

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
2 TRANSCONTINENTAL GAS PIPE LINE COMPANY, LLC.

3 DOCKET NO. CP17-101-000

4

5 PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

6

7 Best Western Gregory Hotel

8 8315 4th Avenue

9 Brooklyn, NY 11209

10

11 Thursday, April 26, 2018

12 5:00 p.m.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1 SPEAKER LIST
- 2 Christine Allen
- 3 Bill Braun-Chair
- 4 Stephen Ryba
- 5 Catherine Skopic
- 6 Elliott Skipp Roseboro
- 7 Zachary Pace
- 8 Justin Pascone
- 9 Barbara Dolan
- 10 Joan Flynn
- 11 James Leonzio
- 12 Claire Hilger
- 13 Kimberly Hauer
- 14 Danny Ruscillo (comment read by Mr. Ruscillo's wife)
- 15 Judith Canepa
- 16 Jhena Vigrass
- 17 Margarita Estevez
- 18 Edward Power
- 19 Riitta Ikonen
- 20 Paul Flansburg
- 21 Patrick Houston
- 22 Jackie Weisberg
- 23 Thomas Wendol
- 24 Tony Rana
- 25 Lyel Resner

1   SPEAKER LIST (Continued)

2   Annie Garneva

3   Susan Wilcox

4   Carol Kelly

5   Barbara Hertel

6   Joanne Boger

7   Christina Simanca-Proctor

8   James Hannigan

9   Alex Beauchamp

10  Eric Wagner

11  James Boyman

12  Eva Welchman

13  Eugene Falik

14  Kathleen Walker

15  Raphael Wakefield

16  George Elliot

17  Ian Kinniburgh

18  Lee Ziesche

19  Jack Depalma

20  Damien James Greene-Ayala

21  Cara Cannella

22  Bridgette Klapinski

23  Shanna Estevez

24  Laura Shindell

25

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

2 MS. ALLEN: The Draft EIS Comment Session for the  
3 Northeast Supply Enhancement Project proposed by  
4 Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company in Brooklyn, New York  
5 began at 5 p.m. The purpose of this meeting is to record  
6 public comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
7 issued by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on March  
8 23, 2018.

9 MR. RYBA: I'm Stephen Ryba, Chief of the  
10 Regulatory Branch for the New York District U.S. Army Corp  
11 of Engineers. I will be the presiding officer on behalf of  
12 the Corp of Engineers at today's public hearing.

13 The Corp of Engineers is here today to obtain  
14 information and evidence that address Corp concerns to  
15 assist in the regulatory review of a permanent application  
16 by Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC. for the  
17 installation and construction of a new natural gas  
18 transmission pipeline loop and associated sub-C manifold  
19 tie-in and the cathodic protection in Old Bridge Township  
20 in the Borough of Sayreville, Middlesex County, New Jersey  
21 and in Raritan Bay, Lower New York Bay and the Atlantic  
22 Ocean, Middlesex County and Monmouth County, New Jersey, and  
23 Richmond County and Queens County, New York.

24 FERC, as lead federal agency will make a decision  
25 whether to issue approval to facilitate the construction and

1 operation of this natural gas pipeline. The Corp of  
2 Engineers is neither a proponent for nor an opponent of the  
3 proposed work. Our role is to determine whether the  
4 proposed activity in this case, the installation of a  
5 natural gas pipeline and associated facilities in waters of  
6 the United States is or is not contrary to the overall  
7 public interest.

8           This hearing will play an important part in that  
9 determination. Please understand that we do not expect to  
10 answer questions in this hearing related to the proposal as  
11 we are here to obtain information and your comments.

12           Questions on the regulatory process in general  
13 will be directed to my staff and the audience today. New  
14 York District has issued a public notice for this project  
15 and with the comment period closing on May 7th the public  
16 notice is currently posted on the New York District website.

17           The website address is [www.nan.usace.army.mil](http://www.nan.usace.army.mil).  
18 We do have some copies available at the registration table  
19 as well. If you are not currently on our public notice  
20 email distribution list and would like to receive an email  
21 announcement for future public notices from my office,  
22 please provide your email address to one of the staff  
23 members at the registration table today, thank you.

24           MS. SKOPIC: My name is Catherine with a "C",  
25 C-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-e last name Skopic, S-k-o-p-i-c and I live

1 in Manhattan, New York, okay. My name is Catherine Skopic,  
2 I live in Manhattan, New York and I'm a member of Interfaith  
3 Moral Action on Climate, Sierra Club, Shut Down Indian Point  
4 Now, and the People's Climate Movement in New York.

5 Sunday, April 22nd, many of us celebrated the  
6 38th birthday -- I wonder how many more birthdays we will be  
7 able to celebrate. We had a member of the group, We Are  
8 Children, prepare a talk for the event we held in Battery  
9 Park, New York City, Celebrate Earth NYC 2018, and I'd like  
10 to read a few excerpts from her Earth Day speech.

11 "Hello, my name is Valentina Ossa. I am 11 years  
12 old and in 5th grade. I was born in New York City and live  
13 in Brooklyn. I am here today to stand for all the people  
14 who don't have the courage to stand up for themselves, for  
15 all the kids who have been told that they are too young to  
16 make a change.

17 I am here for the people who are doing this to  
18 Mother Earth. Why you might ask? Because they are people  
19 just like us who have been raised wrong, taught wrong, or  
20 made wrong decisions in their lives. They haven't thought  
21 about the future generations that I and all the kids will  
22 inherit.

23 If we don't stop now, who will have clean water  
24 to drink and air to breathe or a beach to swim at? All of  
25 these things are rights, not privileges. Every day children

1 are suffering because they don't have clean water to drink  
2 and are worried for their lives.

3           Is that the kind of world we want to live in? I  
4 remember the first time my mom told me about fracking. I  
5 was young and cried and cried. I had a fear of what it  
6 would be like when I was older. I had a fear that people  
7 were doing this to the earth and they wouldn't stop.

8           I had fear that we weren't just doing this to us,  
9 but that we were doing it to all the animals and all the  
10 organisms in this earth. We just went against life itself.  
11 I started doing research every time I got more angry. I  
12 needed to do something.

13           I did everything a 5 year old could do. My mom  
14 took me to a rally, a wrote a letter to Governor Cuomo to  
15 stop fracking and he did, but that's not enough. Climate  
16 change has gotten worse really fast and we need to make  
17 changes faster. We need you to stop compressor stations  
18 when the chemicals go into the air and poison the water,  
19 land, humans, and everything around it.

20           We need you to stop the pipelines. We need 100%  
21 renewables." Valentina is the daughter of Bethany Yaro and  
22 the granddaughter of Marybeth and Peter Yaro, Peter, Paul  
23 and Mary -- three generations of people who care. How about  
24 you care too? Stop the Williams Pipeline.

25           MR. ROSEBORO: I'm Elliott Skipp Roseboro, Elliot

1 E-l-l-i-o-t-t Skip, S-k-i-p-p Roseboro, R-o-s-e-b-o-r-o.  
2 Alright without being just trying to be respectful I just  
3 want to say I think this process is somehow of a fraud, it's  
4 neither public or really a forum.

5           That said, I won't have -- skip what a lot of  
6 people are going to say and just point out that our new  
7 Governor, we forced him a while back to not allow fracking  
8 in this state. It seems incongruous to then allow fracking  
9 outside of the state in other communities and bring those  
10 gases in, all the damage that these different chemicals will  
11 do and so on.

12           And in doing that you also tie us into an  
13 industry that keeps us from being able to move towards  
14 sustainable energy, to move to more sustainable jobs and all  
15 the benefits there, so I think we need to recognize that the  
16 hazards of having the safety records of not only Williams,  
17 but all pipeline companies, but also to have this dangerous  
18 -- these dangerous chemicals which it's not a matter of if  
19 they were spilled, it's a given -- there's no pipeline that  
20 hasn't leaked, when it will leak.

21           And to have it inside our city in areas that are  
22 with population also is a problem. Our rivers and waterways  
23 are already tainted and to have this which will eventually  
24 which Alicia will speak, makes no sense whatsoever. It just  
25 exacerbates an already bad situation so I'll leave it at



1 that.

2 MR. PACE: My name is Zachary Pace, Z-a-c-h-a-r-y  
3 P-a-c-e and I'm affiliated with 350 Brooklyn. I'm here  
4 tonight because I want to voice my opposition to the  
5 Williams Transco Northeast Supply Enhancement Pipeline which  
6 would carry fracked gas through to the waterways by New York  
7 Harbor.

8 I'm opposed to the pipeline and more generally to  
9 all the additional fracking infrastructure in this state for  
10 many reasons but in the interest of time I want to give  
11 specifically on the safety record of the Williams Transco's  
12 previous pipeline projects.

13 Since 2008, ten Williams Transco pipelines and  
14 compressor stations have exploded and/or caught fire. And  
15 since 2008 five other Williams' natural gas facilities have  
16 experienced explosions and/or fires.

17 These explosions and fires have killed 6 people  
18 and injured 141 people, an egregious number for a company  
19 that's insisting to meet the state safety regulations. In  
20 addition these explosions and fires have destroyed property  
21 and burned many acres of land -- a wasteful consequence of a  
22 company abiding by the supposed safety regulations of the  
23 state.

24 Finally, these explosions and fires have released  
25 the potent greenhouse gas methane, which is 86 times more

1 potent as a greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide, into the  
2 atmosphere which is known to contribute significantly to  
3 climate change, which increases the likelihood of severe  
4 weather and threatening the safety of us all.

5           These actions that have been documents in the  
6 public record clearly threaten the lives of the people  
7 working to construct the pipeline as well as those in the  
8 path of construction. The U.S. Pipeline and Hazardous Waste  
9 Safety Administration has repeatedly fined Williams for  
10 violations of safety procedures, even in the absence of an  
11 accident.

12           The Environmental Impact Statement disregards the  
13 consideration of this past record as long as the company  
14 meets the state's minimal safety standards, but I have a  
15 hard time seeing how these past tragedies, that have  
16 threatened both construction workers and citizens are  
17 relevant.

18           If one of those 9 people who died were one of  
19 your loved ones I'm sure you would think it was relevant  
20 too. The poor safety record of Williams Transco is quite  
21 relevant and the recent denial of the water quality  
22 permitted by the DEC because the company failed to complete  
23 its application in a timely manner is a vivid reflection of  
24 the incompetence of the company as a whole.

25           For the safety of the state's workers and

1 citizens, I ask you to choose a true, no-action alternative  
2 and deny the project if the company reapplies. This project  
3 must not move forward, thank you.

4 MR. PASCONE: My name is Justin Pascone, that's  
5 spelled J-u-s-t-i-n and then my last name is spelled  
6 P-a-s-c-o-n-e and I'm here on behalf of the New York  
7 Building Congress. Thank you, the New York Building  
8 Congress is a non-partisan coalition of business, laborer  
9 professionals and government organizations serving the  
10 design, construction real estate industry.

11 The Building Congress supports sound public  
12 policy that promotes productive capital spending and smart,  
13 safe investments in our energy resources. The Northeast  
14 Supply Enhancement Project is a critical expansion of  
15 Transco's existing pipeline infrastructure in Pennsylvania,  
16 New Jersey and New York, to provide its customers access to  
17 an additional 400 million cubic feet of natural gas per  
18 day.

19 The project will provide service to the natural  
20 -- National Grid's service territory in Brooklyn, Queens,  
21 Staten Island and Long Island. Transco's Pipeline has  
22 reliably served the New York City area for more than 60  
23 years and currently provides half of the gas consumed in the  
24 city.

25 The project will establish a critical new length

1 to additional supplies for New York City, making access to  
2 natural gas more reliability, via the safest method for  
3 transporting energy. Thanks to increased natural gas  
4 displacing fuel oils, New York City is currently  
5 experiencing its cleanest air in over 50 years.

6           The project will help the city continue to  
7 progress -- continue the progress it has made improving air  
8 quality and reducing ground level air pollution. The  
9 project could not come at a more critical time for New York  
10 as it experiences significant economic and population  
11 growth.

12           Increasing the availability of cleaner, more  
13 reliable energy to meet demand, will allow the city to  
14 sustain and build on its positive momentum. The New York  
15 Building Congress supports this project and thanks you for  
16 your time today.

17           MS. DOLAN: Okay my name is Barbara Dolan. I  
18 don't think I have any relevant affiliation. B-a-r-b-a-r-a  
19 D-o-l-a-n. I'm here tonight because I want to voice my  
20 opposition to Williams Transco Northeast Supply Enhancement  
21 Pipeline which would carry fracked gas for 23 miles under  
22 New York's lower harbor.

23           FERC's Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
24 freely concedes that toxic substances like lead, mercury,  
25 arsenic, PCB's and dioxins land at the harbor. The vast

1 majority of samples from the proposed path of this project  
2 showed levels of one or more of these above levels judged to  
3 be safe, yet nowhere does FERC address the potential  
4 long-term effects on human and marine life, of churning  
5 these toxic substances up to the waters of our shores.

6           Okay, but while by the 1970's a century of  
7 industrial run-off had made areas of the harbor virtually  
8 dead, 50 years later we have come a long way. We've poured  
9 billions into waste treatment facilities and industrial  
10 run-offs has almost ceased.

11           The toxins laid down years ago are now under new  
12 layers of sand, clay and gravel. If undisturbed they pose  
13 far less risk than they did long ago. Evidence of renewed  
14 health of our off-shore waters have caused the return of  
15 whales and seals in significant numbers.

16           Bottom feeders like the endangered Atlantic  
17 sturgeon and like clams, would be particularly threatened by  
18 excavating these toxins. And the waters off Staten Island,  
19 Brooklyn and the Rockaways are filled with swimmers,  
20 surfers, boaters and people fishing -- these toxins threaten  
21 us all.

22           I urge you to deny a permit to the Williams  
23 Transco Northeast Supply Enhancement Pipeline, thank you for  
24 your time and consideration.

25           MS. FLYNN: Okay my name is Joan Flynn, F-l-y-n-n

1 and my affiliation is to the human race. Okay, so in 1994 I  
2 saw the Edison Gas Pipeline explosion. It was horrifying  
3 and I was in Brooklyn going over the Gowanus Canal on the  
4 BQE. I saw the flames of that from Brooklyn on the BQE and  
5 it terrified me.

6 Then, after a hurricane happened to our  
7 neighborhood of Rockaway, I learned that a pipeline was  
8 coming right down Flatbush Avenue through a national  
9 recreation area and into the ocean. Remembering what the  
10 Edison Gas Pipeline looked like -- again I was pretty  
11 terrified.

12 The hurricane didn't help but every time I drive  
13 down Flatbush Avenue and I see that and I see the transfer  
14 station and I realize what's going on there, it makes me  
15 extremely uncomfortable.

16 The Williams Pipeline -- the Williams' company  
17 record makes me extremely uncomfortable for my safety and  
18 for the safety of my neighbors and my planet. Digging a new  
19 pipeline is going to once again destroy the environment  
20 where I live and I swim.

21 I, -- I'm ashamed -- I'm ashamed of FERC. I'm  
22 ashamed of the government. I don't care who the President  
23 is, this country is an embarrassment with our energy  
24 policies, a complete and total embarrassment.

25 And I -- I can't even say anymore I'm so upset by

1 this.

2 MR. LEONZIO: First name is James, J-a-m-e-s,  
3 last name Leonzio, L-e-o-n-z-i-o. I'm a volunteer with the  
4 Surf Rider Foundation. Hi, my name is James, I live in the  
5 Williamsburg neighborhood of Brooklyn. I'm a registered  
6 intervener with FERC and a volunteer at the Surf Rider  
7 Foundation and I would like to express my concern on three  
8 topics related to the proposed Williams Transco Pipeline.

9 The first one is safety, the second one is impact  
10 on marine and human life via toxic substances and the third  
11 one is harm to the shoreline economy. So first safety --  
12 since 2008 there have been 10 Williams Transco Pipeline  
13 compression station incidents.

14 These incidents are explosions and fire that are  
15 fatal and have caused many injuries and have damaged our  
16 environment. Additional natural gas infrastructure is a  
17 danger that the people of New York City do not want or need.

18 The second topic -- impacts on marine and human  
19 life via toxic substances. The DEIS generally notes some  
20 dangers associated with toxic substances but fails to  
21 mention the sea bed of the lower New York Bay is full of  
22 these very toxins.

23 There are high concentrations of lead, mercury,  
24 PCB's, cadmium, chlorine, that finally settled after  
25 pollution from the early 20th Century and dredging and

1 trenching reversed this process thereby re-releasing these  
2 materials back into the circulating currents and waves and  
3 the ocean that people enjoy.

4 I surf in the Rockaways, my friends and family  
5 surf and you know, swim in the Rockaways. Thousands of  
6 people visit the beaches and ocean in New York City every  
7 year and these substances are extremely hazardous -- this is  
8 something that nobody who visits the beaches around New York  
9 City want.

10 Third is the harm to the shoreline economy. DEIS  
11 inaccurately assesses the impact that the construction will  
12 have on the shoreline economy, specifically with regards to  
13 the construction area being 2,500 foot radius and that is  
14 somehow a minor impact -- it's just simply not true.

15 The construction process -- 7 separate  
16 recreational fishing grounds so imagine what fishing would  
17 be like when their water is full of toxins, lead and  
18 obstacles like machinery and construction material.

19 Even without permanent auditory damage, whales  
20 are expected to flee any vicinity of this construction area  
21 because of noise pollution and it disrupts their habits and  
22 patterns of life and that would completely destroy any whale  
23 watching experience or business that takes people on whale  
24 watching adventures or sight-seeing.

25 So the oceans off New York City beaches are areas



1 that should not be disrupted in this way. Too many  
2 businesses and people rely on this environment being  
3 balanced or relatively balanced -- there is a sense of it  
4 right now and this construction would by far, make it a  
5 whole lot worse in terms of that balance.

6 I, along with many other New York City residents,  
7 strongly oppose the construction of the proposed Williams  
8 Transco Pipeline.

9 MS. HILGER: My name is Clare Hilger, C-l-a-r-e  
10 Hilger is H-i-l-g-e-r. I am Secretary of the Rockaway Beach  
11 Civic Association. I also signed up as an intervenor on  
12 this Docket Number CP17-101-000.

13 There are many reasons why I'm opposed to the  
14 Northeast Supply Enhancement Project proposed by Williams  
15 Transco. My top concerns regarding this project are safety,  
16 water health and health of marine life.

17 First and foremost Transco's record of accidents  
18 causes destruction to the environment, destruction of homes,  
19 cause physical injuries and human fatalities. People have  
20 died because of accidents involving Transco. Several cases  
21 have been documented by the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials  
22 Safety Administration.

23 Cases have also been documented in U.S.  
24 newspapers such as the Denver Post, Scranton Times, Wall  
25 Street Journal. From 2008 to 2017 Transco has had 25

1 documented accidents. With Transco death and environmental  
2 destruction follow. I do not want to invite any part of the  
3 NESE Project into my community where my family and I live.

4 I live in Rockaway Beach, Queens, New York, I  
5 didn't mention that earlier. The DEIS mentions a  
6 possibility of accidents. Given Transco's record it seems  
7 there will inevitably be accidents and there is no sound way  
8 to judge how severe these accidents may be.

9 I was displaced from my home that my husband and  
10 I own in Rockaway Beach for four years and 9 months due to  
11 Hurricane Sandy. The risks involved in this pipeline  
12 outweigh any of the possible benefits. I do not want myself  
13 or my family and friends to be displaced or worse, due to a  
14 manmade disaster.

15 I am extremely concerned about the NSE Project's  
16 negative impacts on water health and the health of fish and  
17 other marine life. My friends and family occasionally fish  
18 in the water surrounding this project. If the waters become  
19 contaminated by the fish, if they survive and we consume  
20 this seafood we all become contaminated as well.

21 In the DEIS, page 250 it states that "Offshore  
22 construction activities could temporarily impact commercial  
23 and recreational fish, species in Raritan and Lower New York  
24 bays. Most of the impacts will be short-term associated  
25 with increases in turbidity, sedimentation from construction

1 activity such as trenching and dredging."

2           So they say most of the impacts would be  
3 short-term. What are the long-term affects -- the document  
4 does not state that. Also, what is the physical make-up of  
5 the sedimentation -- is it organic or is it chemical? Are  
6 there toxins in it?

7           Page 343 of the DEIS states, "Aquatic organisms  
8 could also be impacted by hazardous material spills, marine  
9 vessel traffic and noise, particularly during pile driving  
10 associated with HDD installations."

11           Why should I as a taxpayer in this community  
12 invite hazardous material spills? As a resident of Queens,  
13 New York I have not been notified by any city or state  
14 agencies or National Grid who I have been told is the main  
15 buyer of this gas that we are having a natural gas shortage.

16           The possible effects are too devastating. Also  
17 on page 343 of the DEIS, "Project effects on most marine  
18 organisms, including those due to the re-suspension of  
19 contaminated sediments would be temporary primarily because  
20 the water quality would return to ambient conditions shortly  
21 after construction and the communities would take slightly  
22 longer to recover but would be expected to recolonize within  
23 three years."

24           That's the temporal extent for cumulative  
25 impacts, offshore waters and marine organisms due to

1 increased turbidity and sedimentation would range from  
2 temporary to short-term. The DEIS is vague here. There has  
3 also been work and legislation done to -- enacted to help  
4 clean our waters in New York and New Jersey.

5           Why should we allow Williams Transco to send us  
6 back in time? This is an expected timeline for recolonizing  
7 of these benefit communities. We will have to recreate  
8 habitats for marine life that have only recently returned.  
9 Am I done? My time is up I should say.

10           MS. HAUER: Kimberly Hauer, H-a-u-e-r. My  
11 organization is Ocean Action Research Rockaway. Hydraulic  
12 fracturing for natural gas was banned in the state of New  
13 York in December of 2014. This decision was made based on a  
14 report from New York State's health department which  
15 concluded that fracking will pose health risks to New  
16 Yorkers as well as detrimental effects to the environment.

17           Across the country, case after case of water  
18 contamination, air pollution, leaking wells, explosions and  
19 fires have mounted evidence that fracking is dangerous and  
20 unhealthy. Symptoms ranging from nerve disorders to skin  
21 lesions and birth defects have been substantiated through  
22 peer reviewed scientific research.

23           The lists of risk is endless and continues to  
24 pile up -- all the while greenhouse gases such as methane in  
25 the atmosphere increase putting the entire world at greater

1 risk from the impacts of climate change.

2           On April 19th, 2018 representatives of the  
3 Transco Williams company stated to the public in attendance  
4 at Queen Community Board's 14th Environmental Committee  
5 Meeting that they are unable to track every molecule of gas  
6 that travels through their pipelines and they are merely  
7 transporters.

8           They could not confirm whether or not that the  
9 gas they will deliver through New York State would be from  
10 hydraulic fracturing extraction site. It is well-known that  
11 gas located within the Marcellus shale where the NSE  
12 Pipeline would begin is only accessible through the process  
13 of hydro fracking.

14           In addition to human health risks, millions of  
15 gallons of water consumption and a questionable lack of  
16 waste water disposal sites from the process of hydro  
17 fracking. The proposed pipeline construction would directly  
18 affect 117.2 acres of sea floor in Queens and Richmond  
19 County according to the DEIS.

20           What is not detailed, however, are how many acres  
21 would be indirectly affected due to the suspension of  
22 sediments whose contents are unknown. Representatives of  
23 Williams Transco were unable to identify the exact location  
24 of sample sites used for chemical analysis.

25           The statements made about the resuspension of

1 contaminated sediments in Section 4 of the DEIS are  
2 incomplete and unsatisfactory. Blanket statements such as  
3 and I quote, "Pelagic fish, sea turtles and marine mammals  
4 could also be affected but would likely temporarily vacate  
5 the area to avoid disturbance," are simply not good enough.

6           The people of Rockaway Beach do not want this  
7 pipeline regardless of the interest of National Grid and  
8 former CEO's of National Grid whose position as member of  
9 FERC is contradictory and exhibits special interest for  
10 profiteering.

11           Natural fracked gas is not renewable, it's  
12 dangerous and unsustainable. The risks outweigh the  
13 economic benefits to the few who will profit. We have an  
14 opportunity to support off-shore wind project that will also  
15 create jobs and revenue. Wind power is renewable, is clean,  
16 wind not Williams.

17           MR. RUSCILLO: I am reading this for Danny  
18 Ruscillo, R-u-s-c-i-l-l-o and his wife Linda, this is a  
19 joint statement. We say no to the Williams Company  
20 Pipeline. How much does Rockaway have to put up with?

21           It only takes one mistake or oversight to cause  
22 catastrophic damage from an explosion, fire or other  
23 accident along the Williams Gas Pipeline. The Williams  
24 Energy Company has a terrible track record when it comes to  
25 accidents -- a very good reason why, we, residents of the

1 Rockaway Peninsula do not need to take that chance with the  
2 installation of their pipeline.

3           Rockaway went through one devastation --  
4 Superstorm Sandy and if we ever have to endure another storm  
5 like it with more of these pipelines being installed, nobody  
6 -- not even you Williams, could give us, our children and  
7 our children's children a guarantee that your pipeline could  
8 not be damaged, could not cause an accident which can cause  
9 terrible devastation to us, our beautiful ocean, bay, marine  
10 life and our precious environment.

11           We say no to this pipeline, we say no to the  
12 Williams Company period. We implore you Governor Cuomo, to  
13 veto sign this catastrophe away as you did for the LNG port  
14 for the Rockaway coast.

15           MS. CANEPA: And I'd like to say something as  
16 well from my behalf. My name is Judith Canepa, C-a-n-e-p-a,  
17 yes. I'd like to talk about the 20 square mile dead zone  
18 that was the impetus for the creation of Gateway National  
19 Recreation Area in the waters off the Rockaways.

20           This was a place where such severe dumping had  
21 been going on from the 1920's until 1970 that the Woods Hole  
22 Oceanographic Institute deemed it the most toxic polluted  
23 off-shore water for the entire United States.

24           These toxins -- lead, cadmium, PCB's, organic  
25 phosphates, have settled. They've settled under the ocean

1 floor since 1970. However, they can be released in  
2 trenching for this pipeline six feet deep trenching delay of  
3 two foot high pipeline.

4 This will endanger the safety of the waters as  
5 the Department of Environmental Conservation of New York  
6 State has already stated. It's too risky to stir up the  
7 waters 23 miles from the Bay to New York Harbor of old, old  
8 pollution. I think that's enough, okay.

9 MS. VIGRASS: My name is Jhena, J-h-e-n-a, last  
10 name is Vigrass, V as in Victor, i-g-r-a-s-s. Good evening  
11 my name is Jhena Vigrass and I am a staff member at Natural  
12 Resources Defense Council speaking on behalf of the 2.4  
13 million NRDC members and activists worldwide.

14 I'm also speaking as a native Brooklynite who  
15 remembers summers swimming at Coney Island, biking under the  
16 Verrazano Bridge, birthdays on Rockaway Beach and Staten  
17 Island sleepovers. Thank you for providing us the  
18 opportunity to speak today.

19 The Northeast Supply Enhancement Project as  
20 proposed will cross through the Raritan, Sandy Hook and  
21 Lower New York bays. These bays support species of  
22 ecological, commercial and recreational importance.

23 The Raritan and Sandy Hook bays are especially  
24 important areas for wildlife, officially designated as a  
25 significant habitat complex by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife



1 Service, the area includes essential fish habitat for 33  
2 species.

3 It also includes 23 species of birds and marine  
4 life that are federally listed endangered or threatened, and  
5 18 that are state listed endangered or threatened. Because  
6 of its unique location, Raritan Bay and Sandy Hook are  
7 especially significant as a migratory path for shore birds,  
8 raptors, water fowl, and land birds.

9 The Fish and Wildlife Service counts an average  
10 of over 60,000 birds every year. NRDC has reviewed the  
11 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Northeast  
12 Supply Enhancement Project and has two primary objections.

13 First, the DEIS inadequately considers the  
14 cumulative downstream greenhouse gas emissions of the  
15 pipeline as required by the DC Circuit Decision in Sierra  
16 Club versus FERC.

17 FERC neither includes a measurement of the  
18 potential greenhouse gas emissions in this DEIS, nor does it  
19 explain specifically why a reasonable estimate could not be  
20 made.

21 The mere absence of the one single accepted  
22 standard to measure downstream greenhouse gases is not  
23 sufficient to excuse this emission.

24 Second, the DEIS fails to sufficiently examine  
25 water quality impacts of the pipeline. As New York State

1 recently observed, based on the Department's initial review  
2 of the available information regarding the Raritan Bay loop  
3 portion of the project, the construction of the project  
4 could have significant water quality impacts in New York  
5 State.

6 As proposed, this pipeline would cross six  
7 aquifers, one of which provides drinking water for  
8 approximately 3 million residents in New Jersey. The  
9 construction processes would increase turbidity of the water  
10 column and excavate portions of the sea floor, harming fish  
11 species' ability to eat and breathe.

12 Pipelines put peoples' health, safe drinking  
13 water and our climate at risk. FERC's 18 year old policy  
14 for approving natural gas pipelines should be updated to  
15 include thorough consideration of greenhouse gas emissions,  
16 energy needs in the region where the pipeline will be built  
17 and clean non-pipeline alternatives. It's time to stop  
18 building unnecessary fossil fuel infrastructure that  
19 pollutes our drinking water and ruins our environment.  
20 Thanks for your time.

21 MS. ESTEVEZ: Okay my name is Margarita Estevez,  
22 M-a-r-g-a-r-i-t-a last name E-s-t-e-v-e-z. I represent  
23 Ocean Action Research Rockaway, a volunteer-based marine  
24 preservation organization.

25 I have studied the Draft Environmental Impact

1 Statement and according to Section 4.12.5, "The emissions  
2 from construction of the operation of the project would  
3 increase the atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases  
4 and in combination with past and future missions from all  
5 other sources, will contribute incrementally to future  
6 climate change impacts."

7           That was a quote from the DEIS high in the  
8 document I will quote or we will do another quote. "The  
9 climate change will result in severe flooding due to sea  
10 level rise and heavy downpours are likely to occur more  
11 frequently." That is Section 4.12.4 titled Climate Change.

12           On top of that the global sea level -- on top of  
13 that coastal flooding will increase by up to 1.5% by 2020.  
14 Now as a Rockaway resident, as a resident of a beachfront  
15 block, I am extremely concerned of future flooding and  
16 climate change effects and whether or not these effects are  
17 a part of natural cycle of the earth, as a member of a  
18 coastal community and a member of humanity who has enormous  
19 amount of infrastructure on the coastlines, I'm not  
20 interested in accelerating climate change and global  
21 warming, whether these effects are caused by man-made  
22 activities or man-made activities simply exacerbating the  
23 natural cycles of earth.

24           Then I will quote for Section 4.12.5 again that  
25 says that, "Because they cannot determine whether the

1 project contribution will be significant, they will deem it  
2 insignificant." This is not a good excuse for me because --  
3 just because one person litters and our New York City is a  
4 dirty city, one individual still gets blamed and littering  
5 is still illegal.

6 I believe the same logic needs to apply to  
7 greenhouse gas emissions because the effects of those  
8 emissions are more detrimental than littering and will cost  
9 lives and millions of dollars. Therefore, even the tiniest  
10 increase of GOG's emission should be taken very seriously  
11 and we cannot dismiss any emissions just because we cannot  
12 determine whether the contribution will be significant.  
13 Thank you very much.

14 MR. POWER: My name is Edward Power, E-d-w-a-r-d  
15 P-o-w-e-r. I happen to live at 114 B2 14th Street in Breezy  
16 Point and which is almost directly in the path of this  
17 proposed pipeline.

18 I'm a member of the Literal Society and the  
19 official horseshoe crab county for the Audubon Society. I'm  
20 disturbed by the amount of PCB's and dioxins and heavy  
21 metals that are going to be unearthed by this process,  
22 released into the ocean and which will wind up on the shore  
23 -- I'm also an intervener.

24 It's -- I think I was supposed to say that. I'm  
25 worried about that because me and numerous people we swim in

1 the ocean for cardiovascular fitness from May until  
2 November. We do a half hour -- I only do half hour workout,  
3 and who wants to do that when you're ingesting PCB's that  
4 are right now locked into the ocean floor that will be  
5 liberated.

6 Also, I'm a fisherman. My children fish, we  
7 catch the fish. I'm not going to eat any fish coming out of  
8 the ocean during the construction or even after it because  
9 of the contaminations. And I wonder, you know, what about  
10 the little kids eating sand? I know it's not ideal but PCB  
11 dioxin sand, I wonder if Williams is going to pay for the  
12 cancer bills -- I doubt it.

13 Raritan Bay and Breezy Point are large breeding  
14 areas for horseshoe crabs. I told you I'm a counter. The  
15 numbers have been increasing and this will -- this is going  
16 to be detrimental to their -- to the survival. And as we  
17 know, the birds rely upon them and Rockaways have seen more  
18 whales, dolphins and seals in the last few years than ever  
19 since I've been there -- I've lived there for 59 years.

20 Say goodbye to that. You know, Williams also has  
21 a terrible safety record. I'm sure you guys know about it.  
22 And that their work has killed the most people since 2008.  
23 Also, New York City doesn't necessarily need the gas. The  
24 state has committed to 50% renewable energy by 2030 -- this  
25 is incompatible with that.

1           Also, methane -- this is going to leak. Methane,  
2 we all know, is 84 times worse as a greenhouse effect gas  
3 than CO2. I live in Rockaway like I said. We've suffered  
4 climate related disasters such as Sandy and this pipeline is  
5 only going to make the planet warmer which is going to rise  
6 the ocean. Anyone who lives in Rockaway will be forced to  
7 relocate.

8           And I also want to say that I'd like to  
9 fessiciously thank whoever decided that having the event here  
10 was a good idea because it's nowhere near where the people  
11 are affected, you know. I guess if I wanted to have as few  
12 people come as possible, I'd make it right here, not in  
13 Rockaway where we're all from right?

14           No offense, but I don't know who's in charge of  
15 that but in final summation okay, I want to just sum up that  
16 as the planet gets hotter, people who live in the Rockaways  
17 will suffer from sea rise, and that sea rise -- level rise  
18 will cost trillions of dollars to deal with.

19           What's more important -- the future health of the  
20 earth or the profits of a corporation -- thanks for  
21 listening to me.

22           MS. IKONEN: My name is Riitta Ikonen, you spell  
23 it R-i-i-t-t-a, my surname is I-k-o-n-e-n. I live in the  
24 Rockaways but beyond that I'm not in any group. I would  
25 like to first say that I'm quite opposed to how the whole

1 system is set up today.

2           We have somewhere very far from our community and  
3 where people would actually be -- that would be something  
4 I'd like to put on report. And I'm here to voice my  
5 opposition to the Williams Pipeline in the interest of  
6 common sense A, the safety of my loved ones and my  
7 neighborhood, as well as the well-being of my fellow  
8 creatures in the sea and on land.

9           And I would like you to choose the no action  
10 alternative and to deny the project. This project must not  
11 move forward. And then for environmental reasons I think  
12 it's very important that we don't like this pipeline, that  
13 we absolutely don't need it for any -- this is I think  
14 purely a business reason and without quantifying emissions  
15 FERC provides no way for other agencies such as New York  
16 State DEC to assess the project's potential impact.

17           The document actually claims to quantify  
18 emissions in section 4.11.1.4 but that section is  
19 suspiciously missing from the document. In short, the DEIS  
20 has not adequately addressed the impact of the project or  
21 climate change and the ensuing local and global effects  
22 despite the fact that there are concrete, tangible ways of  
23 qualifying the project's emissions -- quantifying, thank  
24 you.

25           MR. FLANSBURG: My name is Paul Flansburg,

1 P-a-u-l F (as in Frank) - l-a-n (as in Nancy) s (as in Sam)  
2 b (as in boy) u-r-g (as in girl).

3 I'm affiliated with a number of different  
4 organizations. In particular the Rochester People's Climate  
5 Coalition which are several organizations within the city of  
6 Rochester, New York who are focused on combatting climate  
7 change through organization and collaboration with people  
8 throughout our area.

9 The organizations that I'm with that belong to  
10 the Rochester People's Climate Coalition is Federation of  
11 Monroe County Environmentalists. I was asked why a person  
12 from Rochester, New York would come to a pipeline facility  
13 being built in the Rockaways, around the Rockaways and I was  
14 confronted with the notion of the people saying not in my  
15 backyard.

16 And I'm reminded of the fact that all people who  
17 pursue environmental justice have discovered things in their  
18 own backyard and they have collaborated with people  
19 throughout -- they've expanded their reach and I understand  
20 that even though this pipeline is not being built in my  
21 backyard, it has an impact.

22 Actually it has an impact on me and my backyard  
23 in as much as it contributes to climate change. And what's  
24 unfortunate about the DEIS is that it does not acknowledge  
25 the cumulative impacts of greenhouse gases which will be



1 done not only in the transmission of the methane, but also  
2 in its burning once it reaches its destination.

3           So there is the problem with the greenhouse gas  
4 release from the mining process through the transmission  
5 process, through the burning process in each case there is  
6 leaving an environment that we all share vulnerable to  
7 exposure to greenhouse gases which will cause a cumulative  
8 impact on the air we all breathe.

9           So it's interesting that even though it's not in  
10 my backyard then in terms of the construction, the impact  
11 will have its impact on my backyard, and in China and  
12 everywhere else in the world.

13           It's very concerning to me that we're having this  
14 -- this opportunity to be able to comment being done in  
15 isolation. It's an awful way. I feel like -- I mean I read  
16 about Big Brother in school but this is the United States  
17 and it's not supposed to be this way but it is.

18           And you seem like really nice people. I don't  
19 want to have to -- I don't want to have to accuse you of  
20 being Big Brother but there's a problem with Big Brother and  
21 I don't want that to happen.

22           MR. HOUSTON: Patrick, P-a-t-r-i-c-k Houston,  
23 H-o-u-s-t-o-n. And so I'm here today to voice my opposition  
24 and concern about the Williams Pipeline. As you may know  
25 for years the New York City Harbor used to be very polluted,

1 much more polluted with a lot of dioxins and PCB's and lead  
2 had settled on the floor over the years since the industrial  
3 revolution up until about the 1950's - 1960's.

4           Since the 1960's -70's, as more organizations  
5 recognized how much damage the -- how polluted the harbor  
6 was, there've been a lot of efforts to improve the health of  
7 the harbor. A lot of the -- but that hasn't included  
8 cleaning up everything that had already settled on the sea  
9 bed floor.

10           So in order to build this 23 mile pipeline to put  
11 through New York City Harbor, they would have to lay, go to  
12 trench and lay it underneath in the sea bed. That's going  
13 to stir up a lot of the dioxins, PCB's, lead, et cetera and  
14 could really set the health of the harbor back for marine  
15 life, for birds that rely on the marine life, and also for  
16 humans -- for beach goers who go to the shore.

17           So that's just one of -- that's the technical  
18 reason that I'm here today because of the -- to voice my  
19 concern about the health of the harbor, the decrease in the  
20 health of the harbor that it will have because of the  
21 pipeline.

22           But beyond that, I mean the pipeline is going to  
23 contribute to the problem of climate change that we're  
24 dealing with because the gas that it's going to burn  
25 releases methane which is 86 times -- 84-86 times more

1 potent than carbon dioxide and so it's important to  
2 recognize that, you know, the climate crisis is not simply  
3 an issue of carbon dioxide, it's also an issue of methane  
4 emissions.

5           And then finally it's because like the  
6 organization I work for -- we work with a lot of groups  
7 around the city and there's so many people who have been  
8 harmed by Hurricane Sandy. They're still recovering from  
9 Hurricane Sandy. There's one lady who lost her home because  
10 of this project, because of Hurricane Sandy and they can  
11 only expect to see more of these projects if we continue to  
12 rely on fossil fuels.

13           So that and a ton of other reasons why I'm  
14 opposed to the pipeline. Am I able to ask questions in this  
15 session?

16           MS. ALLEN: No we're not taking questions.

17           MR. HOUSTON: Okay.

18           MS. ALLEN: If you have questions regarding  
19 procedure or our process, our staff downstairs can help you.

20           MR. HOUSTON: Okay, well I'll stop down but these  
21 are the official reasons among a lot of others and I don't  
22 want to be rude to you all as individuals, but this process  
23 is complete bullshit. I mean how are you going to have, you  
24 know, there's people there in the Rockaways, in Coney  
25 Island, and Staten Island who are going to be affected by

1 this pipeline and this project is up here in Bay Ridge.

2           It's you know, from a lot of people in those  
3 communities, I have so many people from my organization who  
4 couldn't make it because of the time so soon after work, it  
5 does go until 9 so that's good.

6           But just the process I don't think it's right and  
7 it's not a real public hearing, really. I'll stop there  
8 because I'm rambling but yeah, it's pretty disappointing.

9           MS. WEISBERG: Jackie Weisberg, W-e-i-s-b-e-r-g.  
10 I'd like to state for the record that I find this particular  
11 kind of sequestering one person in a room to be  
12 unconstitutional and takes away from our solidarity and I'm  
13 opposed to it.

14           I'm here today because I want to voice my  
15 opposition to Williams Transco's Northeast Supply  
16 Enhancement Pipeline which would carry fracked gas for 23  
17 miles under New York's lower harbor.

18           I'm opposed to the pipeline and more generally to  
19 all additional fracking infrastructure in this state for  
20 many reasons but I'll just talk about the -- how the  
21 pipeline project would affect climate change and how this is  
22 addressed in the DEIS.

23           The Draft Environmental Impact Statement admits  
24 that the NSE Project would increase the atmospheric  
25 concentration of greenhouse gas emissions in combination

1 with past and future emissions from all other sources and  
2 contribute incrementally to future climate change impacts.

3           In my opinion, anything that will contribute --  
4 even incrementally to future climate change is the opposite  
5 of what we need to be doing in this world. And the pipeline  
6 as we know carries methane which leaks. Methane is 86 times  
7 more effective at keeping gas emissions into our environment  
8 than carbon CO2 over a 20 year period. It is lethal and it  
9 does leak.

10           But the DEIS goes on to claim that there's no  
11 widely accepted standard per international, federal or state  
12 policy or as a matter of physical science to determine the  
13 significance of the project's greenhouse gas emissions for  
14 purposes of meaningfully informing the Commission decision  
15 in this proceeding.

16           By refusing to adequately address the pipeline's  
17 greenhouse gas emissions, the document minimizes the dire  
18 threat that climate change poses to the earth and to  
19 humanity in the form of increased coastal flooding,  
20 worsening heat waves and product shortages, catastrophic  
21 storms and wildfires.

22           Humanitarian crises and countless other issues  
23 that have been articulated, defined and confirmed as effects  
24 of climate change by the world's leading climate scientists.  
25 The National Environment Policy Act requires FERC to provide

1 reasonable forecasting of emissions which includes making  
2 educated guesses about these emissions when the future is  
3 uncertain -- this is yet to be done by FERC in this  
4 document.

5           In addition, a DC Court Circuit recently ruled  
6 that FERC must either quantify and consider a project's  
7 downstream carbon emissions or explain in more detail why it  
8 cannot do so. This is yet to be done in this document.

9           Moreover, the significance of emissions can  
10 indeed be determined by simply quantifying them which allows  
11 one's projects and impact to be compared to another's by the  
12 social cost of carbon metric commonly used by the EPA and  
13 other agencies which estimates the financial damages that  
14 could results from the project's emissions.

15           FERC has determined the significance of pipeline  
16 emissions before as in the assessment or the Atlantic  
17 Sunrise Pipeline. So why can't it do the same here.

18           MS. ALLEN: Excuse me, you've reached your three  
19 minutes if you could just wrap it up.

20           MS. WEISBERG: Without quantifying -- well New  
21 York State is doing everything to go to 100% renewable  
22 energy. We have wind turbines that are going to be going  
23 off-shore, we have solar, we have a -- we have a bill that  
24 passed the Assembly two days ago that calls for 50%  
25 renewable by 2030, 100% by 2050 and it will pass this year

1 in the Senate because we now have a Democratic majority.

2 This goes against everything that New York is  
3 striving to do as a leader in our country. It cannot  
4 happen. It is immoral. It goes against everything that is  
5 good for our world and for our children and our children's  
6 children.

7 MR. WENDOL: My name is Thomas Wendol. I go to  
8 Queen's College, I'm a student in Queen's, New York.  
9 W-e-n-d-o-l, alright, so yeah this is not -- I'm very  
10 disappointed. This is not a democratic speech you know,  
11 like it's not a hearing, like this is -- I don't know who  
12 I'm talking to exactly and I don't know how this is going to  
13 like, whoever -- I'm hoping that the superior you do this --  
14 I believe myself as part of the 99% and the 99% is being  
15 held down not being made aware of what's going on.

16 And people up in their higher positions in their  
17 1% are doing anything possible to you know, keep us you  
18 know, sovereign and take our rights, take our -- they're  
19 going to do 23 miles of dredging through the and from the  
20 Hudson and in the Atlantic from Pennsylvania to Rockaway  
21 Beach and desecrate our beaches and stuff and it's just  
22 horrendous.

23 And eventually the 99% will realize they are the  
24 99% and the 1% will have nothing to do against that and  
25 they're just bringing that closer and closer or we can all

1 just be humans and you know, respect the earth that we live  
2 on. I don't understand why that's like a problem. Why  
3 can't we just respect the earth we live on?

4 Like why does every little ounce of energy --  
5 like we're supposed to be going towards renewable energy --  
6 100% New York State, yet its' okay to pipe the fracked gas  
7 from Pennsylvania.

8 Like you turned Pennsylvania into a third world  
9 country -- they know what's going on there and they're just  
10 keeping New York isolated. And like, that's not okay and  
11 like there will be repercussions because like every society  
12 in history has like fallen and eventually when things fall  
13 shit hits the fan. That's all I have to say.

14 MR. RESNER: Lyel Resner, L-y-e-l R-e-s-n-e-r.  
15 It's L-y-e-l. I'll keep my comments succinct. In  
16 particular I think the process -- this process or lack of  
17 process is disgraceful. The fact that there's no public  
18 hearing the "comments session" was clearly designed to  
19 merely check a box, not to meaningfully engage the  
20 communities that will be subject to the long-term impact of  
21 the project.

22 I also want to note that the Williams safety  
23 track record is horrific and frightening. In particular as  
24 a far Rockaway resident who is regularly in the ocean I'm  
25 genuinely nervous. I think greenlighting the pipeline



1 without inadequate long-term impact assessment in particular  
2 in the DEIS is shameful.

3 MS. GARNEVA: My name is Annie Garneva, A-n-n-i-e  
4 G-a-r-n-e-v-a. I'm live in Brooklyn, New York and you can  
5 put down Sane Energy Project as my organization. I don't  
6 work with them I'm just a concerned citizen.

7 So thank you for holding this public comment  
8 non-hearing apparently they're calling it. There's about a  
9 million and one challenges with this DEIS that I would like  
10 to talk about but I don't have enough time. So I know a lot  
11 of people have talked about climate change issues that I  
12 100% support.

13 So I will focus on the water quality issues that  
14 have to deal with toxins being dredged up. So as you note  
15 in the DEIS, this will cover 117 acre area that will be  
16 dredged up with toxins full of lead and mercury, PCB's,  
17 cadmium, copper and chromium that have settled after 40  
18 years of laws being put into place and making sure that  
19 that's taken into account after about a century of  
20 disgusting pollution coming from our industrial process.

21 You also note in the DEIS that 83% of sea floor  
22 sediment contains at least 1 if not more of these toxins.  
23 The DEIS includes no recognition of the fact that these have  
24 improved over time -- only notes that they exist and I find  
25 that to be problematic.

1           I think more care needs to be taken into account  
2 the fact that we're slowly reversing historical damage that  
3 has been done. In particular, I would like to focus on the  
4 Atlantic sturgeon which is an endangered species that fell  
5 apart due to -- it's population fell apart due to  
6 over-fishing in the '90's and it's slowly been making a  
7 comeback over the last two decades.

8           The toxic sediments that were released by  
9 trenching would set this limited progress back. In the DEIS  
10 you also note that Rockaway, New York is a major hub to area  
11 for Atlantic sturgeon with your studies showing that 70% of  
12 sturgeon are found in the Rockaways in the fall and 57% in  
13 the spring which means that Rockaways are a major important  
14 area for them to take -- for them to habitat.

15           As bottom feeders who forage on small clams and  
16 tiny fish by sucking up the mud and sand, they will be  
17 directly impacted by the trenching that Williams will be  
18 doing of the sea floor and the previously mentioned toxins  
19 would therefore be consumed by the Atlantic sturgeon as well  
20 as more importantly, the clams and the benthic invertebrates  
21 that you talk about in the DEIS.

22           There are three different problems that would  
23 takeaway -- one is that they would be inundated with plumes  
24 of sediments for about 3 to 12 hours according to your  
25 analysis which is about half the day. Two, this would

1 reduce the amount of important prey that they require to  
2 feed on with the DEIS noting that the benthic invertebrates  
3 will be the most impacted of the animals on the bottom floor  
4 and that's what sturgeon feed on.

5           And then they would also take on toxins as they  
6 suck up the rain. The DEIS also talks about the fact that  
7 it would take approximately 1 to 3 years for the benthic  
8 community to recuperate which just pushes aside as an okay  
9 amount of time -- 1 to 3 years for a major food source is  
10 not an okay amount of time for an endangered species.

11           And I would also like to point to the fact that  
12 the analysis done by the DEIS is absurd relative to the data  
13 that you use. In Section 4-116 the comparison -- the  
14 chemical analysis done by Williams about the impact of  
15 toxins is focused on clams in column one -- and I won't go  
16 into details I'll give you written commentary, but I find it  
17 very problematic that it compares data from now relative to  
18 1983 study as it's based -- as its baseline for why, for how  
19 the amount of toxins that would take place were not that  
20 drastic and you compare it to 1980's data.

21           MS. WILCOX: Susan Wilcox, S-u-s-a-n W-i-l-c-o-x.  
22 I'm a sister of St. Joseph of Brentwood, New York. So first  
23 I want to acknowledge that everyone here is part of the  
24 evolution of God's creation and that we are, you know, we  
25 are all part of this. This is all us.

1           And this ocean is all us. And science tells us  
2 that. You know we feel that in our Catholic tradition  
3 because Pope Francis has really been a leader in pointing  
4 this out but this is also science that tells us that we are  
5 all connected in this evolution of our great planet and  
6 that we have to, as the thinking moving beings we have to  
7 take care of it.

8           We have to be the ones. And as a Catholic  
9 religious sister, you know, we have really tried to be a  
10 witness to this and I speak specifically to the Adorers of  
11 the Precious Blood in Lancaster County who this very same  
12 company, Williams Corporation, wanted to build a pipeline  
13 across their land.

14           And they examined this and said no and this  
15 powerful corporation manipulated the municipalities into  
16 granting them eminent domain and even when they said no,  
17 they said no, this is against our religion. This land is  
18 part of how we express our religion.

19           They just mowed right over it and they're still  
20 fighting that now. So you know, I some familiarity with, as  
21 a religious sister, Williams Corporation and how they  
22 operate and they -- they're assaulters. You know, it's an  
23 assault. It's an assault on the land, it's an assault on  
24 our water -- for us as religious as Christians this is an  
25 assault on the body of Christ, this is an assault on God's

1 creation and this is what this company does.

2           And what we're going to get for it is small  
3 compared to what our children and our grandchildren and our  
4 great-grandchildren are going to have to pay for. I mean in  
5 this room there -- I feel the sense of all of our -- all of  
6 our ancestors, all of our indigenous ancestors that are  
7 here.

8           And that's why these people are all here because  
9 they're hearing them. They're speaking so loud for me as a  
10 Christian its St. Francis of Assisi and Clare who, you know,  
11 are just like so present for us, speaking to us, speaking to  
12 us, that we have to do something. We can't just let this  
13 devastation continue to go on.

14           And so for us it's -- it's our faith teaching,  
15 its Catholic social teaching and cyclical. Laudato Si --  
16 care for our common home by Pope Francis this is what we  
17 teach, this is, you know, this is who we are, this is part  
18 of our religion and so we can't just like step aside and  
19 just let processes happen that are not even democratic, I  
20 mean like you know, this process makes me wonder if we're  
21 even in the United States of America because this process is  
22 so -- so undemocratic.

23           So anyway, and I wish you God bless all of you,  
24 you know, I know you're doing your hard job and so God bless  
25 you.

1 MS. KELLY: Carol Kelly, C-a-r-o-l K-e-l-l-y.  
2 Okay so I am strongly opposed to the Williams Northeast  
3 Supply Enhancement Project. Williams's claims that  
4 "converting from dirty oils to natural gases provides  
5 climate benefits," but according to your own FERC documents  
6 20180323-3005 within the Northeast Supply Enhancement  
7 Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement there is "no  
8 evidence" to support Williams' claim.

9 And even small amounts of methane leakage which  
10 exists in all natural gas pipelines erodes the benefits of  
11 switching to natural gas. Here in New York City where I  
12 live, our heating system convergence to natural gases are  
13 happening anyway and they will continue to happen regardless  
14 of whether or not Williams NESE is built. Williams'  
15 Pipeline will not contribute anything to this process. This  
16 proposed pipeline would carry fracked gas for 23 miles  
17 across New York Harbor.

18 Governor Cuomo has banned fracked gas in New York  
19 State and with good reason. Myself and my family are  
20 strongly opposed to the Williams' Transco Northeast Supply  
21 Enhancement Project for so many reasons. Off of the top of  
22 my head the safety records are key. This company is  
23 irresponsible and this pipeline is not necessary -- we do  
24 not need this fracked gas and I am opposed, thank you.

25 MS. HERTEL: My name is Barbara Hertel, it's

1 H-e-r-t-e-l is how you spell my last name. Alright okay  
2 this pipeline is very troubling for many reasons. Oh and  
3 I'm not affiliated with anyone, I'm a citizen and I love to  
4 go to the beach, that is my affiliation is the beach.

5 This pipeline is very troubling for many reasons.  
6 One of them is Transco and Williams both have poor track  
7 records. This has results in accidents and fires and still  
8 is leading people to leave their homes because of toxic  
9 releases.

10 There are unknown chemicals and toxins in the sea  
11 bed that will be dug up. After all the gains in bringing  
12 the water for fish and birds that eat them, this eco-system  
13 will be irreparably harmed if these toxins are loose.

14 We will not be able to cleanse the water for  
15 decades. New York City does not need more gas. There is  
16 enough gas for any increase in the existing pipeline. There  
17 is a huge hint that this is about the mighty dollar since  
18 National Grid will likely sell it to the highest bidder.

19 New York City is also poised to become 100%  
20 renewable in the next 20 years so there will be less need  
21 for natural gas. This is not a hearing at all, this is a  
22 travesty. A hearing is when people are together and the  
23 listeners are on the stage or at a table, one by one people  
24 go to the stage to read their statement.

25 This is truly a distorted event, not a hearing at

1 all which they said that this is a hearing and it's not a  
2 public scoping session. I've been to public scoping  
3 centers, you all sit at tables and then you go and talk  
4 about everything, this is not that.

5 This is talking just to two people and I just  
6 don't think it's right. Thank you.

7 MS. BOGER: My name is Joanne Boger, J-o-a-n-n-e  
8 B-o-g-e-r and I am a member of 350 Brooklyn, which is an  
9 environmental organization concerned with climate change.  
10 Okay, I would like to start my comments.

11 I would oppose this pipeline and I oppose it for  
12 several reasons but the most important reason is I feel the  
13 risk of explosion or fire that could develop if this were  
14 built. Recently I know that Williams Transco has been  
15 responsible for at least 15 different incidents in which  
16 there was a fire or an explosion.

17 And similar risks would be incurred by this  
18 proposed project and I think that in FERC's assessment they  
19 are making the assumption that all safety rules would have  
20 to be followed and so they're kind of not paying enough  
21 attention to my mind as to the poor record that this company  
22 has.

23 And I think that the company's track record  
24 should really be one of the most important things that's  
25 what's thought about and evaluated.



1           I also think that there would be toxic  
2 substances stirred up from the bottom of the sea bed if this  
3 is built and that the digging of a trench would disturb the  
4 sediment which contains things like lead, cadmium, mercury,  
5 chromium, PCB's, you know 200 years of industry has all  
6 settled on the bottom of this harbor and it's taken a long  
7 time for that settling for us to -- first of all we had to  
8 quit dropping those things in the water.

9           And once we quit that it took -- it's taken  
10 decades for any improvement to even happen in our wildlife.  
11 And so now we've actually made progress and I think this is  
12 the wrong time to dig something up when you know, we're just  
13 beginning to feel the positive impact of -- of stopping that  
14 type of pollution.

15           Second off -- second of all I think that the  
16 wildlife in the area includes whales which we now see coming  
17 in and the noise which this project would definitely cause  
18 killing noise that would really damage the whale population  
19 and chase them away from our area.

20           And you know, we've just begun to appreciate that  
21 they're coming in. Another reason I oppose is that they  
22 plan to export some of the natural gas that they will be  
23 pushing through this pipeline. Therefore, we would be  
24 bearing the risk while they make the money and other people  
25 are using the benefits of the gas.

1           Okay, so that to me is not a good deal.  Alright,  
2  I appreciate your giving me a chance to talk, sorry it's not  
3  too public.

4           MS. SIMANCA-PROCTOR:  Christina,  
5  C-h-r-i-s-t-i-n-a last name is S (as in Sam) -i-m (as in  
6  Mary) - a -n (as in Nancy) - a hyphen Proctor P-r-o-c-t-o-r.  
7  Okay thank you.  I just wanted to say first I'm disappointed  
8  with how the forum has been set up.

9           I would have liked an opportunity to hear what  
10 other people had to say and from both sides on this issue  
11 and I think it's disappointing that these -- my testimony or  
12 my comments are private for now.  I understand they will be  
13 transcribed later on.

14           I am a born and raised New Yorker.  I use the  
15 beach not just in the summer but often, year 'round, and you  
16 know I pay a lot of taxes, a lot of city taxes, and it's  
17 disappointing that if this pipeline extension goes through  
18 that I will have one less peaceful space to be which is the  
19 waterfront.

20           And that's very disappointment as a life-long New  
21 Yorker, someone who not only uses the beach and the  
22 waterfront to enjoy peace and quiet but also someone who  
23 swims in the water.  Not happy about the fact that the  
24 pipeline will dredge up sediment from the sea floor, from  
25 the bay floor.  Not happy that that will pollute our waters.

1           I was happy to see in New York one report  
2 recently regarding the returning to seals on the coast of  
3 Staten Island which I thought was wonderful. I fear that  
4 this project will disrupt that. I think it will disrupt all  
5 the wildlife but especially the seal population which is now  
6 as New York One reported, starting to come back.

7           So I think for a tourism standpoint, from an  
8 environmental standpoint, from an economic standpoint, this  
9 is a horrible project and I'm glad that at least our  
10 Governor -- Governor Cuomo has stepped in.

11           I don't identify with any, I'm sorry,  
12 organizations -- you did ask me that. I'm here just as a  
13 born and raised New Yorker, concerned citizen and that's it,  
14 thank you.

15           MR. HANNIGAN: James Hannigan, J-a-m-e-s last  
16 name H-a-n-n-i-g-a-n and I'm here with Benin Casa Community,  
17 B-e-n-i-n C-a-s-a Community. I'm very concerned about this  
18 pipeline, first as a New Yorker and also as a Catholic.

19           Pope Francis in his encyclical Laudato Si very  
20 clearly states the impact that climate change is having on  
21 our environment and the devastation it's causing especially  
22 to the most vulnerable people in our world.

23           And also as a Catholic I did organizing work with  
24 the Adorers of the Blood of Christ in Lancaster County,  
25 Pennsylvania and the Adorers were trying to resist Williams

1 putting a pipeline through their land. It's against their  
2 religious beliefs and seeing the desecration of earth and  
3 violence that Williams reeked on that community was deeply  
4 disturbing.

5 To see it up close and to see Williams trying to  
6 do the same here in New York is also disturbing. I'm very  
7 concerned about climate change and that this pipeline and  
8 its having methane gas go through it, it will contribute to  
9 the climate change and all that goes along with that.

10 But in all honesty what I'm really concerned  
11 about is just future generations that honestly I'm not sure  
12 if I can be confident if I was to have kids that they would  
13 have a safe world to come into and just thinking if I was to  
14 have kids or grandkids, and I am to look them in the eye and  
15 say, you know, "I did try to do my part to stop climate  
16 change."

17 Because at the rate we're going, you know, food  
18 sources, rising water, rising shorelines, their world is  
19 going to look a lot different unless we step up and do  
20 something and I hope that FERC could hear that call and not  
21 look just at short-term things but really take into account  
22 the deep degradation to earth and people that this pipeline  
23 will cause. So I think that is all.

24 MR. BEAUCHAMP: I'm Alex Beauchamp, Beauchamp is  
25 B-e-a-u-c-h-a-m-p so it looks like Beauchamp and I'm the

1 Northeast Region Director at Food and Water Watch. On  
2 Sundays here in Brooklyn we're a national group but with a  
3 pretty big presence in New York.

4           Great so I mean I'll start. I'm here tonight  
5 obviously to express my opposition to Williams Transco's  
6 Northeast Supply Enhancement Pipeline. As you know it will  
7 carry fracked gas 23 miles under New York's lower harbor.

8           I'm opposed to this for a whole bunch of reasons.  
9 I guess I'll focus mostly on climate change though just in  
10 the interest of time. So you know, the Draft EIS admits  
11 that this project would increase the -- I'm going to read  
12 it, "The atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gas  
13 emissions in combination with past and future emissions from  
14 all other sources, can contribute incrementally to future  
15 climate change impacts."

16           However, the DEIS goes on to claim that, "There  
17 is no widely accepted standard for international, federal or  
18 state policy or as a matter of physical science, determined  
19 the significance of the projects greenhouse gas emissions  
20 for purposes of meaningfully informing the Commission  
21 decision in the proceeding."

22           This is ridiculous right? I mean we know this  
23 makes climate change worse. We know methane is 86 times  
24 more efficient at trapping greenhouse gases. The idea that  
25 we're not sure, we're just going to build a pipeline and we

1 have no idea whether this is going to make climate change  
2 worse is ludicrous on its face.

3           FERC knows it, Williams knows it, we all do.  
4 It's absolutely ridiculous that we're sort of going through  
5 this fake process where we're saying, oh, we're not sure,  
6 we're just going to build the thing and then later on we'll  
7 find out.

8           I guess another thing I'd say -- I have two  
9 things really. So one is I work at Food and Water Watch, I  
10 have been to a ludicrous number of public hearings. FERC is  
11 the only agency that does this where you go into a room,  
12 you've turned public hearings into some sort of bizarre  
13 experience like you're going to the doctor.

14           You sit in a room of strangers where people try  
15 to keep some sort of library atmosphere for no reason at all  
16 downstairs. You sit there for an hour by yourself -- not by  
17 yourselves but in a room where you can't talk and then you  
18 go upstairs to a tiny room.

19           This isn't a public hearing. It's created to  
20 ensure that we all know you don't care about the public's  
21 comments which I suppose is a reflection on us because we  
22 know that FERC approves every pipeline that it sees.

23           So it's ridiculous. I'll also say FERC didn't  
24 use to do this right? I mean I've done this for years and  
25 years. You know how to do public hearings because you used

1 to do them. It would be very, very easy to go back to it.

2 So I would encourage you to do that.

3           The last thing I'd say is on maybe a personal  
4 note. My wife and I are expecting our first child this  
5 September. This is becoming cliché and I've been to so many  
6 climate change meetings where people would say I'm doing this  
7 for my kid and I have to say now that I'm about to have one,  
8 I really am, right? If we don't take drastic action -- if  
9 we don't stop approving every single new fossil fuel project  
10 in front of us, we're not going to recognize the world that  
11 we're living in.

12           And our kids -- my kids at least, or my kid,  
13 isn't going to live in a sustainable way or isn't even going  
14 to live in a habitable world and that seems really  
15 depressing. And so on that note, I know I'm out of time so,  
16 on the nose!

17           MR. WAGNER: My name is Eric Wagner, E-r-i-c  
18 W-a-g-n-e-r and I'm not affiliated with anybody. Yeah I'm a  
19 life-long surfer. I live in Brooklyn and I spend a lot of  
20 time in Rockaway Beach which is one of the areas that's  
21 going to be possibly impacted by this.

22           And I think that there are some serious issues in  
23 this country, in the society in general where development  
24 occurs for the profit of a select few people and puts in  
25 jeopardy the rest of the society as a whole -- the rest of

1 society in general, where, you know, things are  
2 green-lighted and things go ahead that will lead to  
3 corporate profits and some economic development but they  
4 will have extreme environmental consequences.

5           And anybody who saw that oil spill that happened  
6 in the gulf a few years ago or any of the more famous  
7 environmental disasters knows that this is not the way to  
8 go, the stuff is too dangerous.

9           Now if the environment is degraded there's no  
10 economy so any sort of a free market or you know, a  
11 conservative economic argument for development goes out the  
12 window when there's no clean air, when there's no clean  
13 water.

14           And this country has gotten a little bit cleaner  
15 in the last couple decades. I remember when I was a little  
16 kid in the '70's you know, there was a lot more dirty air  
17 and you know, I want to see things get cleaner.

18           So there has to be a point at which this side  
19 decides certain things like fracking, like nuclear energy,  
20 like plastics, are just not a good idea and are not worth  
21 you know, endangering the health and welfare of the  
22 population and of the future society in this country and the  
23 world because it's all interconnected to benefit a few  
24 people and a few corporations.

25           So you know, this seems to me to have so many



1 negatives going forward and I'm not going to get into the  
2 talking points that come from certain -- that come from  
3 certain groups but I know that there's a lot of you know,  
4 scripts and things like that, but as a person who spent his  
5 entire life in the ocean and I know and I see more plastic  
6 in the ocean all the time and it's, you know, continued  
7 development and continued trash and continued risk is just  
8 not the correct way to go.

9           So I have one -- I urge this thing say no and  
10 urge it not to go forward.

11           MR. BOYMAN: Okay so hi my name is James Boyman,  
12 so James and then last name is spelled Boy B-o-y (as in yes)  
13 and m (as in Mary), a (as in alpha) n (as in Nancy), so Boy,  
14 Child, Man, Adult.

15           So I live in Park Slope just a little ways down  
16 the road and I'm here tonight because I want to voice my  
17 opposition to the Williams Transco's Northeast Supply  
18 Enhancement Pipeline which would carry fracked gas for 23  
19 miles under New York's Lower Harbor.

20           I'm opposed to the pipeline and more generally to  
21 all additional fracking infrastructures in the state for  
22 many reasons but I want to focus specifically on how the  
23 construction of the pipeline would disturb the now buried  
24 toxins under the harbor floor and the effects of these  
25 toxins on human and marine life.

1           I'm also concerned about the safety of the  
2 pipeline and I don't think that the regulations are up to  
3 snuff and it's definitely going to spill if you build it  
4 because they always do eventually but I'm going to stick to  
5 the script from here on out, which, you know, is what I  
6 really feel.

7           So FERC's Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
8 freely concedes that toxic substances like lead, mercury,  
9 arsenic, PCB's and dioxins lie under the harbor. The vast  
10 majority of samples from the proposed path of this project  
11 showed levels of one or more of these above levels.

12           Just to be safe nowhere does FERC address the  
13 potential long-term effects on human or marine life of  
14 turning these toxic substances up into the water's upper  
15 shores, instead FERC points out that the plumes of suspended  
16 sediments like sand, clay and gravel caused by excavating a  
17 trench for the pipeline would settle back down and on the  
18 harbor floor within hours, but the behavior of these  
19 sediments tell us nothing about how quickly, if at all  
20 molecules of heavy metals or manmade toxic chemicals would  
21 settle out.

22           Secondly, the FERC DEIS repeatedly characterizes  
23 the region from Raritan Bay to the offshore areas off the  
24 Rockaways as already hopelessly contaminated and so assumes  
25 the construction of this pipeline would make no difference

1 but this seriously misrepresents the present state of New  
2 York's lower harbor.

3 Over the 1970's a century of industrial run-off  
4 had made areas virtually dead, 50 years later we have come a  
5 long way. We've put billions into waste treatment  
6 facilities and industrial run-offs have almost ceased. The  
7 toxins laid down years ago are now under new layers of sand,  
8 clay and gravel.

9 If undisturbed they post far less risk than they  
10 did long ago. Evidence of renewed health in offshore waters  
11 include the return of whales and seals in significant  
12 numbers. These toxins threaten not only them but also all  
13 of us who live in this area. I urge you to deny a permit to  
14 the Williams Transco Northeast Supply Enhancement Pipeline  
15 thank you for your time and consideration.

16 In addition I would also like to talk about my  
17 concerns about climate change and how they are not addressed  
18 sufficiently in the DEIS. The Draft Environmental Impact  
19 Statement admits that the NESE Project would increase the  
20 atmosphere and concentration of greenhouse gas emissions in  
21 combination with past and future emissions from all other  
22 sources and contribute incrementally to future climate  
23 change impacts.

24 But the DEIS goes on to claim that there is no  
25 widely accepted standard per international, federal or state

1 policy or as a matter of physical science to determine the  
2 significance of the project's behind gas emissions for  
3 purposes of meaningful informing Commission's decision in  
4 this proceeding by refusing to adequately address gas  
5 emissions, the document reminds us of the dire threat that  
6 climate change poses to the earth and to humanity in the  
7 form of increased coastal flooding, worsening heat waves, et  
8 cetera.

9           We all know the story, as confirmed by the  
10 world's leading climate scientists.

11           MS. WELCHMAN: So my name is Eva Welchman and its  
12 spelled E-v-a W-e-l-c-h-m-a-n and I'm here with 350. I came  
13 because of 350 and I'm in the process of becoming educated  
14 about the system and how the pipeline would be approved or  
15 not approved and my understanding is it has to go through  
16 many arms.

17           I call them arms -- through the Army Corp and  
18 through FERC and so I'm here because I want clean water and  
19 I am here because I believe strongly that our country could  
20 benefit from investing in clean energy and that in the  
21 long-run it would help our economy to invest in clean  
22 energy.

23           And that in the process of helping our economy it  
24 will also help our environment. And I believe that a  
25 pipeline under the ocean cannot be built in a way without

1 there being some leakage. And my understanding is that the  
2 fracked gas is methane and that the environmental impact of  
3 methane is far, far greater than even the carbon monoxide  
4 that comes on the land.

5 And we can't really survive without our ocean and  
6 eco-system and I have to reiterate, I don't believe that a  
7 pipeline can be built, that there won't be leakage at some  
8 point and any leakage of the methane is bad -- bad isn't  
9 even -- it's better for us to invest in clean energy.

10 So I still have time. I swim, off of -- I swim  
11 out of -- I forget Reese Beach it's in Queens and I have  
12 seen that the water has gotten cleaner over the years and I  
13 truly believe that if the pipeline is there that there will  
14 be leakage and that my health will be at risk in that way in  
15 addition to polluting.

16 I eat fish, I eat local fish and I believe that  
17 the fish are going to get -- that there will be leakage at  
18 some point and that I will ingest it through the fish. I  
19 don't know what else to say. So I have three minutes, can I  
20 stop it?

21 MR. FALIK: Eugene Falik, F-a-l-i-k and I'm also  
22 representing the Bay's Water Civic Association. I think  
23 there are a number of issues here. First of all is there a  
24 need for the gas? And that comes first of all to the  
25 National Grid Corporation which I would suggest is a

1 racketeering organization. And that term is used under the  
2 Title 18 United States Code.

3           So therefore any statements they make I believe,  
4 cannot be relied on. A good part of the gas used on Long  
5 Island which this is going to help supply is used to  
6 generate electricity. And as we all know, the use of  
7 electricity is decreasing because people are converting to  
8 what's more energy efficient lighting and motors and also  
9 installing solar cells.

10           So that need for gas is likely to decrease.  
11 There's an assumption that certain stationary sources are  
12 going to convert from oil to gas. That remains to be  
13 proven. So I think there's a real question first of all is  
14 there a need for gas?

15           Assuming that there is that need the question  
16 then becomes -- who should supply it and there's every  
17 evidence based on the company's history that Williams  
18 Company and what is it -- Transco, cannot be relied on to  
19 safely operate any sort of gas facilities.

20           They have a record of multiple leaks. Now if  
21 there is a gas leak in the middle of the arctic, it may have  
22 environmental consequences but few people are likely to die.  
23 If there's a gas leak in the New York Metropolitan area,  
24 that is a different circumstance entirely.

25           And a company that has the record that these

1 people do I think should not be allowed to operate any  
2 dangerous facilities. Certainly they shouldn't be allowed  
3 to operate any new dangerous facilities.

4           And I understand that it's going to come ashore  
5 in Rockaway near a bridge. Now, we all know that gas is a  
6 perfectly safe material and never explodes right? So if  
7 there were to be a leak and an explosion and the gas  
8 migrated through the Raritan Park Bridge, what would happen?

9           MS. WALKER: My name is Kathleen Walker,  
10 K-a-t-h-l-e-e-n W-a-l-k-e-r and I'm a lifelong resident of  
11 Bay Ridge. I'm affiliated with a love of Bay Ridge, I've  
12 lived here my whole life and started two community  
13 organizations -- one Friends and Neighbors of Owls Head Park  
14 to save Owls Head Park in 1999 and Save the Green Church --  
15 the Methodist Church on 4th Avenue and Ovington Avenue which  
16 is now a school, so we didn't succeed in that one so we were  
17 one in one, winning in the community.

18           So I don't believe this pipeline is a good thing  
19 to Bay Ridge. I am concerned about fracking and I'm  
20 concerned about the environment, marine life, Mother Nature  
21 in general, and I oppose any unnatural chemicals or any more  
22 harm that may come to the environment. I read as much as I  
23 can, I listened to WBAI, Gary Knoll and any environmental  
24 shows that I can.

25           And I wish it was a different type of community

1 focus for this event where it wasn't a one by one where it  
2 was a group and the community could be together and hear  
3 each other and talk and have questions answered. So I do  
4 not agree with this format.

5           So I am here tonight because I want to voice my  
6 opposition to Williams Transco's Northeast Supply  
7 Enhancement Pipeline which will carry fracked gas for 23  
8 miles under New York's Lower Harbor. I'm opposed to the  
9 pipeline and more generally to all the additional fracking  
10 infrastructure in this state for many reasons but in the  
11 interest of time, I want to focus specifically on how the  
12 pipeline project would emit greenhouse gases and radiation  
13 into the atmosphere and how this is addressed in the DEIS.

14           The Draft Environmental Impact Statement severely  
15 understates the impact that methane and radon, both of which  
16 the NESE Project could admit in significant quantities,  
17 could have on public health and climate.

18           The DEIS states that pipeline emissions would be  
19 minimal during operations and would typically be limited to  
20 pipeline blowdowns and fugitive emissions at above ground  
21 facilities, but scientific studies have found high leakage  
22 rates of fugitive methane throughout the entire fracking  
23 process, from extraction through delivery.

24           Methane's a main component of fracked gas is 86  
25 to 100 times more potent a greenhouse gas than CO2 in the



1 first 20 years it's in the environment. And for the sake of  
2 the health of our present and future citizens who could be  
3 affected by radon and climate altering methane which is all  
4 of us, I ask you to choose a true no action alternative and  
5 to deny the project. This project must not move forward,  
6 thank you for your time.

7 MR. WAKEFIELD: My name is Raphael Wakefield,  
8 Raphael with a p-h. I'm a member of the Democratic  
9 Socialists of America, New York City Branch, Climate Justice  
10 Working Group and I'm an intervenor, W-a-k-e-f-i-e-l-d.

11 I oppose the Northeast Supply Enhancement  
12 Project. Section 4.12.4 of the DEIS climate change runs  
13 into problems immediately. The first paragraph says, "The  
14 greenhouse gas emissions from the construction and operation  
15 of the project are presented in Section 4.11.1.4", but the  
16 section does not exist and there is no such accounting.

17 Even though FERC previously did such an  
18 accounting for the Atlantic Sunrise Pipeline -- even that  
19 accounting was insufficient for that pipeline because it  
20 failed to calculate the additional greenhouse gas emissions  
21 that would be avoided where the pipeline not to have been  
22 constructed.

23 The third paragraph of that section notes the  
24 current and projected changes caused by anti-pyrogenic  
25 greenhouse gas emissions including those caused by natural

1 gas combustion, including average air and water temperature  
2 increases, increased precipitation and sea level rise and  
3 associated flooding and increase in insect borne diseases  
4 and damage to agriculture.

5           But rather than a science of engineering based  
6 explanation of why this project does not contribute to those  
7 problems, it notes political documents which blindly claim  
8 that natural gas is a "clean" fuel.

9           This is self-evidently not true in terms of  
10 greenhouse gas emissions. The section goes on to say,  
11 "Construction and operations emissions from the Northeast  
12 Supply Enhancement Project would increase the atmospheric  
13 concentration of greenhouse gases in combination with past  
14 and future emissions from all other sources, and contribute  
15 incrementally to future climate change impacts.

16           However, there was no widely accepted standard  
17 per international, federal, or state policy or as a matter  
18 of physical science, to determine the significance the  
19 project's greenhouse gas emissions for purposes of  
20 meaningfully informing Commission decision in this  
21 proceeding."

22           This is an excuse, not an explanation. The EPA  
23 and other federal agencies use a social cost of carbon  
24 metric to determine dollar amounts over fossil fuel  
25 infrastructure life cycles and so can FERC.

1           In the face of the acknowledged risks presented  
2 by greenhouse gas emissions, the second to last paragraph of  
3 the section notes that "the project would align with the  
4 state and local goals outlined above primarily by improving  
5 air quality and off-setting the use of more carbon intensive  
6 fossil fuels by supporting the continued conversion of  
7 building heating systems from fuel oil to natural gas in New  
8 York City."

9           But this is misleading -- take the most  
10 successful possible scenario from which this logic is most  
11 justifiable. The pipeline can transmit a maximum of  
12 400,000 dekatherms of natural gas per day.

13           According to the 2017 Inventory of Greenhouse Gas  
14 Emissions, all stationary fuel uses combined in 2015, equal  
15 about 61 million dekatherms of energy, 400 dekatherms of  
16 natural gas per day would total about 146 million dekatherms  
17 per year. According to inventory about 4.3 million tons of  
18 CO<sub>2</sub>, equivalent are produced every year from these station  
19 and fuel uses. According to greenhouse gas equivalencies  
20 indicate -- calculate an EP website 146 mega-million  
21 dekatherms of natural gas would have combust to produce 77  
22 -- 7.7 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> a year.

23           The locked in then increases to an equivalent  
24 emissions that assumes a 100% replacement fuel and zero  
25 future leaks which is not possible. You know, so I'm sorry

1 we had to rush through that.

2 MR. ELLIOT: George Elliot, two L's one T. I  
3 oppose the Williams Northeast Supply Enhancement Pipeline  
4 for many reasons. The pipeline is both unnecessary and the  
5 city already doubled its gas supply in 2015 and expensive  
6 construction would cost New Yorker's nearly a billion  
7 dollars.

8 Williams Energy Company has a poor safety record  
9 with 10 pipeline fires in the last decade and construction  
10 would churn up toxins, poisoning both human and marine life,  
11 the list goes on.

12 Particularly, I am concerned about greenhouse gas  
13 emissions. FERC's assessment says that construction  
14 operation emissions from the NESE Project would increase the  
15 atmospheric concentration of GSG's in combination with past  
16 and future emissions, et cetera, et cetera, however, there  
17 is no widely accepted standard per international, federal or  
18 state policy to determine the significance of the project's  
19 GHG emissions.

20 By refusing to adequately address the pipeline's  
21 gas emissions, FERC downplays the severity of our climate  
22 crisis. A -- this is illegal. It's both against NEPA  
23 policies which require reasonable forecasting of emissions  
24 and a recent DC court ruling that FERC must quantify and  
25 consider a project's downstream carbon emissions;

1           B -- this is unorthodox. FERC has determined the  
2 significance of pipeline emissions before, for instance,  
3 with the assessment of the Atlantic Sunrise Pipeline; and C  
4 -- this is immoral. Climate changes threaten New York City,  
5 in particularly the Rockaways through coastal flooding.

6           This pipeline would be an affront to vulnerable  
7 first responder communities that bear the brunt of both its'  
8 immediately pollution, via toxins leaked into sea waters and  
9 onto the beaches. And also as long-term pollution, the  
10 contributions to climate change.

11           The DEC said this pipeline raises serious  
12 environmental concerns. New York State does not need  
13 another GHG -- greenhouse gas emitting pipeline at the same  
14 time that we are transitioning to renewable energy, that's  
15 it.

16           I'd also like to complaint about the -- or make a  
17 comment about the form of this forum. I think it's better  
18 and more democratic to have an open public forum with  
19 reporters and where things can be publicized, I don't know.

20           MR. KINNIBURGH: My name is Ian Kinniburagh,  
21 I-a-n Kinniburgh, K-i-n-n-i-b-u-r-g-h. I live in New York  
22 City. Alright I am not aware if the details mandate FERC  
23 and I believe you should take a long route run view of  
24 issues on the first comment on hand and also take into  
25 account that the interest of the population of the country

1 as a whole.

2           Now if we -- diverting slightly, if we look at  
3 the question of energy I think we should take into account  
4 lessons learned from other such projects as tobacco,  
5 asbestos and even DDC. In each of these cases, the  
6 industry's concern publicly denied the scientific evidence  
7 that demonstrated the dangers of these products even though  
8 privately, internally they often recognize these dangers.

9           And I might say that the case of fossil fuels is  
10 very similar, they are far more profound. We're in the same  
11 position now as we were with these products in their middle  
12 phase as it were. The dangers of fossil fuels are far more  
13 profound but the scientific evidence is overwhelming. The  
14 climate is definitely changing, the consumption of fossil  
15 fuels is contributing to that even if we don't know exactly  
16 how much, despite the denials of some members of the public  
17 and also the industry, of course, in particular.

18           Moreover, we're reaching the point importantly  
19 where the climate change will have irreversible effects on  
20 the climate and this has to be taken into account. It's  
21 increasing the evidence on a daily basis on climate change  
22 for rising sea levels, reduced ice caps and so on. We all  
23 know all these things.

24           Very importantly, all governments around the  
25 world, this is not a local issue, this is a global issue and

1 all governments around the world agreed that something  
2 should be done to address climate change in the past -- we  
3 know this.

4 I'm not saying -- I'm just putting out there was  
5 a recognition of the magnitude of the problem, not going  
6 further than that. We can argue about the details of what  
7 should be done but the fact is that we do have alternatives  
8 to burning fossil fuel which is what this project is going  
9 to contribute to.

10 We have possibly there's solar, wind, geothermal,  
11 you know all this, but the amounts it returned is  
12 considered, I understand it may not be within the terms of  
13 reference required for this document. These are not  
14 alternatives that are considered in this proposal -- in  
15 whatever it's called, this impact statement -- it only  
16 considers alternative forms of moving gas around and so on  
17 and so forth.

18 So given the availabilities of these alternative  
19 forms it's irresponsible I think to ignore the use of fossil  
20 fuels, the alternatives of fossil fuels. And these are very  
21 long-run issues, it takes a long time to make this  
22 investment and they last for a long time.

23 And time is of the essence, we have to act now if  
24 we are to address climate change in the time that we have  
25 left available and we should therefore instead of being --

1 building this sort of infrastructure, we should in fact,  
2 take on a wider view of the energy sector and build  
3 alternative infrastructure, therefore I'm opposed to this  
4 proposal.

5 MS. ZIESCHE: Yes my name is Lee Ziesche, L-e-e  
6 Z-i-e-s-c-h-e and I have filed as an intervenor. So I'm  
7 very concerned. I'm here to speak in opposition to the  
8 Williams Pipeline. I don't think the DEIS adequately  
9 addresses the climate concerns.

10 It does say that there will be significant  
11 impacts, yet that there is no standard to measure those by  
12 and that's completely false. I mean we know that we have to  
13 keep global warming below 2 degrees Celsius and that  
14 methane, the main component that this fracked gas pipeline  
15 will transport, is leaking throughout the entire fracking  
16 process and that with more than 3% leakage, gas is worse  
17 than coal for the climate and researchers are finding 5 to  
18 12% leakage rates.

19 There is no mention of any of that research  
20 within the DEIS. I'm also really concerned that we know  
21 that climate is happening, that this is in an area that has  
22 been very impacted by climate change and superstorms.  
23 There's no research about what sea level rise could do to  
24 this pipeline if it's going to be in the ground 30 to 40  
25 years.



1           What kind of impacts could a major hurricane like  
2 Hurricane Sandy have on this kind of infrastructure with  
3 additional sea level rise?

4           I'm also very concerned within the fact that  
5 yeah, it does not really quantify the methane emissions as  
6 well as the impacts that radon could have being shipped into  
7 New York City. The Marcellus shale is highly radioactive,  
8 the DEIS, you know, mentions a DEP report that says that you  
9 know that this is safe but there's been research after that  
10 DEP report that has found really high levels of radon in  
11 people's homes who live next to fracking sites and this is a  
12 very short trip for this gas to be taking from Pennsylvania  
13 into New York City.

14           And I'm very concerned about the radon and I do  
15 not think that is adequately addressed in the DEIS. In  
16 addition, the toxins on the sea floor I don't think the DEIS  
17 does an adequate job of determining whether it's going to be  
18 safe or not to dredge up, you know, 23 miles of sea floor  
19 where we have seen lead, PCB's, all these industrial toxins  
20 that have settled on the sea floor.

21           And, you know, I just don't think the DEIS  
22 adequately addresses those concerns. And then my final  
23 comment is just that this entire process is supposed to be  
24 open to the public. The fact that there was only one  
25 hearing in Bay Ridge, you know, it's not easy to get to. A

1 lot of people are working right now and can't get here.

2           The fact that we have not been able to have the  
3 other public hear our comments, this is supposed to be a  
4 public hearing and yeah, so those are my concerns with the  
5 DEIS.

6           MR. DEPALMA: Jack DePalma, D-e-P-a-l-m-a. I  
7 live in Brooklyn, New York, 57 Montacue Street, I'm the  
8 President of the Physics Club in New York. I'm a United  
9 Federation of Teacher's physics teacher, 32 years retired.  
10 All my life a resident of Brooklyn, New York.

11           I grew up in Grave's End by Coney Island -- is  
12 that what you need to know? I don't know why they have guns  
13 here, could you write that down please? I don't feel that  
14 they need guns to protect pipelines but then again I don't  
15 like the feeling when I walk into a room and somebody has  
16 got a gun, well. I'll have to be protected from pipelines.

17           I think the government should do a better job of  
18 protecting people from companies, big companies that build  
19 pipelines. The reason being simply that what happened in  
20 the Gulf of Mexico indicates that nothing that the  
21 technology provides is ever 100% perfect.

22           There's an interruption, should I stop now,  
23 should I wait? Like I said, highly controlled messages  
24 isn't the same thing as highly informed citizens sharing  
25 their opinions.

1           So for the 30 years I've lived in Brooklyn, New  
2   York I was a baby on Coney Island Beach, I go to Neponsit,  
3   Rockaway all my life. I just think that when you put a big  
4   pipeline for the benefit of an oil company or a gas company,  
5   what happened in the Gulf of Mexico is I don't want to say  
6   inevitable -- because I think the gas lines are very safe.

7           I don't think there's a matter of safety. I  
8   think it's a matter of the planet. A lot of people don't  
9   really recognize that there's this process going on where we  
10  burn petroleum products -- I think they call it climate  
11  changeable circumstances.

12           Human beings have done everything they can to  
13  extract resources and the consequence of extracting  
14  resources you basically sometimes as I was saying before we  
15  were so easily interrupted that things don't always go  
16  perfect.

17           I noticed a couple of years back some plumber  
18  took a liberty with a gas line and blew up a building in  
19  Manhattan, because that's how easy it is for individuals to  
20  disrupt or mistake their behavior in terms of energy  
21  resources, the environment, other people.

22           And that carelessness, that carelessness I find  
23  is usually the hest of big money corporations don't really  
24  have conscience. You can't really put a corporation in jail  
25  so suppose the pipeline doesn't leak but, you know,

1 something happens. You know I read the couple of pages of  
2 the environmental statement and I don't really think that  
3 that's enough to convince me that what we have to do is get  
4 the gas out of Pennsylvania, across New Jersey and into Long  
5 Island -- because I know they've been doing it all the long.

6 I've seen gas lines, I know what happens with  
7 gas. Gas is an interesting phenomenon. Methane -- methane  
8 -- so here's my little -- I'm against transferring natural  
9 resources to other countries. I think that just encourages  
10 more and more and more of the same thing.

11 Oil companies get wealthy and Americans --  
12 Americans, well it was nice to have a Coney Island when I  
13 was a child, I remember all of those roller coasters. So I  
14 don't think the stops really get respected as much as I wish  
15 it did, but unfortunately my children and their children  
16 will not have the same world.

17 They might have sited it someplace else. I don't  
18 know where you would put it because I don't really think  
19 that selling gas to the Mideast or to Asia or to South  
20 America is the goal. I think the goal is to sell gas just  
21 the like the war in Syria, just like the war in Iraq, so  
22 that somebody can get wealthy.

23 MR. GREENE-AYALA: My name is Damien James  
24 Greene-Ayala. D-a-m-i-e-n James J-a-m-e-s Greene  
25 G-r-e-e-n-e Ayala A-y-a-l-a. Greene-Ayala is one word, just

1 hyphenated.

2 I work with the ASPCA closely and I also work  
3 closely with the HSUS and I am a musician that works with  
4 Qsic wildlife music which is a music project that funds  
5 specific environmental entities.

6 So I live in Far Rockaway, New York. I was  
7 placed into foster care and I was custody of the state for a  
8 while and I just recently moved back after Hurricane Sandy.  
9 Far Rockaway was devastated by this hurricane. They  
10 persevered through economic hardship for years.

11 They're small businesses, there are families,  
12 there are entire communities in Rockaway. There are people  
13 in Rockaway of every culture, every language, every code,  
14 every creed, every lifestyle and every background.

15 There are species that are only native to our  
16 inland. We're a fragile infrastructure. We're balancing on  
17 the edge of one of the most preserved areas in New York  
18 City. We're the Sixth Borough. Williams is trying to force  
19 the resources out of it.

20 Rockaway is home and migration path to many  
21 endangered species and life forms, drilling the toxic and  
22 metal-coated sea bed directly disrupts whales, seas and  
23 other species, many who thrive near the sea floor.

24 Williams describes in vivid detail the damage to  
25 these creatures as a result of their operation and their

1 assessment. PCB's and bio-sites can clog marine life from  
2 gills. They can impair their auditory and visual sense and  
3 they can do so temporarily to permanently.

4 They're also responsible of injury and killing of  
5 thousands of marine animals. They don't respond to the  
6 invasion of their habitat quite as often as we think that  
7 they do. Atlantic sturgeon which is an endangered animal  
8 would be forced out and poisoned by the toxic sea bed and  
9 its exposed inhabitants.

10 Toxic chemicals would reach a majority of fish  
11 that are usually killed to eat by small businesses. Not to  
12 mention that five past explosions and fatal incidents  
13 directly caused by William's operations costing lives and  
14 money.

15 Williams is not attempting to buy a space for  
16 resource sales in Rockaway. But to the Rockaways it's more  
17 like unavoidable, ecological and small business collateral.  
18 Williams has already addressed major social and  
19 environmental issues as a direct result of drilling in our  
20 harbor.

21 This affects everyone. This affects Queens, this  
22 affects the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, this affects New  
23 York City. My community will not be treated as collateral.  
24 Reject this and any operation that directly puts New Yorkers  
25 at risk. And by New Yorkers I don't just mean humans.

1 MS. CANNELLA: My name is Cara, C-a-r-a Cannella,  
2 C-a-n (as in Nancy) - n (as in Nancy) - e-l-l-a. Okay, I  
3 live and work in Brooklyn. I'm a volunteer with a  
4 non-profit organization Surf Rider and I'm concerned about  
5 potential harm to the shoreline economy by an extended  
6 Williams Pipeline.

7 The DEIS says "An offshore portion of the project  
8 would have minor, temporary impacts on commercial fishing  
9 during the construction period." FERC's assessment  
10 dramatically underplays its impact on commercial fishing as  
11 a vital part of the shoreline economy.

12 Commercial fishers would need to retrieve  
13 equipment within the project area prior to construction.  
14 This would be particularly hard and shellfish harvesters who  
15 may have a lot of equipment in a single area having to reset  
16 equipment in a new area would force these harvesters to lose  
17 days of crucial income.

18 The DEIS also says that in 2012 fin-fish and  
19 shellfish with values totaling 9.7 million were commercially  
20 landed within three miles of New York shore and roughly 18.7  
21 million within three miles of New Jersey. That's an  
22 important industry we need to protect.

23 As a self-employed writer covering small  
24 business, I know how challenging it can be for small  
25 business owners to stay afloat financially. Every minute

1 counts in generating enough revenue to cover payroll and  
2 overhead and earn a decent living.

3           While Williams Transco's plans to expand its  
4 pipeline will benefit large stakeholders, it does not take  
5 small business owners into account. Commercial fisheries  
6 are already struggling. Profit margins are small for often  
7 dangerous work in rough weather.

8           In January, 2014, the New York Times published a  
9 piece called, "A Speck in the Sea", it's the true story of  
10 John Aldridge and his lifelong friend and commercial fishing  
11 partner, Anthony Sosinski. They work out of Montauk and  
12 while I've never met them, I think about them a lot.

13           The story is a haunting and heart-warming account  
14 of John's 12 hours overboard and the search and rescue by  
15 Anthony, the Coast Guard and a volunteer crew of fisherman.  
16 While they work out of eastern Long Island, beyond this  
17 pipeline zone, the writer tells a bigger story about their  
18 industry.

19           On the docks fishermen teared up talking to him  
20 about John's rescue. He writes, "It was hard to say what  
21 exactly was bringing them to tears, but what seems to go  
22 mostly unspoken in their lives is the inescapable risk of  
23 their jobs and the improbable fact that Aldridge had not  
24 drowned in the Atlantic, somehow underscored that risk for  
25 them even more.



1           He kept himself alive in a way that few people  
2 could and he willed himself to live. To be a fisherman, and  
3 to really know the danger of the sea and to think of  
4 Aldridge in the middle of the ocean for all of those hours  
5 refusing to go under, maybe that was too much to contain."

6           In closing, I ask that you consider the  
7 pipeline's impact on commercial fishers, thank you.

8           MS. KLAPINSKI: So my name is Bridgette  
9 Klapinski, K-l-a-p-i-n-s-k-i. I am on the Executive Board  
10 of the Rockaway Beach Civic Association and a resident of  
11 the Rockaways.

12           So my name is Bridgette, I'm a resident of  
13 Rockaway Beach and I'm here because the Draft Environmental  
14 Impact Study to me is incomplete. The closer I looked at  
15 the document the more unprepared I felt to question and  
16 respond and then I realized that there was a reason -- it's  
17 because there are too many unanswered questions in the  
18 document, specifically with regard to marine wildlife,  
19 marine mammals that we have frequenting the area.

20           Every time I looked at that area in the Draft  
21 Impact it said that further information would be furnished  
22 but here we are in the public comment and it's very hard to  
23 comment on something with full sections of missing  
24 information regarding data, mitigation -- especially with  
25 endangered species and others that we know are critical to

1 our habitat.

2           So I am requesting that the public comment period  
3 be extended until the document is complete or that Williams  
4 Transco furnish all missing information before May 14th, the  
5 public comment -- written comment period, particularly with  
6 regard to marine wildlife and marine mammals.

7           It was stated on the Draft Impact Study that the  
8 primary goal of this session was to have comment from the  
9 public but I find it hard to respond to specific areas if  
10 the information is incomplete.

11           So specifically an area of question was  
12 construction noise -- I know it stated that specifically the  
13 animals would be monitored from a 33 foot radius from the  
14 boats. I found that very confusing as it notes that there  
15 could be harmful impact to animals that are -- as far as,  
16 you know, 2.9 miles away.

17           Again, in the Rockaways when we see very  
18 frequently humpback whales, especially in the spring, summer  
19 and fall as well as sizable pods of dolphins and porpoises,  
20 seals coming up on our beaches.

21           Horseshoe crabs -- we know that these animals are  
22 present and there was just a lot of missing data that I feel  
23 like the public should be informed about. The document even  
24 notes the prevalence of commercial whale watching operations  
25 in this area which means that the animals are present and

1 that they are abundant and I do think that that needs to be  
2 accounted for in the missing data and also with further  
3 detail on the mitigation efforts, I think the people of New  
4 York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania deserve more.

5           It's a critical, you know, it's a critical matter  
6 and there's a lot at stake. Just another to illustrate that  
7 point too with regard to horseshoe crabs which the document  
8 references as being vitally important to migratory shore  
9 birds like the red know, you know it just very simply in  
10 Section -- I think it was 4113 says, "Horseshoe crabs in the  
11 area may be injured or killed by these excavation  
12 activities," and that's all it says.

13           There's nothing about mitigation or how this  
14 could impact other species, not only the horseshoe crab  
15 which is closely monitored in, you know, New York and New  
16 Jersey. I know in New Jersey they have a moratorium on the  
17 harvest of horseshoe crabs and their eggs. You know, it's a  
18 closely monitored species and I think again there's just a  
19 lot of missing information, thank you.

20           MS. ESTEVEZ: Shanna Estevez, S-h-a-n-n-a, last  
21 name Estevez, E-s-t-e-v-e-z. I'm not representing anybody,  
22 I'm just here on my own accord. Okay, so again good  
23 evening, I'm also an intervenor. I already stated my name  
24 and I am here as a true New Yorker, this is my home.

25           I currently reside in Coney Island Beach and I

1 see this proposed pipeline as nothing but a disaster waiting  
2 to happen. This pipeline goes against New York views on a  
3 greener New York. We are currently geared towards, with the  
4 help of Governor Cuomo, fully understanding the long-term  
5 effects of fracked gas methane, not only will the marine  
6 life be affected, human life will be affected as well.

7           We have already seen the poor safety record that  
8 Williams has and as an absolute certainty that this pipeline  
9 would even be considered. New York has invested over 15  
10 million dollars in restoring the Jamaica Bay Wildlife  
11 Refuge.

12           Many birds and even seals have been known to make  
13 it a stop on their journey up north. The noise pollution  
14 will definitely confuse these animals as well as the  
15 chemicals that would be used to which we have not received a  
16 complete report on. It is not or has not been fully  
17 completed or disclosed to the public as well as the  
18 chemicals, MSDS data sheet available to explain the  
19 potential hazards to human health.

20           There have already been documented explosions as  
21 well as loss of life. The public has a right to know about  
22 any and all chemicals to which they will be affected by or  
23 exposed to. All potential affected New Yorkers will be  
24 Staten Island, Manhattan, Brooklyn, Queens, Long Island and  
25 the Rockaways.

1           Okay, and also we cannot throw money at Mother  
2 Nature or any cleanup -- it's priceless. It's taken 25  
3 years to clean up Coney Island Beach, I can recall  
4 personally when I used to work on the beach there were  
5 needles, crack vials, broken glass. In the water you would  
6 see all types of plastic and all types of pollution and  
7 debris.

8           Now it has cleaned up very much and one doesn't  
9 have to worry about stepping on anything or being stabbed by  
10 any needles in a second. Also, Jamaica Bay was heavily used  
11 as a dumping ground for many industries and some still are  
12 using it today.

13           And we here in New York are working to get rid of  
14 the dumping of any toxic chemicals into our national parks  
15 because Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge is a national park and  
16 we don't want any more dumping in our New York harbors and  
17 all beaches.

18           New York is working towards a less polluted, less  
19 chemically saturated environment with over 70 bird species  
20 seen returning back to Jamaica Bay Wildlife Refuge, it is  
21 proof that we don't need industrial waste and/or chemicals  
22 floating about within the waters and waterways of New York  
23 Harbor or Coney Island Beach of which I reside.

24           I can see the number of mysterious afflictions  
25 that will affect people who visit New York beaches every

1 year, mysterious rashes or sudden sicknesses. Williams is  
2 not a New York based company and will not feel or have to  
3 live through any potential effects to human life or  
4 environmental ocean life and the disturbing of the sea bed  
5 which will release tons of chemicals long buried dating back  
6 to the early 1900's.

7           The effect of this pipeline far surpasses any  
8 benefit inevitably the ones that will be picking up the cost  
9 will be passed on to the taxpayers which includes me. It's  
10 almost like we're being forced to pay for mistakes and this  
11 is a detriment to the follow New Yorkers and marine life in  
12 our oceans, rivers, bays, beaches and harbors.

13           The cost is too high and quite frankly  
14 unnecessary. We are confident that New York State will  
15 prominently deny the water quality permit needed to start  
16 construction and we are confident that Governor Cuomo will  
17 hold and permanently close down New York Harbor to any and  
18 all dredging and toxic chemical waste disposal and fracking.

19           This pipeline is only a tragedy in the making and  
20 we will do all that we can to legally make sure that the  
21 pipeline remains a sketch on someone's blueprints. New York  
22 will not let any more digging or negative effects on our  
23 oceans, our rivers, our neighbors and communities and we  
24 won't go down without a fight.

25           MS. SHINDELL: Laura, L-a-u-r-a Shindell,

1 S-h-i-n-d-e-l-1 and I'm with Food and Water Watch. Despite  
2 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement being nearly 800  
3 pages long, methane both the word methane and the  
4 abbreviated format, CH<sub>4</sub>, are only mentioned 18 times on 8  
5 pages and only if you copy and paste all of those together  
6 only 2 pages are dedicated to climate change.

7           Unfortunately the urgency of climate change and  
8 the significant role that methane plays in climate change  
9 was not expressed, nor were there ways to mitigate or manage  
10 methane releases expended upon.

11           This is concerning because research shows that  
12 escaping methane emissions from oil and gas operations  
13 including pipeline transmission, are the leading human  
14 source of methane pollution in the United States and the  
15 second largest source worldwide.

16           Methane is an extremely potent greenhouse gas.  
17 It is 86 times more effective of trapping heat and causing  
18 global warming than carbon dioxide over a 20 year period.  
19 They're a greenhouse gas footprint and natural gas is  
20 actually worse than coal and oil because methane traps more  
21 heat in the atmosphere. Scientists fear that if our planet  
22 warms more than two degrees Celsius we will hit a threshold  
23 that could cause irreversible destructive climate change.

24           And climate change has already strengthened  
25 storms like Hurricane Sandy that devastated New York City

1 and Long Island making this pipeline even more insult to  
2 injury, to be built in the backyards of folks already  
3 impacted heavily from climate storms.

4 Furthermore by refusing to adequately address the  
5 pipeline's greenhouse gas emissions FERC is minimizing the  
6 dire threat that climate change poses to the earth and to  
7 humanity in the form of coastal flooding, worsening  
8 heatwaves, crop shortages, catastrophic storms and  
9 wildfires, humanitarian crises and countless other issues.

10 Without quantifying emissions FERC provides no  
11 way for other agencies such as the New York State DEC to  
12 assess the projects potential impact. The document actually  
13 claims to quantify emissions in Section 4.11.1.4 but that  
14 Section is suspiciously missing from the document.

15 And in other words FERC agrees that the pipeline  
16 will continue to contribute to climate change but is  
17 avoiding saying exactly how by claiming there's no way of  
18 measuring the impacts and so for that reason I am opposed to  
19 the Williams Pipeline and would urge FERC to block the  
20 pipeline's ability to be built and I've got written comments  
21 to produce.

22 MS. ALLEN: The Draft EIS Comment Session for the  
23 Northeast Supply Enhancement Project concluded at 8:26 p.m.

24 (Whereupon at 8:26 p.m., the meeting concluded.)

25



## 1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

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

6 Name of Proceeding: Transcontinental Gas Pipe  
7 Line Company, LLC

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 Docket No.: CP17-101-000

16 Place: Brooklyn, NY

17 Date: Thursday, April 26, 2018

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

22

23

24 Larry Flowers

25 Official Reporter

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

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

- - - - - x  
Transcontinental Gas : Docket No. CP17-101-000  
Pipe Line Company, LLC :  
- - - - - x

NORTHEAST SUPPLY ENHANCEMENT PROJECT

Best Western Gregory Hotel  
8315 4th Avenue,  
Brooklyn, New York 11209  
Thursday, April 26, 2018

The public comment session, pursuant to notice, opened  
at 5:00 p.m.

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

2 MS. OWEN: The Draft EIS comment session for the  
3 Northeast Supply Enhancement Project proposed by  
4 Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company or Transco in  
5 Brooklyn, New York began at 5 PM. The purpose of this  
6 meeting is to record public comments on the Draft  
7 Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Federal Energy  
8 Regulatory Commission on March 23rd, 2018.

9 MR. RYBA: I am Stephan Ryba, Chief of the  
10 Regulatory Branch for the New York District, U.S. Army Corps  
11 of Engineers. I'll be the presiding officer on behalf of  
12 the Corps of Engineers at today's public hearing.

13 The Corps of Engineers is here today to obtain  
14 information and evidence that address Corps' concerns to  
15 assist in the regulatory review of a permit application by  
16 Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Company, LLC, for the  
17 installation, construction of a new natural gas transmission  
18 pipeline loop and associated subsea manifold tie-in and  
19 cathodic protection in Old Bridge Township and the Borough  
20 of Sayreville, Middlesex County, New Jersey and in Raritan  
21 Bay, Lower New York Bay, and the Atlantic Ocean, Middlesex  
22 County and Monmouth County, New Jersey and Richmond County  
23 and Queens County, New York.

24 FERC, as lead federal agency, will make a  
25 decision whether to issue approval to facilitate the

1 construction and operation of this natural gas pipeline.  
2 The Corps of Engineers is neither a proponent for nor an  
3 opponent of the proposed work. Our role is to determine  
4 whether the proposed activity -- in this case, the  
5 installation of a natural gas pipeline and associated  
6 facilities in waters of the U.S. is or is not contrary to  
7 the overall public interest. This hearing will play an  
8 important part in that determination.

9           Please understand that we do not expect to answer  
10 questions in this hearing related to the proposal, as we are  
11 here to obtain information and your comments. Questions on  
12 the regulatory process in general can be directed to my  
13 staff in the audience today.

14           The New York District has issued a public notice  
15 for this project with a comment period closing on May 7th.  
16 The public notice is currently posted on the New York  
17 District website, and that website address is:  
18 [www.nan.usace.army.mil](http://www.nan.usace.army.mil)

19           We do have some copies available on the  
20 registration table as well.

21           If you are not currently on our public notice  
22 e-mail distribution list and would like to receive an e-mail  
23 announcement for future public notices from my office,  
24 please provide your e-mail address to one of our staff  
25 members at the registration table today. Thank you.

1 > MS. KANTROWITZ: My name is Edith, E D I T H,  
2 Kantrowitz, K A N T R O W I T Z. New Yorkers do not want  
3 and do not want another giant fracked gas pipeline in their  
4 waters. Climate change is already here; the ice caps are  
5 melting and the sea levels are rising, and extreme weather  
6 events are becoming more and more frequent. People are  
7 being displaced and their lives are being ruined. Some  
8 scientists have predicted that the human species could  
9 become extinct within the next century if we don't make some  
10 drastic changes, and quickly.

11 It is totally insane to keep using fossil fuels,  
12 especially methane, which 86 to 100 times worse for the  
13 climate in the short term than carbon dioxide. We must get  
14 to 100 percent renewable energy as fast as possible. We do  
15 not expect to see an increase in fracked gas use in New York  
16 City's future because we know that it's renewable energy  
17 that we need, like solar, wind and geothermal in order to  
18 save our planet, and to meet city and state energy goals.

19 New York City boilers should not be converting to  
20 methane in a misguided attempt to reduce emissions and it's  
21 not even clear that this pipeline would result in such  
22 conversions, especially since it would only feed to National  
23 Grid, which does not supply many of the boilers that still  
24 need to convert from oil. But Williams company wants to  
25 build this pipeline, because they are guaranteed a 14

1 percent return on their investment, even if there's no  
2 demand for their gas.

3 Williams, like many other fossil fuel companies,  
4 has an atrocious safety record. Since 2008, ten Williams-  
5 Transco pipelines and compressor stations, and five other  
6 Williams natural gas facilities have exploded or caught  
7 fire. Nine people have been killed and 141 injured in these  
8 incidents. Why should we risk more explosions, leaks,  
9 spills, fatalities when the gas isn't needed in the first  
10 place and it's destroying the only planet we have.

11 There will also be a host of other adverse  
12 environmental impacts connected to this pipeline resulting  
13 from the construction noise disturbing the ocean floor  
14 including harms to commercial and recreational fishing and  
15 to endangered species like the Atlantic Sturgeon. Toxins  
16 will be dredged up from the sea floor including lead,  
17 mercury, PCBs, and cadmium. Horseshoe crabs, whales, birds  
18 and other species will be affected.

19 The New York State DEC has recognized that this  
20 pipeline is a bad idea and has refused to grant key permits  
21 for the project. Now FERC needs to do the right thing.  
22 Start by listening to the people and deny this pipeline.  
23 The emissions don't have to be precisely quantified because  
24 any fossil fuel emissions are unacceptable.

25 We know that the currently planned build-out of

1   fracked gas pipelines will prevent New York from meeting its  
2   greenhouse emission goals. We know methane emissions have  
3   increased by more than 30 percent between 2002 and 2014.  
4   This is largely because of the reliance on natural gas  
5   resulting in new fracking wells and pipelines like this one.  
6   Please stop minimizing the importance of climate change.  
7   The outcome of our future depends on how we handle our  
8   energy needs, and with fossil fuels we may not have a  
9   future.

10       >           DR. RONAN: I'm Dr. Marian Ronan. I'm a resident  
11   of Brooklyn here. I'm a Professor at NY Theological  
12   Seminary on the Upper West Side.

13               FERC: And can you spell your first and last  
14   names?

15               DR. RONAN: Yes. M A R I A N, last name Ronan, R  
16   O N as in Nancy, A N. So, I have come to urge you to refuse  
17   the permit for the Williams pipeline. I have two major  
18   concerns. The first concern is that the safety record of  
19   this organization is outrageous and I know that the  
20   environmental impact statement says that you evaluate each  
21   project independently, but you have to consider their  
22   history. Their history is that they've had something --  
23   since 2008, something like 15 of their compressors or  
24   pipelines have exploded and it's killed 9 people and injured  
25   141 people, and they destroyed property. But in addition,

1 they release methane, which is the gas that's in the  
2 pipeline and people say that this methane is a transitional  
3 fuel so it's better than oil. But it's not really, because  
4 it's 86 times as potent as carbon dioxide and if it gives off  
5 3 percent -- if 3 percent of the methane goes into the air,  
6 than it's worse than other fuels.

7           The other thing is it gives off -- when it's on  
8 land, it gives off benzene, which is a carcinogen so these  
9 people cannot be trusted, and you should not approve this  
10 pipeline.

11           My other concern is that a lot of toxic  
12 substances are going to be dredged up from the pipeline  
13 under water when it's, the pipeline is constructed, it  
14 trenches, and it gives off all these, causes all the toxins  
15 that are under the earth, under the surface to come to the  
16 surface, and so it's toxics like -- I don't seem to be able  
17 to find it now, I had it -- but in any case it's going to  
18 terribly pollute the water, and a number of the toxics that  
19 are going to come up -- lead, mercury, PCBs, cadmium and  
20 chromium are terrible. They get into the sea life and then  
21 people eat it, and one of my major concerns, both about the  
22 benzene that's given off by the accidents on land, and the  
23 toxics that are given off by the trenching underwater is: I  
24 have had cancer twice. I've had colon cancer and uterine  
25 cancer, and these toxics cause cancer. Now, obviously the



1 sea water isn't going to cause me cancer, but if it gets  
2 into the seafood and I eat it and other people eat it, it  
3 increases the likelihood of people getting cancer. So, it's  
4 bad for the air because of the methane and it's bad for  
5 people's health. So, I urge you to reject permit.

6 > MR. WILSON: My name is Eric Wilson. E R I C, W  
7 I L S O N. I'm a resident of South Brooklyn. I'm here  
8 tonight because I want to voice my opposition to the  
9 Williams-Transco Northeast Supply Enhancement Pipeline which  
10 would carry fracked gas to the Rockaways via the New York  
11 Harbor. I am opposed to the pipeline for many reasons, but  
12 for the sake of time I want to focus on how it would affect  
13 climate change and how this is addressed or rather not  
14 really addressed in the DEIS.

15 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement admits  
16 that the NESE project would, quote, Increase the atmospheric  
17 concentration of greenhouse gas emissions in combination  
18 with past and future emissions from all other sources and  
19 contribute incrementally to future climate change impacts,  
20 end quote. But the DEIS goes on to claim that quote, There  
21 is no widely accepted standard per international, federal,  
22 or state policy or as a matter of physical science to  
23 determine the significance of the project's greenhouse gas  
24 emissions for purposes of meaningfully informing the  
25 Commission's decision in this proceeding, end quote.

1           By refusing to adequately address the pipeline's  
2 greenhouse gas emissions, the document minimizes the dire  
3 threat that climate change poses to the earth and to  
4 humanity, to all of us in the form of increased coastal  
5 flooding, worsening heat waves, and crop shortages,  
6 catastrophic storms, and wildfires, humanitarian crises, and  
7 countless other issues that have been articulated, defined,  
8 and confirmed as effects of climate change by the world's  
9 leading climate scientists.

10           The National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA,  
11 requires that FERC provide, quote "reasonable forecasting"  
12 unquote, of emissions, which includes making educated  
13 guesses about those emissions when the future is uncertain.  
14 This has yet to be done by FERC in this document.

15           Without quantifying emissions, FERC provides no  
16 way for other agencies, such as the New York State DEC, to  
17 assess the project's potential impact. The document  
18 actually claims to quantify emissions in section 4.11.1.4,  
19 but that section is not in the document. It's missing.  
20 Suspiciously. In short, the DEIS has not adequately  
21 addressed the impact of the project on climate change. And  
22 the ensuing local and global effects despite the fact that  
23 there are concrete, tangible ways of quantifying the  
24 project's emissions.

25           For the sake of the health of our present and

1 future citizens who will be affected by climate change,  
2 which is all of us, I ask you to choose a true no action  
3 alternative and to deny the project if the company  
4 reappears. The project must not move forward.

5 Thank you for your time and consideration.

6 > MR. WOOD: I'm Robert Wood. R O B E R T, W O O  
7 D. I am here to vehemently oppose the pipeline. And today  
8 I'm going to talk about climate change, although there are  
9 many other reasons that are there to oppose it. This is one  
10 of the potentially civilization-ending crises that we are  
11 facing, and yet in a document that purports to be an  
12 environmental impact statement, two pages are devoted to be  
13 on with this issue.

14 This is woefully inadequate. Woefully inadequate  
15 is putting it mildly. There is absolutely no excuse for not  
16 quantifying greenhouse gases. The D.C. Circuit Court ruled  
17 that FERC had to quantify greenhouse gases in these cases  
18 moving forward and yet the document refers to a chart in  
19 which it says it does this, it does not exist in the Draft  
20 Environmental Impact Statement.

21 It claims that the pipeline will help New York  
22 City and New York State achieve it's renewable energy goals.  
23 This is false. It refers to outdated goals for both New  
24 York City and New York State, which is completely  
25 unacceptable for a federal agency to do. It says that one

1 of the ways that it will do this is by helping New York  
2 City heating transition from oil to natural gas, and yet  
3 there is no evidence in the literature that says that  
4 methane, which is the gas that is released from natural gas,  
5 is any better for the climate than CO2.

6           This is a document, there's no, actually there  
7 are only like 12 mentions of methane in this document at  
8 all. For these reasons and many more I oppose this project.

9           >           MR. GOVE: My name is Matthew, M A T T H E W,  
10 Gove, G O V E. And I might be an intervenor with Surfrider  
11 Foundation, I'm not sure.

12           So, I've got just a few comments here. I think  
13 Williams haven't really done their homework on this. This  
14 is the public's chance to review the project, and there's  
15 tons of things missing in the DEIS. I actually went through  
16 the whole thing which took about 15 hours. They talk about  
17 releasing a couple chemicals when they do a hydrostatic test  
18 of the pipeline; they're going to release something called  
19 CorrectTreat, which is rust inhibitor, apparently very toxic  
20 according to the EPA. And a biocide they haven't even said  
21 what the biocide is, so it's hard to say what these impacts  
22 are and we don't know what is actually going to happen,  
23 which is actually a kind of repeating theme throughout the  
24 DEIS; it says, 'Oh, the full thing will be - Williams will  
25 bring out all the details at the end of the DEIS comment

1 period.' So, if they don't get in until then, how are we  
2 supposed to review this project?

3 This public hearing format is really problematic.  
4 I know Bome has been switching to a format like this, but it  
5 really makes a difference, you know, people do like to  
6 grandstand and get the applause and have a yell session, but  
7 also you learn a lot at those sessions about what the  
8 fishermen think, what my neighbors think. I always end up  
9 learning things that I didn't even know was happening, when  
10 I can hear other people. This back room thing is very  
11 strange. So we would like to get back to a real public  
12 hearing.

13 Also, the states, this isn't probably in your  
14 purview, but I'm not sure how we're going to get to a  
15 renewable goal if we're adding fossil fuel infrastructure,  
16 it's just not possible; the math doesn't work. I'm also  
17 wondering why the DEIS, and FERC isn't penalizing the carbon  
18 pollution coming from the pipeline. If it was a smokestack,  
19 you would analyze what's coming out of the smokestack. FERC  
20 should be analyzing how much carbon pollution will come out  
21 and what that means for climate change. They say that, 'Oh,  
22 we can't because climate change is global, it's like  
23 impossible.' You could say, 'Well, the pipeline is this  
24 big, we expect this much gas to come through it,' that's  
25 equal to X amount of cars, which people do often. Or just

1 say how much it is, how many tons of carbon. But for some  
2 reason the DEIS doesn't cover that at all.

3           And then there's another argument that they're  
4 using that this will, this will help New York City go off of  
5 heavy fuel oil. But any data -- we actually tried to FOIA  
6 them for data -- about price, the economics of this, the  
7 need for it, is there some sort of energy crisis. And  
8 building a pipeline doesn't mean a bunch of buildings are  
9 going to magically go off of heavy fuel oil. It just means  
10 there's more natural gas into the system. They're making a  
11 connection there but they're not showing any facts.  
12 Done.

13       >           MS. SPEER: I'm Paula Speer. S as in Sam, P as  
14 in Pamela, E E R. I would like to start with the safety  
15 record. I have looked up an old article in The Gothamist  
16 which is good but outdated about their safety record. This  
17 morning I looked on  
18 [violationtracker.goodjobsfirst.org/parents/Williams-](http://violationtracker.goodjobsfirst.org/parents/Williams-)  
19 [Companies](http://violationtracker.goodjobsfirst.org/parents/Williams-) and discovered an interesting pattern.

20           In 2015, the Blue Racer Midstream which is a  
21 Williams company, was fined \$275,000 for environmental  
22 violations. In 2016, a year later, they were fined \$50,000  
23 for the same thing. That suggests they don't care very much  
24 about their safety record. And also we can see as recently  
25 as this year a \$53,000 fine for a pipeline safety violation

1 that they made in 2017. There are details if you follow the  
2 links. About how they were not investigating the corrosive  
3 effects of the gas that they were transporting. About how  
4 they allowed a relief device that had drifted in excess of  
5 three percent of the previously set point, which meant that  
6 it was a failure. They failed to document how they were  
7 going to correct it. And they failed to secure block valves  
8 and bypass valves from possible tampering or unauthorized  
9 access.

10                   And what does that amount of \$53,000 mean?

11 Probably not much to Williams, but what does it mean to us?

12 Well, in 2016 they were fined \$53,000, almost the same  
13 amount for something else by OSHA for a fatality in Wyoming.  
14 So, \$50,000 might not mean much to Williams but it may mean  
15 a lot to the community. Pay attention to that safety  
16 record.

17                   Another thing about this pipeline is that we  
18 don't need it. We have enough natural gas for current and  
19 future use and even if we did need it, most of it's going to  
20 National Grid, which is not the main supplier for boilers.  
21 Boilers are what are usually cited as what we need natural  
22 gas for.

23                   The other thing is, most of the commissioners on  
24 FERC, I assume, are very conservative people who care about  
25 federalism. That means you care about state laws. New York

1 State law has a ban on fracking, which took us a lot of work  
2 to get passed. You're just thumbing your nose at it.  
3 You're doing an end run around it by allowing this pipeline.  
4 You're also thumbing your nose at our mandated goal to  
5 reduce climate change gases to below 2005 levels, 80 percent  
6 below 2005 levels by 2050.

7 And the environmental impact statement that  
8 Williams put through was originally set to build the  
9 pipeline during the winter and the spring to avoid the  
10 nesting season of the Piper Plover, but FERC just gave them  
11 the pass.

12 All right. Thank you.

13 > MS. LAURI: Good afternoon, my name, it's Jill  
14 Lauri, J I L L, L A U R I. Good afternoon, my name is Jill  
15 Lauri and I am a resident of Rockaway Beach, Queens, New  
16 York. m On behalf of all living beings, human, animal, and  
17 nature who live in Rockaway and its surrounding waters, I  
18 stand before you in opposition to the Williams pipeline.  
19 The proposed pipeline presents health and safety risks to  
20 our entire community.

21 The Williams company has a very poor track record  
22 in terms of safety. 25 accidents since 2008. The gas that  
23 would be transported through the pipeline would be short-  
24 lived and is unnecessary. The proposed pipeline will not  
25 meet any need for gas but rather only satisfy a desire for



1 profits on the part of the Williams company. The health  
2 and well-being of the living beings must be placed before  
3 that of corporate profit. Both the installation and ongoing  
4 presence of the proposed pipeline will be a disruptive force  
5 to sea life and the environment.

6           Hurricane Sandy gave us the opportunity to see a  
7 larger perspective and the importance of us learning to  
8 exist in harmony with nature. We are all interconnected;  
9 human, animals, nature. When we abuse one aspect of the  
10 whole, it has ripple and sometimes tidal wave effects on the  
11 other components of this system. Our sustainability as a  
12 species depends on our ability to protect the health, well-  
13 being, and safety of all of life. We understand this in  
14 Rockaway and have used our Sandy experience and honor our  
15 Sandy experience by continuing to build and celebrate our  
16 resilience. There is no place for the Williams pipeline in  
17 this vision of peace, health, and safety, and harmony.

18 Thank you.

19           >           MR. JONES: Jeremy Jones. J E R E M Y, J O N E  
20 S. As a stakeholder living in Rockaway Beach, Queens, New  
21 York, I am very concerned about what I've read in the DEIS.  
22 While this is a long report, I'd like to put it in just a  
23 couple points that I have come up with; after reading only  
24 some of it because it is a long document and we haven't had  
25 a long time to read it.

1           It didn't take long to come to executive summary  
2 ES 10. And it states direct impacts on offshore resources  
3 due to sea floor disturbance would include mortality,  
4 injury, or temporary displacement of the organisms living on  
5 or near the 117.2 acres of sea floor directly affected by  
6 the project. Indirect impacts would includes suspension of  
7 the sediments in the water column which could clog fish  
8 gills and obscure visual stimuli for redistribution of  
9 sediments that follow out of suspension which could bury  
10 benthic and demerthal species, resulting in mortality of  
11 eggs.

12           It goes on, I'll just skip to the very end.  
13 Collagic fish, sea turtles, and marine mammals could also be  
14 affected but would likely temporarily vacate the area to  
15 avoid the disturbance. So, on this point, I am a long-time  
16 Rockaway resident. I'm a swimmer. I'm a surfer. A  
17 recreational fisherman. And I can attest to the return of  
18 the abundant marine life that has returned to the waters  
19 just in the years that I have been there. And I'm very  
20 concerned with their health and safety as well as the health  
21 and safety of my neighbors and my family and my dear friends  
22 that live in Rockaway Beach. The thought of having a  
23 pipeline accident seven miles or so offshore would devastate  
24 our entire lives. Having gone through Hurricane Sandy and  
25 just recently returning to my house after four years and

1 nine months, I can attest to how damaging natural  
2 occurrences can be. I couldn't even imagine what something  
3 like this would be.

4           Also, on page 108. I'm going to reference  
5 section 2.3.3.9. Dredge disposal and backfiller. It says  
6 to avoid creating navigation hazard as requested by US Army  
7 Corps of Engineers, Transco will dispose of dredge material  
8 derived from excavations less than 15 feet of water at an  
9 approved site.

10           In addition to potential onshore disposal sites,  
11 which they don't list anywhere in here that I could find,  
12 Transco proposes to use historic area remediation site,  
13 HARS. A 15.7 square nautical mile in the Atlantic Ocean.  
14 Approximately 7.7 nautical miles south of Rockaway, New  
15 York. HARS previously received contaminated sediments and  
16 other materials during 63 years of disposal activity. US  
17 Army Corps is now capping the area with dredge material that  
18 meets certain standards, to paraphrase.

19           Basically, I can't have contaminated material  
20 coming from Raritan Bay dropped off seven miles from our  
21 shores. No matter what they tell me it's not contaminated  
22 with. So, I respectfully thank you for the opportunity to  
23 make this statement and I vehemently oppose this pipeline  
24 and support renewable energy as we move forward in the  
25 future together.

1 > MR. CHRISTOPHER: William Christopher. [Spelling]  
2 I live in Rockaway Beach and I'm an intervenor  
3 for this project. Let me begin by stating the obvious, that  
4 just under two months is not enough time to review the 700  
5 page document or however long it is. This time frame is an  
6 insult to the people living along the route of the proposed  
7 pipeline and it's a violation of democracy. Because of this  
8 blatant move to keep us from properly learning and  
9 understanding what you're saying the impact that this  
10 project will have on our environment and communities, I have  
11 chosen to focus on the climate change component, because  
12 this is an issue I've experienced the consequences of  
13 directly as the Rockaway resident during Superstorm Sandy.  
14 We are still recovering from the damage that storm caused.  
15 The talking point that no particular storm can be  
16 linked to man-made climate change is cute and all, but all  
17 the warm and fuzzy words in the world won't change the fact  
18 that storms are intensifying because of increasing warmth,  
19 and it's your obligation to do anything and everything to  
20 eliminate any and all possible contributions to warming  
21 global temperatures. This includes not allowing  
22 construction with infrastructure that will result in methane  
23 and other greenhouse gas leaks or emissions during their  
24 transport as well as their end use. But since you  
25 consistently choose instead to facilitate the use of fossil

1 fuels and greenhouse gas emissions, let's talk about the  
2 emissions estimate for this pipeline.

3           The DEIS for the Northeast Supply Enhancement  
4 Pipeline is embarrassingly deficient in addressing this  
5 issue. Section 4.12-4 states, quote: There is no widely  
6 accepted standard for international, federal, or state  
7 policy or as a matter of physical science to determine the  
8 significance of the project's greenhouse gas emissions for  
9 purposes of meaningfully informing the Commission decision  
10 in this proceeding.

11           I have three points on this: Number one. FERC  
12 determined the significance of pipeline's emissions in the  
13 assessment of the Atlantic Sunrise Pipeline. Why can't you  
14 do that here?

15           Number two. This same section of the DEIS  
16 claims, quote: The greenhouse gas emissions from the  
17 construction and operation of the project are presented in  
18 Section 4.11.1.4. While the thing is, Section 4.11.1.4 does  
19 not exist in this DEIS. It's nowhere to be found.

20           Number three. Just eight months ago, on August,  
21 22nd, 2017, the court decided FERC had no good reason for  
22 determining the significance of a project's greenhouse gas  
23 emissions, since FERC seems to already forgotten what the  
24 court said, allow me to refresh your memory now.

25           This is from Sierra Club, Petitioners, v. Federal

1 FERC, Respondent, Duke Energy, Florida. Quote: FERC next  
2 raises a practical objection, arguing that it's impossible  
3 to know exactly what quantity the greenhouse gas emitted as  
4 a result of this project being approved. True, the number  
5 depends on several and certain variables including the  
6 operating decisions of individual plants and the demand for  
7 electricity in the region, but we have previously held that  
8 the analysis necessarily involves some reasonable  
9 forecasting. Just that FERC has not provided a  
10 satisfactory explanation as to why they can't quantify  
11 greenhouse gas emissions. And we need a hearing in Rockaway  
12 Beach.

13 > MR. ROSS: Thomas Ross. R O S S. I want to  
14 begin by saying that this is not about personal things. I'm  
15 not here to cast aspersions on any individual. The world is  
16 a very complicated place and we all wind up in different  
17 places in the world. So, this is about a process, a part of  
18 the world. Something that's happening. And not everybody  
19 has the opportunity to be where they want to be in the  
20 world, to do whatever they want to do. That's just the  
21 hardness of the world. So, don't take any of this  
22 personally, it's about the larger thing that's happening  
23 about an issue.

24 What I'd like to do is to read what my comment,  
25 just read the text of one specific comment that I made and

1 have, be done with it. FERC raised the practical objection  
2 arguing that it is impossible to know exactly what quantity  
3 of greenhouse gases would be emitted as a result of this  
4 project being approved. I would like to refer to the  
5 Sierra Club vs Duke Energy Florida, Case No. 16-1329.

6           In this case the court ultimately agreed that  
7 FERC's environmental impact statement did not contain enough  
8 information on the greenhouse gas emissions that will  
9 result from burning the gas that the pipelines will carry  
10 and granted the Sierra Club's petition for review and  
11 remand, for preparation of a conforming environmental impact  
12 statement.                   The Draft Environmental Impact  
13 Statement states: the project will provide about 400,000  
14 dekatherms per day of natural gas to end use residential and  
15 commercial customers in the New York City area. In my  
16 opinion, the FERC should insist that Williams either develop  
17 and present such a calculation, a metric or model structured  
18 in line with comparable existing infrastructure at  
19 comparable levels of throughput for the end-to-end process,  
20 which would provide an estimate of GHG emissions that the  
21 company's expected throughput of 0.4 million dekatherms a  
22 day for public review comment. Or explain in a public  
23 document addressing the specific technical and or  
24 statistical issues involved why it cannot do so?

25           This may seem a little snarky, but again, it's

1 not personal. That is, the company should not simply be  
2 allowed to hide behind the controversial assertion that,  
3 quote, There is no widely accepted standard to determine the  
4 significance of the project's GHG emissions. Since  
5 independent opinion has so frequently in history identified  
6 environmental and health risks in the development of  
7 industrial processes in general, it is completely reasonable  
8 to afford the public an opportunity to not only review, but  
9 rebut the company's result. Whether there is a widely  
10 accepted standard or not, our regional community which would  
11 have to live for long years and whatever is developed, has  
12 every right to either A) receive either a document laying  
13 out a calculated estimate, or a document explaining why an  
14 impact estimate cannot be derived. B) evaluated the  
15 premises and methodologies employed in either case, and C)  
16 require that the conclusions reached in its evaluation be  
17 considered by the FERC and the company in its authorization  
18 process.

19 Thank you. I wish you all the best. Thank you  
20 for your time, your patience, and your tolerance, and your  
21 open minds.

22 > MS. BLUESTONE: My first name is Mimi. M, like  
23 Mary, I, M like Mary, I. Last name is Bluestone. Color  
24 blue, S T O N E. B L U E S T O N E.

25 I'm a mother and a teacher and I am a Brooklynite



1 who loves to swim and to watch the dolphins at Rockaway. I  
2 consider this pipeline unnecessary, expensive, risky to  
3 human and marine life and above all, the fracked gas that it  
4 would carry would only add to the fossil fuel burden that  
5 endangers our shorefront communities and the survival of all  
6 humanity.

7           The New York area has no need for the fracked gas  
8 the pipeline would carry. A study conducted by New York  
9 City by the Mayor's office shows that even if all of the New  
10 York City buildings that currently burn oil were to convert  
11 to gas heating that the demand for gas would rise only by 6  
12 percent. I believe that the pipeline more than doubles the  
13 capacity of the current Rockaway lateral pipeline, so that  
14 would indicate that there's a whole lot of gas in there  
15 that's not needed by our city.

16           And in particular it's not needed because the  
17 overall shift in our city and in our state is towards  
18 renewable energy. And so, we would be needing less of the  
19 gas and not more. The fuels of the future are renewable and  
20 not fossil fuels.

21           Dredging up the arsenic, the cadmium, the PCBs  
22 and the other toxins. Many, many of the toxins that lie in  
23 the seabed where the planned pipeline would go poses risks  
24 to wildlife and to all of us who swim in these waters. And  
25 Williams has a terrible safety record. Ten people have died

1 in accidents at Williams facilities in the last ten years.  
2 Towns have had to be evacuated, there have been explosions.  
3 Many, many very untoward events that indicate a real lack of  
4 concern for safety. And a lot of this has to do with  
5 corroding pipelines, which in an undersea environment would  
6 be very hard to detect.

7           The pipeline would be very expensive, and as a  
8 National Grid customer who heats and cooks with gas, I  
9 resent that I would have to pay to build this unnecessary  
10 pipeline that would enrich National Grid and Williams at the  
11 expense of my family and our fellow New Yorkers.

12           But the biggest risk is the risk to our climate.  
13 Fracked gas is essentially methane. And methane is one of  
14 the most potent greenhouse gases of all. Methane captures  
15 84 times as much heat as carbon over the first two decades  
16 after emissions. So, we're talking about an extremely  
17 potent greenhouse gas and we know the consequences. We have  
18 felt the consequences of Sandy here in our city. We've seen  
19 the consequences of Irma, Harvey, Maria, wildfires in  
20 California this past year. We're killing ourselves and  
21 we're destroying our children's future. And that's why I'm  
22 here today.

23           And finally, I want to say that I think it's  
24 really unconscionable to hold a so-called public hearing in  
25 a room that is anything but public because this is not how a

1 real democracy works. Thank you very much.

2 > MS. GORDON: My name is Bernice Gordon, B E R N I  
3 C E, G O R D O N. I live in Brooklyn, the area is Gorham  
4 Hill. I'm affiliated with "350 Brooklyn" and with those  
5 members of humanity who are concerned about the future our  
6 children and grandchildren and great grandchildren will  
7 inherit. I wasn't prepared to speak so I may be all over  
8 the place, but what I do know this is not a fair process and  
9 I'd like to make that point right now. This is not a public  
10 hearing. This is a way of not being democratic.

11 What I do know is that fracked gas equals climate  
12 change. I was flooded by Sandy. I lived in a mixed income  
13 neighborhood. My house borders on a low income housing  
14 project, and I saw horrendous results of Sandy on the poor.  
15 My career has been with the Head Start program serving low  
16 income families and communities since the Sixties.

17 I know how these pipelines are impacting the  
18 poor. They're usually first in line in terms of the  
19 devastation and they're the last helped. I am very  
20 concerned about the pipeline going to the Rockaways and past  
21 Coney Island and particularly New York Harbor. I mean, I  
22 really believe in climate change and I really believe that  
23 we should be building locks across that harbor preventing  
24 the rising sea level instead of building fracked gas.  
25 Methane gas is worse than coal and just the digging of the

1 trenches themselves will release enough toxins to pollute  
2 the city even more. If you look at the health records of  
3 the people in this city, we have some of the worst health,  
4 particularly in low income neighborhoods where children are  
5 suffering from allergies and asthma as well as adults.

6 I'm also concerned about not allowing the public  
7 to comment before all the information is available. I think  
8 that is a travesty that needs to be addressed. Again, the  
9 danger to human life, to marine life, to the oyster bed  
10 industries and marine industries, we will be eating the  
11 toxins that will be released through this pipeline.

12 I think I've said enough and so.

13 > MS. FRACZEK: My name is Kim Fraczek, K I M, F  
14 like Frank, R A C like Charlie, Z like Zebra, E K. I'm also  
15 an intervenor on this project.

16 So, we read the 700-some pages of this Draft  
17 Environmental Impact Statement and we are very clear that  
18 we're against this project here in this community. This  
19 pipeline is going to trench 23 miles of the ocean floor that  
20 was reserved. Has been built as a restoration from toxics  
21 that have been settling on the ocean floor. Trenching this  
22 will destroy all the endangered species that we've been  
23 seeing come back to this region. We're very grateful to see  
24 the life outside of our community being restored because of  
25 the public park, Gateway National Park.

1           We know that you have already build the Rockaway  
2 Lateral Pipeline which we opposed, and the Williams pipeline  
3 company worked together with Michael Grimm in Staten Island  
4 to build a bill, HR 2606, back in 2013 in order to be able  
5 to come through our national park. And that was approved  
6 after all of us had no electricity and no heat after  
7 Hurricane Sandy. And the pipeline went through. So, we had  
8 no time to make public comments. This is an expansion of  
9 that pipeline but we don't know really what the need is for  
10 this pipeline. All right?

11           So, you say National Grid is your customer. We  
12 know that your chairperson, Cheryl LaFleur, worked for  
13 National Grid for 27 years. We know that FERC is an agency  
14 that looks favorably upon the natural gas industry in order  
15 to pay your fees. To pay your salaries. So, we're not very  
16 clear why, when the 2012 New York City report for our energy  
17 future came out, we know that we don't need the extra gas,  
18 all right? So, that's not a necessity thing. We know that  
19 this harms marine life.

20           Additionally, I want to just put on the record

21  
22 that this FERC process of dividing us one-by-one is  
23 undemocratic and this is injuring what a public hearing is  
24 about. You've now changed it not from a public hearing but  
25 to a public comment period for a court stenographer. This  
goes against the ethics of what a public hearing should be.

1  
And I would implore each and every one of you to take that  
2  
to whoever is your superior, to their superiors, and their  
3  
superiors because we need this process to be brought back to  
4  
a public hearing format. All right?

5                   Additionally, just off the record for you all.  
6    We've created a people's hearing downstairs in the room and  
7    you've gotten the Department of Homeland Security with big  
8    guns to keep us in control. We're just regular people.  
9    This is unacceptable. All of you. It's unacceptable what  
10   you're doing. Thank you.

11       >           MR. KARPEN: My name is Daniel Karpen. K A R P E  
12    N. I'm a New York State Licensed Professional Engineer. I  
13    reside at 3 Harbor Hill Drive in Huntington, New York. My  
14    engineering practice is an energy conservation engineer.

15                   Page 3.3 of the EIS states: We do not consider  
16    the use of renewable sources of energy or energy  
17    conservation and efficiency program to be a viable project  
18    alternative. That is the worst mistake in the EIS. There's  
19    lots of things we can do in the New York Metropolitan area  
20    to reduce the use of energy. The National Grid has energy  
21    conservation programs that are in place to reduce the use of  
22    natural gas. They could expand these programs by a factor  
23    of ten and eliminate the total need for this project.  
24    There's no need for it. There's also a historical graph in  
25    the EIS that's not been shown, not been provided showing the

1 amount of gas coming to the New York Metropolitan area in  
2 the last 20 years, international territory and a projection  
3 of how much more they think they might need; but New York  
4 City is having much greater energy efficiency for the new  
5 construction, new buildings.

6           There's lots of things we can do. We can upgrade  
7 steam systems on buildings that have been heated by gas and  
8 I know how to reduce the amount of gas used in a typical  
9 steam heating system by half. One, insulate the room. Two,  
10 replace the bulkhead door on the roof that's leaking.  
11 Three, put in triple glazed passive, house standard windows  
12 are 9.8 windows that effectively stop drafts, and will be  
13 net gainers of energy even on north sides of buildings.  
14 Then once you do that, you can then put in smaller radiators  
15 in the building. Downsize the radiators by a factor of  
16 three and four.

17           The result is we now can put in a boiler that is  
18 one-fifth to one-seventh the BTE rating of the boiler that  
19 was there. And a smaller boiler means almost no heat left,  
20 lost in the boiler room, R-12 insulation on all pipes,  
21 three-inch thick pipe insulation on all steam and condensate  
22 return lines, and we can separate the domestic hot water  
23 system out by the use of condensing gas boilers that are 95  
24 percent efficient as they come into common use.

25           This EIS is a fraud. It is totally worthless

1 and, in fact, National Grid should move the other way.  
2 There's this path in Robert Moses' famous poem, we go,  
3 which path what is we shall take. This is the path we  
4 should be taking, not building more pipelines.

5 > MS. DORN: My name is Elisa Dorn. E L I S A, D O  
6 R N. I'm a Rockaway Park resident, a FERC intervenor and a  
7 member of the Rockaway Civic Association. I have many  
8 problems with the Williams pipeline, but I'm deeply  
9 concerned about the dredging aspect of this project and the  
10 resulting effects of toxic sediment, disturbance on human  
11 life and marine life.

12 The lower New York Bay is legendary for its early  
13 20th century accumulation of industrial pollutants including  
14 lead, PCBs, mercury, chromium, and cadmium. To disturb  
15 these very toxins would regenerate the effects of these  
16 poisons over an 117-acre area. I also know our emphasis in  
17 the Rockaway Community is in renewable energy and in  
18 combating the effects of climate change, which is not in  
19 line with this Williams pipeline. Thank you.

20 > MR. ALCOCER: My name is Alvaro Alcocer. A L V  
21 A R O, last name A L C O C E R. I am a resident of Brooklyn  
22 and also own property in the Rockaways. I'm here tonight  
23 because I thought this was a public hearing where I was  
24 going to speak in front of my fellow citizens, but instead  
25 I'm here talking to you without any witnesses, nor my family



1 or friends, or the public.

2 I want to voice my absolute opposition to  
3 Williams Transco Northeast Enhancement Pipeline which will  
4 carry fracked gas for 23 miles under New York Lower Harbor.  
5 I am opposed to the pipeline and more generally to all  
6 additional fracking infrastructure for many reasons, but in  
7 the interest of time I want to focus specifically on the  
8 construction of the pipeline and how it will disturb the  
9 now-buried toxins under the harbor floor and the effects of  
10 these toxins on human life, marine life, my personal life as  
11 a store clerk and a father who visits regularly and swims in  
12 the water in the Rockaways and all around New York waters.

13 The risk of polluting the waters is not  
14 acceptable. I don't accept the fact that by putting this  
15 pipeline, I am risking getting sick and also marine life  
16 will be affected and this pipeline has tremendous effects  
17 that increase the problem of climate change.

18 FERC's Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
19 freely concedes that toxic substances like lead, mercury,  
20 arsenic, PCBs, and dioxins lie under the harbor. The vast  
21 majority of the samples that were part of this project show  
22 levels of one or more of these above levels judged to be  
23 safe. This is not okay. It is a fact that the toxics that  
24 are carried in these pipelines increase the effects of  
25 global warming. Instead, FERC points out that the plumes of

1 suspended sediments like sand, clay, and gravel caused by  
2 excavating a trench for the pipeline will settle back down  
3 on the harbor floor within hours.

4 I urge you to deny a permit to the Williams-  
5 Transco Northeast Supply Enhancement Pipeline. This is not  
6 acceptable. Thank you for your time and consideration.  
7 Gracias.

8 > MS. DICESARE: My name is Elizabeth, with a z, E L I  
9 Z A B E T H, Dicesare, D I C E S A R E. Are we going? All  
10 right.

11 Oil and gas infrastructure provider Williams  
12 Companies, Inc. owns and operates Transco, America's largest  
13 natural gas pipeline. Williams is using Transco to keep  
14 profits growing despite tough times for the energy sector as  
15 a whole. But the company isn't content to sit back and let  
16 the profits roll in; Williams has actively expanded Transco  
17 to the tune of \$6.9 billion over the next few years.

18 The Transco pipeline project began in 1950 as a  
19 way to deliver natural gas across the eastern seaboard from  
20 the south. In the years since it was established Transco  
21 has expanded 1,800 miles across 12 states. It's currently  
22 the major conduit delivering natural gas to the New York  
23 Metropolitan area as well as parts of the Southeast and Mid-  
24 Atlantic seaboard.

25 Transco represents Williams' single largest asset

1 and is projected to account for \$1 billion year revenues by  
2 2018. That's even more impressive considering that the fees  
3 Williams can charge for the use of the pipeline are limited  
4 by the federal government through FERC. Rate caps are one  
5 reason why Williams is pursuing such an aggressive growth  
6 strategy with Transco. Williams has been effectively forced  
7 to expand or stagnate and they decided to expand. Williams  
8 Company is leveraging the Transco Pipeline to drive growth  
9 when the rest of the sector is shrinking.

10 As Williams continues to develop, Transco the  
11 company plans to use increasing revenues to increase its  
12 dividend yields. The Transco Pipeline is positioned to  
13 capture growth in the natural gas market and deliver profits  
14 to Williams and their shareholders. I would like to speak  
15 to the necessity of this project.

16 There is no benefit to consumers in New York for  
17 another pipeline. It doesn't benefit our environment; as we  
18 know, natural gas produces methane gas which also  
19 contributes to climate change. Natural gas prices have not  
20 gone down. Pennsylvania is one state -- and I think they  
21 are the highest production state of fracking, fracked gas.  
22 Their production has increased by 50 percent over the last  
23 five years, and you can look that up. Yet, we haven't seen  
24 our gas prices come down as -- I'm a homeowner. My heating  
25 bill hasn't gone down, and I heat with natural gas. There's

1 no benefit to us.

2           This is clearly profit-driven. We have wind  
3 farms that we're looking at I know, in the east, west, in  
4 the South Atlantic. We need more solar farm projects. I  
5 know those are coming around too slowly, I believe, but  
6 there's no reason for this additional pipeline. It doesn't  
7 benefit the environment. It doesn't benefit the consumer.  
8 It only benefits Williams and Transco and their profit and  
9 their dividends and their shareholders. Thank you.

10       >           MS. NIEVES: My name is Catherine Nieves.  
11  
12 [Spelling] I did register as an intervenor. I'm from  
13 Jackson Heights, Queens. And I'm with the organization  
14 Surfrider. As a contributing taxpayer in Queens, in the  
15 State of New York, my personal and public interests, which  
16 may be directly affected by the outcome of this proceeding.  
17 I'm originally from Long Island and the ocean is a huge part  
18 of that. Not only do we, our children in our community  
19 benefit from clean water, we benefit financially as well as  
20 environmentally.

21           It's been well-documented that in recent years  
22 there's been a resurgence of marine life in our waters.  
23 More whales have been spotted, humpback whales, have  
24 returned to the waters of New York Harbor. And not just  
25 occasionally, either. They're coming in enough numbers that  
a company can reliably take out tours to the ocean, within

1 sight of immense skyscrapers to see them.

2           November 2017, a whale was caught swimming near  
3 the Statue of Liberty. It's not just whales we're talking  
4 about. We're talking about dolphins and seals have also  
5 come along for the ride, which is shocking to New Yorkers  
6 because we can all remember when the City's beaches were  
7 really a joke.

8           Congress passed the Clean Air Act in 1963, and  
9 expanded it in 1970, to 1977, and 1990. Air pollution can  
10 infiltrate waterways as well carried by dust, rain, and  
11 through simple gravity. On April 22nd, 1970 the first Earth  
12 Day, then-Governor Nelson Rockefeller signed a New York  
13 Environmental Conservation law which created the state  
14 Department of Environmental Conservation. It provided the  
15 state with the capacity to administer and regulate the state  
16 environmental laws. The creation of the Environmental  
17 Protection Agency that same year, the same on federal level.

18

19           The passage of the federal Clean Water Act in  
20 1972 and the federal Safe Drinking Water Act provided the  
21 legislative framework to hold environmental polluters  
22 accountable.

23           During the drilling and extraction of gas from  
24 our sea floor, gas leaks in marine environments are  
25 inevitable. Gas may leak from pipelines, tankers,

1 underwater storage tanks, or may be released during the  
2 catastrophic well blow-outs, explosions, and smaller  
3 accidental and spills. Spills and blow-ups occur due to  
4 drilling, equipment failure, corrosion of pipeline, human  
5 error, earthquakes, ice storms, shipping accidents, et  
6 cetera. Pipeline failures are most commonly due to material  
7 or welding defects. But pipelines may also be hit by  
8 anchors or trawls or affected by earthquakes or ground  
9 erosion. The environmental consequences of releases of  
10 natural gas into the sea are especially severe when they  
11 happen near shore and shallow water.

12           In the Gulf of Mexico, high concentrations of  
13 methane were found around the offshore drilling rigs in  
14 1975. In the North Sea in California bottom ecosystems are  
15 disturbed and their species compositions altered where there  
16 is gas seepage. The biomass of living things decline and  
17 shellfish disappear. Such fish, such as flounders are more  
18 sensitive to gas than other species. Other fish are also  
19 sensitive.

20           To sum it up, if the gas is sour or contains  
21 sulphite, it is much more, highly toxic to marine life and  
22 beached whales. Flaring or burning off natural gas at  
23 drilling sites causes air pollution. How is this a good  
24 thing? This is our planet, why choose to destroy it?

25           >           MS. GALLAUDET: My name is Lisa Gallaudet, and

1 the last name is G A L L A U D E T. So, first I just wanted  
2 to comment on how this process is an undemocratic process.  
3 This is not a public hearing. It was obviously scheduled in  
4 a community that it's not greatly, that this pipeline is not  
5 greatly affecting rather than Rockaway. It also was  
6 scheduled at five o'clock in Bay Ridge, Brooklyn, which is  
7 over an hour of a commute from, most people, from Midtown  
8 Manhattan where most people work, making it close to  
9 impossible for people to get here to even give their  
10 comments. That being said, I'll give mine, because I left  
11 work early in order to do this.

12 I have been a South Brooklyn resident for over a  
13 decade. Spend my weekends in the summer in Rockaway  
14 surfing, whale watching trips with Gotham Whales, or  
15 relaxing on the beach. I'm also a member of Surfrider  
16 Foundation, and have participated in several beach cleanup  
17 efforts over the years. I'm in full opposition of this  
18 pipeline. Not only is it going to harm human and marine  
19 life, but Williams itself has not expressed or substantiated  
20 any need for this pipeline, and Williams has a significant  
21 poor safety record.

22 Natural gas is primarily methane, a highly  
23 flammable and explosive gas. Williams has had a poor safety  
24 record in the management of its pipelines, compressor  
25 stations, processing plants. In the last ten years,

1 Williams pipelines and compressor stations have exploded or  
2 caught fire over ten times. Incidents in other Williams  
3 facilities have killed six people and injured dozens of  
4 others. These accidents have released methane into the  
5 atmosphere, leveled buildings, and contaminated groundwater.  
6 And even as these accidents have happened, Williams has not  
7 shown any consistent effort to alleviate them or to even  
8 notify the public of these, of the gravity of such  
9 accidents.

10 I will give a few examples. In 2003, Williams  
11 paid \$20 million in fines in reporting false data to  
12 manipulate the California natural gas market. Paid  
13 California \$417 million dollars to settle that case. May  
14 1st, 2003, Williams Natural Gas Transmission Pipeline failed  
15 near Lake Paps, Washington, forcing evacuation of an  
16 elementary school and dozens of homes within a four mile  
17 radius. This was reportedly the fifth failure of the  
18 pipeline in eight years, and that was in 2003. In 2003,  
19 a few months later in December another section of that very  
20 pipeline failed again due to stress, corrosion, cracking,  
21 and external corrosion. In 2008, a natural gas explosion in  
22 Virginia, five people were seriously injured. Property  
23 damage was reported to exceed \$3 million. In 2009, failure  
24 to monitor corrosion adequately was found, with a fine of  
25 \$952 thousand in Virginia pipeline explosion. In 2011,



1 there was a failure of annual inspections found natural gas  
2 stations in Louisiana. In 2011, there was a Transco Natural  
3 Gas Pipeline that ruptured and exploded in Alabama. The  
4 corrosion was not recognized by Williams even though they  
5 claimed that the systems were in place. In 2012, there was  
6 a failure to show internal policies for controlling external  
7 corrosion in a natural gas pipeline here in New York. A gas  
8 leak was found. Over a ton of methane was released. On  
9 April 9th of 2012 a natural gas link was discovered in  
10 Bergen, New Jersey. In 2013, there was a leak found by  
11 accident, the leak was stopped. This was in Terasu,  
12 Colorado but benzene, a cancer-causing agent that breaks  
13 down bone marrow had contaminated the soil. No mention by  
14 Williams was made at the time that the groundwater was  
15 poisoned with this cancer causing agent, and Williams  
16 admitted reporting the spill leak earlier because they  
17 estimated that less than 25 gallons had leaked, so they  
18 didn't deem it important. However, it was later determined  
19 a few months later on March 15th of that year that 36  
20 thousand times greater than the safe level of benzene for  
21 drinking water was found.

22           FERC: Can I ask you to wrap up, please.

23           MS. GALLAUDET: I obviously don't have enough time  
24 to continue my long laundry list of unsafe practices by  
25 Williams Company, but there's been numerous injuries and

1 deaths, and we're just talking about humans. We're not even  
2 getting into how it's impacting climate change, marine life,  
3 and everything it's going to do to our shared oceans.

4           So, this pipeline has, Williams has not  
5 established a need. They've failed to show any need, not  
6 even just a need to justify such dramatic and negative  
7 impacts against our communities, but any need at all. So,  
8 it must be struck down.       > MS. POCHAN: I'm registered  
9 as an intervenor. I just wanted to tell you that. It's S O  
10 M M Y R. Nate, N A T E. Last name P O C H A N. P O C H A  
11 N. It's Sommyr. S O M M Y R. Nate, N A T E. Thank you.

12           I'm a Rockaways local, actually three years ago I  
13 was testifying about Port Ambrose, which is a natural gas  
14 port. So, I'm back again. I live in a super economically-  
15 vulnerable community; we have about 12 percent of the public  
16 housing for all of New York State. It's this little island  
17 where I live; about half of us are below the poverty level  
18 and we're still recovering from Sandy. A lot of people in  
19 my community aren't even back in their houses yet. We still  
20 have power outages. We have bad water a lot.

21           And we're also a community of first responders.  
22 This pipeline, if it burst, which it will because Williams  
23 has a terrible safety record, across the board, in many  
24 areas of the United States. The first responders in  
25 Rockaway are going to be the people called upon to react

1 first because we're the ones who are going to get hit first  
2 given the way the currents go. I'm also a surfer and I run a  
3 water quality testing program in the Rockaways.

4           So, it's unfair to first responders to ask them  
5 to do that; they're not trained for it but they'll be the  
6 ones doing it. We have a tourist-based economy. Last  
7 year, 4th of July weekend, each day we had roughly 240,000  
8 visitors to Rockaway Beach. And that's where most of our  
9 economic engine is, and a lot of that is based on surfing,  
10 people swimming; so this pipeline will affect our water  
11 quality from the dredging and bringing up all the things  
12 that are sitting on the seabed on New York Harbor. It's New  
13 York Harbor. It's disgusting. We also have a lot of people  
14 coming out to see whales and dolphins and obviously they'll  
15 be affected both by the noise of the initial dredging and  
16 drilling and then by water quality effects from the leaks.

17           Also, in the proposal they're going to use a lot  
18 of chemicals that we don't want them to. There's a rust  
19 inhibitor that, in the pipe that will be released into the  
20 open ocean water when they're done with it. They're going  
21 to clean the pipe with seawater, but in the seawater they're  
22 going to put a biocide which kills anything biological and  
23 then they're going to release that back into the open water.  
24 And again, given the way the current goes, that is going to  
25 swipe right down the peninsula, right down my neighborhood,

1 and right all the surfers and swimmers and all of us who are  
2 there.

3                                 We don't have a need for this  
4 project. There's a pipeline right now running parallel to  
5 where this one is. There's a branch of it actually that was  
6 approved two days after Sandy when we were all very  
7 distracted. The government official that approved that is  
8 in jail now on corruption charges, but we have this pipeline  
9 in our backyard that we didn't want and didn't ask for,  
10 thank you. But the pipeline running now is only at half  
11 capacity. The only client of this new pipeline is National  
12 Grid, and the cost of it is going to be pushed off on us  
13 who, we can't get energy but National Grid, so we're already  
14 kind of struggling and we don't want to pay for it, but  
15 we'll have to.

16                                 So that's about all I have to say. Thank you  
17 very much.

18         >             MS. SCOTT: Nikita Scott. N I K I T A, S C O T T.  
19 I live in the Lower East Side of Manhattan and I volunteer  
20 as a chairperson of the Surfrider Foundation, an  
21 environmental organization dedicated to the protection and  
22 enjoyment of our ocean, waves, and beaches. I'm a  
23 registered intervenor in this process. Today I'd like to  
24 elevate my concerns with the Williams-Transco Northeast  
25 Supply Enhancement Project and argue to reject the proposal.

1 My comments are focused on the offshore portion of the  
2 project and the safety and effects on marine life and harm  
3 to the shoreline economy.

4 Williams Transco has a questionable safety record  
5 as a company. In the last ten years, there have been ten  
6 Williams-Transco pipelines and compressor stations that have  
7 exploded or caught fire. In 2015, an offshore pipe used to  
8 transport gas across the Arkansas River operated by Spectra  
9 Energy which owns Williams, ruptured. Spectra claimed that  
10 they monitor all of their pipelines. Yet it was a tugboat  
11 captain who reported the damage and not Spectra. At a  
12 recent community board meeting, three Williams  
13 representatives were unable to answer the procedure in place  
14 for detecting a gas leak -- simply because we don't have a  
15 procedure. FERC also does not have the necessary  
16 procedures in the event of a gas leak. FERC sees a security  
17 risk but does not discuss possible impacts from online  
18 hacking of the Transco system. Given recent attacks on  
19 energy infrastructure including pipelines, FERC must add an  
20 analysis of impacts from such a possibility. FERC  
21 staff will only monitor Transco's construction activities on  
22 a monthly basis which is not frequent enough, given that it  
23 has such a large project, an underwater portion will be hard  
24 to monitor. I suggest Transco find a FERC monitor on board  
25 at all times on their main offshore construction vessel in

1 addition to the contracted quality control. I am interested  
2 to learn who will be responsible for responding to an  
3 offshore fossil fuel leak and accident. The first  
4 responders on the frontline communities are not adequately  
5 trained in how to handle such incidents, but subpar safety  
6 record of Williams-Transco.

7           With regard to impacts on marine life, there is  
8 an area, 8.1 miles of the US Fish and Wildlife Service  
9 designated the Sandy Hook Bay Significant Habitat Complex.  
10 According to the USFWS, the complex is significant because  
11 of its geographic location and to the variety and quality of  
12 its habitat takes which support regionally rare and  
13 important marine estuarine and angonomic species.

14           Despite not knowing the time of year they will  
15 start construction, Transco submitted a draft application  
16 for an IHA for level B to the National Marine Fishery  
17 Service for six marine mammal species: Gray Seal, Harbor  
18 Seal, Hart Seal, Bottlenose Dolphin, Harbor Porpoise, and  
19 Short Beaked Common Dolphin. Yet it's impossible to  
20 accurately gauge which marine animal species could be  
21 affected, as many of them occur in that area seasonally.  
22 The number of species that are known to frequent the New  
23 York-New Jersey Harbor was studied in 2014 and 2016,  
24 optimally 2011, 2013. Proof that our waters have become  
25 more vibrant and diverse in recent years and it's important

1 that we keep them that way.

2 Right Whales are an endangered species, spin  
3 whales have also had effects; had to keep impacts from Right  
4 Whales from pile driving during construction, but it's not  
5 discussing impacts to these whales and their IHA permit.

6 FERC has not provided a plan that protects  
7 wildlife from marine noise; and as Transco has not revealed  
8 their plan at all. It's unfair and does not allow the  
9 public to conduct a transparent analysis on the effects on  
10 wildlife. I'm also concerned about the 117.2 acres of sea  
11 floor that will be indirectly impacted by construction.

12 > MS. PICONE: Noelle Picone. N O E L L E, last  
13 name is P, like Peter, I C O N E. I am an intervenor in  
14 this proceeding. I am a member of Surfrider Foundation, New  
15 York City Chapter. I'm going to be talking about three  
16 topics today: Williams's safety record; climate change; and  
17 the potential that this pipeline has to impact to marine  
18 life. The first topic, which is Williams' safety  
19 record. I don't believe that Williams has a good safety  
20 record on its instillation of pipelines. In the DEIS, FERC  
21 mentions that past safety record really isn't relevant, but  
22 I don't find that that's fair to especially first responders  
23 who have to deal with a fire or an explosion, potentially,  
24 of either the offshore or onshore portion of this pipeline.

25 In the last ten years there have been ten major

1 incidents involving Williams pipeline infrastructure that  
2 included either major explosions and/or fires. 141 people  
3 in those last ten years have been injured, nine have been  
4 killed. I don't think that's a good track record, and that  
5 has nothing to do with the leaks, the daily leaks of methane  
6 that presumably will occur. That occur on all pipelines and  
7 including this one. Second topic is climate  
8 change. The DEIS mentions that there's no national,  
9 international way to measure greenhouse emissions. One, I  
10 don't think that's accurate because they've been measured  
11 before. Two, the decision, Sierra Club versus FERC which  
12 was issued in August of 2017, the D.C. Court of Appeals is  
13 requiring FERC now to assess the impact that a pipeline has  
14 on climate change. My reading of the DEIS, that falls very  
15 short of that standard. It doesn't mention the measurement  
16 of greenhouse emissions at all. And it doesn't, it  
17 discounts the potential effect that the pipeline will have  
18 on climate change. Methane, the primary component of gas is  
19 a very dangerous green house gas emission. In fact, it can  
20 be more dangerous than carbon dioxide in the first 20 years  
21 of its release; it's 86 to 84 times more dangerous and  
22 potent a greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide.

23 Third topic is effect on marine wildlife. Again, the DEIS  
24 doesn't provide many details on exactly how the trenching of  
25 the pipeline which is going to be four feet below the ocean



1 floor. The methodology on that. Or the timeline. Because  
2 of that it's impossible for us to assess the impact on  
3 marine wildlife in New York Bay. Atlantic Sturgeon is a  
4 species of fish that is in the Bay and it's on the  
5 endangered species list. It is a bottom dweller. There is  
6 nothing in the DEIS that addresses adequately in my opinion  
7 the effects that the pipeline will have, construction of the  
8 pipeline will have on the Sturgeon and how Williams is  
9 going to prevent a negative impact. Humpback whales have  
10 made a comeback in New York Harbor. Between 2011 and 2013  
11 there was one Humpback whale siting. Between 2013 and 2016  
12 there have been 45. We want to keep these Humpback whales  
13 in our harbor and I don't think DEIS adequately addresses  
14 that species, either. And just to close, very  
15 quickly, I will say the procedure of this, quote, unquote,  
16 hearing I think is unfair. The way that we're pulled apart  
17 and it's not a group setting. It's more of an  
18 interrogation type setting. It's not, it goes against what  
19 this should all be about, which is that the public should  
20 voice to FERC the issues with the DEIS.

21 Thank you.

22 > MR. GILLIGAN: My name is Thomas Gilligan. T H O  
23 M A S, Gilligan, G I L L I G A N. I'm here as a concerned  
24 citizen. I know that this is not an efficient system for  
25 producing energy for anybody, using shale production. And

1 by approving this pipeline we're just promoting the future  
2 destruction, destructive activities of shale mining. It's a  
3 very wasteful and toxic activity, and unnecessary in light  
4 of current technologies available as a counter to it.

5 I think the company that is doing this effort is  
6 quite contemptuous of the citizenry because they have not  
7 even listed many of the details including the type of rust  
8 inhibitor they're going to put in, many of which are highly  
9 toxic. They didn't get that in there yet. And I think that  
10 shows contempt at least, and I am not extremely  
11 knowledgeable about pipelines, but I do know that the key  
12 environmental agencies are against using this method, as  
13 it's more destructive than efficient for people in general.  
14 The argument can be made that it's more efficient delivery  
15 of gas but as I said in the beginning, it's perpetuating the  
16 cycle of an inefficiency and it's also putting us at great  
17 risk in the event of an explosion on the pipe.

18 I saw where the horsepower is something like  
19 around 80 thousand horsepower at least. Which is enormous  
20 force, and I know they can turn it off, but that's often  
21 after the damage. Maybe if they know where and when it  
22 happens. It's a very unnecessarily risky procedure and  
23 we're feeding into the jaws of destruction here, and I  
24 guess if I were in your position I would try to cite the  
25 statistics of people who can give you more statistics than I

1 can about why this is inefficient and ill-advised.

2 I think that's it.

3 > MS. KHANNA: My name is Nidhi Khanna. My first  
4 name is spelled N I D H I, last name is K H A N N A.

5 My name is Nidhi Khanna and I am a resident of  
6 Staten Island. And I know this pipeline is going to run off  
7 the coast of Staten Island, and currently there is already a  
8 pipeline on Staten Island and the adding another one in the  
9 waterways will be detrimental to not only our water and also  
10 to wildlife. I know this as someone who has studied  
11 environmental science at the graduate level and has worked  
12 as a researcher. When Hurricane Sandy happened, I was on  
13 the ground, talking to folks about the recovery process; and  
14 many parts of Staten Island already flood when it just rains  
15 and the sewer systems can't hold the water. So if we have a  
16 pipeline that is releasing methane gas, it's going to be  
17 detrimental to the waters; and as we know, for the  
18 hurricanes and superstorms will get exacerbated when the  
19 waters keep getting warmer and there's all this energy  
20 churning in there; and as a result we're going to have these  
21 natural disasters occurring more.

22 Many people in Staten Island have been displaced  
23 from Hurricane Sandy and haven't been able to go back into  
24 their homes, and we can't have a pipeline that will  
25 contribute to more natural disasters and impact not only our

1 ecosystem but the livelihoods of our residents in New York.  
2 I know FERC said that this pipeline is going to be helpful  
3 to New York, and they're promoting saying natural gas is  
4 clean. It really isn't clean. Methane gas contributes more  
5 to greenhouse gases than carbon dioxide, and we need to  
6 make sure that we are really having clean energy in New  
7 York, and making sure we commit to that going to renewable  
8 energies like solar, wind or geothermal.

9           So I just think that's really important that we  
10 consider climate change is an issue that is going to impact  
11 us all. We don't see it right now, future generations will  
12 be harmed and we need to consider that this pipeline is not  
13 good for New York. It's not good for us. It's not good for  
14 our ecosystem. Thank you.

15           >           MS. MCCREIGHT: My name is Karen Gargamelli  
16 McCreight. Karen, K A R E N, first to last name is  
17 Gargamelli, G A R G A M E L L I. Second last name is  
18 McCreight. M C C R E I G H T. I am very grateful for the  
19 opportunity to be heard and I'm coming to you from three  
20 different places as a Catholic, as a New Yorker, and as an  
21 attorney.

22           So, as a Catholic, I got involved with pipeline  
23 issues because of the Adorers of the Blood of Christ.  
24 Terrible name, but a group of Sisters in Pennsylvania. In  
25 Lancaster County. And they have expressed very clearly that

1 it was against their will to have a pipeline in their Mother  
2 House. And Williams fought them so hard and actually  
3 ending up using eminent domain to take their Mother House  
4 property, rip up the corn fields that they lovingly cared  
5 for, and put a pipeline through their land. And I guess  
6 this sort of overlaps as a Catholic and as an attorney  
7 because I know that eminent domain is a taking for the  
8 public good. Right?

9           And we now are planning to use this public good,  
10 not actually for the good of the people, but for the good of  
11 corporations. So, the gas line, that's going through  
12 Lancaster, the gas line that's proposed for New York doesn't  
13 help people. It doesn't help New Yorkers. It's for export.  
14 And so when I think about this, I think about what's a  
15 public good. I think of a highway. I don't think of a gas  
16 line that doesn't actually benefit the people that it's  
17 taking land from.

18           Then as a Catholic just understanding, you know,  
19 that life, all life is important. And critically important  
20 more so than money. When I was in Lancaster I understood  
21 that if there was an explosion, that it would be three  
22 football fields of length away from that pipeline where it  
23 would be an incineration zone, if there was an explosion.  
24 And that frightens me, quite honestly. And I live within  
25 three football fields of this proposed pipeline and I'm

1 worried about that.

2           As a New Yorker -- and this also, sort of, goes  
3 as a lawyer too, but our state, state's rights, our State of  
4 New York banned fracking. We the people spoke and said,  
5 This is dangerous and we don't want it here in our state.  
6 And so to have a pipeline come through our state, it feels  
7 like you're going against what this state already said no  
8 to. And I, I don't understand that. I think it was a  
9 little bit jarring for me to come here, quite honestly, and  
10 have the notice and comment period be in a hotel basement,  
11 the police greeted me at the door and let me know that if I  
12 was to be disruptive at this hearing that I would be asked  
13 to leave.

14           I don't know why this wasn't at Burrough Hall in  
15 Brooklyn or why this wasn't at City Hall in Manhattan. It  
16 doesn't feel very public to me and it doesn't feel like a  
17 public endeavor. It feels like private corporations, sort  
18 of going through a ruse. A little bit of a farce just to  
19 make it seem like it's public engagement. Thank you.

20           >           MR. CAUVEL: Sure. My name is Ross Cauvel. R O  
21 S S, C A U V, like Victor, E L. My comments this evening on  
22 the Williams Pipeline Project.

23           From what I understand from the docket, there is  
24 no widely accepted standard for international, federal, or  
25 state policy or as a matter of physical science to

1 determine the significance of the project's GHG emissions  
2 for purposes of meaningfully informing the Commission  
3 decisions in the proceedings. I feel by refusing to  
4 adequately address the pipeline's greenhouse gas emissions,  
5 FERC is minimizing the dire threat that climate change  
6 proposes to the earth in the form of increased coastal  
7 flooding. Worsening heat waves, catastrophic storms and  
8 wildfires and countless other issues. I also believe the  
9 D.C. Circuit Court recently ruled that FERC must either  
10 quantify and consider a project's downstream carbon  
11 emissions or explain in more detail why it cannot do so.  
12 The significance of emissions can be determined via the  
13 social cost of carbon metrics commonly used by the EPA and  
14 other agencies. Without quantifying emissions, FERC  
15 provides no way for other agencies such as the New York  
16 State DEC to assess the project's potential impacts.  
17 Methane, the main component of fracked gas is 86 times more  
18 potent than greenhouse gas than CO2 in the first 20 years it  
19 is in the atmosphere. This means that it's just 3 percent  
20 of natural gas leaks from extraction to delivery; fracked  
21 gas is worse than coal for the climate.

22 I would also say that New York City has pledged  
23 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and has goals, and I  
24 think as a future, a city that represents the future, I  
25 think they should consider other means of energy and

1 possibly look for infrastructure that's more future-facing  
2 and could still be in use a hundred years from now.

3 That's all I've got.

4 > MS. FRIED: My name is Wendy. W E N D Y. Last  
5 name is Fried. F, as in Frank, R I E D. I live in  
6 Brooklyn. I'm really here just to talk about the Raritan  
7 Bay Loop part of the plan. My topic is the fact that  
8 there's so much information missing from this preliminary  
9 EIS, and then to allow Williams to go ahead and not supply  
10 this information when it's too late for the public to  
11 comment on, really have circumvented the whole process  
12 that's intended to bring the public in, and so we can be  
13 heard from; and these are not small items that are missing.

14

15 The effect on fisheries is a really serious  
16 socioeconomic effect on real people. The effects of  
17 dredging up toxic materials. The effect of the noise. What  
18 plans is there to attenuate the noise? What kinds of  
19 additives are being used? These are real items I found,  
20 effects on the actual health of people and our marine life.  
21 Similarly, the effect on endangered species and wildlife.  
22 There have been decades and decades of hard work and  
23 millions of taxpayer dollars spent in this harbor to bring  
24 species back to vitality and you just, Williams is just  
25 going to be cavalier and say, 'Well, we'll tell you later



1 how we'll protect them'; this is an extremely fragile and  
2 delicate ecosystem and that's just not fair.

3 I come to this from the perspective of having  
4 been a regulatory attorney. I worked on Wall Street. We  
5 had to answer to government agencies and there's no way  
6 they would ever let companies that I worked for get away  
7 with not doing their homework. This is Williams Companies.  
8 It's a \$22 billion company. Their CEO made over \$10  
9 million last year. They have 5,000 employees. They really  
10 don't have an excuse not to do what is required, and I don't  
11 think it shows respect for the process on their part; and  
12 this is your process and it's very hard -- I know FERC puts  
13 a lot of work into this and I think there needs to be, I'm  
14 not exactly sure what the solution is but this should not  
15 happen that this goes forward without that important  
16 information and that by the time it comes out it's too late  
17 for the public to comment.

18 So, those are my comments.

19 > MR. PORTA: My name is Richard Porta. P O R T A.  
20 2078, you need my address? No.

21 I am opposed to the Williams, proposed Williams  
22 pipeline for it poses a danger to the environment. There's  
23 a danger of polluting the water and also of the pipeline  
24 possibly disintegrating and/or exploding.

25 This hearing itself was not done in a fair or

1 inclusive way. It's not fair to isolate people and not  
2 allow people to be together. The general public. The  
3 natural gas, in quotations, "natural gas," in quotations,  
4 also poses a danger to the air with many pollutants that are  
5 not even disclosed to the public. We do not need this  
6 Williams pipeline, proposed pipeline. We need energy-  
7 efficient buildings and energy conservation. I feel very  
8 strongly that the safety of the American people is  
9 disregarded as evidenced in the withdrawal and deregulation  
10 of environmental protections sanctioned by Donald Trump. He  
11 should be increasing protection, not decreasing or  
12 eliminating them.

13 I am most concerned about the impact of the  
14 proposed Williams pipeline on the quality of the air and  
15 water. I am concerned that the proposed construction and  
16 implementation of the pipeline, the Williams pipeline, will  
17 have a polluting effect on the air and water. And I am also  
18 concerned about the detrimental impact on the marine  
19 biology and marine ecosystems. We simply cannot afford to  
20 have our air, water, and sea life damaged and polluted by  
21 the proposed Williams pipeline. Please, stop it now. We  
22 will not stand for the destruction of our natural  
23 environment by the voracious greed of a few who will profit  
24 from the destruction caused the proposed Williams pipeline.  
25 That's it.

1 > MS. HODKOWSKI: My name is Alexandra Hodkowski.  
2 A L E X A N D R A, last name H O D, as in David, K O W S K  
3 I. So, I'm here today as a resident of Brooklyn and someone  
4 who goes to the Rockaways frequently, almost every weekend  
5 and I don't believe or trust that the DEIS adequately  
6 addresses marine and human life. So, I'm just going to read  
7 some key points that I've put together addressing those  
8 things.

9 The 700 page document is hard to get through but  
10 these are the key things that I wanted to mention. FERC  
11 does not address the potential long-term effects of toxic  
12 sediment disturbance on shorelines, beachgoers, marine life,  
13 or the health of the shoreline communities. The seabed of  
14 lower New York Bay is full of these toxins which include  
15 lead, mercury, PCB's, cadmium, and chromium. The dredging  
16 and trenching required for the pipeline would release these  
17 toxins into the water over an 117-acre area. These are  
18 waters that we use. These are waters that our fellow  
19 citizens use. These are waters where marine life is helping  
20 our entire ecosystem.

21 The toxins accumulated in the seabed during the  
22 time of intense industrial pollution in the early 20th  
23 Century. The waters off the Rockaways were known as Dead  
24 Sea as recently as 1972, while the New York Harbor Complex  
25 was called the largest grossly polluted area in the United

1 States, if not the world. The toxins have since been  
2 buried by decades of human effort; we've tried to bury them,  
3 and natural processes. FERC makes no mention of this  
4 progress, which its trenching would reverse. The release  
5 of toxic sediments would disturb the recovery of the  
6 Atlantic Sturgeon, an endangered species. They have been  
7 trying to make a comeback for a very long time. And it's a  
8 major habitat, and FERC acknowledges that.

9           PCBs have been associated with toxic effects in  
10 marine mammals such as endocrine destruction, which can  
11 cause impairment of reproduction, development, and other  
12 hormone mediated processes. Yet FERC only analyzes the  
13 impact of PCBs on two species. FERC's analysis uses  
14 outdated data. A study from 1983, a mere decade after the  
15 Clean Water Act was passed to help prove that the pipeline's  
16 impact would be low. 1983. We've come a long way since  
17 then.

18           This is highly manipulative and does not reflect  
19 the urgent need to protect historic improvements. When  
20 compared to a 2001 study by the NJDEP, FERC's analysis of  
21 potential PCB concentration in hard clams indicates that  
22 those amounts would be three times as high as the maximum  
23 amount found in 2001. I think we need to act responsibly  
24 and that this should not go through. The Williams-Transco  
25 Pipeline should not happen to protect the human and marine

1 life.

2 > MR. LOCANTE: My name is Martin Locante. M A R T  
3 I N. L O C A N T E. So this is, the fact that we're even  
4 here, to me, is totally ridiculous. A pipeline in 2018  
5 after Hurricane Sandy, after global destruction, after  
6 countless water supply contaminated, et cetera, et cetera.  
7 We don't need this to fuel New York's energy. Not only do  
8 we not need it. We can't handle it. We can't handle the  
9 destruction that not only using this but having it. There's  
10 no reason, I mean, we should be on 100 percent renewables  
11 right now and we can be.

12 So, it's completely insane to even be having this  
13 conversation. There's no other way to put it. I can't  
14 tiptoe around it. I didn't have family who was affected by  
15 Sandy, but for the sake of them, it's hard to walk on  
16 eggshells, and this is fucking stupid. So, that's it.

17 > MS. BASSEN: My name is Anne Bassen. Anne with  
18 an e, B A S S E N. I live in Brooklyn, New York. I've  
19 been living in Brooklyn, New York for 14 years, and before  
20 that I lived in Manhattan.

21 The first thing I want to say is that I'm opposed  
22 to this way of doing things. I think this should be done in  
23 a town hall fashion where the community is together and the  
24 community can voice their opinions and hear each other. So,  
25 that's the first thing that very upset me about the way this

1 is being done.

2 I am very much opposed to this Williams-Transco  
3 pipeline. I'm opposed to all fracking infrastructure. I've  
4 gone to lectures. I've visited people who've lived in  
5 areas that were fracked and had their water contaminated.  
6 So, this particular pipeline I'm opposed to because Williams  
7 has a very bad safety record.

8 I'm just going to read from this. There's been  
9 since 2008, there's been five other explosions and fires.  
10 These explosions have killed six people and 141 people also  
11 were injured. They've also destroyed hundreds of acres of  
12 property, burning the landscape. It's just, you know, it's  
13 just reckless, totally reckless, disregard for human life,  
14 plant life, which in this time we can't afford. Also, when  
15 the pipelines explode they release methane, which is 86  
16 times more potent than a greenhouse gas and carbon dioxide.  
17

18 And now climate change has been acknowledged as a  
19 real thing happening. I mean, so we can't afford to keep  
20 contributing to climate change with fracking and this  
21 infrastructure and these explosions. And any company that  
22 has that many safety problems, it's ridiculous for them to  
23 keep getting permitted to continue. And you probably know  
24 that the DEC already denied them a water quality permit  
25 because they didn't comply with the documents that were

1 required which is also another sign, like, I don't want to  
2 have a company like that building these very, very dangerous  
3 pipelines.

4           As you know, also, maybe we've been reading in  
5 the news that the XL pipeline was leaking 200 million  
6 gallons of gas, I mean oil, being released, so these  
7 pipelines are very, very bad for human life -- you know, all  
8 life, and we really don't need them. So, I'm just going to  
9 say to sum it up that Williams' safety record is horrible  
10 and they should not be granted any permits. Especially  
11 focusing on this Williams pipeline.

12       >       MS. ESTRADA: My name is Adriana. A D R I A N A.  
13 Estrada. E S T R A D A. I live in Carroll Gardens, Brooklyn  
14 and I'm affiliated with Surfrider, which is a volunteer  
15 organization. I'm an avid surfer, swimming, and habituate  
16 of Rockaway Beach. When I first started surfing at Rockaway  
17 ten years ago, I never noticed any sea mammals, even though  
18 I looked for them. That has changed in the last few years.  
19 I have regularly seen more pods of dolphins, porpoises and  
20 once came face-to-face with a sizable sea robbin, which is a  
21 fish.

22           I'm here to voice my opposition to the  
23 construction of the Williams-Transco's pipeline on the  
24 grounds that construction noise and vibration would have a  
25 negative, if not deadly, impact on the local marine

1 wildlife. Specifically, I am challenging FERC's Draft  
2 Environmental Impact Statement, the DEIS where it says:  
3 Given that the auditory injury thresholds are with respect  
4 to cumulative sound impacts, the marine mammal would need to  
5 spend approximately six hours within the zone of exceedance,  
6 to potentially experience a permanent hearing impact.  
7 That's from Section 5.1.5.2. This statement is downplaying  
8 the potential impacts that construction noise and  
9 vibrations would have on marine life. Here is why:

10 Williams has not yet disclosed a detailed  
11 description of its pile driving activity or trembling.  
12 Offshore construction is expected to last approximately one  
13 year and at times, occur 24/7. FERC acknowledges but does  
14 not adequately address the fact that construction noise  
15 could cause permanent damage to fish auditory systems,  
16 affecting their survival, growth, and reproduction. FERC  
17 also acknowledges but does not adequately address the fact  
18 that construction noise could disrupt the behavior patterns  
19 of marine wildlife such as migration, breathing, breeding,  
20 and feeding up to 2.9 miles from the sound source.

21 Marine mammals including whales and seals have  
22 recently returned to the New York, New Jersey Harbor, as I  
23 have previously noted. I have seen evidence in this every  
24 time I'm out surfing or by the beach. In fact, Humpback  
25 Whale sightings have increased from only one between the



1 years 2011 and 2013 to 45 between 2014 and 2016, and have  
2 been made in all seasons except for winter. Whales are  
3 especially vulnerable to noise and vibration disruptions and  
4 have an additional risk of being hit by ships.

5 Finally, approximately 80 to 120 seals live in  
6 the waters off Sandy Hook and have been sighted in Raritan  
7 Bay and Staten Island. A reduction in prey due to  
8 increased noise levels may lead to displacement of the seals  
9 and whales. Thank you very much.

10 > MS. RUTHER: My name is Amber Ruther. It's A M B  
11 E R, R U T H E R. It's Ruther. R U T H E R. I believe  
12 we're at what is perhaps the most critical turning point in  
13 global history, and this is because limiting our global  
14 warming to the agreed-upon target is 2 degrees Celsius. It  
15 means that we cannot burn all the fossil fuel reserves in  
16 the ground.

17 As the only country on the planet not signed on  
18 to the Paris Agreement and one of the world's biggest  
19 polluters, we have an important choice to make about how we  
20 want to move forward as a society. Will we meet the  
21 challenge of climate change with the transformation of our  
22 energy infrastructure that this crisis demands? Or will we  
23 keep burying our heads in the sand, denying the severity of  
24 the issue or claiming there is nothing we can do about it?  
25 Will we choose to stand up to the powerful corporate

1 interests collectively and decisively? Or will we continue  
2 to allow them to offset the true cost of their destructive  
3 practices to the most vulnerable people around the world?

4 Will we facilitate a just transition to a green  
5 economy, creating better jobs, stronger infrastructure, and  
6 a more equitable distribution of resources along the way?  
7 Or will we refuse to challenge the system that is literally  
8 killing us? Even as our coastlines flood, hurricanes rage,  
9 and droughts and crop shortages exacerbate inequalities to  
10 dystopian levels around the world. This pipeline  
11 demonstrates that New York has chosen the latter option,  
12 which is sociopathic at best. No sane society should permit  
13 a few people to profit at the expense of the health and  
14 economic prospects of the vast majority of people on the  
15 planet.

16 That was my comment. Thank you.

17 > MR. CORI: My name is John Cori. I'm sorry, John  
18 Cori, C O R I. I'm president of Rockaway Beach Civic  
19 Association. Basically, I'm here to say I'm not happy with  
20 the idea of putting another pipeline in. Two reasons. One  
21 is the real proven lack of need and the fact that the  
22 existing pipeline is technically near its useful lifespan,  
23 should be probably decommissioned according to what people  
24 familiar who spoke to us at the last community board meeting  
25 of the environmental committee meeting in Rockaway.

1           So, my concerns are that the true need, or the  
2 falsehoods of the need are really about replacing the  
3 existing pipeline, and I do have concerns and hope that  
4 someone can bring that somewhere, what is the status, the  
5 condition of the existing pipeline.

6           The other big concern I have is how Williams is  
7 able to essentially buy off every civic organization in the  
8 Rockaway Peninsula with grant money, you know, essentially  
9 hush money in my opinion. Especially groups that are  
10 considered environmental groups that have taken between 15  
11 and 30 thousand dollars and now they can no longer be here  
12 at these meetings. So, that's a big concern and I hope  
13 someone is listening to this comment and takes it up the  
14 line.

15           Of course, the concerns about the environment are  
16 twofold, you know. You're talking about fracked gas going  
17 through those pipes. The lack of need as there are many  
18 other options out there that we can look to. And the basic  
19 concern of trenching of an area that has a lot of pollutants  
20 already in there, and I don't want to see those disturbed.

21           So basically it; really not much else needs to be  
22 said. Thank you.

23       >           MS. GRONIM: My name is Sara Gronim. S A R A, G  
24 R O N, as in Nancy, I M, as in Mary, from Brooklyn, New  
25 York. I would like to speak against granting of a permit

1 from the FERC to the Williams Northeast Supply Enhancement  
2 Pipeline.

3 I have a number of concerns about this pipeline.  
4 One of them is that the use of fracked gas or ordinarily  
5 methane, as a fuel accelerates climate change in a way that  
6 is really dangerous. Methane itself is 84 times or 86 times  
7 more powerful a greenhouse gas in its first 20 years after  
8 it reaches the atmosphere, and then it's carbon dioxide and  
9 we probably have a ten year window in which to make  
10 significant differences to the emissions that we're doing to  
11 turn this climate crisis around. Consequently, not more  
12 natural gas into New York but less natural gas is the  
13 direction we should be going.

14 In New York we have a number of policies that are  
15 pushing us in this direction really rapidly. We are already  
16 committed to 50 percent of our electricity generation by  
17 2030 in the state as a whole. I, myself, am part of a group  
18 that pushes this, wants to push this towards 50 percent  
19 across the board. Not just electrical generation but all  
20 energy. And rapidly to 100 percent renewables.

21 We are putting in solar. We are building  
22 offshore wind, which is very appropriate for this area.  
23 Energy efficiency is incredibly important. We are now  
24 experimenting with geothermal. St. Patrick's Cathedral in  
25 Manhattan is now heated totally and cooled totally by

1 geothermal, and uses consequently very little electricity as  
2 a fuel. So we have many ways in which we can approach an  
3 100 percent renewable goal.

4 To hard bake us into a more fossil fuel as our  
5 primary or major source of energy in this state is the wrong  
6 direction for this state. All right? And consequently, I  
7 feel very strongly that this is a project that should not be  
8 built in this state. All right.

9 And that concludes my comments. All right?

10 Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

11 > MR. HIGGINS: My name is Wesley Higgins. W E S L  
12 E Y. H I G G I N S. So, this is regarding the measurement  
13 of CO2. Someone else before here commented on it and I'm  
14 helping him finish the comment, starting now.

15 There is no widely accepted standard for  
16 international, federal, or state policy or as a matter of  
17 physical science to determine the significance of the  
18 project's GHG emissions for the purposes of meaningfully  
19 informing the Commission decision in this proceeding. So,  
20 this is a quote from you, I believe. And then here is the  
21 comment:

22 This is an excuse, not an explanation. The EPA  
23 and other federal agencies use a social cost of carbon  
24 metric to determine dollar amounts over fossil fuel  
25 infrastructure life cycles. And so can F E R C. In the

1 face of the acknowledged risk presented by GHG emissions,  
2 the second to the last paragraph, the section notes that the  
3 project will align with the state and local goals outlined  
4 above, primarily by improving air quality and offsetting the  
5 use of more carbon intensive fossil fuels by supporting the  
6 continued conversion of building heating systems from the  
7 fuel oil to natural gas in New York City.

8           But this is misleading, taking the most  
9 successful possible scenario in which the logic is most  
10 justifiable. The pipeline can transmit a maximum of 400,000  
11 dekatherms of natural gas per day. The quantitative 2017  
12 inventory of New York City greenhouse gas emissions, all  
13 stationary fuel oil uses combined equal about 61 million  
14 dekatherms of energy, 400 thousand dekatherms of natural gas  
15 per day. The total, about 146 million dekatherms per year.  
16 According to that inventory, about 4.3 million tons of CO2  
17 equivalents are produced every year from these stationary  
18 fuel oil uses. Accordingly, the greenhouse gas equivalency  
19 is calculated on the EPA website. 146 million dekatherms of  
20 natural gas would, if combusted, produce 7.7 million tons of  
21 CO2 a year, and that increase of 79 percent, equivalent  
22 emissions and that assumes 100 percent replacement for fuel  
23 oil and zero -- which is not possible.           Again, the  
24 pipeline could at maximum transmit 400,000 dekatherms of  
25 natural gas per day. By contrast, the New York State Energy

1 and Research and Development Authority has determined the  
2 potential for 39 gigawatts of offshore wind energy of New  
3 York could exist. If harnessed by offshore wind turbines  
4 with a conservative turbine capacity, a factor of 40  
5 percent. This would mean an electrical energy equivalent of  
6 over 1.2 million dekatherms per day on average, with  
7 virtually no associated greenhouse gas emissions.

8           This is just one example of a technologically-  
9 feasible alternative that would eliminate discerning  
10 critical economic and environmental damage, climate change  
11 to the States of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania that  
12 this pipeline would represent over its lifetime.

13           I urge the Commission to reject this project  
14 until a scientifically accurate assessment of the danger  
15 presented by associated lifetime greenhouse gas emissions is  
16 conducted. Thank you.

17           >       MS. ENGH: So, for the record, my name is  
18 Gabrielle Engh. It's spelled G A B R I E L L E. And my  
19 last name is E N G H. I am a resident of the Bronx.

20           So, good evening, my name is Gabrielle Engh and  
21 I'm a resident of the Bronx in New York City. I'm here  
22 tonight because I want to voice my opposition to Williams-  
23 Transco's Northeast Supply Enhancement Pipeline which would  
24 carry fracked gas for 23 miles under New York's Lower  
25 Harbor. I'm opposed to the pipeline and more generally to

1 all additional fracking infrastructure in New York State for  
2 so many reasons. In the interest of time I want to focus  
3 specifically on how the construction of the pipeline would  
4 disturb now-buried toxins under the harbor floor and the  
5 effects of these toxins on human and marine life.

6           So, FERC's Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
7 freely concedes that toxic substances like lead, mercury,  
8 arsenic, PCBs and dioxins lie under the harbor. The vast  
9 majority of samples from the proposed path of this project  
10 showed levels of one or more of these above levels judged to  
11 be safe. But nowhere does FERC address the potential long-  
12 term effects on human and marine life of churning these  
13 toxic, toxic substances up into the waters off our shores.  
14 So, instead FERC points out that the plumes of suspended  
15 sediments, sediments like sand, clay and gravel, caused by  
16 excavating a trench for the pipeline would settle back down  
17 onto the harbor floor within hours, but the behavior of  
18 these sediments tells us nothing about how quickly if at all  
19 molecules of heavy metals or man-made toxic chemicals would  
20 settle out. And secondly, the FERC DEIS repeatedly  
21 characterizes the region from Raritan Bay to the offshore  
22 areas off the Rockaways as already hopelessly contaminated,  
23 and so assumes the construction of this pipeline would make  
24 no difference.

25           But this seriously misrepresents the present



1 state of New York's Lower Harbor. By the 1970s, a century  
2 of industrial runoff had made areas virtually dead. That  
3 is the case. That is true. But 50 years later, we've come  
4 a long way. We have cleaned it up. We've poured billions  
5 into waste treatment facilities and industrial runoffs have  
6 almost ceased. The toxins laid down here should go now  
7 under new layers of sand, clay and gravel; so if  
8 undisturbed, they pose far less risk than they did long ago.  
9

10 Evidence of renewed health of our offshore waters  
11 includes the return of whales and seals in significant  
12 numbers. Bottom feeders like the endangered Atlantic  
13 Sturgeon and like clams would be particularly threatened by  
14 excavating these toxins in the waters of Staten Island,  
15 Brooklyn and the Rockaways, as throngs with swimmers and  
16 surfers, boaters, and people who are fishing and living  
17 their lives here. They have every right to do so in a safe  
18 manner. These toxins threaten us all.

19 I urge you to deny a permit to the Williams-  
20 Transco Northeast Supply Enhancement Pipeline. Thank you  
21 for your time and consideration, and also I would like to  
22 mention number one that this DEIS was not held in the  
23 community. I have no problem with speaking to you in this  
24 room; however, that is not the function. This is supposed  
25 to be a community public hearing and it was not public.

1 That's number one.

2           And number two, this location is nowhere near  
3 Breezy Point, which is where this is mainly occurring; and  
4 there was a gentleman here tonight that lives in Breezy  
5 Point who is a fireman, and he said why isn't this happening  
6 in Breezy Point where I live? If this is where it's going  
7 to happen, the people in my community who are mainly a lot  
8 of firemen, a lot of policemen, they are first responders.  
9 They especially -- not because of that, people in that  
10 community have a right to know. This public hearing, if  
11 this public hearing is not going to be held when the EIS  
12 comes out, if it's not going to be held in Breezy Point, it  
13 will be a sham. It needs to be held in Breezy Point where  
14 the directly, the people on the front lines of this will be  
15 affected. Thank you.

16       >       MS. ZEVIN: My name is Alexandra Zevin. It's A L  
17 E X A N D R A. Z E V, as in Victor, R I N, as in No. I  
18 have registered as an intervenor. I live in Brooklyn, I own  
19 a home in Clinton Hill. I have a workspace in Kiwanis near  
20 the Kiwanis Canal. I'm a retired New York City public high  
21 school teacher and a member of the United Federation of  
22 Teachers.

23           I strongly object to the Williams pipeline  
24 because it will contribute significantly to climate change.  
25 I have firsthand knowledge of the effects of climate change

1 on a waterfront communities. New York City school children.  
2 And the public school system in general. I taught in a  
3 public high school in Red Hook during Hurricane Sandy. The  
4 storm flooded my office, destroyed my classroom supplies.  
5 The schools closed during and after the storm. I taught on  
6 the floor of the gym with no furniture for a while. Some of  
7 my students stayed with relatives for weeks, or even months,  
8 during which time they missed learning, which was a barrier  
9 to them becoming productive citizens. And some of them  
10 failed their regents test and failed to graduate from high  
11 school as a result. The general disruption of community, it  
12 just goes on and on. Not every teen bounces back from that.

13           This Draft Environment Impact Statement seems to  
14 say that it avoids measuring the pipeline's impacts on  
15 climate change, particularly like emissions. According to  
16 the National Environmental Policy Act, FERC must provide  
17 reasonable forecasting of emissions. And the ABC court says  
18 that FERC must either quantify and consider a project,  
19 downstream emissions or explain in more detail why it can't.  
20 FERC determined the significance of the Atlantic Sunrise  
21 Pipeline emissions, why not the Williams pipeline?

22           This document even claims to quantify emissions  
23 in section 4.11.14 and that section is missing. Why? I'm a  
24 stakeholder. I own property in Brooklyn, my pension is tied  
25 to the economic health of the city and the state. It's very

1 important that people from all five boroughs be able to  
2 participate in meetings like this. There should be a  
3 meeting like this in every borough, and this meeting needs  
4 to happen all in one room. That's it.

5 [Pause]

6 MS. ALLEN: The Draft EIS comment session for the  
7 Northeast Supply Enhancement Project concluded at 8:26 p.m.

8 [Whereupon at 8:26 p.m., the verbal comment  
9 session concluded.]

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

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

6 Name of Proceeding: Transcontinental Gas Pipe  
7 Line Company, LLC

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 Docket No.: CP17-101-000

16 Place: Brooklyn, NY

17 Date: Thursday, April 26, 2018

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

22

23

24

Dan Hawkins

25

Official Reporter