing through the proposed pipeline would come from, posts a population of which 20.4 percent lists below the poverty line.

Fracking has become the latest chapter in the tragic history of environmental injustices committed by the fossil fuel industry in low-income communities of color.

I challenge FERC to connect the dots, to see that making the choice for the pipeline would perpetuate this history and that the environmental and social impacts of this choice extend beyond Massachusetts. I'll skip ahead to the end.

The fossil fuel industrial complex operates on perpetuating social injury, and this pipeline would be part of the fossil fuel industrial complex. The high combustion of fossil fuels has resulted in a level of CO2 too great to be absorbed by the earth's natural processes.

We do not ask people for their -- we do not ask low-income people of color in the United States, in Mali, and the people of Tuvalu, the people of Bangladesh, we do not ask these people for their consent. We forget that the environmental impact of a pipeline is not isolated to the geography of its passage. I urge FERC to not forget this.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 48. 48? 49. 49? 50. 51. If the 50's people could come up, that'd be great.

MS. HALL: Good evening. My name is Mary Hall, H-a-l-l. So we've gathered here to help you determine the scope of your study of environmental impacts from the pipeline that is proposed. We have been listing concerns about many effects in our area, and there is much more to explore. There's much more to look into in terms of alternatives to this project. We do need more time, I need more time, not only because of the information dumps and data gaps of the -- of the pipeline proponent developer.

Tonight, I would like to propose it is relevant and -- and helpful also for your study to have an inquiry and assessment as to the impact of the fracking that this pipeline would promote. There is no reason now to suppose that the companies doing the fracking could or would repair the damage of introducing toxic chemicals into the water supplies that sustain life. I, therefore, think we must suppose that the environmental cost of fracking will ultimately be borne by the taxpayer, which is to say by all of us here.

Even though FERC does not regulate the production of natural gas, I am asserting that the impact of fracking is germane to your considerations because the pipeline would serve to stimulate more fracking beyond what is happening already. And the more fracking, the more damage to water supplies.

I would like you to assess the effects of every single one of the chemicals being used in the fracking process. In the event that you are unable to obtain a complete list of these chemicals, I would like you to deny any permit from this pipeline on the grounds that you are unable to complete a competent study of the environmental impacts of this pipeline, as required by law. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. 51 we're at now? 52?

MS. CARNEY: Good evening. My name is Delta, D-e-l-t-a, Carney, C-a-r-n-e-y.

I live in the town of Ashfield, and I want you to know that when we had our town meeting and we voted on the pipeline, that it was one vote for yes, they wanted the pipeline. The rest of the entire town said no. It is -- in the 1700s, the average citizen became tired of big business and big government acting together and resulting in a very negative impact on its citizens. Please allow me to have some poetic license. I call it "the 99 percent effect."

An act of civil disobedience, throwing chests of tea into Boston Harbor, started a revolution that ended in the creation of the country we now call the United States. The U.S. was formed for and by the people. Our forefathers thought very hard and long on this, and they wanted to make sure that never again would big business and big government be so strong that the average citizen would have such a negative impact on it, and yet here we are standing before you.

Some of your fellow commissioners have made decisions that are based on what is morally and ethically right, not just on following the exact letter of the law. They followed the intent of the law. I am referring to the commissioners who are dealing with the pipeline in Mayflower. They would not sign off and allow that to be started up again because it was wrong. They did not feel that it was a right thing to do.

We are all here tonight asking you to do the same thing. We are asking you to be moral and ethical in your decision-making process. You have reports from both sides that are giving you a lot of information. But when you have 55 towns, some of those towns don't have the pipeline running through them, but they are next to the towns that do not want this, it is astounding that the plan is still there.

We live in a small town, all through the hill town, and we are tired of people coming through and saying it doesn't make any difference what you want, we're going to do it anyways.

As we speak -- well, maybe not now, but earlier this evening, there was a large group of landowners that are gathering together to file a lawsuit against the GPU because they feel that their civil rights were being usurped by not being represented by our elected officials.

I ask that FERC, that you really look at the decisions that you make and the effect that that decision is going to have on each and every one of us. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 53.

MS. LOEB: Rema Loeb, R-e-m-a L-o-e-b. I want to ask, first of all, that FERC extend the comment period to the end of October at the very least because there is information forthcoming from our Attorney General's Office that you will need. And if Kinder Morgan can get away with this nonsense of filing something on a Friday and we're expecting three days -- three days, four days later to comment, that's not fairness. It's absurdity.

Also, I have a question. What was Kinder Morgan doing, what are their officials doing meeting in this building the same night that the public is here to comment to FERC? Are they lobbying? What are they doing in there? They didn't want to be seen because the gentleman pulled the curtain. Just wondering.

Okay. People were created to be loved. Things were created to be used. The reason why the world is in chaos is because things are being loved and people are being used.

I had planned to speak about the effects upon human health from fracked gas pipelines and compressor stations, studies of which have been or are being done in New York state. This is yet another reason for slowing down the NED project.

All pipelines leak, as do compressor stations. The methane is harmful to all life, more potent as a greenhouse gas than carbon in the first 20 years, over 80 percent more potent.

The other unlisted chemicals and the radioactivity are another part of the problem. But just one of the many studies posted on Common Greens July 29th, 2015, a report from the Rockefeller Foundation-Lancet Commission on Planetary Health -- excuse me -- written by leading academics and policymakers brings new insight. Unless immediate changes take place, the prognosis for global health and the natural systems on which civilization depend is bleak. We have been mortgaging the health of future generations. To put it bluntly, humanity has been treating or trashing the planet like never before.

Professor Andy Haines of the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom, and chair of this report said we are on the verge of triggering irreversible global effects, ranging from ocean acidification to biodiversity loss.

This report is one of several being released in recent months, all agree, whether we're talking about land use, deforestation, degraded -- I'm sorry, degradation of global fisheries, disruption of the climate systems, biodiversity loss, appropriation of food, water, changes to aquatic system, all of the changes are profound, and they are accelerating, and they represent a significant challenge to global health. Samuel Morris, senior researcher scientist at Harvard, the Chan School, Department of Environmental Health agrees with this.

In the good old days, we used to say: If you aren't part of the solution, you're part of the problem. FERC, you are a large part of the problem if you okay this. I don't know what you're going to tell your grandchildren and your great grandchildren why you let this happen.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 55. 54, thank you.

MS. SHAW-PICHETTE: I think I need a soapbox. Hello. I want to thank all the people who stayed who aren't being paid. I don't know about you, I have to work tomorrow.

My name is Reba-Jean Shaw-Pichette. And the last name is P-i-c-h-e-t-t-e. I am the chair of the Deerfield Cultural Council, and I'm also a museum educator in Old Deerfield. And my family and our soccer-playing colleague live in the incineration zone of Kinder Morgan's plan.

It is also the proposed access road, which is next to us, which many people know because they -- the bike rallies, the joggers, the hikers, everyone comes by to look at the stream that runs by our house and the waterfalls.

So I have four simple points. One is I received this letter today. It is from Kinder Morgan, the parent company of Tennessee Gas. And in it -- it's today, by the way, it came. I know I said that -- Kinder Morgan asks us to sign and grant them the right to survey and assess the archaeology -- which, by the way, they spelled wrong -- our wetlands, and our wells and other things. This seems to me like asking Philip Morris is smoking dangerous?

So my question is one of legality. I request that any of these supposed studies submitted by Kinder Morgan on their behalf should be considered null and void by FERC on the basis of conflict of interest on the -- on the point of this company.

Three more points. Simple word that you're hearing a lot today, water. In Colonial America, it was called a necessity. And it had to be free. We are aware of water shortage worldwide today. War over water is imminent, and our states to the west are already experiencing theft of clean water and community conflict over access to water.

The Northeast is the only part of our country still experiencing plentiful clean water on a regular basis. Nothing, no corporate bottom line, no perceived fuel needs should be considered that threaten water. Water trumps it all. No one can drink money.

Three, fuel. Let's look to the future and not backwards. We don't light our lamps with whale oil anymore. We no longer hunt elephants to make our game parts out of their tusks. Plastics have replaced the ivory, and solar here is replacing our lights.

And finally, not to sound like the Lorax, but someone has to speak for those trees. Over 6,000 acres clear-cut. They clean our air. They draw our tourists. They hold our soil. They prevent runoff. Clear-cutting leads to the explosion of invasive species. What are you thinking? It's trees. It's -- it's cordwood. I guess that's it.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 55.

MS. NEVILLE: My name is Pat Neville, P-a-t N-e-v-i-l-l-e. I'm going to do, I guess, the unpolitically correct and say I'm a chaplain and I work with the dying.

If you're from a Judeo-Christian background, probably a Native American background, one of the first things we were told to do was to be good stewards of the earth. And I don't think we're doing a very good job of it in general.

I had wanted to talk to the union folks and say that we do need new infrastructures and jobs. We have many roads, bridges that need repairs. Fixing those would provide jobs as long as we use roads and bridges. This would be without our air and water and land being polluted.

I know that jobs are important, but they're useless if you're critically ill with cancer from pipeline pollution of our water and air. Our country has had the information for many decades to focus on renewable resources. This, again, would be without polluting our water, our air, our children, and our backyards.

We do not want a pipeline in our backyard. This area has the most contiguous forest land in our state. We have lots of rock ledge here, which would make pipeline creation more difficult and destructive to the environment and for Kinder Morgan. These two facts make this area a horrendous place for a pipeline. But I want to say that, truly, everywhere in our country and our world is a bad place for a gas pipeline, yet a good place for renewable energy sources to be built by many construction workers. And lots of many new jobs would be created, as people have been talking about tonight.

Kinder Morgan said that their pipeline will be monitored by sensors in the pipeline that are monitored by computers. I work with computers every day. They must mess up all the time. But the mess-up that Kinder Morgan's pipelines would do would be a lot worse than having a mailing come out wrong.

And Kinder Morgan will not help us when our water, air, health, or property is polluted and spoiled. We truly need to help ourselves by stopping this unnecessary pipeline. Kinder Morgan won't protect us. FERC, you can protect us and this country and the whole world. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 56. Okay. Who's -- by a show of hands, who's left to speak? I think we can do that. 56. 57.

MS. PIERCE: My name is Laura Pierce, P-i-e-r-c-e. Renewable clean energy is here now and can be enough to address our needs if we choose to prioritize it. This would create 25 times more jobs than the Kinder Morgan pipeline.

I can't even believe we're having this conversation. Everyone knows continuing to ravage the planet for fossil fuels ensures we have no future at all.

Big corporations own the government and expect to keep holding the reins to our world, forcing people from their homes, blasting through communities, expecting us to pay so they can export gas for their own profits. The world doesn't belong to corporations. We need to make an about face if there's going to be any chance for humanity to survive.

The pipeline is unfair and unconstitutional. This is a hearing, and the government should be for the people, not the corporations. And the people say no pipeline.

My husband and I are looking for land to buy so that we can build an ecological home and have a home-stead with gardening and be sustainable as much as possible. We found a beautiful piece of land at 137 Beldingville Road in Ashfield, where there was three acres of organically farmed land for scale, part of a whole 26-acre parcel.

We came very close to buying that land, but it was adjacent to the power lines and the proposed pipeline. We actually considered it, even though we knew that. But as we talked to a neighbor who lived down the road who told us that the blasting zone was 500 feet on either side of the pipeline, which would include the house we would have lived in, and that the likelihood of -- that some kind of explosion was -- was pretty good, considering the pipeline would go right underneath the power lines, my husband and I realized that it would be a very foolish decision.

I ask you to consider this, consider all the people whose lives are at stake here, and the whole world. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 58.

MR. WISE: Hi. My name is Jake Wise, J-a-k-e W-i-s-e.

I'm in awe of all the research that's been done, just the amount of it and also just how broad and vast and destructive and horrible the scope of destruction could potentially be from a project like this.

I'm also in full support of the unions having jobs. And I think, even if natural gas were a bridge measured, the -- the horrendous scope of the -- of the destruction it causes, not just some scenery and some trinket shops, there's a whole lot more at stake, and it's really, really inappropriate to use that as a way to justify job creation in a very narrow area of energy -- of the energy sector, which all of the clean energy and responsible use of our resources jobs that anybody could possibly have.

Also, I -- I'm in Plainfield. I live and work at a retreat center, a workshop residency and retreat center called Earthdance. Hmm, yeah, people know about it. We bring people to western Massachusetts from all over the world, thousands every year. People come to western Massachusetts. We're known. People come because they want to study, to retreat. Groups rent us out, you know.

And they also come because the air, water, the light is dark at night, and there's -- it's pristine in terms of sound, too. They come for those reasons.

With a pipeline proposed half a mile from us and a compressor station within a few miles, that would all be in jeopardy, similar to the Uhlman center. Maybe -- I don't know how far away the compressor station would be from them, but, you know, there's a big, big, big risk of losing business and losing people coming to western Massachusetts from the United States and from all around the world.

So I -- I ask you to consider all of this and -- and please do something reasonable, like -- or, I mean, you know. Please make us towards a better energy future, where we're not just pulling stuff out of the earth to burn it and destroy the earth more, please. Thank you very much.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. 59.

MR. DICKERMAN: Bob Dickerman from Northfield. That's D-i-c-k-e-r-m-a-n.

The first thing I want to say is I've heard a lot of people talking about natural gas, raw natural gas releases from fugitive leaks and lowdowns and all that. I think it's a good idea to keep in mind that the compressor station in Northfield, where I live, if it's built, will be burning 1,000 tons a day of methane. 1,000 tons a day. And every -- every pound of that's going to go out the smokestack. And it's going to go out with another thousand tons of -- it's going to end up being carbon dioxide and water vapor, contaminated. So that's something that's important to keep in mind.

I really want to talk about a lack of need. The lack of need has been clear to me since the beginning of this. If the maximum peak demand in the Northeast is 3.3 billion cubic feet a day, then building a 2.2 billion cubic foot per day pipeline just sounds a little out of balance. How could it possibly make sense that the only plausible solution is to install this giant pipeline?

And I say 2.2 billion cubic feet a day because Wheatley has repeatedly said that Kinder Morgan reserves the option to bump it back up from 1.2 to 2.2.

And, speaking of that, they said they're going to reduce the size of the pipe from 36 to 30 inches. But since they're reserving the option to boost the flow rate down the -- down the road, if it is boosted down the road, it's going to take even more than the original 80,000 horsepower that it took to drive that amount of flow through a 30 -- through a 36-inch pipe.

Liquid natural gas companies, such as Dstrigas and those that run those offshore LNG facilities that were mentioned earlier this evening, agree that this pipeline is not needed. The bottom line is that the extractors back there in Pennsylvania want to export this gas to higher-paying overseas markets, which is going to raise the price here in the U.S.

Even Jennifer Boucher of Berkshire Gas proved that her company's three-year moratorium on new natural gas installations is unnecessary when she recently publically said that a build-out of their natural gas -- their liquid natural gas peaking station in Whately, a few miles south of here, would only provide -- would only provide an additional 5,000 dekatherms of gas a day. Well, 5,000 dekatherms of gas a day could heat 5 or 10,000 homes around here. So my claim is that that moratorium is unnecessary.

And I think that it wouldn't surprise me if Maura Healey, the Attorney General, finds that illegal collusion between Kinder Morgan, Tennessee Gas Pipeline, and the LVCs has -- has been happening.

Anyway, I just want to let you -- I want to leave you with the way I feel. I don't know if you followed the rest of that. But the way I feel is I feel threatened. I feel threatened by you, the people you represent at Kinder Morgan, since you serve Kinder Morgan. I feel that you're threatening me, my family, my neighborhood. You're threatening the air we breathe and the water we drink. And I'll bet there are a lot of other people here who feel the same way.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Number 60. 61. 62.

MR. BORTON: Hi. My name is Tony Borton, T-o-n-y B-o-r-t-o-n, from Conway. I thank you for sticking with us. We've had a lot tonight, and there's been a lot of very vocal presentations made to you.

I'm going to throw out my prepared remarks and just give you the feeling that I had. When this pipeline was proposed, I thought, Well, it will never happen because it's just so wrong in so many ways. And so here we are today talking about the pipeline. And after sitting here for all these hours, I found even more ways that it's wrong.

But let me just tell you where I think it's wrong. I'll begin with fracked gas. Now, that doesn't mean that the jury's out on the environmental effect. I think probably the developers know more or are ahead of the regulators as far as fracked gas. But down the road, environmentally fracked gas is going to be a big problem.

The second place we're wrong is fossil fuels. We should not, as a nation, be developing more fossil fuels. That's wrong.

And the third place we're wrong is going into our protected land. Here in the Northeast, we put a lot of energy into protecting land, whether it be state land, private land. And we have these protections on it. And to put a pipeline through it would be disastrous in terms of protecting land in the future. If land isn't protected, what is it?

Also, water, a major, major issue. And this pipeline cannot be good for water. We've heard all sorts of reports. But it cannot help the water situation.

And, finally, the toll this takes on individuals and their properties. The cost to individuals is ridiculous and shouldn't be allowed. It's wrong.

So one thing that really bothers me is the idea of eminent domain. How should a company be allowed to have eminent domain over somebody's private property? Isn't the idea of eminent domain is for the better good of the community, not for a single profit-making company? I think eminent domain really needs to be questioned.

So we've got all these wrongs. Let's make it right. Let's stop this pipeline. We've had a whole auditorium of people here who want to stop the pipeline. It's time to take a moral issue, say these things are wrong, let's make it right. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Number 62. 63. 64. 64. 65?

MS. WALL: 64. Mary Wall, W-a-l-l. All right. This is unplanned. It was a giveaway number. But I am a homeowner and my property is slated for destruction by this pipeline.

I'm a resident of Northfield and Warwick. I want to emphasize some of the points that I heard that were very articulately made.

Kinder Morgan should not be policing themselves and doing their own reports. Independent third parties would be much easier to swallow.

The fact that this goes parallel to the high line is of consequence. The reports that I read -- and I work in the industry, so I've got a kind of conflict of interest even standing up here, but they are something that should be investigated.

The fact that we are geologically on bedrock, many aspects of this pipeline, you're on the spine of the world, you're walking on the bedrock. Geo maps say the rest of the route through Northfield is 3 to five 5 to bedrock. So every time they blast, they're going to be affecting the whole infrastructure of the system.

Connecticut Light & Power recently upgraded the high line on the section from Gulf Road to the New Hampshire border. They changed the wooden poles that they had to metal poles. They created access roads when they did that.

Now, I happen to ride horseback, and I see what happened. Those access roads are now destroyed. They are down to large traprock just with water run. If you put pipeline in an area that they have blasted, try to

line it with sand, and then put in those pipes, that sand is going to be washed out. They just that last summer. So, I mean, it's all washed out. Their pipelines will be washed out by the water flow. It is mountainous. It is hilly.

And then we come back to, and I thank you for mentioning the point, eminent domain. I'm personally -- my grandparents were eminent domained by the Department of Defense. All right, it happens. Hanscom Air Force base needed to sit on the family farm.

The Department of the Interior eminent domained my parents. Okay. Paul Revere happened to fall off his horse next to us.

But now it's private, for-profit business. I do not understand the justification for eminent domain by a private entity. Literally, if you want to listen to Bush, a person, another person can eminent domain my property. I'm sorry. That's enough.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Number 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. Are you 70? Okay.

MS. KELLY: Well, thanks for hanging in there. My name is Pam Kelly, K-e-l-l-y. I'm from Greenfield.

I wanted to let you know that our information says that the Kinder Morgan pipeline still is not needed, either economically or environmentally.

It's clear from the independent research of David Keith from Greenfield, who I'm sure has filed with you already, that Kinder Morgan pipeline is not needed, illustrated by the minimal amount of fracked gas requested in the contract by Berkshire Gas. And we've already built the infrastructure to hold sufficient liquified natural gas to make up the minimal unmet needs of particularly cold winter weather.

Add to that the repair of leaks, leaking methane, and we clearly do not need the extra gas.

But it's also clear that the main reason the pipeline would be needed is for Tennessee Gas to export to Europe, which will put those of us in New England in competition with Europe for the gas, thus raising the cost of gas for New England. So the pipeline is actually directly against our interests, which FERC has sworn to uphold, so I understand.

My own experience, I'm a person who replaced home gas heat in my residence with the one mini-split cold climate electric heat pump. And the electricity is generated by 24 solar collectors, ending my reliance on gas and every source of electricity, lowering my utility bills to almost zero.

And I'm not a wealthy person, but a person who lives on Social Security. So how did I capitalize and pay for those solar collectors? I just cashed in my traditional IRA, which was invested in Wall Street. But I've eliminated my heating and electric bills, so I am now free from the serious disease of the elderly called Wall Street meltdown fear and anxiety.

The Massachusetts legislature is now considering House Bill 3532 to create a green bank that would capitalize a massive green bank loan fund. It's the same way I used my IRA. The loan funds would be used strictly to build infrastructure to transition from fossil fuel to sustainable energy, just like I did my solar collectors doing heat pumps.

Green banks in other states are finding that \$1 invested from the state will garner five to ten times that capital from private investment.

Connecticut's green bank has used a four-year, \$100 million investment to raise 500 to 600 million that are now being used to upgrade commercial and industrial properties to lower their utility costs down to zero or nearly zero. Just like my house, except on steroids.

What if Massachusetts invested the billions proposed for a pipeline and used it to build the green bank loan fund for commercial and industrial energy efficiency, all dedicated to lowering carbon and cost -- and the cost for commercial and industrial electricity and heating and mechanical -- mechanical use?

FERC, if you're doing your job, you should reject the Kinder Morgan pipeline application because the pipeline and the gas is not needed, will actually be detrimental to our well-being, both economically and environmentally. Thank you.

MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. I believe that was our last speaker. Is there anybody else who would like to speak tonight?

Well, the input we received tonight has been very helpful. Thank you very much for your time. On behalf of the commission, thank you. Have a good night, drive safely.

(Hearing concluded at 11:44 P.M.)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
TENNESSEE GAS PIPELINE COMPANY, L.L.C.
DOCKET NO. PF14-22-000
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

JULY 30, 2015

HELD AT:

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY
DAVIDSON HALL
TORP THEATER
1615 STANLEY STREET
NEW BRITAIN, CONNECTICUT

APPEARANCES:

HEARING PARTICIPANTS:

ELAINE BAUM, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION SPECIALIST
LORI COLEMAN, CARDNO
JENNIFER HARRIS, CARDNO

(Whereupon, the hearing commenced at 6:30 p.m.)

MS. BAUM: Alright. I think we are going to go ahead and get started. So you guys are standing in the back, but come on down. Lots of seats upfront. Alright. Good evening. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, also known as the FERC or Commission, I would like to welcome all of you tonight. This is a scoping meeting for the Northeast Energy Direct Project being proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company under FERC Docket No. PF14-22-000.

Let the record show that the Public Scoping Meeting in New Britain, Connecticut began at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, July 30, 2015. The primary purpose of this meeting is to provide you with an opportunity to comment on the scope of the environmental analysis being prepared for the project.

My name is Elaine Baum, and I am part of the environmental staff of the Commission's office of Energy Projects. With me tonight are some staff from Cardno. Cardno is an environmental contractor who is assisting FERC in the preparation of the environmental impact statement or EIS.

As you can see, down here we have a court reporter who is going to be transcribing this entire meeting, and this is being done so that all of your comment will be transcribed and put into the public record. Eventually an electronic copy of the transcript of this meeting will be placed into FERC's e-library system, which contains the entire public record for this proceeding.

So first I'm going to tell you a little bit about who FERC is. FERC is an independent agency that regulates the interstate transmission of natural gas and energy proposals and authorizes construction of interstate natural gas pipelines, storage facilities and liquified gas terminals as a federal licensing agency.

The FERC has the responsibility under the National Environmental Pollution Act to consider the potential environmental impacts associated with the project, which is under its consideration. With regard to Tennessee's Northeast Energy Direct Project, the FERC is the lead federal agency for the National Environmental Pollution Act review and the preparation of the EIS. FERC does not regulate the exploration, production or gathering of natural gas or the local distribution of natural gas. Those activities are regulated by the states.

FERC is directed by five commission members who are appointed by the President with the advice and consent from the Senate. They are responsible for making a determination on whether to issue a Certifi-

cate of Public Convenience and Necessity to the applicant, which in this case is Tennessee.

The EIS being prepared by the FERC environmental staff, which I'm a part of, will describe the project facilities and associated environmental impacts, alternatives to the project, mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts, and our conclusions and recommendations. The EIS is not a decision document. It's being prepared to disclose to the public and to the Commission the environmental impacts of constructing and operating the proposed project.

When it's completed, the Commission will consider the environmental information from the EIS along with the non-environmental issues such as engineering markets and rates and making a decision to approve or deny Tennessee's request for a certificate. There is no review of FERC decisions by the President of Congress maintaining FERC's independence as a regulatory agency and providing for fair and unbiased decisions.

As I said earlier, the primary purpose of this meeting tonight is to give you an opportunity to comment on the project and on the environmental issues that you'd like to see covered in the EIS. It will help us the most if your comments are as specific as possible. These issues should generally focus on the potential for environmental effects, but may also address construction issues, mitigation, and the environmental review process.

Tonight I'd also like to gather additional comments and new issues to analyze in the Environmental Impact Statement, explain how the public may participate or continue to participate in this environmental review process, summarize the project being proposed by Tennessee, explain FERC's role in the review of the project, and then allow you the opportunity to comment on the project.

If you'd like to speak tonight, there is a table outside where you can still sign up to speak if you haven't done so already. Giving verbal comments isn't the only way or chance to give FERC comments. All comments, whether they are at this meeting tonight or arrive through the mail or our electronic filing systems, will be analyzed and dressed.

It's very important that any comments you send, either electronic or by traditional mail, include our internal docket number for the project, and that number again is PF14-22-000. There are comment forms that are on the table outside, and you can fill those out and give them to me tonight or you can mail them to FERC. The Commission does strongly encourage electronic filing of comments, and instructions for this are located on our Web site, which is www.ferc.gov under the e-filing link. Again, I want to reiterate that all comments, whether written or verbal, have the same weight.

So just a few things that I want to go over in terms of the meeting decorum. Please turn off or silence any of your cellphones or other mobile devices. For those of you who have signed up to speak, when your number is called, please come down to the front where the microphone is, state your name, and also spell your entire name for the record. Please try to summarize your points, and remember that you can always submit additional comments in writing, and of course please be respectful and don't disrupt whoever is up here speaking.

So I am now going to give you a brief overview of Tennessee's proposed project. It includes about 418 miles of new pipeline and associated facilities in Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut, nine new compressor stations, 13 new meter stations and modifications at one existing compressor station, construction of eight pipeline laterals, loops or delivery lines in Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Hampshire, and Tennessee's also stated that the pipeline would provide 1.3 billion cubic feet per day of capacity to transport natural gas to markets in the northeastern United States and Canada.

Also for those of you that don't know, Tennessee did file some updated project information this past Friday, and all of that information is available online. I also want to just reiterate that this is a project being proposed by Tennessee. It's not a project being proposed by FERC. FERC is an advocate for the environmental review process. On June 30, 2015 we issued a Notice of Intent or NOI, which opens a formal comment period that will close on August 31, 2015.

The NOI encourages you to submit your comments as soon as possible in order to give us time to analyze and research the issues. If you receive the NOI in the mail, you are on our mailing list and will remain on our mailing list to receive the draft and final Environmental Impact Statement and any other supplemental notices we may issue about the project.

If you did not receive the NOI and you should have, I apologize. The mailing list for this project is large, and it's undergoing constant revisions. You can be added to our mailing list by signing up at the table outside in the back or by submitting comments on the project and including your address.

I also just want to be clear that any comments that were submitted prior to June 30 will be included in our environmental document. Comments will also be accepted after August 31, but our goal is really to get the comments as soon as possible so that we have more time to research the issues. Comments that are received during the formal scoping period will have to be formally responded to by Tennessee.

So this is just a map of the eastern portion of the proposed project route, which goes through Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut, and then just an overview map of the western portion of the project, which is proposed to go through Pennsylvania and New York. So far we have already had a lot of issues which have been identified in comment letters which have been filed in the record in FERC's e-library system.

Some of those issues include a preference to develop alternative energy, concerns regarding transport, the disruption of rural character and land use, the development through higher density residential areas, cumulative impact of fracking, private well aquifer damage, and compressor station noise and air emissions. All of those issues again will be dressed in our Environmental Impact Statement. Tonight we are also looking for new issues or concerns that you may have.

So now I'm going to talk about what FERC's process is. Tennessee entered into the first pre-filing process in October of 2014, which began our review of FERC's project facilities. The purpose of the pre-filing process is to encourage all interested stakeholders in a manner that allows for the early identification and resolution of environmental issues.

As of today, no formal application has been filed with the FERC. However, we have begun working with other federal, state and local agency staffs to review the project. Right now we are also working on analyzing the information that's already been provided as well as gathering additional information necessary to do a complete review of the project by issuing data requests to fill in gaps. Right now it's anticipated that Tennessee will file their formal application with FERC in October of this year.

When we issue the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, there will be a 45-day comment period. During that comment period on the draft EIS you can provide comments to FERC through some of the same methods I described earlier. Also, we will be holding public comment meetings similar to this one tonight to gather feedback on our analysis and findings, and those comments will then be incorporated into our final Environmental Impact Statement.

Both the draft EIS and final EIS will also be available online when they are issued. However, if you are on our mailing list, you will receive a copy in the mail, which will be on a CD. You can request a paper copy by indicating that on the return mail portion of the Notice of Intent.

Only after taking the environmental and non-environmental factors into consideration will the Commission make its final decision on whether or not to approve the project. If the Commission votes to approve the project, a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity is issued, Tennessee will still be required to meet the certificate conditions outlined in the certificate before it can begin any construction.

If approved, the FERC environmental staff will monitor the project through construction and restoration by performing inspections to document environmental compliance with Tennessee's proposed plans and mitigation and the additional conditions of the FERC certificate. The Environmental Impact Statement is an analytical document. Not only will we take a hard look at the environmental impacts of the proposed project, but it will also compare alternatives and address the environmental issues identified here tonight

and in all the written comments we received so far and will continue to receive.

There are also many environmental resources that we will analyze in our document such as the project's effects on waterbodies and wetlands, vegetation and wildlife, endangered species, cultural resources, socioeconomics, soils, land use, air quality, safety impacts.

So, again, before we get started taking comments tonight, I just want to make everyone again silence your cellphones, and of course be respectful of whoever is up here speaking. Again, when I call your number, please come down to the front where the microphone stand is, state your name, and spell it for the record, and also please identify any agency or group that you are representing.

Tonight we are going to put a time limit on speakers, which is going to be three minutes. We have this little, cool light timer up here, and it's going to help you to keep track of those three minutes. You are going to see about two minutes and 30 second in the green time, about 20 seconds in the yellow, and then you will have about 10 seconds of red before your time will be up.

Again, if you have a lot to cover, please consider summarizing your points tonight and submitting additional comments in written form, and, again, I just want to make sure it's clear that your time is not going to begin until you are done spelling your name for the court reporter.

So with that we will start our comments and call our first speaker. So we will go ahead and start with number 1.

MR. KING: My name is James King, K-I-N-G. You'd be surprised. I'm submitting comment on behalf of the Connecticut industrial energy consumers and ad hoc coalition of large commercial and industrial end-users who collectively employ thousands of Connecticut workers at numerous locations throughout the state. We support the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

By increasing the availability of natural gas capacity, among other things, will help to alleviate recurrences of massive electric and gas price spikes such as those experienced in the last few winter periods, increased reliability and availability of pipeline capacity to serve Connecticut's growing reliance on gas-fired generation resources that meet electricity demands, increase availability of gas service to all customers especially in capacity constrained regions of Connecticut and furthering the state's policies of increasing the availability of gas service in Connecticut and increasing the deployment and utilization of combined heat and power and other distributed energy resources.

The events of the past few winters highlight the constrained nature of New England's system especially as it relates to the availability of interstate gas capacity. As has been repeatedly observed, market outcomes were not necessarily the result of getting an adequate supply of gas supply. Instead, the resulting market outcomes were caused by the relative lack of adequate pipeline capacity, the transport of natural gas from its production sources to load centers, and other areas in need of gas supply.

The result was historically high prices resulting in unprecedented energy costs for consumers resulting in, among other consequences, significant losses, deferment or cancellation of capital projects at facilities in New England, and the shifting of internal investments originally targeted for the region to other places.

The increased demand for natural gas also combined with the inadequate capacity available resulted in significant increases in the number of service interruptions throughout the state. Such significant levels of interruption cause major problems for energy-intensive, large commercial and industrial consumers. In some instances the frequency and duration of the interruptions force businesses in Connecticut to curtail operations and wages resulting in millions of dollars in lost production and wages.

In addition, contrary to the determined effort to reduce their respective carbon footprints, many businesses were required to either shut down or burn fuel oil to continue operations. The pressing importance of addressing the region's gas capacity issues is likely to grow in the near future in light of the critically important nature of gas capacity with respect to reliability, energy affordability, and the ability to achieve certain of the state's energy initiatives. Approval of the project is a positive step. Thanks.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Alright. We will go to the next speaker number 2.

MS. LECONCHE: Hi. My name is Tess Leconche, T-E-S-S L-E-C-O-N-C-H-E. So I am Tess. I'm a proud New Englander. I currently live in Rhode Island where I attended college at Roger Williams University back in 2004 and fell in love with the state and its diversity. My boyfriend, who was born and raised in the beautiful state of New Hampshire, he also lives with me in Rhode Island, too with the majority of his family, which we frequently visit, are up in New Hampshire.

I was born and raised here in Connecticut. Pretty much my whole family resides there. They are clearly important pieces of my life, which span across New England, but Connecticut is my true home and where my heart lies.

Growing up I had the privilege of experiencing the impact that labor unions and their jobs have provided for families, friends and their communities. I have seen the growth and results which were born within our first-class training facilities. The simple and hard facts are that we are facing an energy crisis, which is right at our front doors. Unemployment rates are still unfortunately high, and this project would create upward of 3,000 construction-related jobs for hard-working laborers to provide for their families.

The natural gas from a consumer standpoint also provides a cheaper, cleaner and more reliable fuel source. This not only impacts the present but the future needs of New England providing new capacity for growth. I'm in full support for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline proposed by Kinder Morgan, and I am here today to ask you to approve this project. Thank you.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Number 3.

MS. CLIFFORD: Hi. My name is Rachel Clifford, R-A-C-H-A-E-L, C-L-I-F-F-O-R-D. I'm a union member. I live in Rhode Island, and I work throughout the New England area, and I would like to express my full support for the Northeast Energy Direct Project being proposed by Kinder Morgan.

Since the 1920s generation after generation my family has lived throughout New England, and construction careers are what put food on our tables. This project represents the promise of good family supporting jobs for the region. As a consumer, it ensures a cheaper, cleaner and more reliable fuel source, and laborers build pipelines across America safely and efficiently.

We have access to topnotch training in Hopkinton, Massachusetts to ensure these projects are built on time, safely and on budget. I urge FERC to approve this project so we can bring a much needed reliable energy source and good paying construction jobs to the region. Thank you.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Number four?

MR. GUSTAFSON: Good evening. My name is Scott Gustafson. That's S-C-O-T-T G-U-S-T-A-F-S-O-N. I'm the regional organizing director for the Laborers New England region. We represent about 65,000 construction workers in the New England region. I have been to over 50 meetings for this pipeline project, and on many of them I have been booed out of them by the people who opposed the project.

But I'm here tonight, because a lot of the things I have been hearing are what ifs, and I'm going to talk about what is, and we know that we pay the highest -- New Englanders pay the highest rates for electricity and energy costs in industrial, commercial and residential consumers. We know what is is that our grid in New England is volatile at best, and the ISO said this themselves, and that we have a real crisis on our hands if we don't increase capacity and increase power generation. I think it actually becomes a national security issue.

Over the last few nights I have seen a lot of political folks speak against the project. Well, I'm here to tell you tonight that those same political folks are telling us that they support the project, but they need to get reelected, and they want those constituents that are opposing the project to vote for them. So they are not going to come out in public, but they think FERC is just going to push this thing through, and that's their standards on it, and I'm tired of getting back-doored by them. It's sickening.

So we are here to say tonight what is. You got 50 to 60 construction workers in the back of the room here who are all trained in environmental mitigation. They work on these projects. The first thing they get trained in is pipeline safety. It includes environmental mitigation. It's very important to us that they are

trained to do their jobs right, and it's important to them.

People talk about the temporary nature of these jobs. If this pipeline is built and others, it'll create 25 years' worth of work for these construction workers, all good union jobs which are family supporting. 25 years in the distribution network. We know that we have a moratorium at Berkshire Gas. They can't even provide any new customers gas because of the constraints.

This is an issue not only for residential consumers but also for economic development elsewhere, which can create even more jobs and more economic development and certainly a big boost to this region. We urge you, urge you to approve this project, because convenience and necessity? I absolutely think so. It's not a bunch of what ifs. It's not if, you know, a tree is going to fall and make a noise. It's this is the real deal, and people are struggling. They need these jobs. But more than that, we need the energy here in the region, and we need to experience and enjoy the renaissance that the rest of the country has been enjoying with this gas just a few hundred miles to our west. Thank you very much.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Number 5?

MR. MCGLOIN: Good evening. My name is Patrick McGloin. It's Patrick M-C-G-L-O-I-N. I'm here on behalf of the Metro Hartford Alliance. The Metro Hartford Alliance serves the region's economic development leader and the City of Hartford's Chamber of Commerce. Other investors include businesses of all sizes, health care providers, arts and higher education institutions and as well as municipalities of north central Connecticut.

Our mission is to ensure that the region competes aggressively and successfully for jobs, capital and talent so that it thrives as one of the country's premier places for all people to live, play, work, and raise a family. The alliance is also an aggressive advocate for smart investment in our state's infrastructure. Job retention and creation is dependent upon strong infrastructure that supports the efficient movement of freight, information, people, and energy throughout Connecticut.

For too long Connecticut's faced the unfortunate distinction of having the highest energy prices in the continental United States while simultaneously facing insufficient access to energy sources. An adequate natural gas pipeline infrastructure in Connecticut contributes to volatile increased electricity prices which in turn stifle our state's economic recovery and the private sector's ability to retain and grow jobs.

The alliance is pleased that through their Northeast Energy Direct Project Kinder Morgan is working to be part of a solution that will enhance system reliability and lower energy costs in the state. Reliable access to affordable energy is key to making Connecticut a place in which the private sector can thrive grow and create jobs by increasing our state's natural gas pipeline capacity.

We can move closer to reaching Connecticut's energy goal and providing cheaper, cleaner, and more reliable energy resources to the citizens and businesses of our state. Without strength and infrastructure residents and businesses in Connecticut will continue to face high electric prices and, even worse, could experience power outages.

Connecticut is at a critical point. We can no longer continue to travel down the road of higher energy costs which make our companies unable to compete on a national and global level. We appreciate Kinder Morgan's efforts to bring reliable, lower-cost energy to Connecticut's businesses and residents. Thank you.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Number 6.

MS. ALLEN: My name is Judith, J-U-D-I-T-H, Allen, A-L-L-E-N. In preparation for speaking this evening I went to Kinder Morgan's Web site to read about the project. The thing that most puzzled me was the claim that natural gas and renewables have a symbiotic relationship that as the use of renewables increase, the need for natural gas will increase as well. They said this claim has been analyzed by experts, and they provided a link to this expert analysis.

It's a paper created by Citibank for evaluating the benefits and risks of investing in natural gas versus renewables. They report that natural gas pipeline expansions are capital intensive, and the "perception of renewables as an expensive source of energy is largely obsolete."

They report the contamination of aquifer water by fracking is real. That the seismic activity increase due to fracking is real, and that the unavoidable emissions and venting of methane during the extraction process almost negates any advantages natural gas has over coal and oil. They anticipate that these environmental problems will lead to further industry regulations driving up the cost of gas.

Citibank believes that for the immediate future there may be money to be made in the natural gas industry, but for the long haul money is best invested in renewables. The project has promised upwards of 3,000 jobs. These are 2-year jobs. Compare that to a program designed to get us up to 100 percent renewables. The program is called the Solutions Project, and in conjunction with Stamford University they have calculated the jobs needed to reach a goal of 100 percent renewables. These are 40-year jobs.

In Connecticut they project 40,487 construction jobs and 21,662 operational jobs, and these are 40-year jobs. The possibilities for jobs is much greater in ramping up renewable energy infrastructure in line with Citibank's analysis that long-term investments in renewables makes the most sense. Thank you.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Number 7.

MR. VARGAS: Good evening. My name is Omar, O-M-A-R, last name Vargas, V-A-R-G-A-S as in Sam. I'm the executive director of government relations for Praxair headquartered in Danbury. Praxair is one of Connecticut's largest companies and one of the largest atmospheric specialty and petrol gas producers in the world. Praxair's commitment to all employees, customers and the communities in which we operate is to make our plant more productive. You may have even seen that phrase written on one of our two trailers as you were traveling here tonight.

This commitment means offering products and technologies that support a strong growing economy and minimized environmental impacts. We have been globally recognized for this commitment and have been referred to as one of the greenest companies in the world. We are a manufacturer, and as a result of our continuous investment in demand site energy efficiency, our manufacturing operations are highly efficient. Nevertheless, we are an energy intensive manufacturer in many areas of the country, including Connecticut. The cost of electricity can account for a substantial amount our total production costs.

As we know, the cost of electricity is a significant determining factor of whether we choose to either build new facilities or expand existing facilities. This is why I'm here tonight to speak in strong support of the Northeast Energy Direct in Connecticut Expansion Project.

As a direct result of limited natural gas pipeline capacity in the region, Connecticut's industrial electricity prices are the highest in the continental US and significantly above the national average. The state's rates are not only high, they are highly volatile, especially in the winter freeze and summer heat. This is true throughout New England.

This current reality makes it incredibly costly to be a manufacturer in the region. By way of specific example, our facility just north of here in Suffield competes against a variety of our other facilities in the region. As a result of energy prices, we can at times of high prices more affordably serve Connecticut customers from our facilities in New York and Pennsylvania than we can from Suffield.

Praxair strongly supports policies and projects that encourage the robust development of affordable, reliable and cleaner energy. The Northeast Energy Direct and Connecticut expansion projects are these types of projects. Combined, they will result in significant economic impact in the immediate forms of hundreds of construction jobs and in-state capital spending. But perhaps more importantly, long term in the form of lower, more stable electricity prices.

These projects also make environmental sense in that natural gas-fire generation on a per unit of energy delivered basis emits 32 percent less greenhouse gases than oil-fired generation furthering not only federal policy priorities but also Connecticut's own comprehensive energy strategy in the region's 6-state energy action plan. Thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. No. 8?

MS. GAVREAU: Christine Gavreau, G-A-V-R-E-A-U. I'm with 350ct.org. I want to begin my remarks

by stating something extremely obvious which no one has raised up to this point. Every climate scientist has told us that all fossil fuels, 100 percent of fossil fuels that have not yet been drilled must remain in the ground by 20/50 if we are to prevent catastrophic climate change.

Now, the first five speakers gave the impression that we had to choose between saving the planet from catastrophic climate change and massive species extinction and the loss of major cities and huge portions of our population, that we have to choose between that and jobs. I say that's a lie.

As a previous speaker said, there have been numerous, serious studies that show that if we stopped right now digging up fossil fuels by injecting poison in the ground and destroying the land and water of farmers and working people across this country, if we ended that right now and switched to building an infrastructure of 100 percent renewables, we would create many, many more jobs. They could be high-paid union jobs. That's what the climate movement supports, 100 percent union guaranteed jobs to rapidly build the sustainable alternative energy infrastructure we need.

And as a previous speaker said, and I would like to expand on it, the studies from Mark Jacobson from Stanford about what could be done in Connecticut say this. \$1 million invested in natural gas, which is fracked gas, that is water destroying our environment, I mean drilling destroying our environment, creates five jobs. \$1 million invested in wind creates 13 jobs. \$1 invested in solar creates 14 jobs, and that over all 44,000 construction jobs for 40 years would be created in Connecticut if we immediately stop this project and put the energy of the Federal Government and the state government and every part of private industry we could muscle to do so into developing alternative energy now.

What are some of the other questions facing us and our children? By 2030, 15 years when your son or daughter born today is in high school, in order to stop this catastrophic climate change 85 percent of existing energy needs --

MS. BAUM: Can you please finish up your comments? Thank you.

MS. GAVREAU: Yes -- to be converted to renewables, and that would save us \$6 billion in mortality and health care costs for your family and mine. I oppose this project, and I urge FERC to oppose it, not do what they did with Spectra Energy and the Algonquin line, but speak for the people.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Number 10. 9, sorry nine.

MR. MARTIN: You skipped me.

MS. BAUM: Sorry. My apologies.

MR. MARTIN: I will not be ignored. My name is Ben Martin. That's M-A-R-T-I-N. I'm also with 350 Connecticut, and we stridently oppose the Northeast Direct and all natural gas pipelines being run through Connecticut for the following reasons.

There was a lot of talk tonight about us having the highest electric rates and energy prices in the continental US. Renewable energy will bring our prices down not only because you are producing your own energy if you have renewable energy on your home, but because once it's built we don't have to buy fuel for it. You billed it. It just sits there and generates energy for everyone. So it's a much better alternative than building a natural gas pipeline.

We talked about the economy. Germany, widely known right now as having the most powerful economy in the world, recently got 78 percent of its power from clean power in one day. Now, if the most powerful economy in the world is using renewable energy and still has a strong economy, I think that the United States can do this.

One of the previous speakers talked about how our union friends are trained on mitigation of danger and safety of these pipelines. There's much less mitigation that's needed for renewable energy, because you don't have an explosive substance running through a pipe that is guaranteed to degrade over time. We have natural sunlight, natural wind and natural water that can supply us energy.

Also he talked about what is. I will talk about what was, because what was was a natural gas explosion

that took out a city block in Springfield, Mass. What was was a natural gas explosion that killed 6 people in Middletown, Connecticut. This is not safe, it's not needed, and we can go with 100 percent renewable energy, as one of our previous speakers said.

So I just want to say to the union people in the room and any union members out there that I want to thank you, because you are a powerful force, and you brought me an 8-hour workday. You brought me a five-day week, and I want to thank you for that, and in return I want to bring you jobs where there is not danger of explosions. I want to bring you jobs that last 40 years instead of two years, and I want to bring you a state that cares about you, the air you can breathe, and the safety of your families with renewable energy.

So this pipeline and all of the pipelines need to be stopped. FERC has a responsibility to stop it and once it's stopped we can invest in renewable energy that's better for all of us, better for the unions, better for the people, and better for our state. Thank you.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Number 10.

MS. SHAW: My name is Carolyn Shaw, S-H-A-W, and I lived in Middletown for almost 50 years. I'd like to take this conversation in a slightly different direction, I guess. I'm moved more by facts and figures than what's on my heart. I'm a woman of the Christian faith. I have been considering the moral implications of this scoping hearing and of the Northeast Energy Direct Project.

Like me you may have heard the following verse from Psalm 8 of the Christian Bible many times. "When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, what is man that thou art mindful of him?" Tonight I wonder. Aren't we all infinitesimal parts of the great universe mentioned by the psalmist? By virtue of the complex brains of our species don't we have the responsibility to be deliberate in all things, and with regard to this hearing and this project I also wonder to what extent, if any, should decisions made by individuals at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission be exempted from the rigorous ethical parameters other people try to follow in their lives and if they are to any extent be exempted, should that be changed?

For many months people and organizations have been reaching out to FERC attempting to comply in good faith with its processes, dutifully filing required documents, and attending scoping hearings such as this one. No actions have lessened the number of permits granted or the ensuing damage to the earth. The necessity for increased moral reflection by FERC as it makes permitting decisions has become clear to me.

I suggest that there be both environmental and ethical impact statements. The existence of these two types of EIS will encourage more balanced decision making. Two sides of the equation will be taken into account, the need to protect the creation for which all humans are stewards and the need to exhibit the noblest of ethical behavior.

From poet and writer Wendell Berry, two stanzas of his poem Questionnaire. "How much poison are you willing to eat for the success of the free market and global trade? Please name your preferred poisons. In the name of patriotism and the flag, how much of our beloved land are you willing to desecrate? List in the following spaces the mountains, rivers, towns, farms you would most readily do without."

Finally, as adults, we make hundreds of choices weighing possibilities. Despite the politics, despite the lobbying from oil and gas companies, despite peer pressure from those around you, my hope is that each person leading this scoping meeting and everyone in this theater will choose to be the greatest possible version of him or herself.

Listen to your mandate as an ethical human being whether you work on First Street in Washington or represent --

MS. BAUM: Ma'am, if you can --

MS. SHAW: -- an agency --

MS. BAUM: -- just -- your time is up.

MS. SHAW: I have one more sentence.

MS. BAUM: Thank you.

A. Or represent an agency in other parts of the country, let the moral dimensions of your choices rise to the surface of your mind, and, again, from Psalm 8, I'm closing with this, in stark contrast to the images that Berry's poem --

MS. BAUM: Ma'am, you can certainly submit more comments on the record if you --

MS. SHAW: For thou hath made him --

MS. BAUM: Ma'am --

MS. SHAW: -- lower than the angels and has crowned him --

MS. BAUM: Ma'am, we have other people who are planning on speaking tonight.

MS. SHAW: Thank you.

MS. BAUM: No. 11?

MR. CALANDRELLI: My name is John Calandrelli, C-A-L-A-N-D-R-E-L-L-I. I'm on the staff --

MS. BAUM: Spell your first name, too.

A. John, J-O-H-N, sorry. I'm here on the staff for the Connecticut Chapter of the Sierra Club, and many of the facts that you have heard already today I can come up with opposites so it depends on who you want to believe. Could you possibly put up the list of your criteria again that you use to grant these permits? You had it up here earlier, please.

MS. BAUM: We do have a time limit tonight so we can --

A. Yes. I can try to do it by memory, because by your list of FERC's criteria we shouldn't even be here tonight. You should be saying no to this right away. When you come to the point of the criteria, wetlands, species, land use, local air pollution, local noise pollution, environmental impact statements, environmental assessments, and especially since methane gas is 86 more, times more potent a climate change gas than even CO2, your decision is easy.

So if you go ahead and consider jobs, temporary jobs at that, more important, then the old joke of FERC actually standing for the Federal Energy Rubber Stamp Committee will be true. Thank you. I will submit electronic comments later.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Number 12?

MR. SWICK: Good evening. My name is Scott Swick, S-W-I-C-K. I'm a representative for the International Union of Operating Engineers here in Connecticut. Our union is affiliated with the Hartford and New Britain building trades which represents over 10,000 skilled construction workers here in Connecticut, some of which are here tonight. The operating engineers, our members are heavy equipment operators, mechanics, technicians, welders, surveyors, and we are here in support of this project.

There could be potentially 500 or more quality, good-paying jobs associated with this project to generate over \$4 million in tax revenues, which is great for the state. Also, these good-paying jobs, this income will filter down and into the communities here in Connecticut, and obviously we support that.

As far as the gas expansion, I know in my neighborhood I'm lucky. I have the choice. I happen to have natural gas. Some folks in my neighborhood have access to it but choose not to use it. Some have alternate means. Others choose to use oil. But at least they have a choice, and so we're in full support of that, expanding the infrastructure so that people do have a choice. If they choose not to, so be it, but without having the infrastructure in place there is no choice.

Connecticut's way behind and so is the whole Northeast region. So also I want to talk to you about the fact that this is a transportation issue. These pipelines are transporting this natural gas. It's one of the safest forms of transportation there is in this country. There's hundreds of thousands of miles of this pipelines that exist including this particular project. There's nothing more than expansion of the existing pipelines, working within the same right-of-ways.

As far as the training, I can tell you firsthand being involved with a lot of training it's very comprehensive. There's an extreme emphasis and oversight on safety to the public, to the workers that work on these right-of-ways, that work on these pipelines, and to the integrity of the pipeline itself so that safety is the number 1 importance. I have experienced it firsthand, and our members are highly qualified and trained. So, again, thank you, and we are in support of this project.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Number 13.

MR. WALLICK: Good evening. Robert Wallick, R-O-B-E-R-T W-A-L-L-I-C-K. I have a number of concerns which include the ability of this project to meet the requirements of public necessity or convenience. According to the Oxford Dictionary necessity is defined as the fact of being required or indispensable, and convenience is defined as the state of being able to proceed with something with little effort or difficulty. Having said that, according to the ISO New England news wire published May 5, 2015 regarding the 10-year period between 2015 and 2024 I quote, "Combining photovoltaic and energy-efficient forecast savings into the base load forecast results in a reduced total peak demand growth of 0.5 percent annually over the 10-year period, and a flat total energy usage growth of 0.0 percent." This alone shows there is no requirement for additional electricity in New England, and so no requirement for additional natural gas electricity generation.

I don't think there are any intelligent people in this room that would disagree with the concept that destroying 6,700 acres of land in scenic New England is far from convenient. Many thousands of acres that will be affected by this project are protected or conservation lands and waterways. The possibility of damage to aquifers, wells, ponds, lakes, rivers and streams is not convenient to the people of the Northeast or the wildlife here either.

I'm concerned about the environmental impact of this project, proposed pipeline would have in regards to global warming. The fact is that there is a significant amount of natural gas that is released into the atmosphere between the wellhead and the points of use. This gas is commonly referred to as lost or unaccounted for.

According to the US Department of Transportation Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration, there are two main reasons for this lost gas. The first is leaks. The second is measurement issues caused by inconsistent meters. As an example of reported lost gas, Southern California Gas Company reported that 0.87 percent was lost in 2012 and 0.84 percent in 2011.

Washington Gas Company had a 3.65 percent loss rate in 2012 and 4.0 percent loss in 2011. Now, that's a wide range, and I don't want to mislead anyone here. I do want to make sure you understand that not all lost gas is methane, and not all lost gas reaches the atmosphere. But for the sake of discussion let's assume that between 0.6 and 1.1 percent of the lost gas is methane and does reach the atmosphere.

This project is slated to transport 1.3 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day. At 0.6 percent that would release \$7.8 million cubic feet per day or 2.847 billion cubic feet of methane per year.

MS. BAUM: Sir, you have to stop. You can certainly submit additional comments online or we have comment forms in the back. Thank you. Number 14?

MR. RAWITSCHER: Yes, hello. My name is George Rawitscher. That's spelled R-A-W-I-T-S-C-H-E-R. I have a request to FERC and a comment, and I will be very brief. The request is the following.

Suppose that FERC ends up with the conclusion that after having evaluated the environmental impact and possible economic impact, they decided to be in favor of whichever it is, one or the other. The request I have is that the reasoning which FERC comes up with deals specifically with each of the issues. Not just tell us, see, I told you it's okay, and you can go ahead. I would like to know how much the leakage of the methane has been taken into account and various other factors. I would like to see specifics, okay? That was one point. That was my request. Now here's my comment.

I'm a member of a group called CCL, Citizens for Climate Lobbying, and that group supports and lobbies for a carbon tax. Now, we have heard arguments which are in favor of developing these pipelines,

but these are short-range arguments, and we have heard arguments for the long-range, which will ruin the lives not only of ourselves but of everyone in this world, and these are very serious topics.

I appreciate that the union workers would like their jobs, and I appreciate that economic industries like to have cheaper sources of energy but please weigh that in contrast with the enormous damage we are doing to ourselves and to the world.

And, finally, I still have some green light, one reason I would be against the expansion of these gas pipelines is because the companies who are doing those expansions are sinking that money into it, which means they have a vested interest in the gas, which means that they will not support the development of alternatives.

If I speak a little too strongly, I would say we will have bad things, and we will suffer the consequences. So I am not in favor of the expansion of these gas lines. Thank you.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Number 15.

MS. RAWITSCHER: My name is Joyce, J-O-Y-C-E, Rawitscher. We're a team. R-A-W-I-T-S-C-H-E-R. I have always been -- my profession has been clinical social work, and so I have been exceedingly focused on individuals, but this evening I'd like to focus on my grandchildren and their grandchildren and the children who will follow.

We are at a tipping point, and some scientists say we have gone beyond it in terms of waking up and focusing on the climate change that has already occurred in our world that is occurring now in our country. You may have read the article in the New Yorker about the Colorado River, about the need to change a lot of water practices in California that will have an impact on our food supply, on the forest fires in the west.

We have here in the east an abundance of good water, and we need to cherish that, and we need to preserve it, because others in this country will probably be coming to the Northeast, because this is where there will be good water. And so I encourage that we take kind of a Native American point of view of looking at seven generations.

Wars have already been started and fought because of climate change, desertification in Africa, the high cost of wheat and bread in Egypt, the drought in Syria, these impacts of climate change are here with us now, and I would just encourage us to be as absolutely adult and mature as we can be and preserve this beautiful planet for children to come. Thank you.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Number 16.

MS. BOSCO: My name is Sunny, S-U-N-N-Y, Bosco, B-O-S-C-O. I live in Moodus, the Town of Moodus, which was once called the Catskills of Connecticut, among other things. It has many beautiful lakes. Before hopping in my car today I took a quick dip in one of those lakes, which is a wonderful thing to be able to do.

I want to say that I feel pretty lucky to live somewhere where I can do both of these things, come to a meeting like this to speak my mind and take a dip in a lake. In taking a swim in a public lake and speaking at a public meeting I'm doing something that you can't do in a lot of countries in the world. In Russia, where I lived and worked for a while, the water is too polluted just to jump in, and there is certainly many countries that don't hold town meetings where citizens are invited to speak their minds.

Yet here we are, and we are invited to have this conversation, and my mind goes back to that evening swimming in the local lake and the abundance of water that Joyce spoke of and how we need to cherish it. What would happen if we could -- sorry. I don't know how to use a microphone.

What would happen if we could no longer do that, if we couldn't trust that the water was safe enough to just jump in, if it was too polluted to enjoy, to swim in or if we couldn't just turn on the tap and trust what came out? It would be awful, but it would be exactly what would happen if we allow this project to go forward, because fracked gas pipelines leak at a minimum rate of almost 3 percent. That's what they admit to. That's not counting for accidents.

That leakage is contaminated with a proprietary concoction of unknown fracking chemicals and contaminants that we don't even know what they are, and those residents that are unlucky enough to live near a metering station would suffer critical short-term exposure to vented gas that is also contaminated with fracking materials.

The pipelines also need to be periodically flushed, and where does that contaminated water go? Ultimately it will end up in our rivers, our lakes, our farms, and our wetlands, not to mention that the pipeline gas is methane rich, which is effectively supplying a real credible bomb to the backyard of every citizen unfortunate enough to have an address in the pipeline's path.

The idea that the project will create jobs is a fallacy. That the jobs are mostly temporary, and a lot of them come from out of state. It also won't lower costs. It will actually raise corporate profit. 56 percent of the pipeline is gas for export. We don't need this project. The gas companies need it to increase their bottom line. It's going to sacrifice public health for corporate profit, and all of us here are terrified that you will fail to protect us. So please act in the public interest and say no. Thank you.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. And number 17.

MS. WALLACE: My name is Patricia Wallace, P-A-T-R-I-C-I-A, W-A-L-L-A-C-E. I will first speak as the clerk of Connecticut Valley Quarterly Meeting of New England Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends. The statement on behalf of the Quakers and most of Connecticut and western Massachusetts is a simple sentence. We oppose the pipeline. I will add a sentence of explanation and say that we are gravely concerned about climate change. The pipeline route will also come near Woolman Hill, a Quaker conference center, which is dear to us.

Speaking out as a person, I'm a social worker. During storms Nemo, Sandy and Irene I was at the time the director of Elderly Services for the City of New Haven. I was the person in the Emergency Operations Center for all three of those storms. Every call from a senior citizen in New Haven came directly to me. I'm extremely conscious therefore of the consequences of global warming on the most, some of the most vulnerable people in our state.

The buildings that were without power for days and days. The seniors who, in some buildings, fell in the dark and broke hips. The people who did not have a way to get food. The people whose relatives had to haul them up and down multiple flights of stairs by hand because the elevators weren't working. We have already seen disastrous consequences of climate change.

There are alternatives that can create many, many jobs for the people in our region who need them, and we have increasing access to alternative sources of energy like solar power that can do what we need to do without the consequences of this form of energy. Thank you for your attention.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. That's all the people who we had sign up to speak so far. Is there anybody else here who has not spoken yet who would like to do so? Oh, okay, come on down.

MR. FOX: Thank you. My name is Brendan Fox, F-O-X. First name Brendan, B-R-E-N-D-A-N. I'm the Assistant District Council for the Metropolitan District located in Hartford, Connecticut. The Metropolitan District, known as the MDC, is the provider of potable water services, among other things, to 400,000 people in Greater Hartford. We are owned by eight member towns, the City of Hartford and the seven surrounding towns. We own 30,000 plus acres of property in Connecticut and in Massachusetts.

The proposed loop that is going to be, could be structured in Connecticut is going to go through a portion of our reservoir property. We are not here to oppose the project. We are not here to speak in favor of the project. What we would ask is that FERC ask Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas to host some public informational meetings within the district towns. So our members, our ratepayers are aware of what is proposed to occur on MDC property. In addition, we would ask Kinder Morgan and Tennessee to provide us with the detailed information.

There currently is a gas line that goes through MDC property, and it has been there since 1952. We've gotten some rough estimates of where this proposed loop would be constructed. We don't know precisely

where it is going to go nor do we know exactly what the impact would be, in other words, how wide the easement would be, where the access roads would be constructed, and things of that sort. Those are critically important to us, and we would ask that FERC direct Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas to provide us that information, number 1.

Number 2, to host informational meetings so that people within at least the district, the MDC, understand precisely what's going to happen so that they can voice their concerns or support for the project. Thank you.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Is there anybody else?

MS. FIELDING: I thank you. My name is Eileen Fielding, E-I-L-E-E-N F-I-E-L-D-I-N-G. I'm the executive director of the Farmington River Watershed Association, and I just briefly want to fully support the comments of Attorney Fox and extend that request to all the towns in the Farmington Valley because we also have a concern about the details of the pipeline running through that region. Thank you.

MS. BAUM: Thank you. Anybody else? Alright. Well, I guess I'm with no more speakers. We will conclude the meeting. Let the record show that the scoping meeting tonight ended at 7:40 p.m. I'd like to thank all of you for coming tonight and for your comments.

(Whereupon, this meeting was concluded at 7:40 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Jacqueline V. McCauley, a Notary Public duly commissioned and qualified in and for the State of Connecticut, do hereby certify that the Northeast Energy Direct Project Public Scoping Meeting was taken on July 30, 2015 at 6:30 p.m., and reduced to writing under my supervision. That this meeting is a true record of the statements given by the public.

I further certify that I am neither attorney nor counsel for, nor related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this meeting is taken, and further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, or financially interested in the action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 6th day of August, 2015.

Jacqueline V. McCauley

Notary Public My Commission expires: 5/31/2017

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
IN THE MATTER OF:
NORTHEAST ENERGY DIRECT PROJECT : PF14-22-000

Franklin Pierce University
40 University Drive
Rindge, New Hampshire 03461

Tuesday, September 29, 2015

The above-entitled matter came on for technical conference, pursuant to notice, at 6:00 p.m., Eric Tomasi, the moderator.

PROCEEDINGS

(6:08 p.m.)

MR. TOMASI: Good evening everybody. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission I want to thank everybody for coming out tonight and also this is the scoping meeting for the Northeast Energy Direct Project proposed by Tennessee Gas Pipeline and the Docket Number for this Project is PF14-22. My name is Eric Tomasi and I am the Environmental Project Manager for FERC who is the lead federal agency for this project, who is specifically reviewing this project.

I work in the Office of Energy Projects at FERC and I am the technical lead for air quality, noise and pipeline safety as well. I have several people here who are integral to both the setup of tonight's meeting as well as helping me and my staff at FERC, prepare the Environmental Impact Statement.

They work for a contractor Cardno, and their names are Oliver Paul, Lindsey Potaski, Sarah Holmes, Jennifer Wallace at the table here in front of me -- behind me I should say, Doug Mooningham, Bruce Hart and Jason Dickey and I want to thank them as well.

Also I want to thank Franklin Pierce University for hosting us here tonight. We know this is an inconvenience and that we are interrupting normal student life but this is a really great venue and we want to thank them for having us here tonight. A couple of other quick points, there are bathrooms out in the mail hallway, they are off to the right and we will be taking a break right around 9:00 P.M. so we will give people a little bit of a break from speaking.

Also you may have noticed that there is a court reporter to my right and they are transcribing this meeting. This is so we can have an accurate record of tonight's comments and eventually an electronic copy of the transcript of this meeting will be available on the FERC's e-library system on our website and that will contain the public record for this proceeding.

Now we have a transcription contract with Ace Reporters and if you want to obtain a copy of the transcript prior to its placement in the public files you have to contact them directly. Now also we are doing this meeting a little different -- now some of you have been -- many of you in fact, have been to some of the other meetings that I have had and where we have the one court reporter who is going to be taking all of your comments.

Tonight, as most of you heard coming in we do have a second court reporter here tonight, it's in the what the area in the front when you first walk in, it's a little side room where you can walk in and you can give the court reporter and one of my staff your comments in private, so if you don't want to wait around, that opens now so if you want to go give your comment and leave you can do that as well.

Those comments whether you speak in front of me tonight or you speak in front of the court reporter in the private room, they are exactly the same so I want to point that out. Or if people get -- if you are tired of waiting you can go ahead and give your comments out there because this meeting is planned to go to 11 P.M. so this will run a little late so if you want to give your comment in private you can give it out there.

Now next slide please -- okay, there are a couple of things that I want to point out about the purpose of tonight's meeting and many of you again -- many of you have heard this before but I am going to go through it again because that's what I am here for. I want to accomplish a couple of things, one I want to summarize the project for you. I want to go and explain how FERC, how FERC does our EIS process and our entire review.

Also I want to explain the role of how the public can participate in the process, not just here, but in comments or in other venues and I want to finally of course allow you, the public, to actually comment here tonight. Now also as you can see here these are sort of the things that I am looking for tonight is identifying new issues for analysis in the EIS, as I mentioned explaining the FERC process, provide these opportunities for public input and identify future public input opportunities.

I will be talking about a process even though you may not want to speak tonight or don't have your comment in now, there is plenty of time to get your comments in both formally and well as throughout our entire process.

You know I always say this in all of these meetings and most of you come to meetings and have heard over and over and over again that your input is pretty critical. Just for instance today I was at a meeting of one of your local organizations and there was really good information that I was given from local people about the particular impacts that you know, perhaps the state didn't know about -- perhaps we didn't know about from surveys, they can give us information and the public can give us information that we may not be able to find in any other format so it is really important for us to get those comments from you, so it is really critical.

And I want to just stress how important of a role that you guys do have because we have to address every single comment that comes into us. Now all of you who will have gotten, I hope, or at least seen our last NOI which extended the formal comment period, the comment period originally -- the formal comment I should say originally ended at the end of August however because this meeting is happening we extended that comment period until October 16th. Now that is the formal comment period.

Now what that means is that if you file during that formal comment period from way back in June until October 16th, Kinder Morgan, not just us but Kinder Morgan also has to respond to your concerns. Now after that we still take comments and we will still respond to every other comment that we get throughout the entire process so I want to point out that even if you missed that October 16th date for comments, we still address your comments throughout our entire process.

Now there are other input opportunities that are going to happen later on but there is something that is also really important -- next slide please -- is as I said there are these scoping meetings which you can give your comments to us but there are other opportunities, obviously you can supply us written comments. You can mail them to us, you can go ahead and use the comment form on the table and give them to us tonight or mail that comment form in or you could just go ahead and use our e-library system.

There's a couple of different ways that you can do that, if you go to ferc.gov through e-comments, you know or e-library you can file your comments on that and so of course if the project does keep progressing and we do issue a Draft Environmental Impact Statement we will be out here for another set of meetings. There is another comment period that happens after the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is issued and we will have a whole other set of meetings just like this one and other ones we have had to get your comments on the Draft EIS so that we can see what you think about how we wrote the environmental impact statement.

So another thing is that people are always concerned well I haven't had time or I only have three minutes to give my comment. Well the thing about the comments is that -- next slide please, is that the written comments are given the exact same weight as the verbal comments. So even if you are unable to speak tonight or don't wish to speak or perhaps don't want to actually speak in public, your written comments are exactly the same weight as the verbal comments and we have to address all of those.

I think the last thing I want to point out before I talk a little bit about the decorum and the way we are go-

ing to run the meeting is that this is not really a hearing, I know in New England there is a grand tradition of having public hearings where you can speak to your elected representatives and ask them the questions. This meeting is primarily to get the comments from you so that we can address those comments later so I want to stress that it's not going to be a give and take, a back and forth, if there is some time in the end I may be able to answer a few questions but given the -- you know we are going to plan to end this around 11, we may not be able to do that but I'll see if we do end early we can do that, so next slide please.

So again, bear with me, many of you will have heard this stuff before about who FERC is and what we do but let's put a pin on the meeting decorum real quick and I'll talk a little bit about FERC. Now we are an independent agency. Now what is an independent agency, what does that mean?

Well FERC's -- when the five Commissioners vote on a project their decision is not reviewable by either the President or Congress, it has to go through the court system, okay so that's the first thing to understand is, you know the President can't overturn, the Congress can't overturn, of course Congress can pass laws to control FERC just like any agency.

Now FERC, we regulate the interstate transmission of electricity, natural gas and oil. Now we review proposals like this one that authorize construction or review the construction of interstate natural gas pipelines, storage facilities and liquefied natural gas terminals but also we also do siting and licensing of inspection and inspection of hydro-electric projects.

And there are a couple of projects in New Hampshire as well as Massachusetts that are FERC regulated that are hydropower facilities as well. One of the big reasons and the only reason frankly that I am here is as a federal licensing agency, we have responsibility under what is called the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA. Now we have to giving the fact that we are going to authorize or certificate or potentially review a project we are required to look at the potential environmental impacts associated with this particular project that is under consideration.

Now we regulate specifically the interstate transportation of natural gas. As I mentioned earlier we also regulate non-federal hydropower, we do electric rating, rates, we do oil rates, but we do not site power lines or oil pipelines and I think also last and most importantly we do not regulate in any way the expiration, production or gathering of natural gas, drilling, fracking, we have no authority to review that at all. However, having said that we do have a responsibility under NEPA to look at cumulative impacts that may encompass things that are in the area that maybe drilling or some sort of related expiration in that sort of way but it also includes many other facilities, any other industrial facilities or commercial facilities in the area of the project and we have to look at that under a cumulative impact analysis.

Now we do have five Commissioners, many of you will probably be familiar, went to our website to look at them. Our current Chairman is Chairman Norman Bay, we have four other Commissioners and they are the ones, the five Commissioners at FERC, they make the decisions on whether a project goes forward or not.

Each of the Commissioners are basically appointed by the President and approved by Congress so that's who they are and that's what they do. One thing you need to understand is that I do not make any decisions on whether the project will or will not go forward. My sole responsibility and the responsibility of the Office of Energy Projects and the staff that work with me we actually do the environmental review, which our job is to write the Environmental Impact Statement so that we can minimize the impacts and also disclose impacts both to the public and to the decision-makers which are our five Commissioners.

So, a little bit about decorum here. Now I made a mistake once in not turning off my phone while I was giving this meeting decorum, but again please turn off your phones or put it on silent mode so it does not ring when your fellow citizens are giving their comments. Now most of you who want to speak will have been given a number so when your number is called please come up to the microphone.

Now because we have some people on the bleachers back there, for those of you who are on the bleachers and do have a ticket to speak, please you know - come down a little early, I don't want anyone to hurt

themselves coming off those bleachers so just be a little careful so we are basically going to stage people, if you want to come down, if your number is a few away we have some chairs here reserved if you want to sit and wait as your number comes up.

Again you are going to have three minutes to speak here so please summarize your points and if you have much more extensive points or extensive things that you want to point out, please give us those in writing, even if you have a speech written out and you don't complete it, please give that to me today before you leave and we will make sure that that entire speech gets into the record.

Again one thing this going to happen is there may be people here who do not agree with your point of view. There may be people here who are pro-pipeline. There are certainly people here who are anti-pipeline and I respect everyone's position, but I think it is important that even if you disagree with the speaker, please do not boo them, do not interrupt them so that everyone here gets their three minutes to speak and then we will go on to the next speaker.

Believe me those of you who are against the pipeline will have plenty of representation here at the speaker's list tonight so I am quite aware of that so please those people who you may not agree with please let them speak and just let them be done.

Also I understand people there is a heightened emotion, people are going to cheer, people are going to clap, that's fine but you have to be aware that the longer you clap, the longer you cheer, the less people we are going to be able to get through as the night goes on, so I just want to point that out.

I am not going to stop you from clapping I can't do that you know, but the more -- the longer the clapping or cheering goes on the less people we are going to be able to get through. Again, like I said any disruption is only going to interrupt the next person who wants to speak, okay, next slide please.

Now most of you know what the project is so I am not going to go through this a great deal, but it is a very long pipeline, a very large project. As you can see 418 miles of pipeline and associate facilities throughout New England, New York and Pennsylvania, there's a total of 9 new compressor stations that are proposed, you know one of them is not too far away in New Ipswich, which we did go ahead and tour that site yesterday.

There is also several laterals and loops that are happening in Pennsylvania as well as in Massachusetts and right now Tennessee recently decreased the size of the project however they are still planning to transport 1.3 billion cubic feet of natural gas through the pipeline to Dracut, Massachusetts and throughout the laterals.

Now we do understand that right now they have only given us 0.5 -- 500 million cubic feet of how much they are actually going to propose -- they have only given us those from the customers for .5 BCF so we will be looking for those additional numbers and see who they plan to deliver that gas to.

Next slide please. Again this is a pretty big overview map of the east side that goes through this particular area here. As you know it is currently proposed to be adjacent to a power line as it goes through New Hampshire so that is where it is currently proposed and we do plan to see additional information from the company that will give us a little more granularity, a little more detail on the exact route because we do know that pipelines -- building pipelines are a little different than building electric lines. Electric lines may be able to go where a pipeline cannot so we are looking for a little more granularity on that as well as looking at different alternative routes which are not on this map.

But we are looking at that information and we are developing requests for the company to get additional information so that both the public and us are more informed, next map -- next slide.

This is the western side sorry I apologize for this and go on to the next slide please, okay -- now obviously I have been this is the 14th meeting for this project. I have been -- not to all of them, I have done the majority of the meetings but I have not done all of them and we have gotten a lot of really good comments both here at these meetings as well as in writing, as well as people calling me or e-mailing me.

So we have -- I think over 5,600 comments on the record so far for this project and yes the majority of

them are critical of the pipeline however that is a hugely large volume of information for my staff to look at but we are required to look at that or look at all of that information to insure that we address all of those 5,600 comments and that was 5,600 from I think that week so we could be at 5,700 or 5,800 by the end of this meeting so we will have to address all of those comments.

Now these particular comments right here, we went through and sort of sorted all of the comments and looked at the ones that people have commented about the most and these are some of the ones that we actually found that people were most concerned about. Now we do know of course that you know, there has been as we can see and a lot of the signs here tonight, there's a definite preference to develop alternative energy as opposed to using natural gas for which this project would do.

Now we also have there has also been a lot of public concerns, a lot of things in the docket in the file as well as spoken comments about concerns regarding the export. This is something that we are still looking at and we will have to address just like we are going to have to address all of these comments because in fact we are required as I said multiple times, we are required to address these comments.

Now another thing and especially we hear a lot of this in this area as well as a little further east is disruption of the rural character. This pipeline is going through a lot of rural areas and this area just east of here near New Ipswich as well as through Massachusetts so we are very cognizant of that fact and you know we are trying to look at what is called socio-economic impacts which we will try to sort of quantify these particular impacts on rural character and the rural economies that sort of thing.

Also of course in Massachusetts the concerns are a little different where in eastern Massachusetts we are looking at development through higher density, more suburban, maybe even closer to urban areas so that's another concern and that is something that we have to address and look at very specific instruction techniques and ways to address those comments.

Also of course as I mentioned before cumulative impacts as well as fracking, we are required to do cumulative impact analysis. Again we have heard a lot of concerns in this area about aquifers as well as private wells and of course east of here in New Ipswich concerns about compressor noise as well as emissions. So all of these are things that we will have to address in the environmental impact statement and in fact we will send out the draft as I said for comment and that will allow you to tell us what you think of our analysis if you think you are not happy with it tell us, if you are okay with it fine but if you are critical of it or think that we have done, made the wrong assumptions that's why we come out in that time so that we can get your comments about that, next slide.

Now a little bit about the FERC process, I am going to go through this really, really quickly. As you know we have been in the pre-filing stage now for about a year, actually almost exactly a year I believe and the anticipated application that Kinder Morgan/Tennessee has told us at this point is late October. We will -- even after the application comes in there will be additional questions that we send to the company, in fact we are finalizing some questions this week which we are going to send to the company very soon and it is very likely because right now we do have concerns about the level of information that we have in the current resource reports and we want to make sure that the application has a lot more information in it.

Then of course we will be issuing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement eventually, we will have a comment period for the Draft EIS, we will come out here for meetings, we will then address all of those draft environmental impact comments in our Final EIS, that Final EIS will include recommendations to the Commissioners.

Now those recommendations are recommendations to minimize the impacts and that may include alternative routes so that goes directly to our Commissioners. Our Commissioners vote on the project and in their Order, their Certificate Order, they will either adopt or reject any or all of our conditions, my recommendations, the staff recommendations.

Typically the Commissioners accept most if not all of the recommendations that we give however there have been instances where they have rejected certain ones or the company has already complied with what we would have. So and then for that point there would be the Commission decision and that would be

whether they would vote yes or no for the project and then at that point it would go for re-hearing and then potential court cases if people wanted to continue fighting it, okay.

Next slide please. Now the EIS, what is the EIS. Well it is the environmental report for the document. That is going to explain as best as we possibly can, using the best science that we have and using a rigorous hard look analysis to look at the impacts of the project and compare the alternatives.

Now it is an analytical document. What an analytical document means is that we have to use science to sort of quantify impacts wherever we can and whether 500 people comment on the exact same issue or one, we still have to analyze that so that's -- you need to understand that as well.

Again as I mentioned numerous times the EIS will in fact address environmental issues identified here and written comments that are both specific to the project as well as cumulative. Next slide please.

Okay before we get to the final reminder and start getting to the speakers, there are a couple of things that I do want to point out is that in our Environmental Impact Statement we also talk to a lot of people, not just the public, not just local agencies, we also talk to a lot of state agencies, as well as federal agencies to get their input, because I always say this over and over again is I will never know a project area as well as the people who live here, or the agencies that regulate resources, be they biological, be they water-based in that specific area so that's why it is really important for us to go out and speak to these agencies to make sure that we get their input on this project.

And probably one of the biggest things that I need to point out is that when we do this analysis it is really important that the public gives us information in ways that we can use. The more specific that you can get on your concerns, the better we can address them. I always use the point of yes we recognize and we appreciate the fact that you oppose this project, that's great and we appreciate hearing that comment however the more specific you can give us on your concerns the better we can address it and the better we can avoid those impacts, or mitigate those impacts.

Because if we don't know about something we can't mitigate it or nor can we avoid it. One of the things that has you know for this particular project there is a very low survey access and I know that there's a lot of people here -- there's a lot of people here who have rejected survey access for the company however it is always FERC's position that we want to be able to understand what is on a property because just to let you know projects have been approved by the Commissioners will a significant amount -- without a significant portion of land surveyed.

So we need to understand what is there and so if you -- it is your right and I fully support your right to not allow surveyors on your property, it is your right however if I don't know about this, if my staff does not know about what is on your property we can't avoid it, so if you do not wish to allow surveyors on your property please tell us at least in writing somehow identifying your particular plot of land and telling us not just that you don't want it -- give us information.

If it had to go across your land what would be the least hurtful to you as a person on your property. You know I always tell people don't put all of your eggs in one basket and although you may oppose the project I respect that, but if it were to go nearby or on your property what would be the most acceptable area for you for it to go across.

I know many of you may not want to hear that but it is important for you to realize that if I don't hear from you at all we assume that the pipeline is fine to go across your property so that's very important for you to know. Okay, I understand, I understand but again I have to know, I have to know about these properties - - I have to know about the land before I can actually address impacts and so it is very important for people to know that.

Now the last thing that I want to talk about before meeting reminders, before we go to the decorum is that those of you who have already gotten our notices will be on the mailing list. Most of you may have gotten that and those of you who are on the mailing list you will in fact get a copy of the Draft EIS. Now the default Draft EIS will be coming to you on a CD, if you want a hard copy you need to return that to us and

those of you who are not on our mailing list, please make sure that you sign up in the front so that you can get a copy and if you sign up in front please let them know whether you want a hard copy or a CD copy is fine.

Now obviously those of you who don't want either, the Draft EIS and the Final EIS will be posted on our website very clearly so that you can read it there if you don't want to get a hard copy or a CD.

Now again we are going to go ahead and start the meeting here in a second, start the comments but again when I call your number please come up to the microphone. I want you to speak clearly so the court reporter can get that and this is for both this particular room as well as the other room. The court reporters are using slightly different techniques in each room but it is important that you speak clearly, that you spell your name for the stenographer as well as you know make sure that they understand what you are saying.

Now there will be an enforced time limit. There is going to be three minutes in this room if you do choose to go speak in private you will have four minutes, so you have a little bit longer out there. Now those of you who have been to these meetings before you will know the little stop light that we will have up in the front.

Could you hold that up? You will see there will be this little stop light up here and basically it will be 30 seconds when it turns yellow and then when the red light goes on your time will be up so please when your time is up please leave the podium so the next speaker can come up because we have about 60-some speakers on the list for this room and that will pretty much take us to 11 if not later so please if you -- the quicker you get up to the podium the better.

So again don't interrupt the speaker. Now we are going to go ahead and turn this around here so that you can, so that the speaker will be facing me and we will go ahead and start calling up the first people, thank you.

One last thing I do want to point out that I will be calling as usual elected officials first, then we are going to get to public speakers, okay thank you.

The first speaker will be from Senator Shaheen's Office, Emily Cashman.

MS. CASHMAN: Thank you, my name is Emily Cashman, I am here from Senator Shaheen's Office. Senator Shaheen and her staff have met with constituents and stakeholders about the proposed Kinder Morgan Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline Project and her constituents have raised a number of concerns that warrant consideration by FERC.

While reviewing information relative to the proposed NED Project she expects that FERC will carefully consider the comments of all stakeholders of the impacted communities. Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act she also expects that the Commission will conduct a thorough analysis of all potential impacts of the proposed NED route in New Hampshire as well as all possible alternative routes and configurations that lessen the potential impacts to the region.

It is imperative that New Hampshire residents are provided ample opportunity to participate in the FERC permitting process in a meaningful way. The pre-filing comment period is a critical piece in that process and I trust that the comments made to the docket, that Senator Shaheen's Office has received which we will forward to FERC, along with all New Hampshire comments submitted to the docket will play a key role in your continued analysis of the NED Project, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next we have John Green from Congressman Kuster's Office.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, whereas the Congresswoman is in Washington taking a vote today I have a letter from her, it reads:

Dear Chairman Norman Bay, Thank you for hosting the scoping meeting in my district today. I am grateful for all the efforts that you and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission have made over the course of the preliminary filing for the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline.

The siting for the current preferred route for the NED Pipeline has been a complicated process and the

project has raised a number of concerns among impacted communities here in New Hampshire. I'm an advocate for smart energy policies that protect the public, preserve our environment and lower electricity costs. I have made it a point to visit a number of the sites associated with the route and speak with the town officials and impacted residents.

It's with these experiences in mind that I write you. As the only agency with direct oversight over the siting of natural gas pipelines FERC has a critical process ahead of it. I have appreciated the opportunity to give greater voice to the thoughts of my constituents.

As FERC's preliminary filing period continues and the official filing begins I would ask that you respond to the concerns that many of my constituents have raised. It is the natural beauty and pristine character of our state that provides us with the New Hampshire advantage that many speak of. It is important that any project being proposed in our state help protect that character. I share the concerns of many of my constituents about the environmental impacts that this project may have on existing conservation lands, high priority habitats and drinking water aquifers.

I ask that you take particular care in studying the impact of wetlands and river crossings, private wells, aquifers and habitats of high concern. It is my goal to ensure that the public interest is upheld in this process. It is with the public in mind that I request that you consider the impacts that this project could have on public safety, both because of its proximity to schools, particularly the Temple Elementary School's proximity to the compressor station and because of the limited ability of these small, rural, volunteer-run communities to handle any potential events relating to a pipeline.

I ask that this reality be addressed openly and transparently. My goal, similar to yours is to ensure that we encourage smart energy policies that protect our environment, preserve our way of life and lower electricity prices. I am acutely aware of the regional need for electricity and the plethora of energy projects being proposed to meet that need.

Given the regional nature of our electricity market and the complicated changes that are underway across the region, both with new projects being proposed and older power sources leaving the grid, I believe that FERC can only perform its duties by assessing these projects as a whole instead of in silos.

All options and alternatives must be considered when we look at these proposals and fit them to the needs of our region. Whereas New England is on a regional grid it only stands to reason that we should site these projects and their impact as a region as well.

Given the magnitude of this project and all the projects being considered in the Northeast, I can appreciate the task that your agency has ahead of it. Please know that the record number of comments that this project is receiving is a direct reflection of the time, energy and thoughtfulness that my constituents have put into this process.

I am certain that you will take the same time, energy and thoughtfulness as you review and incorporate their concerns into your work moving forward. It is imperative that this process be as respectful to the public as possible and I will continue my efforts to ensure that happens.

I look forward to your responses in continuing this dialogue as we seek to -- as I seek to advocate on behalf of my constituents, thank you for your time, sincerely, Ann McLane Kuster.

MR. TOMASI: Next Mr. Dave Wheeler and I would like to personally apologize to Mr. Wheeler, I left him out of the meeting last time in Milford, here's your time.

MR. WHEELER: Apology accepted. Just to remind you I am an Executive Counselor, I represent around a quarter million people in the state of New Hampshire and I will speak clearly. I oppose this pipeline and will do all in the power -- I will do all in the power of my office to stop this pipeline from going through New Hampshire.

I want to now repeat what I said in Milford but I have new information regarding state-owned property within the 400 foot study corridor that NED proposes. Those are Rhododendron State Park, Russell State Forest, Russel Abbott State Forest, Cheshire Monadnock Branch Rail Trail, Greenville Branch Rail Trail

and the Mason Rail Trail.

I want the people to know that if this becomes on state land, the chosen route that I as Executive Counselor will oppose any taking of state land for this pipeline. I also want to say just a little bit about the process because this scoping process kind of gets people feeling like well you can change this a little bit, you can change that a little bit but you still have to have it.

So the process itself is a little bit of a farce. And I want to lead with this question, "What will it take for you to stop this pipeline?" I represent a quarter million Granite Staters and I am pleased to tell you tonight Executive Counselor Colin Van Ostern is here and he will give you his thoughts on the pipeline, that's 40% of the voters in the state represented here tonight from the highest elected state office.

In Milford there was one of us, now there is two. Please the only option here is no-build in New Hampshire.

MR. TOMASI: Well that was a good introduction for our next speaker, Mr. Colin Van Ostern?

MR. VAN OSTERN: It was a good introduction but a heck of an act to follow. My name is Colin Van Ostern I represent 4,341 New Hampshire citizens in the town of Winchester as well as another 220,000 citizens across the state and while those -- Dave Wheeler and I know that often we don't agree politically, sometimes local control trumps party politics.

And I share the concerns that he has raised and the concerns that we heard from Congresswoman Kuster and Senator Shaheen's letters as well and I would like to leave a couple of questions that I have heard from constituents who I represent with the Commission and ask them to address them.

First, why is it in the best interest of New Hampshire citizens and United States citizens for a pipeline that goes from Pennsylvania to Massachusetts to come through New Hampshire?

The second, New Hampshire has now officially about a year ago adopted the long-term energy plan for our state, one that focuses on energy efficiency and diversifying away from fossil fuels. How would this proposal be compatible with our official state energy plan?

Third, there is an identified national need for lessening the environmental impact of both fracking and the burning of fossil fuels, how would this pipeline be compatible with both?

And fourth and five, where will the rest of the pipeline get gas that is currently being built for go to and finally why isn't the Environmental Impact Statement being considered now being done in the context of the four other pipelines that are currently being planned in the state of New Hampshire? Thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Next up unfortunately my list does not have state Senators versus Representatives so I am going to call Jim McConnell first.

MR. MCCONNELL: Thank you, hi my name is James W. McConnell, M-c-C-o-n-n-e-l-l, I'm a State Representative, I represent Cheshire 12 which is the towns of Richmond and Swanzi. I have a number of points to make -- first of all the environmental damage that this thing is going to cause on installation is going to be significant. Almost all of the towns that you are going through in the southwestern corner of this state are dependent on wells and the amount of blasting that is going to be required here is likely to screw a lot of them up.

The bottom line is they call this state the Granite State for a reason, it is going to be a problem. Beyond that the longer term problem is that we all rely on aquifers. In the event that there is a spill we have got a whale of a mess it is not going to be easily cleaned up, it is going to be the end of some of these small towns in the event that we do have a spill. You can go beyond that and say that there might be an explosion, great, same thing it is still going to be a hell of a mess.

Finally this is an export pipeline, if you don't believe me believe the Industrial Energy Consumers of America. I just heard the question asked as to where this gas was going to go. It is going to go to the maritime to be exported. The price of natural gas at the moment overseas is much higher than it is in the

domestic market. The bottom line is that unless the south forest field coming out of Iran and I'm sure the Chinese are drilling as we speak, drops that price -- there's a whale of a lot of money to be made by shipping this stuff overseas.

It is going to be very difficult to make the case that it is not an export pipeline. If you don't want to believe me the Industrial Energy Consumers of America attempted to block the Department of Energy from shipping from issuing an export permit for this gas which in May they went ahead and did anyway.

Finally the way Kinder Morgan operates, I have got three letters here that I have sent you that touch on the subject of TBD's that's to be determines and the fact is the way Kinder Morgan operates on this, the sloppier the better apparently. They go with TBD's they change their plans at the last minute and it is extremely difficult for us in the affected area to be able to keep track of it all.

My last letter to you was about a change that the town of Richmond found out about solely by accident on August 17th--August 17th is the date of my letter but it moved through very sensitive environmental areas -- any sort of problem there is going to be a whale of a mess.

The fact is though that TBD's are when used on the scale that TGP does and I will quote my letter it simply means -- are simply a means of avoiding public comments. In addition they foster a sloppy approach of ensuing errors and moving from what was a woodland into all of these environmentally sensitive areas in Richmond was a butte. The bottom line is the town wasn't informed, just that's the way it is going to be, that's not good enough.

And who do I blame for all of this? First I blame FERC, we shouldn't be holding scoping hearings. Two weeks after the scoping hearings began, if it was even that, they dropped a 65 -- Kinder Morgan dropped a 6500 page change in all of their plans on us. The bottom line is if you expect us to respond to this we have to know what they are planning on doing, that's very hard to do given the way they operate so I blame FERC.

I also blame quite frankly our elected senior officials, starting with the Governor, both of our Senators and our Congressmen. The bottom line is they have had 10 months to figure this out, what are they just plain stupid? The bottom line is there is no point in having this thing in New Hampshire, the only thing we get out of this is the honor of hosting it, it's an honor we can do without, the answer for you is to deny the Certificate of Convenience, period.

MR. TOMASI: Next we have Charlene Takesian?

MS. TAKESIAN: My name is Charlene Takesian, my last name is spelled T-a-k-e-s-i-a-n, I'm a State Representative representing the towns of Hudson and Pelham. Hudson has about 30,000 people excuse me and Pelham has about 13,000 so it is about 43,000 people that I represent and I know that you are going to think that I am saying not in my backyard, Pelham is very highly impacted by this pipeline. There is probably 75 houses on the route that are going to be -- they are like directly on the easement for the power lines right now so they will be very highly impacted. We already have a pipeline going through Pelham and we have no access to that pipeline, there is no natural gas in Pelham. We don't expect to get any access to this new pipeline that is going to come through Pelham that will again highly impact us.

But Liberty Utilities has now come to the town of Pelham and said, "Oh, we want to put a takedown station on the Tennessee gas line that is already going through your town," to give us a little carrot to say well we will give you some of the gas from the pipeline. However, the houses in Pelham and it is probably the same case with all these other towns up here are at least 200 feet apart because we have a 200 foot furniture requirement so I can't imagine -- I live a mile from a main road and there are probably 30 houses between me and the main road, I can't imagine that I would ever get gas at my house.

I'm at the top of a hill and again it is the Granite State so there is granite all the way up the hill so although they are dangling this carrot in front of us saying that they are going to supply the town of Pelham with gas, it is just not going to be the case. They may supply some of the schools and the businesses, but it will never be distributed to the town of Pelham it is just impossible.

I want to put a face to the people who are going to be impacted by this, you see this crowd out here, they are all people, they are all impacted, this is their homes and their lives, they have lived in their homes some of them in Pelham 50, 60 years some of them they have inherited from their grandparents, it's their way of life, no one wants a pipeline in their backyard it will impact them forever, they will lose their property value and they will lose their piece of mind.

That's not what we call quality of life in the state of New Hampshire. So I think that is all I have to say but I can't see the need for it, they are trying to create a need, there is no need in Pelham for sure, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next up is Gregory Smith?

MR. SMITH: Good evening I'm State Representative Gregory Smith, that's spelled S-m-i-t-h, I represent the towns of Pelham and Hudson, the same District as Charlene and I am going to say one of the amazing things about New Hampshire and I didn't grow up here I actually grew up in California is that New Hampshire is a place where an average guy like me with a full-time job who is not a lawyer with a couple of kids can become a Representative for the people of this state and so I am not speaking just for myself I am also speaking for the people who live in my town who are going to be greatly impacted by this pipeline and have no benefit from it.

What amazes me is that I look at the overall pipeline projects in the Northeast and I actually do think that we need more natural gas, but you have got a number of pipeline project proposals on the docket right now in front of you proposing to use existing rights-of-ways, expanding existing pipeline capacity that don't require new green field access, they don't require eminent domain on people's land again as Charlene was saying has been in their families for generations, there's no reason to be building this pipeline when there are other alternatives.

Who knows maybe we actually do need Northeast Direct and we will figure that out in 5 or 10 or 20 years but right now this is not needed. The combination of building of adding additional capacity on the existing pipelines and conservation measures should buy us decades of time and we can revisit that in the future. Right now there is no reason to do this, there is no reason to build this pipeline.

Now, unfortunately for Kinder Morgan, Kinder Morgan wants to build this pipeline and make money at it, the other projects down in Connecticut, New York and Massachusetts are Specter it's a different company so obviously they have got a stake in this. At the end of the day this project is not needed.

Second of all and you actually answered the other part of the question with the fact that Kinder Morgan has only picked up about 500 -- a little over a third of the proposed capacity, it's been asked before where is the rest of it going? Well it is going to Canada, it is going to Europe it is completely obvious. Everybody wants to dance around the subject but at the end of the day this is an export pipeline, it is not going to benefit the people of New Hampshire, it is not going to benefit the people of Pelham and Hudson who I represent and it is not going to represent the people behind me who live here in Rindge and New Ipswich and in Fitzwilliam.

I recommend unlike the federal officials who have not actually been willing to take a stand on this which I think is completely obvious to everybody in the room, I say don't build this pipeline, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Next Eric Eastman?

MR. EASTMAN: Chairman Bay and members of FERC, distinguished elected state and local officials, citizens of southern New Hampshire and other concerned parties, my name is Eric Eastman I represent Ward 1, also known as District 28 Hillsborough District, 28 in Nashua, last name is spelled E-a-s-t-m-a-n just like our buddies at Kodak.

Originally I'm a Hollis boy, the next town over. I used to go to school with kids from Hollis, Brookline, two towns that are going to be directly profoundly affected by this should this pipeline go forward so that is where my heart is and I would also by the way publicly like to thank our majority leader from New

Hampshire House of Representatives for being here today, Jack Flanagan, he represents Brookline and I would like to give him a round of applause for him being here so thank you for that.

Until the environmental impact report and proposed routing of this considerable construction project is closer to being finalized and the enumerable number of TBD's or to be determined items are worked out and clarified, these scoping hearings which are purported to serve as a forum for public inquiry and scrutiny and rebuttal and criticism really perhaps ought to be held in temporary abeyance.

The lack of clarity and non-specificity that the preponderance of TBD's and pending route changes creates in Kinder Morgan's NED plans leaves concerned citizens, affected municipalities and New Hampshire business concerns functionally and perpetually in the dark and we are strategically disabled in our ability to accurately assess the many ways our region would be affected adversely or otherwise.

In short it seems fair to me to stage public forums for this kind of reasonable discourse once all parties know what is going on and what it is that they are talking about. One can't help but question whether this information disparity and ongoing obfuscation of key facts that are germane to worthwhile public discourse is being orchestrated by design, one can't help but wonder.

If it were not so I imagine that FERC would ensure that these deadlines for the public forums were extended until affected parties and municipalities had all the facts so that they too can respond to those facts intelligently, you know, the way they do in a representative democracy, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next, Susan Emerson?

MS. EMERSON: Good evening. At the last scoping session my speech was 11 minutes. I have drastically cut it down tonight. For the record my name is Susan Emerson, S-u-s-a-n E-m-e-r-s-o-n. I represent Cheshire County District 11 which is Rindge and Fitzwilliam. I am here to give voice to the overwhelming opposition to this pipeline in Fitzwilliam and Rindge. Thank you -- you are no doubt aware of the high rate of refusal to the survey access in these towns and across most of New Hampshire. I am blessed with very intelligent and well-informed constituents and this project is not welcome here.

For excellent reasons that you have received thousands upon thousands of comments submitted on Docket No. PF14-22-000. This project offers nothing of value to my District but it carries so much liability that it is my duty as an elected representative to oppose it.

While I am aware of FERC's constraints, there are no good reasons that FERC should approve every large commercial energy project that comes before it. Denial of Kinder Morgan's application for the Northeast Energy District Project would be a good first step in regaining some of the public trust that your Commission has clearly lost.

I urge the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to reject Kinder Morgan's application for this unwanted and unnecessary project, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: I believe that was the last State Representative, next we have Patricia Martin, after Patricia Martin we have Tad Putney.

MS. MARTIN: Patricia Martin, M-a-r-t-i-n, Rindge Energy Commission. I would like to draw your attention to the unprecedented plans for financing this pipeline project. I don't believe the majority of electric ratepayers in New England are aware of that plan and I wonder how the FERC process will include their interests.

Electric ratepayers are being asked to accept the tariff through the utilities to reserve capacity on the pipeline which the utilities through some mechanism to be determined will then sell to electric power generators and quite likely to exporters. This contract is expected to extend for 20 years. The statements by the New England Power Generators Association and Unitil regarding the pipelines are summarized in a report released by the New Hampshire Public Utility staff in Docket IR15-124 dated September 14th.

The power generators -- the folks who will theoretically buy that gas from the utilities do not support these proposals. They didn't want to take the risk for buying that gas and they don't think ratepayers should have to either. Currently New England generates 50% of its electricity with just one billion cubic feet per

day of natural gas fired generation.

By adding more than 1 billion cubic feet per day the current plans call for much more than that, more than 2 billion cubic feet per day, New England can produce 100% of its electricity with natural gas, think about it, 100% increase in pipeline capacity to address a 1.2% supply problem for a single fuel source.

How can this be a good thing for New England's economy? Natural gas will have a monopoly on electricity generation while ratepayers take all the risks. Moreover, the entire electricity pricing crisis has been largely manufactured for the benefit of the pipeline companies and utilities with a financial interest in the pipelines.

I mapped the data from the EIA.gov website into a graphic representation of New England's all sectors retail prices versus the U.S. average. In general retail prices for electricity have ranged somewhere between 14 and 16 cents per kilowatt hour from 2006 through 2014. Note that retail prices in New England have been consistently 40 to 65% higher than the national average since at least 2001.

Where were these pipeline proposals in 2008 when prices peaked? The danger of lost fuel diversity not only puts us at risk for financial disaster, but also to loss of grid reliability. With all of our eggs in one basket what could possibly go wrong? The pipeline companies are the only guaranteed winners if these projects go through. Liberty utilities and Berkshire Gas have also made investments in the pipeline and will share in a steady revenue stream whether or not a single dekatherm of gas is used to generate electricity -- all paid for of course by New England's ratepayers.

Finally, since Kinder Morgan has so cleverly co-located its pipeline path along the powerlines why can't they use electric-powered pumps to their compressor stations, metering stations and pigging stations to avoid emissions in residential neighborhoods from operating gas-powered pumps?

Further since Kinder Morgan totes its support of renewable energy, why not source the power with large solar installations? Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on a matter of great concern to the people of New England.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up we have Tad Putney.

MR. PUTNEY: My name is Tad Putney, that's P-u-t-n-e-y. I represent the many towns of the New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition and wish to provide comments on two items. The first has to do with potential easement language for the pipeline. Our towns are very concerned that if approved the pipeline could at some point in the future not be needed to transport dry, natural gas and would then be available for the transportation of other liquids.

Some such liquids could be very hazardous. In order to protect the potentially impacted New Hampshire communities, the New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition requests that FERC require Kinder Morgan to include language in any and all easements within New Hampshire that strictly limits the easement for the use of dry natural gas only in the pipeline.

The second item involves streets that would potentially be cut off from emergency services in the event of a pipeline incident while the probabilities of such an event may be small it is critical that we plan for the worst.

The New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition requests that FERC require Kinder Morgan to develop plans with the emergency services departments of any New Hampshire town with roads that could be cut off from emergency personnel in the event of such an incident. The plan in each town would detail how residents will be reached and evacuated in the event of such an incident where the existing road to them is impassable, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next we have Roberta Oeser.

MS. OESER: Hello Eric, my name is Robert Oeser, it's O-e-s-e-r, I'm a Selectman here in Rindge. Now that you have come to our beautiful area of New Hampshire can you see why we don't want the pipeline here? I want to thank you for having the scoping session in Rindge, I have a question, why is a Massachusetts pipeline going through New Hampshire? The benefit to our state is absolutely minimal while the

benefit to southern New England, Connecticut and Massachusetts is great.

Seeking an alternate route closer to the greater need only makes sense. When I last spoke in Nashua it was for all towns in the coalition. Tonight I'm addressing real concerns to Rindge. Although all towns share in the very real worries about the potential sorry -- catastrophic impact to our most precious of natural resources, our lifeblood, our water supply.

The vast majority of homes and businesses in the proposed path of the pipeline are supplied with private water from wells. In Rindge, it is 100%. In the last release of the Kinder Morgan impact study they stated that only five wells were near it. Impossible there is at least 200 that are close to it, there is over 2,000 water wells in Rindge so it is an absurd number.

And it's why I am extremely concerned. If a company that is planning on laying waste to our towns have no concept of the damage that can be done to the wells and water supply with blasting the lateral drilling at a considerable distance, what guarantee do we have that they will even be able to continue to live in our homes?

They have no concept that this is the Granite state. When Kinder Morgan was asked about the potentially damaged wells the calloused answer was, "We are insured". In order to absolutely protect our community I ask that if this project is approved that Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas must provide for quality and quantity testing of all wells within 300 feet of the project and they must abide by local blasting ordinances to protect the property along the corridor, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you next up is Suzanne Gray, after Suzanne Gray is Nancy Nye.

MS. GRAY: Good evening my name is Suzanne Gray actually, S-u-z-a-n-n-e and the last name is G-r-a-y like the color with an "a". Thank you so much for letting us speak here tonight. I am currently serving on the Fitzwilliam Planning Board and I have done so for the past 12 years and I am also Chair of the Fitzwilliam Economic Development Committee and I am here to ask FERC to please review the siting of this proposed pipeline in conjunction with other pipeline projects in New England as we have heard from previous speakers, I agree wholeheartedly with them and also please require an assessment of the un-monetized externalities that are affected.

This is well within FERC's jurisdiction under your current policy statement. When I speak of un-monetized externalities, I am referring to things such as pollution, noise, impact on plants and wildlife, watershed and view shed impacts, land takings, eco-system impacts, climate change impacts and any potential impacts on human health.

In 2006 and 2007 Fitzwilliam had a town-wide questionnaire and a day long forum meeting for our residents and our landowners where we asked the question what makes Fitzwilliam special? How do residents define rural character of our town and what locations in town would residents most want to preserve as open space?

Teams were assembled and by 2011 they created natural resource inventory and the open space plan, copies of which I have here for you if you would like to have them. So what they said in the open space plan, they had five highest priority locations chosen by our residents to be preserved, three of those five are directly in the path of the proposed pipeline they are Rockwood Pond Watershed, Gap Mountain lowlands, and Little Monadnock Mountain.

The recommendation in the National Resources Inventory includes maintaining a 75 foot buffer zone of undisturbed land around all bodies of water which is also part of our wetlands protection overlay district in Fitzwilliam, part of our zoning ordinances. How can this project ignore our state and local land ordinances? How can you do this -- just ignore all the things that we have on the books, all of the things that we have determined to help us keep our rural character and help us keep our water clean?

My request to FERC is to examine the un-monetized external impact to wildlife, loss of undisturbed hiking trails, destruction to Scott Pond, our eco-systems and conservation lands. The Fitzwilliam Open Space Plan also lists our forested and agricultural lands as areas to be protected. The pipeline is mapped to tra-

verse all of these important areas in Fitzwilliam.

We also have a 20 historic homes within a half mile of the pipeline route and 5 of those historic homes are within 300 feet of the pipeline. These examples of un-monetized costs are in Fitzwilliam but they are actually in every single town that is represented here tonight. I am just speaking about them about Fitzwilliam but they are across our entire state and I ask that FERC determine the best solution by examining the new construction projects in New England with existing infra-structure and give strong consideration to those un-monetized costs.

We must protect this land. We are only stewards here and we must protect this land for future generations, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next as I said Nancy Nye, after Nancy is Dennis Eklof.

MS. NYE: My name is Nancy Nye, N-y-e. I have been a resident of Fitzwilliam for over 50 years it took my husband and me three years to find the perfect house and the town to raise our children in. In the last year and a half I have put more than \$100,000 into the house, this includes a new roof, a bathroom and a kitchen.

A few years after we bought our house, the Vermont Yankee atomic power plant took an acre of our land to put their powerlines through. There was always a hum and a glowing at night around the lines.

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am can I interrupt you for a second? Are you speaking on behalf of Fitzwilliam or on behalf of yourself?

MS. NYE: Myself.

MR. TOMASI: Okay this is for people speaking on behalf of the towns, I'm sorry I know you said you are the ballot clerk, is everyone okay to let her finish? Okay, forget that I just wanted to make sure, go ahead.

MS. NYE: Okay, they really sizzle when there is any dampness in the air and during electrical storms they draw the lightning towards them. My house is in the direct route of the proposed gas pipeline as it follows the power line. I have been told by Kinder Morgan representatives that they do not take houses. Their solution is that shortly before my house they will jog under the existing power line and then jog back out after they pass my house.

It is my understanding that the gas pipeline had to be at least 50 feet from any electrical powerline. In the meantime they will have to remove all of the organically grown apple and pear trees, the blueberry bushes that my husband has been growing since he was in high school and flower beds that have been in existence since before we moved into the house.

Not only will all of this disappear but my septic and well will also be gone. So that I will not be disturbed during this process they will build me an earthen berm four feet from my house down the entire length of it, which is approximately 125 feet long. When construction is over they will replace the berm with a fence and what will this look like, like the fence along 91 down in Connecticut?

I have a letter from a realtor that I would like to read. It says, "Dear Mrs. Nye, as you know I inspected your home several months ago in an attempt to establish its fair market value. I was prepared to evaluate it based on the traditional method of comparing it to similar properties that have been sold in the recent period of time, however, we discussed in depth the proposed Kinder Morgan Pipeline.

As I understand it their plans in relation to your property would utilize the existing public service of New Hampshire easement and perhaps an expansion of that easement. As I recall the easement for PSNH literally goes through your property. If you were to put the house on the market you would of course disclose the possibility of the pipeline coming.

I am not sure that anyone knowing that would want to buy your home except for a fire sale price. I know that you have put quite a bit of money into renovations fairly recently but I am afraid that if the pipeline does come through you would have a hard time recouping the cost of improvements let along selling the house. I am sorry to be the bearer of bad news, let me know if I can be of further help, very truly yours,

Mark Teeter, President Teeter Realty.

You have the power to take my house by eminent domain. I ask that there be more environmental studies done or to consider an existing pipeline route or one that does not take privately owned land by eminent domain, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you.

MR. EKLOF: My name is Dennis Eklof, D-e-double “n”-i-s E-k-l-o-f as in Frank. I am a resident of Groton, I represent the Northeast Municipal Gas Pipeline Committee that represents about 10 towns in north-east Massachusetts.

I’m also a PhD energy economist with 45 years in the energy business most of which was consulting with companies and government agencies on energy markets and infrastructure development. I am not going to try to recap the thousands of pages of documents that I have analyzed about this pipeline, I have been at it for about a year and a half.

What I am going to try to do is put a little perspective on that totality of information overload. We are being told by pipeline proponents that this pipeline is going to avoid a “energy crisis” in New England, that it is going to lower our utility rates, that it is going to provide construction jobs, that it is going to spur industrial development in New England and it is going to do all of this with a minimal impact on the environment and our quality of life.

Unfortunately those proponents are the ones with the big buck budgets for PR, they are the ones that can advertise and set up shell corporations that are “independent analysts of the issues” so where do we go. On the opposition side there are a group of companies who will also make money if the pipeline isn’t built. Renewable energy developers, that sounds like a good thing to me, certainly GDF, the LNG importer in New England, but the biggest opposition comes from all of you and similar groups in Massachusetts who without resources, without financial backing have managed to mount a pretty stiff opposition to this pipeline.

Now I said I wasn’t going to try to summarize all of the stuff that I have studied but a very recent study I did want to mention and I will come to the reason for it in a minute, was completed only last month by a well-respected energy economics consulting company in the Boston area, it was done under commission to GDF, LNG importer.

It concluded that this pipeline if you take into account the pipeline expansions that are already planned and approved, the alternative energy projects that are going ahead, we don’t need the pipeline, we have sufficient capacity to meet New England’s energy needs for at least a decade.

It further concluded that if NED is approved there is a very high risk that we, electricity rate-payers, will be subsidizing the export of natural gas. We will bear the risk, we will subsidize it through the tariff structure that has already been talked about and Kinder Morgan will make all of the money.

Now the second study that I want to mention only briefly is one that I did independently myself, well over a year ago. I looked at all of the information that was coming out and did my own analysis which is what I did for a living for decades and I came to roughly the same conclusions that the new study came to, this pipeline is not needed.

So where are we? All of these folks here have objected to this pipeline because of environmental reasons, et cetera and there is certainly other reasons to consider for example the long-term economics of this pipeline are predicated on a long-term supply of low-cost gas coming out of Marcellus and related supplies. I don’t know whether you have looked lately but oil prices are way down and some of the shale development companies are going broke and DOE itself forecasts that next year there will be a decline in shale oil production in the United States because of this, so where is the long-term gas supply coming from?

So we can only hope that the Commissioners at FERC can satisfy their historic, biased words approving every major energy infrastructure that comes before them and give a more balanced look at the overstated benefits and under-estimated costs, risks and economic impacts of this pipeline, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up is Sean Radcliffe, after Mr. Radcliffe is John Kieley.

MR. RADCLIFFE: Good evening, my name is Sean Radcliffe, S-e-a-n R-a-d-c-l-i-f-f-e. I'm with the Temple Conservation Commission, my words are going to follow what Pat Martin had mentioned earlier about rates, ratepayers and actually follow-up with Dennis Eklof from Groton just mentioned about a study, it actually was my position as well.

There is a lot of PR that is saying that the new gas pipelines are going to reduce electric and natural gas rates, well a few weeks ago a company names skipping stone released a report stating no additional gas pipelines are needed, moreover additional pipelines would not be cost effective to ratepayers, this is a study that Mr. Eklof I believe who mentioned the Skipping Stone report states, and I quote, "The most important fact to remember about New England's gas problem is that it is a deep winter, peak demand deliverability problem, not a year-round capacity crisis," as a result building more gas pipelines which would supply a year-round supply of gas, whether it is needed or not is simply not a cost-effective solution.

The report demonstrates using imported LNG, during deep winter demand is cheaper for ratepayers. The Skipping Stone solution addresses the problem without increasing rates, adding the unnecessary and expensive infrastructure or taking people's private property. The Skipping Stone study proves there is no real need for this pipeline in New England, the only value of this pipeline is for those who want to export LNG to Europe.

I have the Skipping Stone report I am going to supply it, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you so much. Next up is Mr. Kieley after John is Susan Silverman.

MR. KIELEY: My name is John Kieley, K-i-e-l-e-y, the town of Temple. The first thing that I would like to do is to read into the record a letter from our Senator, Andy Sanborn, I'll go through this very quickly.

"Thank you for giving me the opportunity to have John Kieley read my letter for the record as I am out of state and unable to be present for this meeting. I also appreciate the many meetings with representatives from all entities involved in this proposed pipeline and I look forward to a continuing open dialogue where we can discuss the concerns residents have and the solutions to ensure we protect this great state and the people in it.

Nevertheless I do want to comment on this matter tonight before FERC due to the significant potential impact on the residents in the district and to all of those who enjoy the natural beauty of New Hampshire. This project is projected to cross miles of our most conserved, pristine, traditional land in this wonderful state and the prospect of disturbing this habitat is alarming and not necessary.

The fact that to accomplish this task people will be vacated from their homes against their will only adds insult to all of those who treasure traditional New Hampshire values. Acknowledging that you will hear much tonight concerning many existing issues and challenges which need to be addressed prior to a meaningful consideration of a project like this.

I wish to focus my comments on the fundamental need to protect people from eminent domain as authorized by your agency. Frankly there is no more precious -- nothing more precious than the right of people to safety own and manage their land, free of the fear that their government will come and take it away. The concept of a government empowered to take a legislative proxy, their home -- defies the most basic sanctity of rights of people in America.

To protect individual and property rights New Hampshire has worked hard to create a fair level process where projects like this can and should be given robust consideration through existing legislative intent and the recently enacted Site Evaluation Committee. There continues to be confusion as to what role, if any, the New Hampshire SEC plays in this project and I do believe FERC needs to clearly confirm if it intends to fully and faithfully comply with the SEC process, findings and recommendations.

I am formally requesting that FERC publically state to what extent it will support and follow recommendations put forth through the SEC and under what conditions if any it may choose to pre-empt local statutes. Clarification of FERC's position on this issue will help New Hampshire residents better understand

to what extent the federal government and its regulating agencies will respect New Hampshire laws.

I believe that is incumbent upon FERC to clearly express its position on this critical issue, thank you for your time,” State Senator Andy Sandborn.

I would like to make some brief comments relative specifically to the town of Temple. The 41,000 horsepower compressor station planned for the town of New Ipswich would be one-quarter of a mile from the town of Temple’s elementary school and in close proximity to dozens of Temple residences, farms, our large aquifer and the reservoir for the town of Greenville. At the scoping meeting in Milford many local residents offered comments about the inappropriateness of locating such a facility, a compressor station on this site.

Since that scoping session Kinder Morgan has held information sessions for the public where they have unveiled new renderings which showed the compressor station even closer to our school. While Kinder Morgan’s FERC filings provide no information regarding the types and the levels of toxins, carcinogens and particulate matter that this compressor station will not might -- will emit, studies from both Pennsylvania and New York show that some 187 different chemicals will be emitted and that the volume will total hundreds of tons per year.

The known impacts on human health of these chemicals range from nosebleeds and dizziness to liver damage and various cancers. It is unacceptable and un-American to subject our residents and particularly our school children to known health hazards, particularly when these emissions will be regular occurrences from this compressor station.

This project is not about bringing energy to New Hampshire, it is about bringing fracked gas to Maine and the Maritimes for export. It just happens that in order for Kinder Morgan to use eminent domain and be able to pollute the air we breathe, they need to have a partner with a distribution company to fabricate a local need under the FERC rules.

They have found a willing partner in Liberty Utilities here in New Hampshire and rewarded them with a 400 million dollar investment in this project. The residents of southern New Hampshire are simply in the way of corporate greed. FERC needs to view this -- FERC needs to view this as the sham that it is and deny this application, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: After Susan Silverman is Terry Silverman.

MS. SILVERMAN: My name is Susan Silverman, I am on the Board of Selectmen for the Town of Fitzwilliam. Tonight I speak for Nancy Kerney, our Fire Chief and Director of Emergency Management as well as Deputy Chief William Priggy.

Collectively they have served our town and our region with over 50 years of experience in fire-fighting and emergency services. They meet with adjoining towns and came up with these concerns and I want to say at first that I don’t think this is a good project for Fitzwilliam, the town has come out very clearly against it but these are concerns that we want to make sure get entered into the record so during construction what is your emergency response plan?

When will we receive a copy of it? Will Kinder Morgan be installing an active Co2 or passive fire suppressions system? Will Kinder Morgan install gas leak detectors at the compressor station if one is installed in the town? Will you provide and pay for the initial and ongoing training for all first responders, police, fire, ambulance, emergency management and highway?

How often will training take place? Is there a point at which training would end? If so what is this point? Will Kinder Morgan supply emergency responding personnel with pipeline safety education to the level of technician training in accordance to meet or exceed OSHA 1910.120? Are you providing trench rescue and confined space rescue training for all personnel along the pipeline corridor?

Is there a maximum number of personnel you will train all currently employed and/or volunteer workers be trained? What kind of special protective gear is needed for first responders at an incident? Please list any and all specific equipment? Will Kinder Morgan provide and maintain it or replace it if damaged as

long as it is needed? How many personnel would respond from Kinder Morgan in the case of an incident? What security monitoring would be implemented during the construction along the length of the pipeline? Alarms, fences, manpower, cameras and patrols?

How many systems? Who will monitor them? Where will tapes and images be kept? How long will they be kept? Who will assess them? Will the information be available to all departments? What access will emergency responders have to the pipeline and compressor stations? Will they have access 24 hours a day, 7 days a week? If not, how will access be conducted and by who and who will be the immediate contact?

Will Kinder Morgan provide an ATV or like vehicle for access to the pipeline by emergency responders? Will we have keys to unlock newly installed gates or other restrictions at the Ever Source right-of-way and Kinder Morgan right-of-way to have emergency access?

Will evacuation routes be maintained during construction? What plans are there for the town due to the fact that three major evacuation routes out of town are crossing over the pipeline during construction? How often will meetings with the compressor pipeline operator or designate be held? How often will you supply a detailed site plan?

Will Kinder Morgan provide medical equipment for a mass casualty incident? What is the plan to protect the pipeline from a soft terrorism threat? Will Kinder Morgan provide a messaging system for notification of an incident or training including message boards? How is the lack of 24 hour police coverage going to be addressed? We don't have that.

Fire Department and EMS Services are call departments with minimal manpower during the daytime, this needs to be addressed. Will Kinder Morgan maintain road access to the compressor stations and the pipeline? This would include snow removal and roadway maintenance and upkeep so that emergency vehicles can respond.

What will the state involvement be in an incident? Who will be contacting the state departments in case of an incident? Where is the closest service field rep located and what is the response time to any individual town? Where does funding come from to reimburse for emergency response including alarm activations and full-blown incidents? How soon is it available?

Will Kinder Morgan be paying for security details for surveyors and workers during the initial phases of the project? Access for emergency agencies into homes and neighborhoods that have only one way in and out -- this is a particular concern for our town and many others I believe -- the fact is the pipeline will be directly under the only access to these places.

Warning system locations -- how are they activated and what is the time lapses for activities? And then there is basically all of the items that I just read are also important during the actual operation should this happen which I'm not in favor of but -- in addition to that what plans are there for the town due to the fact that three major evacuation routes out of town are crossing over the pipeline?

With both the primary and secondary emergency shelters being within the hot zone, in case of an incident what will Kinder Morgan do to mitigate the situation and relocate the shelter out of the hot zone? Actually both of our shelters -- our primary shelter and the secondary one are within that route and we don't have -- I mean we looked hard to find places in our town and we don't have like extra buildings for shelter.

And there are a few comments for decommissioning. What is the time-frame for the use of the pipeline and what is the process for decommissioning the pipeline? What are the phases of decommissioning the pipeline and the timeframe for each phase? What are the long-term environmental emergencies for the decommissioning of the pipeline and what happens to the pipeline and all equipment following the decommissioning?

At the last two hearings actually I mostly spoke about water resources which is a major concern. There are alternatives for energy which people have already mentioned but there really aren't any alternatives for property loss and the loss of water resources, please turn this project down.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you next up is Terry Silverman, after Terry Silverman is Jennifer Daler.

MR. SILVERMAN: My name is Terry Silverman, S-i-l-v-e-r-m-a-n and I'm a 30 year member of the Fitzwilliam Planning Board, being a slow learner. I am current Chairman and a member of the New Hampshire Municipal Pipeline Coalition.

FERC Docket PL-99-3-000 issued September 15, 1999 states the Commission's goals are to appropriately consider goal one, enhancement of competitive alternatives. When considering the NED proposal will FERC take into account no-build options such as the Portland Natural Gas transmission system that ends in Dracut, Mass. and achieves the increased supply by increasing the compression upstream?

When considering the NED proposal will FERC consider the expansion of the Spectra line? Goal two, the possibility of over-building an infrastructure -- will FERC consider the dwindling resource of the Marcellus plate as outlined by the town of Step Stone of oilpro.com and it quotes the production of the Marcellus is in fact breaking down.

Will FERC consider the Constitution Pipeline to connect NED to the Marcellus plate has not yet been approved making this a segmented project for which I believe you are under lawsuit.

Goal three the avoidance of any unnecessary disruption of environment -- those FERC questioned the assumption that NED is co-located when it is in fact a Greenfield Project. Co-location intends to locate a project along an existing corridor to less the environmental impact. How does NED, Kinder Morgan achieve this given the number of wetlands, private wells, aquifers, vernal pools, streams, rivers and the numerous headwaters it affects?

Given the low expectations of FERC for mitigation cited in the Robert Bailey study of 1999 and the lower success rate of those lower standards and projects how can FERC justify the approval of any decay in pipeline? Given the geological structure of New Hampshire resting as it does on the African tectonic plate which has generous amounts of wetlands and granite, how can FERC oversee the mitigation and problems that any project presents.

New Hampshire Office of Economic Planning has requested from towns a smart growth report of how the state is doing implementing the principles outlined in New Hampshire RSA 9B which states, "Smart growth also means the development and the use of land in such a manner that it is physical, visual or audible consequences are appropriate to the traditional and historic New Hampshire landscape.

Smart growth preserves the integrity of open space and agriculture forested and under-developed land." How does the NED project adhere to his law? Our goal is to prevent the unneeded exercise of eminent domain. If NED were truly a co-located project the need for taking of private and public lands would not be necessary and FERC justifies the taking of so many parcels for a private for-profit use.

New Hampshire RSA 674-34 outlines and codifies property owner's vested rights. This NED Project PF14-22 does not come close to meeting any of FERC's own goals for an appropriate project. No amount of compensation to communities or individuals will make up for the loss of sensible use of local lands and resources.

I urge FERC to deny the NED Project as unnecessary and it will be adverse in its effects.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up is Jennifer Daler and after that is Bob Hamilton.

MS. DALER: Hi I'm Jennifer Daler, D-a-l-e-r, I'm with the Temple Ad Hoc Pipeline Advisory Committee of the town of Temple and in thinking about my comments today I am drawn back to Secretary Kerry's comments many years ago basically asking FERC how can you ask the people of southern New Hampshire as well as the people of Massachusetts, New York and Pennsylvania to take the risk of the -- to be the last to take the risk of such an infrastructure construction when fossil fuels are on their way out?

They are not of the future, they are of the past and how can you ask us to take the risks, have the land disrupted and have families disrupted, children's health put at risk as well as the risk of explosions and other things that come with gas pipelines now when we are on our way hopefully towards a renewable future, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up is Bob Hamilton, after Bob Hamilton is Carol Jameson.

MR. HAMILTON: I am Bob Hamilton, Robert A. Hamilton, H-a-m-i-l-t-o-n and I am a resident and the Chairman of the Board of Selectman of the Town of Rindge. I am here to testify on behalf of myself and of the majority of the residents of Rindge. Our opposition to Kinder Morgan, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, NED Pipeline Project is for our concern about the following:

Our wildlife, our wetlands, our streams, our plant life, our ground water, our wells, our land, our air quality, our town roads, our highways, our scenery, our serenity, our costs, our capabilities, our safety, our need, our benefits, our compensation into our property.

While this might not be a complete list there are points that have been brought -- these are points that have been brought to my attention, I will just briefly touch upon these concerns as I know that there were more adequately trained individuals that will expand on these topics tonight.

Our wildlife -- the worry of fragmentation of habitats, the protection of some rare and threatened species.

Our wetlands -- disruption of possible permanent alteration to the land in and around these 17 impacted wetlands in Rindge, our streams -- erosion and resulting alterations of the stream channels in the five impacted streams.

Our plant life -- an invasive species may overwhelm and overtake the impacted native species. Our ground water -- risks of contamination. Our wells, there is no possible way to guarantee the safety of our wells from damage, pollution or contamination.

Pollutants and contaminants will be present during and after the construction project. There has been no assurance that natural gas would be the only product transported in this pipeline. This town is entirely dependent on well water. Our land -- mitigation plans and efforts could never return affected lands to their original state.

Our air quality -- during and after construction there is no question that local air quality will be impacted. Our town roads and our highways, increased traffic flow and transportation of hazardous materials and damage from heavy construction equipment.

Our scenery -- this speaks for itself. The resulting scar from the construction will never fully heal. Our serenity -- while it has already been disrupted the construction period will be a constant headache. Our costs -- repairs to our roads and highways, legal bills and extended training for first responders will just be the tip of the iceberg of our costs.

Our capabilities in Rindge with a police force of 7, a volunteer fire department and our proximity to rescue and medical services makes us extremely vulnerable. This meeting alone has stressed the capabilities of our community. Our safety -- I'm not even allowed enough time to get into this topic, I would need for Rindge, our region, in the state of New Hampshire there is absolutely no need for this project.

Our benefits -- none, our compensation, the promise of local tax payments from Kinder Morgan which will legally be contested year after year after year, beyond that we get no compensation. Our property, this is our property not Kinder Morgan's, not FERC's and not the U.S. government's property and it should stay that way.

Finally this entire process reminds me of what President Reagan once said, the 9 most terrifying words in the English language are: I'm from the government and I am here to help, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up we have Carol Jameson, after Carol is David Drouin.

MS. JAMESON: My name is Carol Jameson, J-a-m-e-s-o-n, I'm the Chair of the Select Board of Richmond. Our town overwhelmingly opposes the pipeline for many of the reasons that you have heard here tonight. I am going to reference some of our town concerns with respect to the route as it goes through Richmond.

Wildlife -- the pipeline crosses directly through two large areas classified by New Hampshire Fish and Game as "highest ranked wildlife habitat by ecological condition." Each is approximately one and a half

miles long, one on the Winchester border to the west, the other just east of Fish Hatchery Road.

The pipeline will bisect both of these critical habitats and disrupt wildlife movement. Water -- the proposed pipeline passes over a series of vernal and permanent ponds and streams as well as you know the major aquifer that services Richmond, Swanzi and Keene. We have many concerns about the impact on our drinking water and the impact on the wetland habitat.

As you have heard from many other towns tonight all of Richmond's residents' water supplies come from wells or springs. We have identified more than 19 residential wells within a quarter mile of the buffer zone, we don't suspect that this is a complete inventory but we know at least of these.

Brook and stream crossings include many which are classified as high-quality tributaries and wild trout water. These include Brick Yard Brook and Tilsey T-il-s-e-y Brook, both of which feed directly into Roaring Brook which supports cold water fish assemblage, including wild brook trout and cask, Rice and Fall Brooks running into Martin Brooks support wild trout and sliming sculpin.

The route also impacts local residential ponds including Sandy Pond within a thousand feet of the pipeline which has a camp on the pond, Cask Pond, Larry's Pond as well as Sprayed Brook which is classified as an outstanding riparian and riverine wetlands complex. In the past herbicide use upstream from Sandy Pond along the power line route had caused pollution of pond. Herbicides are therefore no longer used. Our concern about impact on our water supply includes ancillary impacts such as the consequences if herbicides are used in maintenance of the right-of-way.

Land -- the route in Richmond as in most of our area traverses extremely rough and hilly terrain, a series of hills and valleys, granite ledges, steep slopes. We have concern about the impact of blasting on streams, wetlands, streams and wells, animal and plant life, the foundations of houses in close proximity.

The pipeline is currently proposed to cross three protected conservation lands in Richmond including the Quint Preserve, Doswood and Rhododendron State Park. Historic buildings -- Richmond has numerous historic homes located within the pipeline route and buffer zone. It is our understanding that Federal Heritage Law requires a section 106 review to be done. To our knowledge and after doing with other towns we are not aware of any such review being in progress as no inquiries have been addressed to the town to elicit the required information.

We have problems with process and specific issues with Kinder Morgan. One -- Kinder Morgan has failed to propose re-routes among our residents which have not been filed with FERC and which therefore have no official existence. These proposed re-routes raise entirely new issues but there is no venue in which to raise these concerns except privately with Kinder Morgan.

The unofficial proposed re-route through Scott Mountain Road in Richmond raises serious concerns about the impact on residents and historic sites, whereas these concerns are not present in the official route which is currently on file. We find this very frustrating. We continue to have specific problems with the conduct of Kinder Morgan specifically in areas of communication and in areas complying with the instructions and requests of our residents.

The most recent incident regards communications between Martha Hezinsky of Kinder Morgan and Martha's no regard of Richmond, his home is directly on the pipeline path. Four individuals surveyed Mr. Beaurigard's property this weekend in spite of his public refusal to allow surveyors on his property, delivered by certified mail to Kinder Morgan and filed with FERC some time ago.

And in spite of his on-going conversations with Miss Hezinsky which repeated his denial and in which they had another call scheduled for this Monday but the surveying happened over the weekend so thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next is David Drouin.

MR. DROVIN: David Drouin, the town of Rindge, D-r-o-u-i-n. First of all from the town of Rindge, welcome FERC to Rindge, welcome to our neighbors to the south and our surrounding towns, thank you for your assistance. We love joining up with our other regional conservation commissions in this fight. It is

very important to make sure and do a little shopping before you leave town, don't just drive through, okay. The Rindge Conservation Commission opposes the NED Pipeline because of the threat to the natural resources from all of southwest New Hampshire. In Rindge we use water from private and public wells, we have no water coming -- falling into town. Any water we get falls from the sky and is stored underground or it flows downstream of town. We treasure our water in Rindge.

One of our conservation properties owned by the town is a future water source. A property we pay a mortgage on, that we pay to have an easement on to forever protect it. What good is this easement or any future easement if a private company is allowed to violate it? What will the future of conservation be in New Hampshire if the lands that we value the most to protect are able to be forever changed by the interest of a private corporation?

What incentive will any private landowner have to protect their land or to donate it to a town if their wishes for permanent protection can be set aside for the latest commercial project? This project is not needed, gains in solar and wind sources combined with consumption efficiency gains and a repair of leakage from current pipelines in New England can more than meet the expected increase in energy needs.

This pipeline is not needed, does not benefit the area, threatens our natural resources, does not get us away from fossil fuels, is a bad idea plain and simple and to steal a phrase, "We the people do not need, we the people will not benefit from, we the people do not want this pipeline," thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Next up is Jan Griska.

MR. GRISKA: My name is Jan Griska, J-a-n G-r-i-s-k-a, I'm with the Rindge Conservation Commission and I would like to open my comments by saying that few people realize that while New Ipswich is the only town that is facing a compressor station at the moment that if gas volumes increase on this pipeline we all would get a compressor station. Okay, that said I will start my comments.

I was first exposed to compressor stations in Bradford, Pennsylvania. They are used as gathering points for gas wells and Marcellus shale. I off-road, I enjoy that area, a compressor station in the environment is about the size of a one car garage okay. The compressor is driven by a large diesel engine, my guess would be no larger than 5 or 600 horsepower but I'm told they can be as pick as 1500 horsepower.

Increased power means more noise. You can hear them, the small ones a mile away when you are in the woods, okay. My experience in Bradford caused me to look at the compressor stations as they will be used in the proposed NED Pipeline. Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline one day were proposing a 36 inch pipeline, we are talking about a compressor station which would use compressors driven by as much as 98,000 horsepower. Because diesels can't produce that kind of power, jet engines are used to power the compressors.

Then because of the lack of customers in New Hampshire they dropped the pipeline's diameter to 30 inches which better than half the power requirements for the New Ipswich compressor station, approximately 43,000 horsepower, can you imagine what that noise is like?

What Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Pipeline haven't told people here along the pipeline route is once they have their foot in the door there is no stopping them. Do you know as demand for gas pipeline goes up, export demand in Europe et cetera, they will have to add more compressor stations. The next compressor station could well be your backyard.

Okay, assuming Kinder Morgan Tennessee Gas Pipeline gets their foot in the door they will then have free reign to add more pipelines to our energy corridor, they can and will change the content of the pipes, they have on your property -- and please research natural gas liquids on the net because they can turn around if they decide that the gas is not commercially viable they will take these chemicals that are used to make plastics, and they are far more toxic and they will pump them down the pipeline, okay?

Now where are the good guys in all of this? The EPA has taken a strong position on compressor stations and how they should run and be maintained but why the emissions from the compressor stations themselves that have been hamstrung by petrol dollars fronted to Congress and FERC.

The EPA made recommendations on how a compressor station should be configured, run and maintained. The sites are easily found on the internet. The key word being EPA and compressor stations, they are out there they are published, they just can't implement them. Please note one of the EPA sites identifies the gases released from compressor station and main line valve blowdowns, okay and general pipeline leaks. The gases are noteworthy, methane we invest what they are pumping, methane, benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene and xylene. I'm not a chemist but I do know that methane is the worst of the greenhouse gases. And the CO2 -- and that benzene is a carcinogen, okay.

A gas pipeline watch-core group Metropolitan Engineering and Consulting Forensics, has published an article on the internet also that explains things that could be done to a compressor station to improve the air quality around them. The data is interesting and the changes they suggest are very doable but before I get into that let me tell you about the volumes of gases released in the please note section above.

I physically talked to Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline people so the volumes of gases that are blown down are from them. I didn't invent the numbers, okay. A single compressor blowdown releases approximately 15,000 cubic feet of gas, okay. The emergency blowdown, that means if they have to shut down the entire compressor station and say there is a problem with the pipeline or something out of order, give me as much as 1.3 million cubic feet of those gases, okay?

Now for the big one, Cheshire County, because of its low population has faced the main line valves, the main line valves in the gas pipeline control how they manage gas flow should there be an emergency okay. So they are legally allowed to space these mainlines out 7 and miles apart because we are low population acute meaning low population, excuse me I'm sorry.

Okay so picture a vessel that's 30 inches in diameter and 7 and miles long, I can do the math around the geometry of that vessel but it is way bigger than anything that I have quoted to date, so the problem here is we have got a pristine environment and they are introducing crap into our environment. Given the above information I have felt comfortable in having a one on one conversation with the Kinder Morgan representative in Fitzwilliam, the Kinder Morgan open house. I have talked and lo and behold I found a Kinder Morgan representative who said he was qualified to talk about compressor stations.

My first question was why do you have to blow down compressors when taking a compressor offline? His response was they didn't, but if they didn't do it it should shorten the life of the dry seals on the shafts on the compressors, they would have to replace the seals more often, okay --

MR. TOMASI: Sir could you wrap up your comments you have had around 7 minutes, could you wrap them up.

MR. GRISKA: This can be very brief -- the next question was why not feed gas you would vent into the atmosphere into a compressor from a compressor that you have taken off line and put it in the input side of a compressor that was online, okay -- his response was that would require installing a pump, my God. By the way all of this I haven't mentioned the exhaust from the jet engines that co-location at Kinder Morgan is so proud of on the power lines, it would reduce emissions if they would use electric motors to drive the compressors.

Come on paper -- bear with me --

MR. TOMASI: Sir you are more than welcome to put your comments in writing.

MR. GRISKA: Oh no they are in writing, you will get a copy, I have one last paragraph.

There are people they say they are good neighbors, that's Kinder Morgan now, these people they are people that will cost the building and maintaining compressor stations above the lives of our people, our children, our livestock, our crops. I ask you the cost benefit, we are the impacted citizens who don't actually have to live with the cost that Kinder Morgan and Tennessee Gas Pipeline live with the benefits, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We have just a couple more elected officials left. I would like to point out that the room out there is open for comments out there. The next person up is Paul Kotila.

MR. KOTILA: Thank you my name is Paul Kotila, K-o-t-i-l-a. I am the Chair of the Fitzwilliam Conservation Commission and for the record I would like to note that Dorothy Zugg who has work the Commission greatly appreciates has not been and is not now the Commission chair as seems to be the impression of Kinder Morgan, she doesn't want the job.

The mission of the Fitzwilliam Conservation Commission is to protect the natural resources of the town. In regards to this mission the Fitzwilliam Conservation Commission has several concerns that we feel the Environmental Impact Statement must address including the following:

One -- what are the short-term and long-term impacts of pipeline construction and maintenance on the natural resources of Fitzwilliam, including but not limited to terrestrial eco-systems, surface and ground water supplies and aquifers, aquatic eco-systems including ponds, streams, wetlands and vernal pools, air quality, night-time lighting and noise and sound levels.

Two -- the impact study should also examine the short and long-term environmental impacts of construction activities, road and building maintenance excavation and blasting, vegetation removal and management, including herbicide use, inspection and repair activities, future construction or expansion including additional pressurization stations, releases of potential contaminants into water bodies in the air including greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide and methane and possible explosions or fires. In Fitzwilliam we are particularly concerned about the disruption to Scott Pond and associated wetlands, the adjacent Gasso Conservation Land and other focus areas along the proposed NED route that have been identified in the town's open space plan.

All of these have been identified by citizens as parts of town that reflect the value that we place on our natural resources and the importance they plan in our sense of community.

Three -- the impact statement should examine the environmental advantages and disadvantages of alternatives to the proposed project including alternative routes, reduction in the size of the project, alternative energy sources and not building the project at all.

We also request that the impact statement examine the cumulative effects of this and other energy projects on Fitzwilliam's open spaces, scenic views and natural communities, particularly since the town has already experienced considerable disruption due to power line infrastructure.

Finally we request that the impact statement examine the long-term impacts of continued and expanding reliance on fossil fuel energy sources in light of undeniable global climate change which will affect all of us and the natural communities that we live in. Completion on the NED Project will ultimately contribute to global warming and may thus prove both unwise and unnecessarily environmentally destructive, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much sir. Next up we have Ruth Gus, or Gus Ruth? I guess it is Gus Ruth.

MR. RUTH: You know sometimes it is hard to live with two first names. My name is Ruth like in the candy bar Babe Ruth or baseball player Babe Ruth so that's the only thing I share with them. I'm representing -- I'm from Winchester, I'm on a Conservation Commission also on the Planning Board of Winchester. I was a Selectman for several years in Winchester until recently. The people of the voters in Winchester voted against the pipeline, they voted against having surveys done on town property.

The first piece of land that the pipeline touches the proposed route that was filed with the FERC is a piece of land that is owned by the town of Winchester, managed by the Winchester Conservation Commission. We have deep concerns about that area which has been filed with FERC and other comments that were filed with FERC.

Continuing on the route that was filed with FERC we have an aquifer crossing a proposed municipal wells area that would be in the well head protection area. Also on that aquifer we have a very high transmissivity in that aquifer that leads to a good area for a future municipal well.

We have talked with Kinder Morgan about our concerns and they came up with two proposed routes, alternate routes since the filing. Actually they talked to us about it before they filed but I assume they didn't

have time to file the actual route that they want to file. We are really concerned about them not filing the routes that they told us they would file.

So far in Winchester we have had five different routes that they proposed in Winchester. It is hard for the local people along these routes to figure out if the pipeline is going to come through their house or their property or somebody else's property or be on the other side of town, but the aquifer in Winchester goes through the whole town and there is no way that they can cross our town without going through our aquifer.

The area that they -- the latest areas that they proposed the last three proposals that they have, also the one that was filed with FERC is going through an area that has been proposed for wildlife refuge, the same concerns that Richmond has about Roaring Brook, we have concerns about Roaring Brook also about Miry Brook, our aquifer and a future well site.

Because of the high transmissivity in this aquifer at that point the chance of pollution is very great. The towns along the route have shown that they really don't want the pipeline. You don't see the benefits of the pipeline, in fact there is very little benefits. The biggest concerns would be environmental concerns, safety concerns, but I don't see any real benefit to the towns that this town is passing through so I would suggest that maybe FERC should look for another route for this pipeline, preferably south of the border of New Hampshire, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next up Melanie and I'm sure I'm going to get this name wrong, Melanie Levesque or Levesque --

MS. LEVESQUE: Levesque -- that's L-e-v-e-s-q-u-e. Thank you, my name is Melanie Levesque, I'm a 24 year resident of Brookline. I serve on the Brookline Pipeline Task Force and we in Brookline opposed the pipeline overwhelmingly. I also served as a Representative for 6 years, representing Hollis, Brookline and Mason, New Hampshire.

I have some very serious concerns about the proposed pipeline and bear with me because there are several thoughts that I want to share with you. First of all we have come together tonight as New Hampshire citizens who value our conservation land. We value our homes and our way of life. We are responsible and resourceful. The great majority of us supplement our energy through sources such as pellet stoves, wood stoves, electric ductless systems that provide cooling and heating, I have one of those.

But these types of fuels are to provide heating not electricity and that brings us to NED. The NED Project is advertised as a project that will feed the New England grid yet all of the customers that Liberty has are heating customers. The NED Project is not about the electricity and the grid it is about heating.

It proposes to go through 17 towns, most of which cannot use the gas, these towns will bear the burden of a pipeline without any benefits. The natural gas industry has done a very good job of convincing our businesses that they need gas when through energy efficiency and energy alternatives, they can further reduce their costs in a more responsible manner.

Our local legislatures and representatives have listened to the people and for the most part stand with us. We in New Hampshire plan have met with Governor Hassan, with Senator Jeanne Shaheen and Congresswoman Kuster and we have expressed our concerns and we are very happy to say that the delegation has written you a letter and we hope to hear the results of that and we look forward to their continued support.

We also need and we will be asking for support from Presidential candidates, we want this issue to be heard and one of the things that we are hearing is that this is a local issue -- well when we are engaged with the Federal Energy Regulation Commission to discuss a pipeline running from Pennsylvania to New Hampshire, going to Massachusetts, proposed by companies from Texas and Tennessee this is not a local issue.

And we will continue to solicit their support. With a Citizen's United decision corporations are considered people and have an equal or greater voice in our political system and clearly they seem to have a greater voice when it comes to determining what we can do with our property and this is wrong and we have got

to change that.

I attended the scoping meeting in Nashua and we heard from several union people who expressed their need for jobs and I have a difficult time understanding why their temporary jobs are more important than our conservation land and the property that my neighbors have built their lives around.

And finally to FERC I ask that you look at the New England projects, the many projects that are going on in its entirety and work not just for companies to approve pipelines but determine if this project is truly needed, we don't believe it is needed. Understand how this project has violated the people of our state and worked with us to further our energy efficiency and renewable energy goals, thank you very much.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you so much, thank you very much. Our last speaker of elected officials actually is Tim Murphy, Tim are you still here?

MR. MURPHY: Good evening Tim Murphy, M-u-r-p-h-y representing Southwest Region Planning Commission. Thank you for having a scoping meeting in Cheshire County. I have a few prepared remarks that I would like to share. We have some of the highest electricity costs in the nation. It makes it a challenge for us to compete economically but that doesn't make this proposal a good one.

SWRPC is the regional planning agency serving the 34 town planning district of southwest New Hampshire, this includes 7 communities located directly on the proposed pipeline corridor with two additional towns immediately adjacent that will be impacted by the 37 miles of proposed pipeline route through the region. The Northeast Energy direct proposal represents the largest infrastructure project in southwest New Hampshire in the last several decades and perhaps ever.

The project has the potential to undermine the efforts of generations of hard-working volunteers to provide stewardship for and maintaining the quality of life in our communities. Therefore we have significant concerns regarding the potential, natural and cultural resource impacts of this proposal.

Let's start with need. Based on agreements with potential customers only 38% of the capacity of the pipeline has been committed and without a demonstrated need FERC lacks the authority to approve the project. Furthermore other proposals for increasing the supply of natural gas in the Northeast, U.S. and New England are at various stages of development.

One or more of these proposals may represent a less environmentally damaging, practicable alternative as espoused by the National Environmental Policy Act. In keeping with the spirit and intent of NEPA, all known proposals to increase natural gas supply in New England should undergo simultaneous and collective review rather than being considered individually and in isolation from one another.

We ask that FERC include a detailed analysis of these alternative proposals as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement to be issued for review and comment. Also with respect to the need for this project it is prudent that other alternatives to meet electricity generation and natural gas demand be fully explored energy conservation, renewable energy sources, LNG storage and improved operational efficiencies of other natural gas pipelines.

Little information has been made available describing the positive impacts associated with the proposal and that which is available is overly general in nature. We would expect to have access to clear, specific and quantifiable information regarding the projects' benefits including a breakdown for residents and businesses in our state and in our region.

Such information should indicate the extent of benefit in terms of dollars saved in household budgets and specifics related to employment and wages or direct, indirect and induced economic activity in the absence of such information we can only be left with the perception that the negative impacts of the project outweigh its benefits.

As WRPC intends to submit additional detailed comments requesting further information to adequately assess the impacts of the proposal on the resources of our region, we have collaborated with regional planning agencies in Massachusetts and New Hampshire to develop a joint request for further study and information which addresses concerns regarding impacts to water resources, wildlife habitat, air quality,

land use, noise, existing infrastructure, socio-economic implications, public safety and more.

Finally we understand that the FERC process is focused on the transport of natural gas and less concerned with its production and consumption. Monadnock Region's future, the regional plan for southwest New Hampshire encourages us to reduce our reliance on fossil fuels and focus more on energy conservation and the use of renewable energy sources.

In addition there are many questions about the effects associated with the practice of fracking as used in the Marcellus shale fields where this gas is sourced. It is important that we find a way to make these issues relevant to this FERC process during continued review of this Northeast Energy Direct Proposal, thank you for this opportunity to provide comment.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, thank you very much. The first speaker is Josiah -- could you get the mic for him please. You can start whenever you are ready.

MR. BARTHELMESS: Hello my name is Josiah Barthelmess, J-o-s-i-a-h Ba-r-t-he-l-m-e-s-s. I live in New Ipswich directly across the street from the proposed compressor station. Sorry -- Hi Mr. Tomasi, it's been a while but I am back. I would like to introduce you to a few of the people I have brought. These are just a few of the kids of the Pipeline Resistance, I told you are numbers were growing. Please take a good look at each and every one of us. We are just a small number of kids who will be greatly affected by your decisions.

We don't own property or have any money, we are not old enough to vote. But we have heart, we have voices and we will be heard. We learn in school that all people have the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, all three of these are under fire right now.

How was your kid's summer compared to mine Mr. Tomasi? Have they had to fear they would lose their home, or have you had to tell them that they have to move because this area will be unhealthy to live in?

Do you have strangers trespassing on your land and out-of-state contractors racing up and down your road daily? This has become our reality and it is unacceptable. My generation had to grow up quicker than intended and we have Kinder Morgan to thank for that. Let's talk about the environment where us kids live and how it will change if this station comes in.

We will no longer see the stars or hear the birds chirping when we play in our yards. Our parents chose New Hampshire to raise us away from the city pollution and noise. If our parents want to hear an air conditioning running 24/7 they would have moved to Florida.

If FERC approves this pipeline we, along with hundreds of other children will be breathing in methane, formaldehyde and benzene, just to name a few of the poisonous emissions, we will no longer be able to drink the fresh water from our wells, even taking a shower could impose a health risk. I know my teachers will be upset with that one if I don't shower, after all I am an 11 year old boy.

Studies are coming forth regarding the effects of living near compressor stations, bloody noses, migraine headaches, skin rashes, respiratory issues, just to name a few. This is what you are bringing to the town of New Ipswich and hundreds of children and you expect my generation to thank you for the promises of lower energy costs at the sacrifice of our health. You are asking New Hampshire to sacrifice the health of their children for corporate greed.

You are chancing our health and our lives and we are not pleased. FERC you need to take into consideration the studies that are being done regarding children who grow up living near a compressor station. We need to slow this project down instead of barreling forward. Bad decisions are often made during the so-called crisis and those decisions will greatly affect generations to come.

FERC needs to make every TBD by Kinder Morgan answered and accounted for before your decision is made. If I filled in a job application with TBD's I would either be asked to answer them directly or my application would be thrown out, I wouldn't get the job.

Kinder Morgan needs to answer all of these to even be considered of getting the job or yet I have a better idea, throw the application away. I don't see any Kinder Morgan executives or any of the people who hold

the decision whether this pipeline goes in such as FERC's board. Moving your families and children to live across the street from a 40,000 compressor station -- maybe it's those people who make the decisions to live in a half-mile of a 40,000 compressor station it would give more credit to you saying they are safe and environmentally okay.

As long as it isn't your health and the environment in which you live in. You could say whatever you want. Would you take the change and sacrifice the health of your own family and children? Yet here we are standing before you the Kids of the Pipeline Resistance asking you why we don't matter? Is your decision easier when we are just a number and not a face? We are here tonight to put faces to that number, we are just as important as your own children and we are here to say that we do matter. Thank you for your time.

MR. TOMASI: Next up is Mackenzie.

MS. CORMIER: Hi my name is Mackenzie Cormier, M-a-c-k-e-n-z-i-e C-o-r-m-i-e-r. I live in New Ipswich near the proposed compressor station. A few months ago I started asking my mom about the pipeline. I saw signs in our neighborhood and wondered what it was all about.

My mom told me about the pipeline and the compressor station and about all the chemicals used in making natural gas. She said that the chemicals would be released into the air near our house during blowdowns. In school I learned all about habitats and eco-systems. I am worried that the chemicals, noise and light from the compressor will hurt the eco-system.

I play in the stream behind my house and I am worried that the water will be contaminated because of the blowdowns. I am confused about why Kinder Morgan is allowed to pollute our environment like this. If people get caught littering by throwing trash out of their cars they get fined almost \$300.00 so why is Kinder Morgan allowed to pollute the environment and put people in danger?

I am also worried about breathing in the chemicals that come out of the compressor station during blowdowns. I don't like standing near people smoking cigarettes because it makes my eyes itch and makes me cough. I know that lawmakers made it legal to smoke in a car with kids in it and that second-hand smoke is more harmful to kids than it is to adults.

Many of the chemicals that are in cigarettes will be sent into the air near my house during blowdowns, so living near the compressor station will be a lot like living with second-hand smoke every day. If you let Kinder Morgan start this project chemicals will get into our air and lungs and my family might get sick.

I'm worried about my brother Parker because he is only 4 and I know that chemicals aren't good for kids. Please do not let this happen, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Thank you so much, next up we have Carolyn Cormier, we will give you guys a second.

MS. CORMIER: Thank you for this opportunity I am Carolyn Cormier, C-o-r-m-i-e-r of New Ipswich.

A few months ago my husband I discovered that one of the largest compressor stations in the nation is proposed for installation within one mile of our family's home. This project if approved will poison our children. This may sound like an over-reaction, a worried mother blowing circumstances out of proportion but I assure you this is neither of those things.

This project has potentially devastating impacts on the environment, wildlife and quality of life for New Ipswich residents. While all of these are valuable, worthy concerns the focus of our research in energy has been on one pivotal question, what impact does living in the proximity of a natural gas compressor station have on our young children which are the most important consideration of your environmental impact study?

The answer to this question is a disturbing and frightening reality for our kids and the hundreds of other children living, playing and schooling near the compressor station. As you know natural gas production relies on the use of over 600 chemicals. Exposure to these carcinogens is linked to short and long-term health effects in both the animals and humans.

Long-term exposure has permanent damaging effects on the human nervous system. A Pennsylvania study of residents living near a much smaller compressor station cited joint pain, forgetfulness, headaches and nosebleeds. These statistics have me gravely concerned for the health and welfare of my children, especially in light of the fact that children and pregnant women are especially sensitive to pollution and the fact that the pipe used near our home is a very low grade because we are in a low incidence area.

Why are our children less valuable than those living in the city? Kinder Morgan reports emissions in averages, doing so assumes that the compressor station will emit toxins at a constant rate. It assumes that the compressor will emit pollutants at an equal concentration. It assumes that all pollutants travel in the same manner. My research tells me though that these assumptions are not in fact the case.

In reality emissions from compressors vary based on operation. In reality wind speed, wind direction and cloud cover determine the location and speed of pollution. In reality homes surrounding compressor stations report emission instances that exceed EPA regulations.

In reality this yearly average measurement is an incomplete and inappropriate picture of the actual toxic exposure that our children will receive. Assumptions and generalities are not enough regarding our children's safety. We need specific answers to our questions. How much will our household be exposed to on a given day? How high will toxin exposure levels climb?

What affects will surges in toxicity have on our children? Kinder Morgan doesn't have the answers. Our children are wild and messy, they can be noisy, impatient and impolite but they are curious, they forgive easily, they are tolerant and accepting, they are fun-loving and carefree, spontaneous and flexible, they are our biggest worry and our greatest job and they are not disposable.

Finally I would like to leave you with this, last week the Pope addressed Congress. Among other things he told members remember the Golden Rule, "Do unto others as you would have them to do unto you". So Commissioners I ask you this, if your nieces and nephews lived near this compressor station, if your children and grandchildren were exposed to these toxins on a daily basis, what would your decision be then?

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are on number 4, so people who have tickets number 5 and 6 please be ready, number 4 come on up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes I gave my testimony in the other room so I am done.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, so number 5--number 5 -- okay.

MS. HILL: My name is Jennie Hill, J-e-n-n-i-e H-i-l-l. I live in Richmond. Kinder Morgan's posture has been as if FERC's approval of the pipeline is just a formality. We have not felt the need to submit accurate or complete information to the Commission in their filings.

From the first submission modifying the NED route to the New Hampshire power line alternative until the present, the town line between Winchester and Richmond, New Hampshire has been plotted incorrectly, Hatch McDonald December of 2014, page 68 in a subsequent revision dated August shows that about 900 feet west of its actual location, town line signs and markers are clearly visible in the vicinity of the proposed route.

This calls into question any function performed by their software. From the Draft Environmental Report of December 2014 another glaring omission is the use of TBD in text and tables. Areas of pipeline looping and co-location of pipeline facilities are summarized in text form and in table form. Any location where the proposed pipeline is looping or co-located with an existing line -- I'm sorry this isn't my bailiwick. Any locale where the proposed pipeline is looping or co-located with an existing line or utility corridor, there are detailed project plans and other resources which show depth to bedrock, soil terrain et cetera yet when you scroll forward to rugged topography on page 67 the slope gradient tables are all filled in with TBD.

A special construction techniques and alternate temporary works -- additional temporary work space requirements for slopes over 30% are cited, this is very relevant in evaluating the merits of this route. All it takes to figure out slope percentages is a topographic map and a ruler. You would think with the technol-

ogy available in the existing plans mentioned above, Kinder Morgan's engineering department should be able to do likewise.

It again speaks to the assumption that neither FERC nor the public have a need to know this information. Another concern is the stated intent to bury the pipe no more than 3 feet deep. Given that when the route is not going through bedrock it will be mainly through unconsolidated glacial till, the pipe will be subjected to freeze/thaw activity.

Considering what frost action can do it seems to me that it should be buried below the frost line. Canada lynx have taken up residence in Richmond and Fitzwilliam, having been sighted by at least three people I know since the beginning of the year. Canada lynx are protected by the Endangered Species Act. Bats are also a protected species. They have homes in numerous buildings near the proposed route.

These protective species should be given consideration to minimize disruption to or to avoid their habitats all together.

The burden of proof for all of the many questions should be on Kinder Morgan. I am very heartened that FERC has given us this extra time to voice our concerns, I appreciate your time tonight and the efforts of the many staff members working on this document.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up is number 6 and then number 7 please be ready.

MR. VAILLANCOURT: Henri Vaillancourt, Greenville, New Hampshire. H-e-n-r-i V-a-i-l-l-a-n-c-o-u-r-t. In the 19th Century the elite of Scotland devised a scheme to convert the highland from subsistence farming to sheep grazing so that they, the already wealthy could further profit from the wool supply to the growing industrial revolution.

To that end the farming families were driven from their lands and their farms burned. In a cruel, inhumane exercise that became known as the Highland clearances. It would be hard to imagine such a crime against humanity in today's world but the greed that affects the soul of some men knows no restraint and history repeats itself, over and over again.

With this pipeline the greedy concoct clever false narratives of need, repeated incessantly through our elected officials and the public in the hopes of building justification for what is essentially an appropriate of private land for the benefit of an already obscenely-wealthy elite.

It would be difficult to see what we have here today in this room, something other than one part of an unjust rigged game. A rigged game which favors the elite over the common man, a rigged game which is an unholy collusion of government and corporate power over the lives and well-being of the people -- and it would be difficult for history to see the FERC as anything but complicit in perpetuating this injustice against humanity.

Complicit in furthering an industry extracting fossil fuels, in this case fracked gas that is wreaking havoc in the fracking fields to our west, complicit in the pollution of those fracking fields of the land, air and water that are the very essentials of life. Complicit for the cancers, the respiratory problems and other ailments suffered by those living near the fracking wells and compressor stations -- complicit in endangering the very stability of this planet with the approval of infrastructure which favors the extraction and burning of dirty fossil fuels over the development of clean, renewable energy.

And you, the FERC, are on the wrong side of history in this fight. Since Kinder Morgan announced the rerouting of the pipeline on December 8th, Quebec has banned the fracking of gas, followed the next day by New York, then New Brunswick, then Scotland, then Wales, then Maryland, then Holland.

As the science behind fracking reveals the devastation that this is having on the lives of people within the environment, state after state, province after province and country after country is banning this extraordinarily harmful practice. You the FERC have a choice to make -- you can proceed as usual with the indiscriminative approval of every fossil fuel project put forth by companies run by soulless men whose lust for money blinds them to the suffering and damage they inflict upon our communities and the planet.

Or you can do what's right by your fellow man and by the world we all share, a world whose custody is

placed in our hands and which we are morally obligated to protect and pass on to those generations yet unborn. Do what's right, do not approve this pipeline.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next number 7, number 7 is up, number 8 please be ready.

MR. CHATEO: Good evening Mr. Tomasi my name is Lou Chateo, C-h-a-t-e-o. I have lived in New England all of my life with the last 23 years in New Ipswich. I suspect you have heard lots of pros and cons about pipelines in general and more than likely what I say today may sound familiar to you but perhaps, someone will say one thing that may capture your attention long enough to give you a reason to deny Kinder Morgan's profit line in New Hampshire.

It will destroy our communities, the environment and the very essence of what this state is and what this state stands for. Other than big business profit I have heard that our demand for energy is what is driving this pipeline of destruction. However, I have also heard and read enough stories that we are actually using less energy now than in recent years, I know I am.

I have also read that the cost of energy is the lowest that it has been since 2004, perhaps modern technology, more efficient equipment or maybe it is just everybody being more cautious and less wasteful is the reason why we are using less energy. All of this makes me ask is this a need or a want? Unfortunately I suspect Kinder Morgan wants the revenue that it will bring to them despite the cost to New Hampshire residents.

With all the known health and environmental hazards, I would rather pay more to avoid what you and the federal government already knows, pipelines are dangerous and they are unhealthy. Thousands of our residents will be affected for generations to come. I can't imagine that cigarette smoking is banned just about everywhere but in this case polluting the air, water and ruining the environment is acceptable.

How is this the right thing to do? Would you want your family to live next to a 40,000 or an 80,000 compressor? I doubt it. We totally destroyed Hiroshima with the atomic bomb and with the grace of God they rebuilt. 911 affected the entire world in so many ways they are only just starting to rebuild.

If this pipeline goes through New Hampshire we will never be able to rebuild. In fact the devastation will likely outlast most of us in this room today. We owe our children a better future and a better option. I have read that this pipeline will effect conservation lands, go through towns, wetlands, under bodies of water but sadly it is going to affect 822 households in New Hampshire.

Those households contain our families and everything that we have worked for, unfortunately they are all at risk and will negatively be affected because of big business greed and the lack of respect for the residents of New Hampshire. New Hampshire will never be the same because of this pipeline for profit. Haven't we suffered enough?

We all deserve better than this, tell them to find a better option. My last hero was my younger brother, Bob, who died last September. He was a firefighter and paramedic who dedicated his life to safety in the community of Pelham, New Hampshire. Will you and your agency be heroes to our New Hampshire? We need you, no we beg you to support this beautiful state and deny anyone's ability to ever get a pipeline in New Hampshire and if you can't will you help us find someone? Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Thank you so much, next we have number 8, Rose Wessel, after Rose of course 9 and 10. After the 10th speaker we will break, it will be just about 9 o'clock.

MS. WESSEL: Good evening my name is Rosemary Wessel, the last name is spelled W-e-s-s-e-l and we have all heard passionate, passionate opposition today from citizens as well as elected officials speaking for hundreds of thousands of constituents who not only fear for their immediate health and safety but for the economy of a region that is built on its rich and clean natural resources and for the health of the larger environment which cannot bear the brunt of more greenhouse gas emissions, not only those of CO2 generated when more gas is burned, but the far more potent methane that is emitted from system leaks and from intentional blowdowns that are a regular part of pipeline operation.

Because of these concerns so far 75 communities between New York, Massachusetts and New Hampshire

have passed resolutions banning new pipelines. Nearly two-thirds of all landowners along the proposed and ever-shifting market pipeline route have refused to allow a survey of their property. Over 20,000 people have signed petitions against this project and of the 5600 comments already on the FERC docket, 5200 are opposing the pipeline.

Multiple studies by respected energy analysis firms have shown that there is little to no need for extra gas pipeline in the region and that the winter peak demand period cited as the reason for the proposal can be addressed in a variety of less costly, less impactful, more efficient scalable and more modern ways.

The Attorney General of the state of Massachusetts herself has asked that the FERC process be halted while her department awaits the results of their own Commission study and yet there is no response and no halt from FERC. How do you define public interest when the only obvious benefit of the project will be Kinder Morgan's own private bottom line?

How do you hear thousands of solid well-researched documents against the project and continue proceedings to consider it? How do you hear hundreds of pleas from people whose lives along this route would be ruined and continue the parade to its approval? How when voices like ours are rising up against project affecting people all across the country does your agency continue on with business as usual? How when faced with protestors who in the absence of any dialogue from your agency have taken to fasting at your Washington, D.C. doorstep and how can your Chairman Norman Bay state directly to their faces that these are just pipelines?

These hearings are not just for pipeline builders to gather information but for the people to be heard. Please let us know that our wishes are being heard and reject the application for Northeast Energy Direct, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next up number 9, number 9 -- is number 9 here, Scott -- okay number 9 we can move on, number 10? Is number 10 here? Number 10, number 11? Okay, 11, 12?

MR. MATTHEWS: My name is Sam Matthews, M-a-t-t-h-e-w-s. To remind people here tonight this meeting is to convey to FERC the consequences of the pipeline and the associated compressor stations on the environment. Environment can be defined as the conditions of all living things and a prescribed area share, therefore it can be said that the environment concerns here is the land, the air and the water that surrounds the pipeline as it imposes itself across southern New Hampshire and Massachusetts.

How far that surrounding environment stretches away from the pipeline seems to be an expanding envelope. It started the only towns actually on the route seem to be aware of the consequence of their misfortune. Now other communities further away from the route are realizing the danger of their situation.

In the last two weeks, both Peterborough and Wilton have voted to come out in opposition to the pipeline and all of its downsides and conservation commissions across the state have voiced their concerns over the damage.

In fact more and more people are coming to understand the advertising and propaganda spread by the profiteers in support of the project are lies and designed to misdirect and divert people from the reality of this for-profit proposal.

People have come to understand that they are suddenly an endangered species. We are in the way of a project that would make huge profits for its proponents by destroying all that stands in its path. What a strange, terrible idea to suddenly have to assimilate. We the species that always have been the one to do the damage are suddenly the ones that are in danger ourselves.

So here is an interesting situation. Under the definitions above we as part of the environment are something that FERC has to take into consideration. What a novel idea. Let me say I have already observed the effects of the human endanger on local people -- people are scared, their habitat threatened, the stress of the situation is disrupting families, people are worn and battered by the assault upon them by the twists and turns of a predator that has no sense of the value of each one of us as a living being.

So FERC please acknowledge that we the people are part of the environment that you are charged to as-

sess when Kinder Morgan makes this proposal, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. And with Mr. Matthews we are going to take a quick 10-minute break, we are going to come back and then go through the rest of everyone. I would like to make another quick announcement. There is a phone that was found on the bus, if you lost a phone please come up I will turn it into the university at the end of the night.

(Whereupon a recess was taken, to be resumed this same day.)

MR. TOMASI: We are going to start again with number 13, is that you? We are going to go ahead and start with number 13, Kenneth.

MR. BERTHIAUME: All right welcome and thank you for this additional opportunity my name is Kenneth, K-e-n-n-e-t-h Berthiaume, B-e-r-t-h-i-a-u-m-e. Let me start first with something that hasn't been mentioned tonight. Improper segmentation --customers listed in the Connecticut Expansion Project are also listed in the NED FERC docket, specifically Connecticut Natural Gas and the Southern Connecticut Gas Company in the amount of 35,000 dekatherms per day and 10,000 dekatherms per day respectively.

This equates to approximately 8.5% of the NED total. The environmental impact of the Connecticut Expansion Project must be considered as part of the NED Environmental Impact Statement or these amounts removed from the NED commitment total.

Temporary work space and additional temporary work space, NED Resource Report 1, Page 1-44 indicates that this temporary space is almost three times the space proposed for the permanent right-of-way, specifically 8,799 acres versus 2,329 for the total project. The use of temporary work space and additional temporary work space must be considered in the environmental impact as permanent impact, particularly when related to clear cutting of mature forest and regrowth.

The basic question how does FERC consider environmental impacts relative to the need as projected into the future was raised at an earlier FERC scoping session. The FERC representative responded that he could not answer the question as it would involve other sections of FERC beyond his area of expertise but he indicated that the question was now on record.

The point is that the energy landscape has changed dramatically over just the past five years and shows no signs of slowing for the foreseeable future. How will these rapid changes in renewable technologies, when projected forward, 5, 10, 15 and 20 years factored into the assessment of need and environmental impact?

Massachusetts specifically already has unused infrastructure that was commissioned in 2008 and 2010 respectively and cannot afford additional overbuild at the expense of the environment, homeowners and rate payers. In May of this year ISO New England stated in an update and I quote, "When these savings are factored into the region's load forecast, energy usage is expected to remain flat, with an average annual growth rate of 0.0%."

In a more recent Draft Report that number has gone even lower, i.e. negative for the next 10 years. The New England region is host to several types of viable alternative renewable energy resources including but not limited to on-shore and off shore wind, solar, domestic hydro and imported hydro, hydro-kinetic and others. Accurate and fair consideration of these renewable energy resources today, as well as their project impact 5, 10, 15 and 20 years from now will result in the only feasible response to this NED proposal which is the no-build alternative, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Number 14?

MR. GAUVIN: Hi my name is Dennis Gauvin from New Ipswich, D-e-n-n-i-s G-a-u-v-i-n. I would like to address my time specifically to the dangers of the compressor station sited for New Ipswich and all of the surrounding towns where the wind will carry the pollutants that we all know exist.

It is expected that two Titan 250 compressors at 20,000 horsepower each would be installed. The VOC's, volatile organic compounds, estimated to be emitted are around 52 tons per year. In addition approximately 36 tons of PM 2.5 fine particulate matter will be emitted per year.

Focusing only on the PM 2.5 a detailed study by the Southwestern Pennsylvania Environmental Health Project, SWPA in Minisink, New York, concluded families living near the compressor station are exposed to elevated levels of PM 2.5. The episodic nature of health systems reported by residents is likely associated with the episodic high emissions that come from the compressor station.

They have two 10,000 horsepower compressors. You will be hearing a lot more about the Minisink studies as we have been in contact with all of the experts that have been involved with that over the next couple of weeks. The SWPA has received grant funding to expand their study into New York State with focus on conditions near the 22,000 horsepower Wright compressor station.

They are currently seeking participants for the study. Two recent Harvard University studies in December of 2014 and June of 2015 indicate elevations of PM 2.5 have a significant effect on mortality and people over 65 and women exposed to high levels during pregnancy particularly during the third trimester may face up to twice the risk of having a child with autism than mother's living in areas with low particulate matter.

A further study by SWPA on compressor stations and health impacts is 36 pages long with 4 pages of reference data from experts around the country. A report from the Environmental Health Journal states Congressional exemptions of oil and gas operations from provisions of the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act and other statutes limits data collection on the impacts of oil and gas development.

After just this little information stated here it is no wonder Kinder Morgan declined to meet with the Conrail School Board to discuss the emissions and the Temple Elementary School's exposure. I applaud the Conrail School Board's request to FERC that the Tennessee Gas Pipeline be denied and would hope other school boards would follow, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next number 15, Kathleen?

MS. GAUVIN: My name is Kathleen Gauvin, G-a-u-v-i-n. I live in New Ipswich, New Hampshire. To the FERC Commissioners I wish you were here. You should be listening to our voices, you should be here seeing our faces. We are the next sacrificial lambs that will be offered up all in the name of big corporations and their profit-making schemes.

It is time that you take notice. When does the issue of what is morally right super cede the issue of passively permitting these contaminating monsters that are ravaging through our country like cancer in its final stage? When will you consider the people? We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union established justice, insured domestic tranquility, provide for common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity to ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Where in this process does FERC consider we the people, or consider in order to form a more perfect union, or consider promote the general welfare, or secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity? As I read the research into the disastrous effects of a 20,000 horsepower compressor station's emissions in Minisink, New York, I knew that we the people was not a consideration in this permitting process.

Minisink is a difficult article to read, we are now potentially the next Minisink populous. Minisink is a town inhabited by people just like us who were not given the justice that they deserve. Their general welfare was not protected and most certainly the blessings of liberty were not preserved for themselves or their posterity.

When the permitting of Minisink, New York pipeline and compressor station was discussed by FERC Commissioners in 2012, two of the FERC Commissioners dissented. These Commissioners expressed similar opinions noting that the construction of the Wagoner alternative would provide numerous benefits beyond those provided by the Minisink proposal with significant fewer emissions and thus reducing the effects on the local air quality.

The other three Commissioners voted in favor and the permit was granted. The Minisink, New York

residents living near the compressor station are now plagued with numerous health ailments and research shows that they are probably a direct result of these emissions. So to you the FERC Commissioners I ask will you pay attention to us? Will you look at less harmful alternative routes and will you make a morally right decision, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, we are at number 16.

MS. BROKENSHERE: Good evening my name is Deveda Brokenshere, D-e-v-e-d-a B-r-o-k-e-n-s-h-i-r-e. My family owns property at 119 Sandy Pond Road in Richmond. Our home is one of the ones that Carol talked about as being historic, having been built in 1810. My grandfather bought it in 1910 for a place for his five boys to run and it has been in the family ever since and we are on our fourth generation and it has been used every summer.

I started at 6 months old and I have only missed one in my 76 years. We own quite a bit of property up to the power line and behind the power line, it includes some property on Sandy Pond Road. I'm sorry -- our well is in our backyard and also further up into the woods is our family burial site where my parents, my sister, my cousin and my uncle who was a war veteran is buried.

If the pipeline goes through it will be very, very close to our backdoor and of course we do not want that. Sandy Pond which is down in front of us is a very small pond 6/10ths of a mile long and is on all private property. There are three real small cabins on that lake, one of them was my uncles and on one end is Camp Wiyaka which is an Athol YMCA camp that has been in existence since 1921.

Sandy Pond is solely fed by a brook that runs through our property and underground streams and we are very worried that any kind of insecticides or anything they use will seep into that underground and into the brook and contaminate it as well as Sandy Pond and of course we don't want that because we all enjoy swimming there.

And not only that, it could ruin the camp because you don't want to send your child to a camp where there is a lake that is contaminated, okay. We are in the incineration zone all the way up to the middle of Sandy Pond which is rather scary because any leaks or any explosions would just do us in because Richmond does not have a great big fire department or police.

Sorry I get nervous when I speak -- and I understand that the pipeline can be smaller in bigger areas and I'm just trying to figure out why our property and our lives are less valuable than those who live in bigger areas? It is not. We love our property as much as anybody else.

Noise pollution will be terrible because up in back of our house along all of the pipeline are ledges and rocks, I don't mean just little ones, big boulders and if those things blow up debris is going to be flying all over the place, it could fly into the yard and hit somebody or there could be health problems -- I'm sorry is my time up? A bunch of us have allergies and it will be terrible.

MR. TOMASI: Can you wrap up your comments ma'am, your time is up.

MS. BROKENSHERE: That's it.

MR. TOMASI: Okay thank you.

MS. BROKENSHERE: Please no pipeline, don't destroy what we have and contaminate our pond.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next 17.

MS. DURLING: Susan Durling, it's spelled D-u-r-l-i-n-g. I'm also going to speak about the Minisink Health Project. The Minisink Health Project shows that fugitive emissions could occur unpredictably and that particulate matter levels vary significantly on an hour by hour level and I'm not going to repeat a lot of the information that was delivered by previous speakers.

The predominant health impacts were respiratory problems, neurological and dermatological problems as well as a decrease in overall mental health and well-being levels. The Draft Environmental Resource report in Section 9.1 discusses U.S. EPA national ambient air quality standards expressed in terms of air concentration level and associated averaging period.

This use of averaged levels is an incorrect method of examining air quality and since it forms the basis for the whole report the entire report is flawed. We ask that FERC require Section 9 be re-written using episodic high emission levels as a basis for determining any health effects and air quality.

As a nurse I had to practice evidence based practice, I asked FERC to practice evidence based denial. If this project is built how will these health impacts be minimized? Please look into technology that reduces emissions from compressor stations, pigging stations and the like and require Tennessee Gas to install such technology.

We ask that a monitoring system for particulate matter and chemical emissions be implemented and overseen by a team of environmentalists and public health officials to be paid for by Tennessee Gas. This monitoring system should be in place before any infrastructure is built to document pre and post operational levels. In addition we should have a health registry administered by a research institution such as Cornell University or Dartmouth College.

This registry should include all people living within a 10 mile radius of this pipeline and should be started immediately and continued for at least the lifetime of the people that are alive when this pipeline is built with periodic reports to be published in medical journals. This too should be funded by the company building the pipeline.

If this study shows adverse health effects on the population as I believe it will what is the plan, how will this pipeline be shut down? How will these people be taken care of? We demand that Tennessee Gas plan for these probable scenarios and document their plans in their environmental report.

And in addition several million, I can't imagine how much should be put aside in a trust fund to pay for the medical expenses and medical infrastructure that is going to be there and needed related to pipeline emissions, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you so much, thank you. Next we are at number 18.

MS. ST. GEORGE: Hi I'm Christine St. George, Christine with a C-h S-t period, G-e-o-r-g-e. I am a member of the Brookline, New Hampshire Pipeline Task Force. I am also a union member who is not in favor of the pipeline. Tonight I wish to speak about a letter our town and others have recently received from Kinder Morgan. In it Kinder Morgan noted its willingness to provide compensation for various impacts the proposed pipeline would have.

It suggested the compensation could take the form of a monetary contribution to a state fund for distribution around New Hampshire. I believe that such a letter is very premature as Kinder Morgan has not even filed this project with FERC and continues to change the location of its proposed route. How can we possibly discuss mitigation, compensation if we are not certain of the pipeline's proposed route? Should this project be approved? We request that FERC require that Kinder Morgan one -- limit any compensation mitigation funds it pays for this project to those towns directly impacted by the project, not a state fund and provide governing boards of all impacted towns with documentation of the project's impacts and the mitigation compensation provided to each New Hampshire town.

Such information will provide each impacted town with the ability to evaluate the degree to which Kinder Morgan has proportionately distributed funds relative to each town's incurred damage. If Kinder Morgan starts writing compensating checks, full transparency across all impacted towns is critical information to the public.

Also Kinder Morgan a week and a half ago blind-sided several communities, Hollis and Merrimack with a change in their route. It was supposed to go down 101A through Amherst and into Merrimack, go right through PC Connections parking lot and up Continental Boulevard for a change of route to above some things in Amherst.

There is quite a number of landowners and business owners who are directly affected now that don't have a chance to evaluate and participate in any scoping with FERC. I believe that FERC needs to extend the deadline so that some of these people can come up with a plan and you know come and talk to FERC and

look at what their problems are with this change. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you so much, next we are at number 19. I would like to point out that the other room is still available if people want to speak out there.

MR. PIERCE: Hello my name is Melvin M-e-l-v-i-n Pierce P-i-e-r-c-e. First off I would like to ask a question which is where do we get the responses of our comments that we are making tonight and or either sent in, you said like you have had about 5600? When do we get those and where do we find them, okay?

Second I want to talk about the state of New Hampshire's Department of Resources and Economic Development, specifically book 1213 page 102 which contains map 30 of lot 1 which states the following restriction found in the deed page 3, that transfers ownership to the state of New Hampshire on 9/24/87, that's of Rhododendron State Park to the state of New Hampshire and it states, "That grantee acknowledges that the grantee acquired this property with federal land and water conservation fund assistance under New Hampshire Project 33-0551 or 00551 and the property cannot be converted than other than public outdoor recreation use without the written approval of the Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior."

Has Kinder Morgan done that? Because they are planning on going through part of Rhododendron State Park.

Number two -- today I looked up the Spectra Pipeline and the Kinder Morgan Pipeline or the Kinder Morgan overall pipelines that they have in the New England area and I was kind of surprised that actually to see that Kinder Morgan's pipeline, they have a pipeline that goes right through Massachusetts in the southern tier of Massachusetts and it ends up somewhere around Wister I believe.

Why aren't they piggy-backing from Wister right to Dracut rather than going north and coming through New Hampshire? It makes no sense whatever okay.

Three -- if from what I understand from Kinder Morgan's meetings about 80% of their gas is going to be shipped overseas, why don't they avoid here entirely because they are in Pennsylvania, go up into the Great Lakes and go out through the St. Lawrence Seaway, that was they can go overseas, they don't need to bother with the pipeline, don't need to bother with anybody.

Four -- do the members of the board of FERC who make their decisions on the pipeline own stock in pipelines? And if they do are they required to disclose that they do own stocks in pipelines?

Kinder Morgan says we will pay less for electricity if their pipeline is approved. How much will my electricity bill when this happens? If they don't know how can they make this type of a statement? What does Kinder Morgan plan to do when their pipeline work releases a chemical plume that is already present and stable at the Troy Mill Superfund site? Okay, what are they going to do with that? Where is the staging site in Troy, New Hampshire going to be?

The Environmental Impact Statement for Kinder Morgan says it is on the pipeline route but a map that has been kind of circulated from the Southwest Regional Planning Commission shows it as being off on Marlboro Road, it is nowhere near the pipeline route, is a potential for another pipeline that could go around everything and not go through Rhododendron State Park but now they have other impacted communities.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up sir thank you. Next up number 20?

MS. SCHERR: Thank you for not having a music stand tonight that slid down as I spoke in Lunenburg. Stephanie Scherr, S-c-h-e-r-r Fitzwilliams. The People's Climate March in New York City on September 21, 2014 signaled to global leaders that large numbers of people in the United States care about the climate crisis. Over 700,000 people from all over the country joined in the largest climate action in history. Climate change is an environmental, social and economic justice struggle. I participated in that march as well as many others here tonight, just two months before Kinder Morgan publically announced their plan to build a pipeline in New Hampshire. Today is Global Women's Climate Justice Day of Action. I stand before you as a woman fighting for climate justice. I am determined, I am driven and I will relentlessly fight for clean energy technology standing in the face of those who would have us linger in their profit-

able, billowing clouds of smog.

Pope Francis said the earth, our home, is beginning to look more and more like an immense pile of filth. The idea of unlimited growth is based on the lie that there is indefinite supply of the earth's goods and this leads to the planet being squeezed dry.

Former New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg stated that all over the world governments are encouraging greenhouse gas emissions by subsidizing them. The International Energy Association has estimated that governments are providing 550 billion dollars in subsidies to fossil fuel companies every year.

For every dollar used for renewable energy they are spending four and a half dollars to encourage the development and use of fossil fuels. You get what you pay for and right now we are paying for a hotter planet. We are starting to put our money where our mouth is. Presidential candidate Bernie Sanders says that climate change is real, caused by human activity and already devastating our nation and our planet.

The United States must lead the world in combatting climate change and transforming our energy system away from fossil fuels and towards energy efficiency and sustainability. Our Governor Maggie Hassan needs a climate reality check. New Hampshire has a rapidly increasing population of informed citizens who know we need to live carbon free or die.

New Hampshire is not a carbon corridor for Kinder Morgan or any other fossil fuel pusher. We have had enough of the Kinder-Nader of untruths in the Blue Man Group, the bullying FERC's helpline, and the inaction of those who want to keep being funded by the Coke Brothers. You have been put on notice. If you want to be elected or re-elected in this state look around you. The world has changed and you must change with it.

Pope Francis also said, "All is not lost human beings while capable of the worst are also capable of rising above themselves, choosing again what is good and making a new start." My friends we need to step up our game, we need to show up in force in greater numbers at higher visibility events and with louder voices. Stand back and look at the movement, the war against fossil fuels is global. We are not alone and we can stop this pipeline.

All summer activists in kayaks surrounded Shell's giant oil rig in Seattle and dangled from a bridge to prevent their department for arctic drilling. Yesterday, to the great joy of climate deniers everywhere, climate fighters everywhere Shell announced their decision to pull back from exploration of the arctic drilling and said the disappointing results of the initial well were the reason.

The industry can call it what they want to, the fossil fool era is over. Rural lives matter. We are fierce we will not back down --

MR. TOMASI: Ma'am your time is up.

MS. SCHERR: Green energy creates green jobs and a green economy, anything less is unacceptable, thank you Mr. Tomasi.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you, next number 21.

MS. OPRAMOLLA: My name is Debra Opramolla, O-p-r-a-m-o-l-l-a and I live in Rindge. Nothing has been said by Kinder Morgan or you, FERC, about the most vulnerable in our community -- the elderly and people who experience a disability.

In New Hampshire the majority of the elderly and disabled are not found in nursing homes or institutional settings and I as an advocate am a community organizer along with others, work too damn hard to make sure that they are found in the community to return them to institutional settings, it is not going to happen. They are encouraged and supported to live independently as possible within the community. This means that they are in their homes. My concerns are for the safety of these people during an explosion or during construction.

The Attamatok Virginia explosion reported had two important conclusions, in a state of emergency, those living in the impacted area took about 5 minutes to get out with minimal bodily harm along with a vehicle

is the best mode of evacuation. Many of the elderly and disabled are not able to get out of their homes in that timeframe. Those in the community that have mobility issues and are wheelchair users take longer to transfer to a vehicle and that is if they are already seated in their chair.

However, the report did not conclude the confusion of the elderly or developmentally disabled person in an emergency. As a mother of a disabled person, there is a lot of confusion in a panic emergency situation that he might act out with his behavior and not be able to be moved and I am no longer able to physically pick him up and move him.

How are they supposed to be kept safe and evacuated safely? If the report it mentioned that the siren would go off to alert the community to evacuate. I am also a parent of a deaf child. What is being done for the deaf and hard to hear community to alert them? I'm asking FERC to do an impact study in the affected communities that address the effects of the elderly and the disabled of the NED gas pipeline.

To the disabled and elderly loss of life is not an acceptable collateral damage. In New Hampshire no one is a second class citizen and every voice must be heard, but more important my son's voice could not be heard today because you do not have interpreters here in the public setting.

MR. TOMASI: Next we are at number 22, is 22 here? Moving to 23, 23? 24? 25?

MR. DURMER: Hello my name is Erik Durmer, that's Erik with a "k" Durmer, D-u-r-m-e-r and I would like to begin by first of all thanking all of my fellow New Hampshire-ites you know, pretty much tough as granite for sticking it out this long. I also want to give thanks to -- there's been some talk here today about you know sending the pipeline back to Massachusetts, I want to remind people in this room that we in Cheshire County owe a huge debt to the people from Massachusetts who are fighting this pipeline who came up here and warned us when Kinder Morgan was trying to do a bait and switch, okay.

The next thing that I was trying to do after sitting here for so long was think of what could I add that was new, I just didn't want to repeat things. And fortunately this project is so poorly designed, conceived and executed that it wasn't hard even in this to find something that hadn't been talked about too much.

The first is we have talked a lot about upgrading existing pipeline infrastructure and I support that. Not only do I support that, Kinder Morgan agrees with that position all right, Kinder Morgan in their Source Report Number 10 of July, 2015 states that without their proposal it simply means that other pipelines and other companies would have to increase their capacity.

Kinder Morgan understands that this pipeline is not needed. Secondly another thing I found in my thing was that given that FERC is funded by the gas industry through the fees for this application process, I realize that I would like you to put down what policies, procedures and independent oversight are in place during this process to prevent what appears to be blatant conflict of interest from clouding FERC's judgment because any impartial review of the information that has been coming out from Nashua, Milford, here and beyond leads to a very clear conclusion that this pipeline is not necessary.

We also -- the other thing I thought about was I haven't seen too many orange shirts here talking about jobs but this is not a jobs bill, it's an energy bill and New Hampshire happens to be economically pretty well off you know, we are the 7th per capita richest state in America, one of the richest countries in the history of the world, we have the lowest poverty rates, we have the 4th lowest unemployment rate, does that mean that we can't do better or we don't have people who need our help? Absolutely -- but what it does mean is that the sky is not going to fall if this pipeline isn't built.

And what it means is that we have been through the same recession as everybody else, we have had the high electric prices forever, we have been dependent on high foreign oil forever and still we are doing better economically than Texas, Tennessee or Pennsylvania.

I see the red light is up I actually have a couple of more things that I won't say, I will let you read them tonight at your convenience.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir, we are on number 26?

MS. PORTER: Hello I have waited a long time tonight to be here. My name is Connie Porter and I am an

educator, oh Porter, you got it, I am an educator, a professional and a grandmother from Fitzwilliam. My great fear is a carbon heavy future that we are not bold enough to address now. Right now is when we need to change policy direction.

In every industry that force carbon emissions into the air my great frustration is with elected and appointed officials who do not seem to understand that -- sorry -- that natural gas production and transportation is a heavy land and air polluter. This is by no means a clean energy source.

FERC's mandate is to assess the level of public good that would allow eminent domain and the taking of private property. Hmm -- who constitutes this public and what does good mean? I chanced upon a list compiled by the Pennsylvania Alliance for Clean Water and Air of entries submitted by individual people who have had documented experience with natural gas production and transportation over the last four years.

Did these people constitute the public? If not them, who? Let me read a short sampling from this list. It's called the list of the harmed have you seen it? Possibly. First entry, Pam, Judy and family from Pennsylvania, compressor station 780 feet away, symptoms -- headaches, fatigue, dizziness, nausea, nose bleeds, blood test shows exposure to benzene and other chemicals.

Number two -- Darryl Siminski from Pennsylvania gas well less than 1,000 feet away, exposure water. However the water contained toluene, acrylonitrile, strontium, barium and manganese -- symptoms rashes on the legs from showering, symptoms animals, five healthy goats dead, fish in pond showing abnormal scales. Let's skip ahead.

625th entry -- Roy and Amy Heddy and children, Glenda, Kirsten and Don, Terry and Dustin Smith, Bobby and Amanda Smith near Carlsbad, New Mexico, gas facility -- a 30 inch gas pipeline explosion ten deaths two injured. Skip ahead some more -- 6,112 Berthold Reservation, the whole reservation -- North Dakota, exposure brine pipeline spill, million gallons, dead trees, dead grasses, dead bushes, the spill went undetected for some time.

Last entry, 16,712th entry, Laverne Johnson from Iowa is being forced to allow access to his property. Johnson is opposed to the possible impacts of water and crops, do you want to be remembered for making the most money however you can make it or do you want to be remembered for doing the right thing?

I respectfully ask that FERC Commissioners, Tony Clark, Cheryl LaFleur, Norman Bay, Philip Moeller and Colette Honorable interview these over 16,000 people who have been harmed by the gas industry and FERC's past decisions and then do the right thing for the first time in the history of all of your decisions say no and look to the future. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next up we are at number 27, is 27 here? 27 out there, okay next 28.

MR. PINNEY: I am going to try to condense a four minute comment into three minutes so I hope you will indulge me. My name is Dana Pinney, D-a-n-a P-i-n-n-e-y. I live on a dead end road in Fitzwilliam. My house is on the pipeline route. I am an endangered species already in that I am a native New Hampshire resident.

I would like to take this opportunity to speak about how the proposed pipeline is already affecting an endangered species, that species is homosapien which is a current image of man that has evolved and watched today on the planet. Homosapien is unique among other life forms on our planet in that we can both see and plan for the future.

We set goals, obtain an education, plan careers and raise families. We have visions of our life. This ability to see the future can also bring stress into our lives. Stress is known to directly and indirectly contribute up to one in six deaths in this country. Stress can influence the progression of heart disease, diabetes, anxiety, eating disorders, sleep disorders and create general fatigue and mental health issues.

These symptoms inhibit our ability to function normally at home and at work. I ask that your EIS report include the cost and effects of stress on all of our lives. One source of stress in all of our lives today is the proposed Northeast Direct Pipeline. The representatives have come into our state, communities and

homes telling us of their vision of a brighter future if we would only embrace natural gas. The vision for our life is in quandrum with our vision and that causes stress for us.

The fossil fuel industry has created a manufactured energy crisis in New England. We are told every evening through push ads on the news that natural gas is safe and that we need pipelines. It is the shale drillers in Pennsylvania and the LNG facilities in Canada that need this natural gas, not us.

People have addressed data dumps by Kinder Morgan which include thousands of the too be determined's in those thousands of pages of documents. I have dozens of too be determined's of my own and I will share a couple.

When sitting with my wife facing the loss of the use and enjoyment of our property through eminent domain it gives me resolve to be determined to derail the FERC train. I remain motivated to be determined to continue to write to legislators, conservation groups and speak out on Facebook and any local and social media.

I re-commit to be determined to not get caught up in petty conflicts and to stay focused on the goal of ridding our communities of this unnecessary project. I ask all of you to continue to be determined to expose this project and the FERC regulatory process to all who will listen and call out the injustice that is being inflicted upon us.

Mr. Tomasi, your resume lists that you have a degree I believe in aerospace engineering. That fact creates a little stress for me when I consider as a group of aerospace engineers that issued the control that it was safe to launch the Challenger in 1986. I can envision a similar catastrophic failure of this pipeline system. We do not need this pipeline in New Hampshire, we all speak with one voice when we say that there is no need for this egregious overbuild of infrastructure on our state.

Kinder Morgan we do not want or need your pipeline passing through our state nor passing through the towns or cities of our friends in Massachusetts and New York. Keeping in mind that FERC offices in Washington and Kinder Morgan offices in Houston are a long ways away, do not be afraid to raise your voices. Let us all now take the opportunity to let our voices be heard as one.

In closing I ask all of you here tonight do we want or need this pipeline running through our communities?

THE CROWD: No.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir, next we are at number 29?

MS. ERB: Mr. Tomasi nice to see you again. Oh kind of -- all right my name is Julianna Erb, J-u-l-i-a-n-n-a Erb is E-r-b. I came here only to listen tonight I wasn't going to speak and then I saw this piece of crap from Northeast about the Northeast Energy Direct Project from Tennessee Gas Pipeline, it was handed out at the New Ipswich open house by Kinder Morgan and it specifically states that the natural gas that they will transport through their pipeline through the compressor station does not have benzene in it.

You can't have this, this came from Wendy she said she will get you one. If the fracking industry doesn't disclose what chemicals they use then how can Tennessee Gas Pipeline tells us that they filtered it out? I took the opportunity to look at the EPA eco-site today. I looked at 10 different stations they list in each station that I looked at, thousands of pounds of carbon monoxide, thousands of pounds of methane, thousands of pounds of sulfur dioxide, sorry -- thousands of pounds of carbon dioxide, thousands of pounds of boc's, xylene, mercury, cobalt, toluene, cadmium, formaldehyde and nickel and guess what benzene.

So this newsletter that they put out is an out and out lie and they need to be called on it and you need to ask them why they are lying to the people of the state of New Hampshire in telling them that these things are not in their gas and are not omitted by their compressor stations.

Do they think that we are a bunch of country bumpkins that we don't have access to the internet and can't look this stuff up for ourselves? It is hubris in the worst possible way for them to expect that we are going to take their B.S. and swallow it because it is not going to happen. I'm done.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are at number 30, is 30 here? 31?

MR. NOLAN: Thank you my name is Martin Nolan and I am a dying breed apparently as well. I have lived in New Hampshire all of my life. As a professional in the energy field I have many concerns of this natural gas pipeline proposal.

Leaks are one of the major issues. Most home explosions that you have heard about over the years have been attributed to natural gas lines in urban areas. The leaking gas from a pipeline which is under low pressure follows the path of least resistance underground, usually along buried lines or natural cracks through the ground at which point it finally finds its way into a structure.

There's a real possibility that this same thing can happen to the proposed pipeline only on a larger scale. The difference is that this gas from the proposed pipeline from Kinder Morgan will be under very high pressure. This could very easily travel underground several hundred feet or more before entering a building. While a leak under low pressure might affect a few residents a leak under or adjacent to a high tension power line would have devastating consequences and destruction would be horrific magnitude with the incineration zone of about 1,000 feet which is what the company says but the destruction will certainly be several times that area.

The commercial underground fuel tanks they are required as well as the piping associated with it to continuously monitor and alarm for a leak. A leak within that inner space allows time to stop the pumping and remove the products, thus protecting the environment from the leak before it hits the atmosphere.

If this pipeline is allowed I would strongly recommend and ask that it also be a double-walled pipeline and continuously be monitored. While not completely eliminating the possibility of a catastrophic leak, it would surely lower the risk.

The next point is the need for natural gas. I see very little need for this natural gas in our region. The majority of the users for natural gas are in the eastern part of New Hampshire or south of New Hampshire in central and eastern Massachusetts. Much propaganda has been printed about saving the northeast from high fuel, the fact is that the proposed route would have little economic value to convert to natural gas.

There are existing pipelines already on the New England coast which if there is a need for more gas can be upgraded as some of the proposals are. The end of the proposed pipeline will be in Dracut, Mass. where they will tie into another line with a final point of the line being in a seaport where it can be exported overseas.

The cost of the natural gas will be set by the demand. There seems to be a far greater demand in Europe and as such the price will be determined by the world demand, not simply by local needs. The economic value in this pipeline as it is will be for Kinder Morgan to make more profit at the expense of our region.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up, thank you, thank you so much, next up is number 32?

MS. NOLAN: Thank you for the opportunity to address my concerns. My name is Denise Nolan, N-o-l-a-n and I am a longtime resident of this area. I would like to address two of my concerns tonight. I will not address the very real fact that lowered property values will mean higher property taxes for all.

Mortgage companies cancelling or denying loans for homeowners, the blight on the landscape, the dangers to my drinking water from well contamination or the real potential of my foundation cracking during the blasting stages of construction or the almost certainty of my long-time neighbor losing her home, I will leave that for others. My first concern is security.

This pipeline will be carrying highly flammable gas for hundreds of miles. In New Hampshire and Massachusetts the pipeline will run through some very isolated and rural areas. One is only to pick up the newspaper or tune into the nightly news to know that there are many angry, disturbed people in the world today, not even mentioning organized terrorist groups or lone wolves.

It should be noted that the pipes will be thinner in our rural area and as such not as strong as in more urban areas. Miles of unprotected pipeline plus thinner pipes plus violent times equals a disaster waiting to happen. Will this pipeline be secure 24/7 for its entire length? Will there be armed on-site security personnel ensuring these scenarios won't happen?

In addition to the pipeline itself are the compression stations a target in its own right, this brings me to my second concern -- noise pollution. According to the leaflet distributed at the last open house by Kinder Morgan, compressor stations will be emitting a constant noise level, your FERC's requirements are that "the noise level can be no greater than 55 decibels on a day/night average sound level at the closest noise sensitive area, 55 decibels is equivalent to a refrigerator running in the same room as you."

I and others in this room live here in rural New Hampshire to enjoy the quiet and the sounds of nature. This never-ending continual noise will destroy our way of life. Windows would have to be shut year 'round and we would not be able to enjoy the outdoors.

As a musician who is very attuned to sound I cannot imagine living with that constant noise. I must stop here but in conclusion I implore you to not allow a for profit corporation destroy our homes, our properties, our rural lifestyle and our peace and quiet to make money on the backs of the good citizens here in New Hampshire and Massachusetts, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are at number 33, I would also like to point out again the room out front is still open if you do not want to wait any longer.

MS. JOHNSON: Good evening my name is Christine Johnson, spelled with a C-h you know how to spell Johnson, okay very good. I'm speaking tonight as a representative for my father -- oh I live in Greenville by the way if I didn't say that -- so I am speaking as a representative for my father Charles Stickney, an 88 year old native resident of Amherst, New Hampshire, a 70 year property owner in that town and also is a Trustee for the family revocable trust.

Our property 28 acres, exists along the power line corridor. The house sits 45 feet from the right-of-way. We were recently informed of a new proposed alternative route which would take the power -- the pipeline away from the powerline corridor, splitting our property into land-locking a large portion of land, crossing through our pasture, going alongside the stream which flows through the property through a small pond, crossing into our neighbor's property through his leach field, then crossing route 122 over into an adjacent meadow and wetlands before continuing into commercial industrial land to travel alongside the Boston main railroad bed to then connect to Continental Boulevard and on up into Merrimack.

This route goes through part of the Penashock watershed and through a very busy high traffic commercial business area along Route 101A. My point being this proposed alternative route is no longer along the powerline corridor it is wavering through private lands, wetlands, watersheds and more. Our property has been farmland for 200 years, this area is rural, residential and already burdened with a power line for many years.

A representative from Tennessee Gas Pipeline told us we would be offered a one-time purchase for an easement through our property for the pipeline. We would still be responsible to pay for all property taxes and insurance, our yeah -- all property taxes and insurance, our access to the other side of the pipeline would be limited and also to be determined after survey.

My father had this question, how can FERC allow a for-profit company not fully compensate a 70 year taxpayer property owner for its land, its plans to use and burden, alter, change and de-value? We as a family and the residents of New Hampshire strongly request that you hear what everybody here is saying. No build, no pipeline, we have no use for it, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you so much. Next we have number 34?

MS. LYNN: Hello my name is Ara Lynn, A-r-a last name L-y-n-n. I live in New Ipswich. My comment today is addressing environmental concerns. I am outraged that Kinder Morgan intends to bring fracked gas, very polluting to the land where it is produced and carrying it through our towns in a pipeline that scars our land, degrades our rural character and exposes our communities to potentially deadly risk.

I am outraged that they intent to regularly release tens of thousands of cubic feet of methane gas directly into our atmosphere through a blow-off stock, they told me it wasn't a blow-down stack at the compressor station located in my town of New Ipswich.

Now the gentleman previously said he was told by the Kinder Morgan people that it was 15,000 cubic feet of methane gas that the blew off. When I asked the specific question at a meeting we had with them in Farm Borough they told me it was 24,000 cubic feet so I think they are pulling numbers out of the air.

They also told me that the distance between the valves was 15 miles instead of 7 and so I don't know what's up with that, okay. This release of methane into our atmosphere is a guaranteed occurrence if you allow this project to proceed. I no longer believe that you can require enough safeties on the compressor station to prevent harm to our local and our global environment.

We are already in the middle of a global climate emergency. This compressor station and its sister located in Northfield, Mass. will be contributing new greenhouses gases which do not original locally and which will affect the environment and the young people at this university and the ones that were sitting in the back there and came up and talked to you will be dealing with this in their lifetimes. This has got to stop here and now.

Since it is difficult for the human mind to grasp broad, global, seemingly intangible problems let me break it down to something smaller. To allow a compressor station so large that none of comparable size exists on the east coast, to allow this to be located so that homes and a convent and an elementary school all lie within the half mile incineration zone is the height of their responsibility.

Kinder Morgan doesn't care about collateral damage in the pursuit of the corporate dollar. If Kinder Morgan did care about the collateral damage they would not be proposing this situation. Spewing greenhouse gases into our air is a guaranteed and totally unacceptable risk. An explosion that wipes out an elementary school is only a risk but if an incident should occur, Kinder Morgan's lawyers and PR people will be unable to control the fire storm that will erupt in public opinion.

Jobs at FERC will be on the line since FERC has been thoroughly warned about this situation in these hearings. Please make sure the Commissioners are aware of it. Kinder Morgan will disappear one day, the air we breathe, the climate we live in and that our children and our grandchildren will inherit and do our jobs are more important than their corporate dollar. For the sake of the world, please deny this project.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next number 35?

MR. LEWICKE: John Lewicke, Mason, New Hampshire that's L-e-w-i-c-k-e. Eric Tomasi you have been presented on several occasions by several people with incontrovertible evidence that the Independent System Operators in New England manipulated the natural gas and electric markets, interstate markets in the winter of 2013-2014. I am once again give you this document.

This is fully footnoted with references from the FERC site and various other sources showing that ISO New England did manipulate the market. This is a direct violation of 717C of the Natural Gas Act. The Natural Gas Act is your charter to maintain fair prices and to prevent market manipulation. I have heard nothing about FERC's enforcement arm taking any action on it. You, Eric Tomassi, are FERC's man on the ground here in New Hampshire, what action are you going to take to get the enforcement of the Natural Gas Act and to find out whether it was truly criminal or not and what are you going to do to get this to the Commissioners?

And are you going to make sure that any so-called need based upon the market manipulation documented there and on your own website is not used to justify this pipeline? There is no public convenience or necessity, the necessity is based on fraud and market manipulation, that market manipulation and the price distortions associated with it are nation-wide at least as far as Henry hub and this was paid for with 66 million dollars of our money paid for through our system benefit charge and what benefit do we get from this?

Once again how much did it cost the rate payers and fuel users of New Hampshire as a result of this market manipulation so anyway it's you -- you are the one who is here, you are the one responsible, you should get this information to the Commissioners, and there should be some investigation and prosecutions, hopefully.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir. Next we are at number 36.

MR. DOUGLAS: My name is Curtis Douglas, D-o-u-g-l-a-s. I'm from Richmond, New Hampshire. Like most of the folks that were here and are here tonight I didn't ask for this fight. Some company I didn't know anything about and it's cadre of fixers and bag men declared war on me while I was otherwise just minding my own business.

My opposition to this proposal rests entirely on the fact that it represents a very real threat to the health, safety and well-being of my family. The pipeline routing currently proposed will place its center line within 20 feet of our house. Shoe-horning it into this location will result in not only a permanent right-of-way on our property but a permanent right-of-way through our house.

Our loss in value will most certainly be 100% under this scenario. In addition excavation and blasting will occur within 20 feet of our home and within 60 feet of our potable water well making damage to both a virtual certainty. As reprehensible as it is that Kinder Morgan wants to do this, it is even more repugnant that FERC will give serious consideration to approving it.

What if they wanted to blow up our kitchen, I mean let's be honest for a minute. There's already blood in the water, more sharks keep showing up by the day and thus far Kinder Morgan and FERC give every indication that you are just not going to be happy unless something gets blown up -- houses, finances, people, they are all pretty much the same to you right.

Pure predators are rarely discerning when it comes to their next meal. Just out of curiosity is there anywhere Kinder Morgan can propose placing the explosives that would raise a red flag other than near some endangered garden slug habitat of course. As we have all seen those types of concerns are way more important to you than our families.

But what about under our son's bed how about that? Or would that proposal receive consideration too as long as they promise to offer us a few trinkets and some glass beads for the fair market value of his pillows and blankets.

From where we sit every time this clown act you call a Commission approves another of these money-grabbing schemes, while all of the politicians in Washington look the other way and then suddenly developing amnesia about who they are really supposed to be working for, you hand the equivalent of a briefcase of nuclear launch codes to a couple of madmen in a form of eminent domain.

And this dog and pony show you so carefully scripted and now pass off as a legitimate process makes abundantly clear that how we feel about it and how dearly we may be forced to pay in some cases with our lives and the lives of our loved ones, doesn't really matter to you. It doesn't matter to our elected officials, it sure as hell doesn't matter to Kinder Morgan.

But it still matters to us and we still feel like we should count for something in all of this so for once why don't you prove that you actually have spines by manning up and regulating something instead of continuing to allow companies like Kinder Morgan to pimp you by rubber-stamping your approval of every crackpot idea that they dream up.

You know having a little respect for yourself can actually be liberating, you should try it some time.

MR. TOMASI: Next number 37? Is 37 here? 37? 38? 38 back there?

MR. MACDONALD: Good evening my name is John McDonald I live in Richmond, New Hampshire, M-a-c-D-o-n-a-l-d. There must be something in the drinking water in Richmond because I rarely agree with the previous speaker about your performance. Mr. Allen Fore, a public affairs representative for Kinder Morgan was recently quoted in the Greenfield, Massachusetts Recorder newspaper stating that, "He knows of no Kinder Morgan projects rejected by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission."

He went on to say, "When we file we are confident that we are going to make it." Yet we are told that our voices are going to be heard and we are told by our elected officials that it will be a level playing field. In light of Mr. Fore's remarks and FERC's record supporting Kinder Morgan I ask the representative of FERC what we are doing here this evening other than participating in a sham hearing so that you can meet your regulatory requirements.

You and our elected officials are well aware of the successful record Kinder Morgan has before your Commission and although our Governor and Washington delegation tells us that you are wholly independent from political influence, your Commission was created by Congress, is funded by Congress and both the House of Representatives and Senate has oversighted your Commission. So although you tout judicial review with each branch of government including the Supreme Court politics is involved.

No government agency or Commission are free from political influence and your track record shows that you are far from free from political influence. But we are supposed to be lulled into a belief that this process has a level playing field, that we have influence equal to the multi-billion dollar interest of Kinder Morgan and their lobbyists at the capital and White House.

According to one political watchdog group, an owner of Kinder Morgan has donated two million dollars to the Presidential campaign of Jeb Bush and tens of thousands to numerous other officials already in Congress and that's just one Kinder Morgan representative. Other than bringing in Tom Brady to our side of this level playing field how are we to compete against the influence one gets with millions of dollars in campaign contributions, much of that given to those with oversight of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

With all due respect to the Governor and our Congressional delegation, in my opinion any elected official calling for an open process and a transparent process as our Governor and Washington delegation have done are in effect supporting this pipeline. I think it is absolutely disgusting that they don't have the guts to stand up and oppose this like the senators in Massachusetts have and to fall back, Councilors Wheeler, Van Ostern and Austin representative McConnell were able to say no pipeline in New Hampshire, why can't Senator Shaheen and Congresswoman Kuster do the same.

Now that said I will say that we have had some negotiations directly with Kinder Morgan to move the pipeline out of my backyard and out of the backyard of my five neighbors and to be put away from our houses. They have tentatively agreed to do that and we are waiting final results of new plans and we will see how far that goes.

MR. TOMASI: Sir your time is up.

MR. MACDONALD: I'm just going to finish this because if I get a pipeline in my backyard you can listen to the rest of this.

MR. TOMASI: Sir your time is up.

MR. MACDONALD: There needs to be a recognition by your Commission of the difficult if not impossible task that an average person of even a small town has attempting to influence this process in organizing to effective opposition and a recognition of your responsibility in allowing this imbalance of power to exist to the detriment of the people and the town's affected by these pipelines.

This should lead to a fundamental change requiring FERC to be involved earlier and more directly rather than an almost impossible and meaningless task of over --

MR. TOMASI: Sir your time is up, you can go into the other room and speak, we only have one half left and we need to get through another 20-some more people.

MR. MACDONALD: And perhaps occasionally opposing Kinder Morgan.

MR. TOMASI: We are at number 39?

MS. CHAPMAN: Thank you, hello my name is Kathy Chapman, C-h-a-p-m-a-n and I'm from Mason, New Hampshire. I want to just in the beginning bring up the three points that I want to hit so I don't lose them at the end. The first point is that the lateral going through Mason, no one has mentioned that tonight, no one has mentioned that there is even a customer for it but that still leaves the people in Mason up in the air about it so it would be really nice to have that lateral gone and have some notification really soon that it is because property values are affected, you have heard all of that tonight.

The next thing is the scoping should not end until the pipeline route is set. Because people -- it can be

moved anywhere at any time but scoping will be over and the example is Merrimack and Amherst moving to Merrimack and Hollis but that can happen anywhere, anytime the pipeline gets moved it is going to go on somebody else's property and those people have had no chance at all so it gives Kinder Morgan all of the incentive to just draw a random line on the map if they don't have to -- scoping will end no matter what so that's a bad rule that needs to change.

And my last point is that there are five different pipeline projects proposing to nearly double the amount and people have mentioned this before of natural gas coming into New England, but by dealing with each project in isolation, FERC risks violating its own rules against segmentation and overbuilding causing excessive and unnecessary environmental and socio-economic impacts for redundant infrastructure. FERC also opens itself up for a legal challenge based on NEPA and so you know you have these cases I'm sure right at the tip of your tongue but this goes back as far as 1985 where the court noted that scoping regulations require connected, cumulative and similar actions to be considered together in the same EIS.

More recently on June 6, 2014 FERC and the Tennessee Gas Pipeline were found to have impermissibly segmented the environmental review in violation of NEPA so our friends, the Tennessee Gas Pipeline lost in that case and hopefully they will continue to not be successful and then in December of 2014 the Council on Environmental Quality Guidance announced similar kinds of rules about a lack of segmentation.

Problematic examples of situations where projects need to be combined -- several similar actions or projects in a region or nationwide, a suite of on-going proposed or reasonably foreseeable actions that share a common geography or timing -- I'm sure you are well aware of these regulations.

The Northeast Gas Association provides a list of planned pipeline projects, Tennessee Gas, Kinder Morgan, Connecticut Expansion and the status is the application has been filed with FERC, Spectra Atlantic Bridge in FERC pre-filing, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Northeast Direct, what we are here for tonight in FERC pre-filing, Spectra Access Northeast open season 2015 and Portland Natural Gas open season 2015, these projects are redundant and they cannot be considered independently.

The excess gas from all of these projects will have to go somewhere and we are guessing as you have heard many times tonight that it will be going for export.

MR. TOMASI: Your time is up ma'am.

MS. CHAPMAN: Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. Next we are at number 40? Number 40? 41? Oh 40 okay. I would like to point out that we don't have a lot of time left, sorry this doesn't count against you obviously but there are still many people on the list and we may not be able to get through so if you are up in the 50's you may want to consider giving your comment out in the other room.

MR. GOETTLE: My name is Dick Goettle, last name is G-o-e-t-t-l-e. I am a resident of Fitzwilliam. Your mission is to assist consumers in obtaining reliable, efficient and sustainable energy services at reasonable costs through appropriate regulatory and market means.

The irony of this is that the Kinder Morgan's of the world get to define where the need is, you don't even look at that so I would urge you in your EIS activities to really look at the information that Kinder Morgan provides and really dig down deep and I will give you an example.

There is a document on their website, a report that is published by ICF, a very reputable consulting firm in Washington that attempts to justify this pipeline. There is also an analysis by the Energy Information Administration that looks to clean power plan the context of all of their forecasting. It turns out that if you really look at this the two documents agree on residential, commercial and industrial demand.

What they disagree on is electricity. The ICF report has electricity growing at .8% a year out to 2035 and EIA has it growing at .4% so that's a big difference and that will be a big difference in natural gas demand. What is really revealing is that at the end of the day ICF comes up with this gap, this 2.2 billion cubic feet with a demand that's 6.7 and a supply that's about 4.5 in 2035.

If you look at the numbers in essence what they are saying is that natural gas consumption in the electric

power industry is going to be 4.9 billion cubic feet, that's 20% of the total amount of natural gas consumed in the electric power industry in the EIA forecast.

We only consume 4% now in New England so that's just ridiculous. I would urge you please look at the stuff that they provide with a really hard review of what they are telling you. This pipeline is not needed the EIA forecast is comfortably under 4 billion cubic feet a day which is satisfied by existing supplies on the books so we don't need it so the gas is going to go for export.

The ICF report has LNG terminal at Everett at 25% of its capacity. We could basically fill the needs of New England by just operating that at something like 80% capacity so please look at this stuff. Another area is property values. The property value citations in the report the Kinder Morgan documentation -- look at those reports. I am an economist, I have been doing energy analysis for 40 years, if you look at these property value things, these are bad models, they are weak models, they did an analysis, a really good analysis but it turns out that the residential development occurred after the pipeline had been installed for 20 years so of course there is no impact on property values but there was an accident there and that accident cost property owners \$10,000 on average so you know really do a hard look at the information that is being provided and you will find this pipeline is not needed and the information you are getting from Kinder Morgan is a sham, thank you sir.

MR. TOMASI: Next we are at number 41, 41? 42? 42?

MR. MILLER: My name is Nick Miller, M-i-l-l-e-r. At a recent scoping meeting hosted by FERC I asked Mr. Eric Tomasi if he had any response to the multitude of lies told to the public by Kinder Morgan. Mr. Tomasi asked that I file any comments regarding Kinder Morgan's misbehavior with FERC so that they are documented.

I replied that I had already done so many times. Mr. Tomasi the list below provides you with just some of the comments that I have filed with FERC beginning in October of last year, all of these comments include examples of Kinder Morgan's misdirect and outright lies. The filings are titled one -- why Kinder Morgan isn't more forthcoming.

Two -- Kinder Morgan continues to torture the truth. Three -- the damage caused by Kinder Morgan's deliberate misinformation. Four -- how FERC has failed the public on the Northeast Energy Direct Project. Five -- fix FERC first, Chapter 3, FERC allows the public to be misled and if FERC is interested in locating filings from other commenters who also complained about Kinder Morgan's lies and misinformation I suggest the following:

Make use of your own e-library search capability in the NED docket using search terms such as deceptive, mislead and misinform. These three searches will all return multiple comments on Kinder Morgan's deceit. In a recent FERC filing titled open house meetings averted from obligation to inform into opportunity to sell.

Another commenter searched your e-library using the search term open house and has located 36 separate comments that report Kinder Morgan's continued attempts to mislead the public. Mr. Tomasi, the information that you requested has long been available in FERC's own repository but the public is simply not at all sure that you read this information or that having read it that you believe it or that believing it that you have the slightest inclination to put a stop to it and to remediate the damage that these lies have caused to the public.

Kinder Morgan doesn't want there to be an informed public. An informed public asks hard questions and does not accept vague misleading answers. Kinder Morgan much prefers a more complacent ill-informed public. If FERC is unwilling or unable to control this misinformation that the pipeline company spreads or to apply some type of sanction to it, why would Kinder Morgan not continue to lie to the public?

How about it FERC, do you have any control over your orgy of misinformation that Kinder Morgan supplies and do you have any intention of remediating the damage that it has already done to the public or are we as completely on our own in trying to defend ourselves against Kinder Morgan as we would appear to

be?

Printed copies of this document include links to all of the comments that I have referred to above. I also have extra printed copies if anyone would like one.

MR. TOMASI: Thanks. We are at number 43? 43?

MR. BORDEN: It's been a long night my leg went to sleep. Robert Borden, Borden as in milk, B-o-r-d-e-n, 199 Farm Hill Road, Fitzwilliam. My wife and I bought the property and moved in on the 30th of November and a week later we discovered this mess so I had to go to meetings about it and late January snow still on the ground, came home one day and there is a strange car down the road by the power line which goes diagonally across my property.

Hmm -- went down Louisiana license plate, two young men I asked them who they were and what they were doing. Well they did admit they were surveyors they worked for such and such a company and I said never heard of them and they were subcontractors with somebody else and finally we worked our way up four links of the chain of command and the big boss was Kinder Morgan.

And I said well I happen to be a property owner, you know this is posted both sides and you are on the pavement that is your legal right but if you step off I am calling the police. Oh we are not going to do that sir. Two weeks later another car down there this time I did call the police -- only one patrolman in the daytime in Fitzwilliam and it took him a while to get down there and I got impatient and went down. A Texas license plate -- and I didn't talk to them but I very obviously took their plate number so that they could see me and I went home, officer got there a few minutes later, talked with him came up and said well I reviewed New Hampshire property laws with them and they assured me they are not going to step off the pavement.

And I said well you know it doesn't hurt to let them know they are being watched. I went down later and they had driven a yellow surveyor spike into the pavement. Had a phone conversation with some PR firm in Massachusetts told them I wasn't happy -- wrote to the Governor of the state offices, wrote to FERC, wrote to Kinder Morgan.

They keep sending me publicity puffs, now I have always put my correct return address but they are still sending their letters to me at my old Massachusetts address. Yes, the wife and I fled Tax-achusetts. Wasn't that smart of us? So several things I am concerned about. A power line goes diagonally across the property my house is within that incineration zone, if that line goes the 1768 house and anybody in it is history.

And I am concerned about the water level quality, the purity of my well, I know on my property there are moose, I spotted a bald eagle last week, there are Canadian Lynx and bears in the neighborhood occasionally, something else to think about.

If you go down my woods towards the Rindge line you cross two streams, I wouldn't say they are intermittent but they are a lot wider in the wintertime and very narrow come July so that's another concern. I don't intend to cooperate, I have told them that, they can take me to court and I hope to God everybody else in this town feels the same way and let me remind you what General John Stacks said, "Live free," thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you sir, we are at number 44, 44? 45? 46? 47?

MR. PRIMUS: Good evening Mr. Tomasi Vince Primus, Pepperell, Massachusetts. Well I have to start by saying I'm disappointed in your list Mr. Tomasi at the top of the meeting you seemed to be missing the topic of need from your list of public concerns that you have discovered over the last several weeks. The issue of need is the cornerstone of this docket yet it plays no part in your charter to develop an Environmental Impact Statement.

Need typically falls under the purview of credentialed industry stakeholders. The public is dismissed as unqualified to contribute as we can be "fickle and recalcitrant" if you recall according to Ben Dentonio, Staff Attorney for the New England State's Committee on Electricity.

The case for need is generally predicated on the winter peaking problem. Winter is a time when the weather is dangerous and people are vulnerable. It's a scenario screaming for exploitation by an opportunistic businessman looking to export natural gas to global markets.

I have testified that New England's winter peaking problem is a 1% problem --1% of the region's annual demand of 889 billion cubic feet, just 10 billion cubic feet. Now I am not credentialed but it turns out that this number was independently confirmed last year by ICF International and they are credentialed. They provide expert consulting services to public and private sector clients on comprehensive energy strategies like Kinder Morgan, GDF Suez and ISO New England.

In November of 2014 they published a study commissioned by ISO that examined near term gas supply constraints on electric generation. They took into account historical temperature trends, planned retirements and unplanned outages and they projected that this region's median annual winter gas supply deficit for the year 2020 would be 10.7 million dekatherms or 10.7 billion cubic feet, my very 1% problem.

While you do not build a privately owned export pipeline capable of moving 800 billion cubic feet of natural gas each year to markets in Europe and Asia on the backs of New Hampshire and Massachusetts homeowners to fix a 1% problem, especially when you plan to steal their land via eminent domain while telling them it is for the greater good to do it.

If ISO was serious about a winter-reliability program that serves the rate-payer they could augment interruptible gas supply by subsidizing three tankers worth of LNG each winter for the next 30 years before they exceed the cost of building this 5 and billion dollar pipeline.

A bridge for a few years until renewable distributed generation and battery storage have matured to the point of serving the region's grid scale base load power demands. I see the red light blinking, I will finish with this.

The subject of needs deserves to be deliberated in a transparent and quantitative manner with informed rate payers like us. FERC needs to convene a formal public hearing specifically dedicated to an assessment of the Northeast Energy Direct Pipeline need and one in which the no build option is firmly on the table.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you and we only have a few minutes left before I have to close the meeting so again we still have another room outside, please if you haven't spoken try to get up there, we are at number 48 is 48 here? So if you have above number 50 I highly recommend going outside and giving your comment there.

MR. CHESEBROUGH: My name is Rob Chesebrough, C-h-e-s-e-b-r-o-u-g-h. Kinder Morgan's Northeast Energy Direct Project is a high pressure pipeline carrying excessive amounts of natural gas through New Hampshire without a primary benefit to the state. It's a bad deal for New Hampshire that would take lands by eminent domain, likely raise energy rates, decrease home values and threaten water quality across the region.

We demand a more sensible course for New Hampshire's energy future with a plan that is flexible and forward leaning while preserving live free or die state. We demand the Governor, unequivocally oppose the forfeiture of New Hampshire lands and the use of utility rate payer's funds to construct the NED pipeline. We call on Governor Hassan to stop NED.

This statement is from an on-going Petition in New Hampshire carrying over 8500 signatures. "During the FERC Environmental Impact Review we request that the Commissioners consider that over 8500 residents that signed this Petition are a critical part of New Hampshire's environment which negatively is affected by this project.

Over 8,500 citizens of this state object to this oversized project strongly enough to Petition the Governor to stop it. We request that the citizens are not simply mitigated or downplayed. New Hampshire is our home, our safety, our well-being and our playground. Chairman Bay this is not just a pipeline. Commissioner Clark this is not a simple pipeline. Thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you very much. Number we are at 49?

MR. HORTON: Rick Horton from Winchester, New Hampshire. Horton, H-o-r-t-o-n. I am the Founder of Winchester Proud, I am the Winchester School Board Chairman and most importantly I am a father of five children that are now home asleep. I don't know if you know Winchester. We are home to about 5,000 people, home to about 700 school-aged students and home to the Winchester Pickle Festival.

Most importantly tonight home to a winning boys' soccer team. Tonight after standing in the rain watching some boys play their heart out and win and the parents cheering them on in the rain it became very clear to me what I needed to speak about tonight.

Tonight I speak about our youth and our future. I was very happy to see the young group of kids that came up and spoke because we are making decisions for their land, for their world, for their backyards, not ours. What we do today is what our youth will have to deal with.

Do you want them to clean up our mess because there are a lot of messes that we are cleaning up from generations passed. Let's break the cycle, let's teach energy conservation and not alternative fuels. We need to evolve we need to change the example by which we lead. I ask that you be brave and courageous not for the adults in this room but for our youth they are our future, be brave and say no to the pipeline, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you. We are at number 50 is 50 here? 51? 52? Is 50 here? Okay --

MR. REECE: You got doubled up on the numbers I guess. My name is Seth Reece, R-e-e-c-e from Richmond and I am following on the heels of some other pretty significant Richmond folks. Tonight I could come to you and I could speak as an elected officer on the planning board for the town of Richmond but I am not going to.

I could come and speak to you as an appointed representative to the Selectmen for the Pipeline Awareness and I am not going to. Today I am just going to talk to you as my daughter's dad and since I found out about this project and the intentions of Kinder Morgan to come through our land with a 36 inch fundable gas pipeline I tried to do a little bit of research to find out exactly what the heck all of this was about.

And the more research I did the less I liked it. The more research I did on Kinder Morgan the less I like them as a company and the less I like them as people in general because I am generally one who would like to be straight up with people and I expect the same from those I deal with.

Kinder Morgan is anything but, they use this word transparent and I don't think it means what they think it means. FERC uses the word transparent and I am pretty sure you don't know what it means. You are an appointed agency with government power delegated outside of the three branches of government immune to the system of checks and balances that this country has instituted.

You have authority and you have power and you have zero responsibility. There's a definition that I looked up today and it is called a -- it's called regulatory capture. Sure you must have had the best intentions setting out -- regulatory capture happens when a regulatory agency formed to act in the public's interest eventually acts in ways that benefit the industry it is supposed to be regulating rather than the public. And since your institution you have denied a total of 2 pipeline certificates and neither of those were for standalone pipelines.

You are funded by the industries you regulate. You essentially write your own paychecks. What motivation would you have to deny Kinder Morgan a pipeline? This is money in your pocket. When you go home tonight Mr. Tomasi I wouldn't mind if you called your fellow Commissioners and said, "Hey listen we are doing this the wrong way, we actually need to serve the public and we need to not line our pockets."

Because what you are doing now is just stealing from us and that is an act of war and we will not accept it, thank you.

MR. TOMASI: Okay we are going to do one more person and then we are going to have to wrap this up so next person, we are at number 53?

MR. COOPER: Good afternoon I'm Ronald Jonathan Cooper, III from Rockingham which is a bit far away from here. I am a student at this lovely Rindge Campus at Franklin Pierce University and I am also a candidate for State Representative in Rockingham County. I may only be 18 but don't discredit my opinion.

I am here to speak for my generation and for my children's generation so let's get started. Kinder Morgan is not a company to be trusted. In 2009 the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration, PHMSA cited Kinder Morgan for violating safety standards regarding the distance between a natural gas pipeline and a high consequence area such as a school or hospital. The pipeline was too close for safe operation and in case of leak.

That is not something I think the people here want and I'm not sure that that is something that any of us want. In 2011 PHMSA cited Kinder Morgan for these safety violations including failing to maintain a big map showing pipeline location which we know their TBD's are for, failing to test pipeline safety devices, failing to maintain proper fire-fighting equipment, failing to inspect its pipeline as required and failing to adequately monitor pipe's corrosive levels.

They are not abiding by the laws set before them, they don't care about us they don't care about you, they don't care about me, they don't care about any of us, they don't care about New Hampshire, all they care about is making money and that is not something that this state needs, we are the granite state for a reason and we are going to stand solid.

MR. TOMASI: Thank you and unfortunately with that we are going to wrap up the meeting. Again I want to thank everybody for coming and staying late. I want to thank Franklin Pierce University for hosting us tonight and everyone have a safe ride home, thank you.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 11:06 p.m.)