

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

BEFORE THE

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

----- x
 IN THE MATTER OF: : Project No.
 ROVER PIPELINE PROJECT : CP15-93-000
 :
 ----- x

Chelsea High School
 740 N. Freer Road
 Chelsea, Michigan 48118

Wednesday, March 23, 2016

The above-entitled matter came on for Scoping Meeting, pursuant to notice, at 6:00 p.m., Kevin Bowman, the moderator.

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

2 (6:06 p.m.)

3 MR. BOWMAN: Okay evening everyone. I think we
4 are going to go ahead and get started so if I could have
5 everyone's attention and if everyone could grab a seat.
6 Good evening, everyone. On behalf of the Federal Energy
7 Regulatory Commission or FERC, I would like to welcome all
8 of you here tonight to the public comment meeting on the
9 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Rover Pipeline
10 and Trunkline and Panhandle Backhaul Projects. Let the
11 record show that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or
12 DEIS comment meeting began at 6:06 p.m. on March 23, 2016 in
13 Chelsea, MI.

14 My name is Kevin Bowman and I am an Environmental
15 Project Manager with the FERC's Office of Energy Projects.
16 Also to my right is Christine Allen, representing FERC and
17 also at the sign-in table who you may have met on the way in
18 tonight is Kim Sechrist, Oliver Pahl and Jon Hess. You will
19 note that we have arranged for a court reporter to
20 transcribe this meeting so we have an accurate record of the
21 meeting. So if you would like a copy of that transcript you
22 can make arrangements with the court reporter after this
23 meeting.

24 In February of 2015, Rover Pipeline LLC,
25 Trunkline Gas Company LLC and Panhandle Eastern Pipeline

1 Company filed applications under Section 7 of the Natural
2 Gas Act to construct and operate certain interstate natural
3 gas pipeline facilities. Rover's Project would consist of
4 the installation of about 500 miles of variable and some
5 dual diameter natural gas pipeline in West Virginia,
6 Pennsylvania, Michigan and Ohio as well as ten new
7 compressor stations. Panhandle and Trunkline's Projects
8 would involve modifications to the existing facilities to
9 allow Rover to deliver their natural gas into other existing
10 pipeline systems.

11 The primary purpose of tonight's meeting is to
12 give you an opportunity to provide specific comments on the
13 draft Environmental Impact Statement that was prepared by
14 FERC's Staff on these three projects. It will help us the
15 most if your comments are as specific as possible regarding
16 these proposed projects and the FERC's Draft Environmental
17 Impact Statement. So I would like to clarify
18 that these projects are not projects being proposed by the
19 FERC. Rather, they are being proposed by Rover and its
20 affiliates. FERC is the federal agency that is responsible
21 for evaluating applications to construct and operate these
22 natural gas pipeline facilities. Therefore, FERC's not an
23 advocate for the Project, instead FERC particularly the
24 environmental staff here tonight we are advocates for the
25 Environmental Review Process.

1 So during our review of this Project, we have
2 assembled information from a variety of sources and this has
3 included the applicants, the public, other state, local and
4 federal agencies and our own independent analysis and field
5 work. We've analyzed this information and prepared a Draft
6 EIS that was distributed to the public for comment. A
7 notice of availability of the Draft EIS was issued on
8 February 19, 2016.

9 Along with FERC Staff, this document was prepared
10 with several help from additional Federal and State agencies
11 and those included the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the
12 Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
13 Service, Ohio EPA and West Virginia Department of
14 Environmental Protection. Those agencies participated as
15 "cooperating agencies", in our review of this Project. I
16 would like to thank them for their continued assistance.

17 So we are getting close to the end of the 45-day
18 comment period of the Draft EIS and that comment period ends
19 April 11, 2016. All comments received, whether they be
20 written or spoken will be addressed in FERC's Final
21 Environmental Impact Statement. I encourage you, if you
22 plan to submit comments and have not, please do so here
23 tonight using one of the written forms in the back of the
24 room or verbally during the comment portion of tonight's
25 meeting.

1 You can also submit comments using the procedures
2 outlined in the FERC's Notice of Availability of the Draft
3 EIS which includes instructions on how to file comments
4 online on FERC's website. Your comments will be considered
5 by FERC with equal weight regardless of whether they are
6 provided verbally tonight or in writing. If you receive a
7 copy of the Draft EIS in the paper or CD format, you will
8 automatically receive a copy of a final Environmental Impact
9 Statement. If you did not get a copy of the Draft EIS and
10 would like to get a copy of the final, please do leave your
11 name and address with us at the sign in table so we can make
12 sure you get a copy of the final EIS.

13 I would like to mention that neither the draft
14 nor the final EIS are decision-making documents. In other
15 words, once they are issued, they do not determine whether
16 or not the Project is approved. I want to differentiate the
17 roles of different staff at FERC. Myself and the other
18 environmental staff here at FERC oversee the preparation of
19 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and final EIS. We
20 do not determine whether or not the Project moves forward.
21 Instead, the FERC Commissioners, who are five,
22 Presidentially-appointed Presidential nominees who are
23 confirmed by the Senate are the ones who are responsible for
24 making the decision on whether the project moves forward.

25 So in the Commissioners decision-making process,

1 they will consider environmental information in the final
2 EIS, public comments along with a host of other
3 non-environmental information such as engineering, markets
4 and rates in making its ultimate decision on whether to move
5 forward with this Project. Only after taking into
6 consideration all the environmental and non-environmental
7 information will they consider their final decision on the
8 projects.

9 If the Commission does approve the Project and
10 issues a certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to
11 the applicants, each of the applicants will be required to
12 meet certain conditions outlined in that certificate. If
13 so, FERC Environmental staff would monitor the projects
14 through the construction and restoration, forming daily
15 onsite inspections to document environmental compliance with
16 applicable laws and regulations, the applicant's plans and
17 mitigation measures and any other conditions imposed upon
18 the applicants by the FERC's certificate.

19 So that's the quick overview of the FERC role in
20 the process and we will move on to the part of the meeting
21 where we take verbal comments from members here tonight. I
22 will mention that if you don't speak tonight, or you don't
23 get to say everything you wanted you can still hand in
24 written comments summarizing the points that you didn't get
25 to say tonight or anything additional that you would like to

1 bring up to FERC.

2 This meeting again is being recorded by a court
3 reporter so your comments will be accurately transcribed and
4 placed into the FERC record. I will start by calling
5 individual speakers to come up to the lectern and present
6 their verbal comments tonight, so please do speak clearly
7 into the microphone so that the court reporter can
8 accurately capture your comments.

9 My number one rule for this meeting is please do
10 show respect to the speaker that is up at the podium
11 regardless of whether or not you agree with their comments.
12 So far we have about twenty-eight speakers signed up
13 tonight. We do have this facility until 10:00p.m., so I
14 would suggest that trying to keep your comments to about
15 five minutes would be ideal for allowing everyone within
16 appropriate time to speak tonight.

17 So our first speaker tonight is Amanda Sumerix.

18 MS. SUMERIX: Good evening and thank you for
19 providing the opportunity to provide input on the Rover
20 Pipeline Project. My name is Amanda A-M-A-N-D-A Sumerix
21 S-U-M-E-R-I-X and I serve as the Communications Director at
22 the Michigan Forest Products Council. MFPC represents the
23 state's entire forest product industry value chain. Our aim
24 is to promote, protect and sustain Michigan's forest
25 products economy.

1 Wood products account for nearly 17.8 billion in
2 annual economic activity to the State of Michigan. From
3 lumber, tissue, packaging and paper to flooring,
4 biochemicals, furniture and cellulose, trees played some
5 sort of role in their making. Our industry sustains 87,000
6 Michigan jobs and accounts for 518,000,000 in value-added
7 international exports. There are over one thousand two
8 hundred forest product companies that operate facilities
9 across the state.

10 Clearly MFPC has a vested interest in Michigan's
11 environment. After reviewing the Rover Pipeline's Draft
12 Environmental Impact Statement we were impressed by the
13 steps that Rover has taken to mitigate its environmental
14 impact. I believe that Rover has sufficiently addressed the
15 Commission's requirements. The sheer length and detail
16 included in the DEIS is a testament to the amount of
17 planning that Rover has completed to date.

18 With that said, I have some concerns with FERC's
19 insistence on a three-foot maximum for tree clearings for
20 construction. This is an impractical limit and strikes me
21 as atypical for construction activities. More
22 importantly, it poses a risk to the safety of workers and
23 our forests at large. I urge FERC to adopt a ten-foot
24 standard, more than three feet is needed to access and
25 operate construction equipment. Trees and shrubs that are

1 located within 15-feet of the pipeline centerlines that have
2 roots that could compromise the integrity of the pipeline
3 coating.

4 Ultimately, in our estimation, the difference
5 between a three-foot clearing and a ten-foot clearing should
6 not have a substantial impact on Michigan's forests and
7 would actually create a safer buffer for construction and
8 operation of the pipeline within our wooded areas. Lastly,
9 I would draw the Commission's attention to the many economic
10 benefits that would stem from construction of the Rover
11 Pipeline Project. MFPC's member organizations require a
12 significant amount of energy in order to process timber and
13 manufacture the everyday products used across the country.

14 The Rover Pipeline would meet that demand with a
15 supply of clean, affordable and domestically produced
16 natural gas. Thank you again for the opportunity to speak
17 this evening. I hope I have conveyed the ways in which
18 Rover has addressed environmental concerns and I encourage
19 the Commission to proceed with its review of the project.

20 (Appause.)

21 MR. BOWMAN: Our second speaker tonight will be
22 Frank Zaski.

23 MR. ZASKI: That's right. Frank Zaski, Franklin,
24 Michigan. I have a lot of comments, they may not seem like
25 they are directly related to the EIS but in the end I will

1 pull them together and they will be. For the final EIS,
2 FERC must ask more questions and do more research with the
3 numbers. Primarily the current market statistics,
4 forecasts, a more thorough analysis of alternatives to
5 Rover, the ability of 35% Rover owner Travers Midstream,
6 which owns 35% of Rover, their financial ability. They
7 added many of the shippers, drillers to meet their
8 commitments.

9 Regarding the market statistics the Draft EIS
10 references the Michigan 21st Century Engine Plan. I was on
11 the 21st Century Engine Plan work group. This report was
12 issued in 2007, written in 2006 with sales forecast from
13 2004 that was 12 years ago. So I hope no one, Rover or FERC
14 actually uses the numbers from this as a reflection of
15 demand for gas in Michigan. It seems like other aspects
16 that in the EIS and Rover appear to be fairly dated or maybe
17 favoring Rover the way they are being used.

18 Here's the latest facts on Michigan. Gas demand
19 in Michigan actually so far this decade through 2015 is
20 actually lower than it was for the same period last decade.
21 Electric usage has diminished and has dropped almost every
22 year for the last 9 years. In our big utilities DTE and CMS
23 which is about 90 percent of our market are forecasting
24 lower electric sales and gas sales in Michigan. Michigan
25 only about 20% of our gas used in Michigan actually goes to

1 generate electricity. So you think we're going to go out of
2 sight, but you know shutting down coal plants using more gas
3 for electricity.

4 That's not necessarily the case. It will be used
5 more for that but 80% of the users in Michigan, residential,
6 commercial and industrial are actually their usage is
7 declining for gas. So we are not going out of sight for
8 demand for gas. And oh, by the way, the Rover apparently
9 doesn't have any customers in Michigan. They were talking
10 to CMS but CMS wanted a metering station and things and
11 Rover said they weren't going to do it.

12 Now, shipping gas through Michigan, because
13 there's apparently no customers, shipping it to Chicago
14 isn't needed as you know. There are other lines that go to
15 Chicago. Rockies Express, Columbia, ANR and others and
16 Canada. It seems like the bulk of Rover and even Nexus Gas
17 is destined for Canada just to be shipped through Michigan.
18 Canada already receives plenty of gas from the U.S. and
19 their own wells.

20 The Ontario Energy Board has stated that
21 Marcellus and Utica gas is already flowing to Canada and
22 going through pipelines through Michigan and New York,
23 particularly around Niagara Falls. Plus pipeline reversals
24 and increased gas shipments to Canada are planned from
25 Eastern United States. So Canada is getting a lot of gas

1 already. They don't need the extra gas that would come
2 through Rover or Nexus.

3 Rover is clearly producer-driven. Entero, Range
4 Resources, Chesapeake want to push it somewhere because they
5 have what they call "stranded gas". That's like if I have
6 stranded money in my bank account, do I need to pull it out
7 as soon as possible and use it as soon as possible? That's
8 their opinion of their gas but anyway, they want to ship to
9 Canada. One intention probably would be to ship to the east
10 coast for LNG export.

11 Well, the EIA has reported that market conditions
12 have changed. Market conditions have changed since many LNG
13 export projects in the United States were initially
14 proposed. Proposed LNG terminals in the United States face
15 increased competition. I'd even go on to say Australia is
16 basically tripling their production of LNG export. There
17 are pipelines coming from Iran that's going into Europe.
18 Russia is getting a hold of their share, they are pushing
19 it.

20 So there is a lot of gas, LNG out there and the
21 forty-eight possible LNG plants out there in front of FERC
22 even if you approve them all, very few will be built. In
23 fact, six that are under construction now may have been the
24 only ones. There is another fly in the ointment too is that
25 experts are now reporting that big plans for U.S.

1 Petrochemical plants are fading. Many plants have already
2 been cancelled and the worldwide glut of oil and natural gas
3 products have basically taken away the U.S. advantage cost
4 advantage for petrochemical plants. Plus there are already
5 eleven existing pipelines transporting Marcellus to Utica
6 Gas to the Gulf region.

7 FERC needs to take a broader look at the
8 alternatives to Rover. The draft EIS seems to use Rover
9 words and superficially just dismisses all of the
10 alternatives because of capacity but as noted in my previous
11 comments, demand for Rover gas probably won't be there.
12 Plus, the dynamics of the market are really changing.
13 Energy Transfer is buying Williams, Transfer is Buying
14 Columbia Pipeline. This will have an impact on Rover,
15 Nexus, other pipelines, other shippers and producers
16 involved.

17 FERC needs to take a look at all of these because
18 it does have an impact on the whole market place. Plus,
19 Rover and Nexus are virtually identical. They are virtually
20 twins. They start near Clanton, Ohio; they go through Ohio,
21 they come within seven miles of each other in Ohio, they
22 come up through Michigan, end at Vector with the intention
23 of going over to Dawn Hub and Canada. Well, this is so
24 twin-like so why would you want to approve them both?

25 MR. BOWMAN: You're just over five minutes, I

1 will ask that you wrap up.

2 MR. ZASKI: Okay. Basically, plus a lot of
3 shippers are in trouble, Chesapeake and all those near
4 Flint. My basic points are that you need to do more
5 in-depth analysis and independent analysis. You just don't
6 accept what Rover tells you. There are many of the firm
7 contracts that Rover says justifies this plan are based on
8 very poor-quality financials of these shippers and
9 producers. There is a real chance of over-building here.
10 Over-building hurts the environment but not only does it
11 hurt the environment, it tears up the landowners history of
12 what they have on their property and it tears up landowners
13 dreams of what they have hoped for their property. That's
14 it.

15 (Applause.)

16 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number three is Clifford
17 Rawley.

18 MR. RAWLEY: Thank you for the opportunity. And
19 first I really do earnestly thank you and your colleagues
20 for your efforts on behalf of the United States in these
21 functions. I recognize you do not represent Rover. So
22 first off I just want to thank you for your efforts on
23 behalf of the United States. I recognize you do not
24 represent Rover and the thoroughness of a nearly 500-page
25 document speaks for itself. However, I do have some things

1 I wanted to bring more specifically to the attention of FERC
2 and those involved.

3 My name is Clifford Rawley. I've got a Master's
4 in Public Health. I live at mile-marker 85.5, which is map
5 on page 3.28, I am along market segment number 2. There are
6 four alternatives within the nearby vicinity where I live.
7 Unlike the other three adjacent market segment alternatives
8 in this area which were positively resolved, in response to
9 landowner concerns, this portion of the proposed route is
10 strongly objected to by several landowners.

11 We have sought and received corresponding
12 supportive resolutions from our own township board that this
13 should follow the adjacent powerlines of ITC. Our proposed
14 route, the market segment alternative number two, would
15 achieve 71.4% of collocation versus 13.5. That's from your
16 own document. But in your document this emphasizes that
17 this has environmental advantages but as you well know in
18 your other documents when pipelines are located, co-located
19 there is actually a higher safety aspect.

20 The community would be safer with the collocation
21 also. All of the landowners that we are associated with, a
22 current proposed route by Rover would be more protected.
23 However we are totally at the mercy of ITC and Rover in
24 their negotiations. We do not even know what the issue is
25 that's involved and have no input at all in terms of the

1 resolution. Over 50 to 60 families and residences are
2 impacted by this proposal.

3 We strongly encourage FERC and the Secretary to
4 robustly approach both parties and encourage them to resolve
5 this matter in response to landowner concerns, similar to
6 the other three adjacent parcels. This would encourage
7 safety and it would reduce environmental impact. By
8 collocating the pipeline along market segment alternative
9 no. 2 route with ITC.

10 Unfortunately, as a result of this sequence of
11 events of at risk homeowners, we've identified several areas
12 of concern and I will try and address more specifically but
13 again I strongly implore you to work with Rover and ITC to
14 resolve this issue on our behalf. The first key issue is
15 safety and if you look at the National PMS maps, this route
16 this pipeline goes through highly concentrated, high
17 population areas. I'll tell you this is unnecessary.

18 Number two. Near mile-marker 83 of the market
19 segment of the proposed pipeline passes within one-tenth of
20 a mile of the entrance to Silver Lake State Park and it
21 parallels that entrance for about a tenth of a mile just to
22 the south of there. This is the only way in and out of the
23 park. If there was a critical event on the wrong day at the
24 wrong time of year over five hundred people would be trapped
25 and would not be able to get out. You would have a

1 horrendous calamity.

2 This is avoidable utterly and there should not be
3 a pipeline to such a location. Further, the Pinkney State
4 Recreation area is a state park. It is protected state
5 land. This area of the proposed route through the pipeline
6 goes through what has been designated by the chief of the
7 DNR as a primitive zone. Meaning it's supposed to preserve
8 the natural resources and it is not to be impacted. In
9 other words, the pipeline violates the stated purpose
10 represented for our state parks and as desired by the State
11 of Michigan and this is in phase two of the long range
12 planning document of the Director of the Parks and
13 Recreation February 2013.

14 Inserting the pipeline directly into the area
15 then violates the purpose of the state park that the
16 Michigan people have valued and put aside and the designated
17 purpose of that area. The Pinkney Recreation area also has
18 both the Panhandle and Crude Oil Pipeline pipelines going
19 through the Pinkney Recreation area already. We've already
20 got the burden there.

21 MR. BOWMAN: You are over five minutes. I will
22 ask that you wrap up your comments.

23 MR. RAWLEY: Thank you, I will be quickly. The
24 most important thing is the recreation area has globally
25 rare prairie fens. The density of threatened wildlife per

1 acre in a prairie fen is 500 times the average acre in the
2 state of Michigan. there are series, including USW, Fish
3 and Wildlife as well as State of Michigan action plans based
4 on protecting and preserving fens. Fens are when
5 groundwater comes to the surface. The key thing here is
6 that the only way to protect fens is you must protect the
7 source of the groundwater that impacts the fens. The fens
8 are throughout Livingston and Washtenaw and Lenawee County
9 and Western Jackson.

10 The impact upon people, the park, the risk of the
11 people at the beach as well as the prairie fens can entirely
12 be avoided. Now I've said this twice in two letters to the
13 Secretary. Instead of going northeast you go northwest out
14 of Defiance, Ohio. You can get to the same pipeline for
15 Consumer's Energy and you get to the Vector Pipeline within
16 twenty miles less. You save 20 miles in construction cost.
17 You avoid all highly populated areas. You avoid protected
18 state land. You avoid all the prairie fens. It's an entire
19 no brainer to protect the people, to protect the property,
20 to protect the threatened endangered species and protect the
21 people of Michigan. Thank you so much.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number four is Charles
24 Steele.

25 DR. STEELE: Good evening and thank you. My name

1 is Dr. Charles M. Steele. I am an associate professor of
2 Economics at Hillsdale College and I am an economist with
3 the Hillsdale Policy Group. As an economist who has studied
4 the issue extensively, it is my opinion that the new
5 proposed natural gas pipeline project, especially the Rover
6 Pipeline are in the best interest of Michigan and Ohio
7 agricultural producers. My colleague Dr. Gary Wolfram and
8 I, recently authored a white paper that looks in-depth at
9 the relationship between the proposed pipeline projects in
10 Michigan and Ohio that would move natural gas from
11 Pennsylvania and the likely impacts of those projects on
12 agriculture in Michigan and Ohio and the Eastern Midwest.

13 What we found was that new natural gas pipelines
14 would offer substantial net benefits to agricultural
15 producers in these areas with minimal downsides. The Rover
16 Pipeline Project in particular could help reduce
17 agricultural production costs for farm operations, provide
18 stable prices for electricity and lower the prices for
19 fertilizer and pesticides. I thoroughly reviewed the draft
20 Environmental Impact Statement and I want to address
21 landowner concerns about whether or not this Project would
22 negatively impact property values or the ability to get
23 insurance on land.

24 The good news is that independent experts already
25 concluded that living near a natural gas pipeline does not

1 have significant impact on property values or insurability.
2 An extensive study done by the independent Right-of-Way
3 Association and Integra Realty Resources found that natural
4 gas pipelines do not measurably impact sales prices, demand
5 for nor property values for properties located along in the
6 proximity of natural gas pipelines. Integra also found that
7 the presence of a natural gas pipeline does not have an
8 effect on obtaining mortgage or property insurance.

9 Now I'd also like to note that the Rover Pipeline
10 in particular has been attentive to local farmer and
11 landowner needs. Rover will pay an estimated one hundred
12 million dollars to landowners for permanent and temporary
13 easements in the next few years. They have added local
14 agronomists and agricultural engineers to their team to work
15 alongside farmers and landowners on mitigation plans.
16 They've held meetings with local communities to discuss the
17 route, the construction of the pipeline and restoring land
18 on properties as well as the advanced safety technology that
19 will be incorporated into the pipeline design.

20 In reading the Draft Environmental Impact
21 Statement, it is clear to me that FERC recognizes the
22 Project has plans in place to address the landowner concerns
23 about restoration after construction. Rover Pipeline stands
24 to benefit farmers, manufacturers and consumers throughout
25 the region and I believe it should be allowed to go forward.

1 Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number five is Ken High.

4 Combining the last two names, sorry about that.

5 MR. HIGH: Good evening. My name is Lieutenant
6 Ken High with the Michigan State Police Emergency Management
7 and Homeland Security Division. My organization, we
8 understand that the design, construction and the maintenance
9 as well as operation of the pipeline is strictly governed by
10 the code of Federal regulations.

11 However, it is our responsibility to respond to
12 an incident if it were to happen. To that end, I can easily
13 say that Rover LLC has reached out to both state, local and
14 county officials to assure us that they have a response plan
15 in place as well as to keep that communication line open.
16 In fact, Rover reached out to us before we were even advised
17 of the plans for the pipeline of the possibility coming into
18 the state and we held that in high regard because of their
19 willingness to do so. I have had the opportunity to also
20 work with Panhandle through Paradigm Services and their
21 outreach program as well as in Calhoun and Kalamazoo County
22 and have found them exceptionally easy to work with as well
23 as very open and inviting to assistance with their response
24 plan. Additionally, Rover has met with as I said, county
25 and local officials as well as fire departments and HazMat

1 units again if an event were to happen on their property due
2 to one of their pipelines and they have also gone out of
3 their way to assure those local responders that they would
4 assist in any way possible.

5 Now a response such as this would not be a single
6 response and some of you may be wondering about this would
7 be a multifaceted response involving local, county and state
8 resources as well as of course Rover resources itself.
9 Again, to that end we have been very satisfied and pleased
10 with Rover's outreach to us as well as local and county
11 entities as I said.

12 Rover has an emergency response plan in place.
13 We are aware of that. We have seen its draft version. We
14 have been given the opportunity to offer any addendums to it
15 or any assistance in preparing the response plan and we have
16 taken that opportunity as well. I think you for your time
17 to speak to you tonight.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number six is John Bedawka.

20 MR. BZDAWKA: Good evening. I want to thank FERC
21 for the opportunity to speak tonight on the draft
22 Environmental Impact Statement. My name is John Bzdawka and
23 I'll spell it. B-Z-D-A-W-K-A n and on behalf of the
24 International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers I have come
25 today to express our support for the planning, construction,

1 and subsequent maintenance of the Rover Pipeline.

2 Since 1890, the IBW has represented men and woman
3 working in a variety of fields including utility,
4 construction and others. Today, we are 750,000 members
5 strong with workers in both the US and Canada. We support
6 the Rover Pipeline because this endeavor will invest over
7 3.7 billion dollars in our local economies and supply
8 regions along the pipeline with nearly ten thousand
9 immediate construction jobs, many of them for local union
10 workers.

11 After reviewing the FERC's Draft Environmental
12 Impact Statement it is clear that Energy Transfer Partners
13 has designed the Rover Pipeline to alleviate any potential
14 negative environmental influences, both in the short and
15 long-term. Thanks to the ever-evolving technological
16 advances pipeline transportation continues to get safer and
17 safer all the time. Today there are already 2.6 million
18 miles of underground pipeline safely transporting energy
19 products across the U.S. every day.

20 We, in the IBW are proud to have been selected by
21 Energy Transfer Partners to work on the Rover Project and it
22 is a project that we do not take lightly. We understand
23 that we have been chosen because ETP knows we will do the
24 job correctly, efficiently and to the utmost safety
25 standards. We stand ready and waiting to get to work on

1 this project and ask for its timely review and approval.

2 Thank you.

3 (Applause.)

4 MR. BOWMAN: The seventh speaker is Doug Needham.

5 MR. NEEDHAM: Good evening. My name is Doug
6 Needham and I'm the President of the Michigan Aggregates
7 Association. The Michigan Aggregates Association is a
8 statewide, nonprofit trade association that represents close
9 to ninety companies engaged in the production of crushed
10 stone, sand, gravel, recycled aggregates and slag. We were
11 founded in 1960 by a group of conscientious and
12 environmentally concerned aggregate producers to protect and
13 promote the interests, growth and welfare of our industry.
14 We have the best interest in the state's economic and
15 community development, particularly through enhancements to
16 our public infrastructure.

17 I am here tonight to support the Rover Pipeline
18 Project. I, along with others in the construction industry
19 support infrastructure projects that provide benefits to the
20 citizens of the State of Michigan, either via job creation
21 or retention, increased or sustained tax revenue, and/or
22 overall benefit to Michigan's Economy. We have learned that
23 the Rover Pipeline Project has an estimated total payroll
24 for the construction phase to be around 620 million.

25 This includes about 61 million in payroll for

1 Michigan. We have also learned that the direct construction
2 impact may be as many as ten thousand jobs that includes up
3 to fifteen hundred jobs in Michigan. In addition, we have
4 been informed that there would be close to five thousand
5 jobs for those in the supply industry such as quarries,
6 equipment, manufacturing, pipe suppliers and trucking firms
7 that deliver these products. This project deserves our
8 support as the Rover Pipeline Project stands to greatly
9 benefit the construction aggregates industry and the state
10 of Michigan at large. Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker eight is Mike Hayter.

13 MR. HAYTER: Good evening. Thank you very much
14 for allowing me to speak before you. My name is Mike Hayter
15 and I am a field representative for Local 499 Laborers. I
16 am here in my official capacity on behalf of our
17 organization to testify in support of the proposed Rover
18 Pipeline Project. I have been advocating in support of this
19 project for the better part of a year and a half in the
20 hopes that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will
21 approve this Project.

22 This Project, which will help provide a stable
23 and consistent energy source for our state will provide
24 nearly ten thousand new jobs along the pipeline route
25 including roughly one thousand right here in Michigan.

1 Specifically in the counties of Lenawee, Washtenaw and
2 Livingston. For a construction worker, this kind of work,
3 sometimes is called temporary jobs, is essential.
4 Construction in its nature is temporary work. But we all
5 know the importance of having well-built buildings that also
6 rely on safely-built energy infrastructure such as the Rover
7 Pipeline.

8 I am confident in Rover's plans to mitigate any
9 environmental impacts that might arise during the
10 construction and operation. Rover has satisfied and even
11 succeeded the requirements laid forth by the Commission.
12 That said, I want to address FERC's insistence on a
13 three-foot maximum for clearings. In my experience and
14 based on the experience of the workers I represent, this
15 serves as an impractical limit that could interfere with
16 construction and even endanger laborers. I urge FERC to
17 adopt a more standard ten-foot rule.

18 I am proud that Energy Transfer has agreed to use
19 our trade to build this pipeline at Liuna. We set the bar
20 high with regard to our training requirements and
21 construction practices. Rover knows we will do the job
22 right the first time. We will continually work to ensure a
23 safe, clean and minimally evasive construction site and we
24 are committed to operating with minimal construction or
25 impact to landowners.

1 We also applaud Rover for making a concerted
2 effort to use American-made products. This creates even
3 more employment opportunities down the supply chain, not
4 just in the actual construction and the fact nearly
5 three-quarters of the pipe itself would be manufactured in
6 the United States helping to maximize the capacity of U.S.
7 steel mills. This project is critically important to the
8 workers I represent and to the thousands throughout the
9 Midwest.

10 We need jobs in our region and we need a reliable
11 supply of domestically produced energy. This project will
12 satisfy both those needs and to do so with minimal impacts
13 to the communities along the pipeline route. I urge you to
14 approve this important project and for the good of the
15 people of Michigan and for our economy. Thank you for your
16 time.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number nine, Ron Kardos.

19 MR. KARDOS: Good evening. My name is Ronald
20 Kardos. I'm from Livingston County, Michigan and I'm
21 speaking on behalf of myself and my family. We aren't
22 directly affected by the proposed E.T. Rover Pipeline.
23 However, we would have been had the original route through
24 Livingston County been used. Thankfully there was a great
25 deal of opposition for that route which ultimately pushed

1 the E.T. Rover to connect with the Vector Pipeline near
2 Howell.

3 I speak before you as a landowner with the Vector
4 Pipeline as well as the Enbridge line 6B through my
5 property. Because of that, I can speak directly to the
6 issue of imminent domain and the tactics used to coerce
7 landowners to comply. When we were approached by a
8 Right-of-Way agent, the issue of imminent domain surfaced
9 not five minutes into the conversation. We feel that FERC
10 provides that impetus for pipeline companies to use imminent
11 domain as a scare tactic with the use of language in early
12 communications with property owners.

13 The statements I speak of are part of the Notice
14 of Intent, the Certificate Policy Statement, and the order
15 Clarifying Statement of Policy. In these communications,
16 landowners are encouraged to acquiesce instead of going
17 through the imminent domain process. What they don't tell
18 the landowners is that complying simply pumps up compliance
19 numbers, which give the applicant an advantage.

20 Moving on to another issue, that of public
21 convenience and necessity, there is absolutely nothing
22 convenient about having a pipeline through one's property.
23 The disruption to one's life, the environment, wildlife and
24 the soils is not convenient. Any suggestion that when a
25 pipeline goes through your property the soil isn't impacted

1 and/or the fact that they will restore it to its original
2 condition is absolutely false. We've been dealing with
3 getting our property restored for quite some time now, since
4 the "replacement" of the line 6B, and it still isn't
5 restored to our satisfaction.

6 Our front yard and garden, the pipelines are
7 within a hundred feet of our front porch and they are
8 evidence that the soil is never the same, despite promises
9 that the soil will be restored to its original condition.
10 To date, there is no evidence that suggests that there is
11 necessity for yet another pipeline through Michigan.
12 Current market conditions suggest that there is an
13 overabundance of natural gas as Frank Zaski pointed out,
14 Michigan has ample gas storage facilities and further
15 pipelines are not needed.

16 If the purpose of the FERC is to regulate the
17 energy of the country, this pipeline proposal should be
18 denied for any one of the above-mentioned reasons. Thank
19 you.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number ten, Mariah Urueta.

22 MS. URUETA: Hello Commission. Thank you for
23 listening to everyone's testimony today. My name is Mariah
24 Urueta, that's M-A-R-I-A-H, last name U-R-U-E-T-A. I am an
25 organizer for Food and Water Watch and I am speaking to you

1 today on behalf of our twenty-seven thousand Michigan
2 supporters. The proposed E.T. Rover Pipeline Project has
3 already been rerouted as mentioned twice due to strong
4 objection from landowners and local municipalities.

5 This pipeline would threaten landowners property
6 rights as you just heard, pose safety issues and would cause
7 both environmental and public health problems for
8 communities along the proposed pipeline route and this is
9 evident with the current natural gas pipelines that already
10 exist in the Midwest region of the United States. The E.T.
11 Rover Pipeline as been stated, would be an unnecessary piece
12 of infrastructure. Michigan's energy statistics
13 given in the draft Environmental Impact Statement shows that
14 there is no need for Rover in Michigan as electric and gas
15 use in Michigan are declining. Rover provides inadequate
16 reasoning for the construction of this pipeline. E.T. Rover
17 is a producer-driven pipeline with no real market demand and
18 with gas prices being low there is no need for this
19 pipeline. The only reason E.T. Rover is being posed is to
20 lock in an increased future demand for fracked natural gas.

21 Those with sunk costs in the project, the banks
22 that own the debt will expect to get paid from maximizing
23 gas production, even for export. This flies in the face of
24 climate science, which is clear that we must maximize what
25 we keep in the ground instead. At that, given all of the

1 public opposition, the Washtenaw County Board of
2 Commissioners has passed a resolution opposing the E.T.
3 Rover Pipeline. So please listen to the constituents and we
4 hope that every FERC comment is being read and taken into
5 account. Thank you for your time.

6 (Applause.)

7 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number eleven is John
8 Dulmes.

9 MR. DULMES: Good evening. My name is John
10 Dulmes and I am Executive Director of the Michigan Chemistry
11 Council. Our organization represents the state's third
12 largest manufacturing sector, the business of chemistry.
13 The companies support nearly one hundred and twenty thousand
14 Michigan jobs across the state, generate one hundred and
15 twenty-seven million dollars in state and local taxes.
16 Ninety-six percent of all manufactured goods are directly
17 touched by the business of chemistry, making our industry
18 essential to many parts of Michigan's economy.

19 Our members support this expansion of domestic
20 energy production and we encourage the development of safe
21 and reliable energy infrastructure including the Rover
22 Natural Gas Pipeline. We are thankful for the release of
23 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. It is a step in
24 the right direction towards the final review of this
25 important project and we applaud the agency for taking the

1 time to carefully review it.

2 In reviewing the plans for the pipeline and the
3 draft EIS, we believe there has been a very comprehensive
4 assessment of both the benefits that this project will bring
5 but also the necessary work that will need to be done in
6 order to mitigate impacts to the environment and to our
7 communities. Energy Transfer Partners, the company that has
8 proposed the pipeline estimates that it will bring ten
9 thousand construction jobs to the state including fifteen
10 hundred positions in Michigan.

11 We also applaud the strong "Buy America" policy
12 that this project has been founded on and that seventy-six
13 percent of the pipeline will be made in the U.S. and many of
14 our companies are involved in this supply chain as well.
15 This is important to our companies and its employees. The
16 majority of the equipment and greater than one billion
17 dollars in good will be purchased from manufacturers
18 including businesses here in Michigan. Again, many
19 businesses that support our members as well.

20 We have been impressed with the transparency and
21 openness of the process. The Rover team has conducted
22 hundreds of meetings along the route with different groups
23 including farm groups, community leaders, business
24 associations and the landowners, many of whom are hear
25 tonight. We've seen that this project has consulted with

1 state agricultural agencies, the state police, independent
2 consultants, land improvement and drainage tile contractors
3 and the landowners in order to develop the careful plans for
4 the repair of drainage tile and other systems that will be
5 effected by the construction. We hope that this openness
6 and transparency will continue and that the company will
7 continue to share their plans with the agency and any other
8 interested parties.

9 So with that in mind, we would be supportive of
10 reducing some of the quarterly progress reports that were
11 recommended. We understand that these reporting
12 requirements might not be necessary if that level of
13 communication that has been given so far continues. In
14 conclusion, the continued development of Michigan's energy
15 infrastructure, our state's manufacturers depend on natural
16 gas and the infrastructure to move it to market. As
17 mentioned, many of our products are made with natural gas as
18 a feed stock including fertilizer, clothing, plastics,
19 insulation and tires.

20 This pipeline is an important step in developing
21 our nation's energy infrastructure and our state's energy
22 infrastructure. We believe that the final review should be
23 conducted on an expedited timeline. Thank you for the
24 chance to speak.

25 (Applause.)

1 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker twelve is Terry Langley.

2 MR. LANGLEY: Good evening. Thank you for giving
3 me this opportunity to speak. My name is Terry Langley.
4 I'm a representative of the United Association and
5 Pipeliners 798. Since the 2008 recession, many of our
6 workers have found themselves under-utilized and under-paid
7 as projects get postponed and certain positions get sent
8 overseas to less skilled and far less devoted workers.
9 Large infrastructure projects like Rover Pipeline are the
10 kind of endeavors our country needs to put American Workers
11 and the communities in which they reside back on the path of
12 economic prosperity.

13 Using the skilled workers of the United
14 Association, the Rover Pipeline would be constructed using
15 the most advanced engineering technology. According to the
16 FERC's Draft Environmental Impact Study, it seems that the
17 pipeline officials have guaranteed to meet and even exceed
18 State and Federal pipeline safety requirements. This
19 includes a fast inspection of every weld connecting segments
20 of the pipeline as well as pre-testing for leaks and defects
21 using water under higher than average pressure, automatic
22 emergency shutoff valves will also be utilized in the event
23 of an emergency. Thank you, and I urge you to advance this
24 permit. Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

1 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number thirteen and sorry if
2 I get this one wrong, George Stamadianos.

3 MR. STAMADIANOS: Hi, I'm George Stamadianos
4 representing the orange shirts in the room from 499. I've
5 been construction labor for 21 years. I support the
6 pipeline also because I am a small businessman and during
7 the recession of 2008, my family business almost closed and
8 that's about when I started with the pipeline. I have been
9 a building trade's guy also. I've seen many stores continue
10 business because of the pipeline in the area, all the people
11 who are buying food, gas, snacks, et cetera. The health
12 care that I can get from the pipeline has really impacted by
13 life. When I was working the family business I would paying
14 almost sixteen hundred a month for Blue Cross, but now I
15 have 5 dollar co-pays.

16 I've done many aspects on the pipeline. I have
17 been fire watch, flagger, and the environmental crews. We
18 do a safe, reliable job and we restore the properties in
19 very good condition. With a little patience from the
20 homeowners, I personally reassure that the property will be
21 restored in good condition. Thank you for your time and I
22 support the 499 guys for their families and myself also.
23 Thank you.

24 (Appause.)

25 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker 14 is Steve Schmitz.

1 MR. SCHMITZ: Hi. I'm just a farmer down on the
2 Michigan/Ohio line. The pipeline is going through about six
3 of the fields that I farm and my landlords and I just want
4 to say what they're doing is, as far as the drain tile, I
5 think it's a great deal. I'm also a drainage contractor,
6 been doing it for forty years. This year, the way that
7 Rover is handling the drain tile along with Land Steward is
8 a great idea, probably the best thing I've ever seen. When
9 they get done relocating all these tile, the pipeline goes
10 through, they come back a year later, two years later or
11 whatever and retile the strip that is not done so I think
12 whatever Rover is doing with the drain tile I think it's an
13 excellent idea and I support that, thank you.

14 (Applause.)

15 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker fifteen is Mike Cook.

16 MR. COOK: Good evening and thank you for
17 providing me the opportunity to testify in support of the
18 Rover Pipeline Project. My name is Mike Cook and I'm here
19 tonight on behalf of the Michigan Chapter of the Land
20 Improvement Contractors Association of America. For over 50
21 years, LIC has worked throughout the country to ensure that
22 their land improvement projects are undertaken in a
23 responsible and effective manner. We encourage high
24 standards of workmanship and resource management, land
25 improvement practices and to promote private enterprises in

1 land improvement contracting. Our creed is "preservation of
2 our natural soil and water".

3 The Rover Project has distinguished itself from
4 other pipeline infrastructure projects with its diligent in
5 minimizing its impact on the properties along the pipeline.
6 Michigan LICA was thoroughly impressed with Rover's early
7 request to consult with our specialist. Since that time, we
8 worked hand in hand with Rover to craft a plan that
9 addresses any potential issues that might arise with an
10 attention to Michigan and community-specific details.
11 Additionally, Rover has hired other private Environmental
12 consultants in order to identify local concerns.

13 For these reasons the Michigan Land Improvement
14 Contractors Association endorses the Rover Pipeline. Our
15 members are excited to get work on this project and I thank
16 you for your time and consideration.

17 (Applause.)

18 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker sixteen is Keith Cottrill.

19 MR. COTTRILL: Good evening. My name is Keith
20 Cottrill. I am a land improvement contractor. I come up
21 here to speak on what I have seen as Rover is working with
22 us to work on keeping the draining systems working on some
23 very highly productive farm ground. What I have seen Rover,
24 this is a good project. They seem to be working with us
25 well.

1 I believe that some of the routing should have
2 been worked with the farmers a little closer. The procedure
3 we had we had a survey crew come up and ask if they had
4 permission to come across the property. Most of our farmers
5 allowed it. After they got the survey done they said
6 "here's where we are going". They did not come back to the
7 landowner and ask "is this is a good route? Is this a bad
8 route? What have we got in the way?"

9 I kind of believe that maybe that needs to be
10 looked at a little closer. The property owners are the ones
11 that understand their property the beset. I believe if they
12 were worked with a little closer this could have made the
13 process a little easier for them. As far as LICA coming or
14 Rover and Land Stewards coming to us local contractors to do
15 the work, I believe we are the ones that understand putting
16 the tile back together and understand the land as good as
17 the farmers and I appreciate that you folks are working with
18 us, talking to us and allowing us to come speak at these
19 proceedings. Thank you.

20 (Applause.)

21 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker seventeen is Dennis Rector.

22 MR. RECTOR: Good evening, thank you. My name is
23 Dennis Rector. I am a drainage contractor. I own Water
24 Management Specialists. I am a LICA contractor. I want to
25 commend Rover for hiring the local contractors. We are the

1 contractors that have been putting this drainage system in,
2 designing them and installing them, what's there.

3 They've come to us and I've been doing this for
4 about twenty years repairing and fixing these areas where
5 other pipelines have gone through and bring that expertise
6 here and they've requested that we come up with a plan that
7 gets their soils back into restore it as close to possible
8 of what they already have. I want to support this. I think
9 this is a good project. Rover has done, from what I've seen
10 with the customers that we have, they've done everything
11 they need to do for this project to go forward so I support
12 it.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number eighteen is Patricia
15 Cingel.

16 MS. SINGLE: Good evening, my name is Patricia
17 Cingel and I am one of the landowners along the pipeline. I
18 am definitely out of my comfort zone but I am here tonight
19 because I think it's important that you consider the people
20 that own the property along the pipeline. For all of the
21 consideration that's done to the environment and safety
22 concerns is the people living in those communities that will
23 live with any risk or any disaster that could happen.

24 It is a permanent change. It's not a temporary
25 change. The people living along the pipeline will deal with

1 that forever and whoever comes after them will deal with
2 that forever. It changes the potential uses of their
3 property, what they can do with it. I don't understand the
4 driving need for this, for a new pipeline. There seems to
5 be existing ones. The gas that is to be delivered isn't
6 even for the benefit of the state and our community.

7 So I just ask you to consider us, the people.

8 Thank you.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. BOWMAN: The nineteenth speaker is Gary
11 Mowad.

12 MR. MOWAD: My name is Gary Mowad. I'm a former
13 special agent with the United States Fish and Wildlife
14 Service and served as the Deputy Chief for the National Law
15 Enforcement Program. In this capacity, I supervised Fish
16 and Wildlife Service law enforcement program from coast to
17 coast and U.S. Territories.

18 I'm an expert in the Migratory Bird Treaty Act
19 and the Endangered Species Act having given testimony before
20 numerous Federal Grand Juries and serving as an expert
21 witness for the U.S. Government. I've been retired now for
22 over three years and only represent myself here tonight. I
23 have a letter I would like to submit into the FERC record
24 and I'd like to speak to some of the points contained
25 within. Would that be with your guys?

1 MR. BOWMAN: You can leave it with us tonight.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. MOWAD: Okay. I have thoroughly reviewed the
4 Rover Pipeline Project's Draft Environmental Impact
5 Statement and conclude that Rover's Migratory Bird Impact
6 Mitigation Plan completely satisfies the requirements set
7 out by FERC. It also is in full compliance with all
8 provisions of the Migratory Treaty Act and its implementing
9 regulations.

10 I am very concerned and troubled with a new
11 requirement coming from both the Fish and Wildlife Service
12 and FERC during oil and gas pipeline consultations. I
13 currently have pipeline clients who have been
14 inappropriately asked to pay mitigation for perfectly lawful
15 impacts to migratory birds and their habitat. Not only are
16 these requests inappropriate, but I believe they are also
17 unlawful and should be investigated by the Office of the
18 Inspector General for both the Department of Interior and
19 FERC.

20 As an expert on the migratory Bird Treaty Act
21 with thirty years of experience, I assure FERC the Migratory
22 Bird Treaty act and its implementing regulations do not
23 prohibit modification or destruction of migratory bird
24 habitat. Nor do they prohibit harassment of migratory birds
25 or destruction of their nests when viable eggs or young are

1 not present. Yet, the United State Fish and Wildlife
2 Service and FERC have been unlawfully requiring mitigation
3 for these otherwise lawful impacts to migratory birds and
4 their habitat for the past two years.

5 I worry that FERC may be unknowingly facilitating
6 Fish and Wildlife Services improper requests for mitigation
7 for perfectly legal impacts to migratory birds. When
8 questioned on the authority for such requests, the Fish and
9 Wildlife Service cites executive order 13186 as the basis
10 for its authority to require mitigation for impacts to
11 migratory birds and their habitat. However, this order,
12 issued in 2001 under the Clinton Administration was clearly
13 intended for Executive Branch Agencies only.

14 Specifically, the Executive Order requires a
15 Federal Agency that takes actions likely to have negative
16 impacts on migratory bird populations to enter into an MOU
17 with the Fish and Wildlife service to "promote the
18 conservation of migratory bird populations". Action is
19 defined in the Executive Order to include actions directly
20 carried out by a Federal Agency. It goes on to say "actions
21 delegated to or assumed by non-Federal entities or carried
22 out by non-Federal entities with Federal assistance are not
23 subject to this order."

24 So the Executive Order the Fish and Wildlife
25 Service cites is conveying authority for these mitigation

1 requests and this does not apply to the public sector
2 projects such as oil and gas pipelines. FERC entered into
3 an MOU with the Fish and Wildlife Service on March 30, 2011.
4 Among other authorities cited in the MOI, the MOI cites
5 Executive Order 13186. None of the Federal statutes or the
6 Executive order cited in the MOU protect migratory bird
7 habitat and consequently none of the statutes or the
8 executive order requires mitigation for modification to
9 migratory bird habitat. Modification to migratory bird
10 habitat is not prohibited by law, regulation or executive
11 order. Requesting or requiring mitigation for such
12 modification is inappropriate.

13 To be clear, none of the authorities cited in the
14 FERC MOU with the Fish and Wildlife Service protect
15 migratory bird habitat. The Endangered Species Act does,
16 however require Federal action agencies whose projects may
17 affect listed endangered species to consult with the Fish
18 and Wildlife Service. FERC is often an action agency for
19 pipeline projects as many pipelines require FERC
20 Authorization. Consequently, FERC is required to consult
21 with the Fish and Wildlife Service under Section 7 of the
22 endangered species act.

23 It is during these consultations that the Fish
24 and Wildlife Service and FERC ask for voluntary mitigation
25 payments to offset impacts to migratory bird habitat.

1 However, if a pipeline project fails to pay the requested
2 migratory bird mitigation, the project's required ESA
3 clearances, or FERC authorizations will not be issued. In
4 actuality, the Fish and Wildlife Service and FERC are
5 committing extortion.

6 I have personally set in meetings with the Fish
7 and Wildlife Service in which personnel from the Fish and
8 Wildlife Service state failure to pay the requested
9 voluntary migratory bird mitigation payment will change how
10 the Fish and Wildlife Service Views the Project as well as
11 future projects from that company. The threats are not even
12 veiled and clearly represent misuse of Federal authority.
13 This issue has been reviewed by no less than five of the
14 most prominent environmental attorneys of the country
15 including a former Deputy Assistant secretary for the
16 Department of the Interior.

17 We all conclude that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
18 Service and FERC are acting outside their authorities and in
19 essence this action equates to circumventing the federal
20 rule-making process and implementing new law through misuse
21 of an executive order. I highly recommend forward this
22 comment to your legal counsel for immediate review and stop
23 the unlawful practice of requesting or requiring voluntary
24 mitigation payments for perfectly legal impacts to migratory
25 birds and their habitat.

1 Withholding required FERC and ESA clearances
2 until unnecessary migratory bird mitigation payment is paid
3 is wholly inappropriate and represents misuse of Federal
4 authority. Thank you for allowing me to bring this issue to
5 your -- or at least putting it on your radar screen tonight
6 and please have your legal counsel review this. I would
7 certainly like to see this practice stopped. Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. BOWMAN: You can leave the paper comments at
10 the sign-in table. Thanks. Speaker twenty is Charles
11 Yates.

12 MR. YATES: Good evening. Again, how are you?
13 My name's Charles Yates. I am here representing the United
14 Association and Local 798. I'm a representative for Ohio,
15 Indiana and the great State of Michigan. I would like to
16 thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the
17 United Association, to voice our support and to build the
18 Rover Pipeline.

19 As so many jobs continue to go overseas, the
20 Rover Pipeline is an incredible project that promises to
21 create nearly ten thousand construction jobs many of which
22 will go to my fellow United Association Members. Of the
23 total 3.7 billion dollars to be invested in this project,
24 approximately 570 million will be reserved to labor
25 expenses. Over 75% of the pipeline including assembly,

1 packaging will be manufactured right here in the United
2 States by American workers. Energy Transfer Partners has
3 selected the United Association to work in this project
4 because they understand that we hold our workers to the
5 highest standards and operate under the most advanced
6 engineering and construction practices.

7 Most importantly, we understand that safety is
8 our number one priority and ensuring safe and stable
9 finished product will be the goal in building the Rover
10 pipeline. Upon review of the Federal Regulatory Commission
11 draft Environmental Impact Statement, it is clear that the
12 Rover Pipeline was precisely designed to minimize noise,
13 preserve the health and beauty of the surrounding
14 environment and ensure minimal destruction to landowners and
15 those in the community.

16 United Association shares these goals and will
17 conduct our daily operations accordingly. We therefore ask
18 that the FERC complete its review of the Rover Pipeline and
19 allow our devoted UA members to get to work on this most
20 worthy project. Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker twenty-one is Nancy
23 Schiffler.

24 MS. SHIFFLER: Good evening. My name is Nancy
25 Shiffler and I am speaking on behalf of the Michigan Chapter

1 of the Sierra Club. We will be submitting detailed, written
2 comments prior to the April 11th deadline for tonight. I
3 just want to emphasize a few key points particularly
4 regarding the balance of adverse impact and certificates of
5 need. First, FERC is providing incomplete information to
6 landowners regarding acquisition of easements.

7 From your Notice of Intent and in the Landowner's
8 Guide that you're passing out tonight you duly note to the
9 landowner that they will be receiving contact from the
10 pipeline regarding acquisition of an easement and they also
11 dutifully point out that if the Commission approves the
12 Project, that approval conveys with it the right of eminent
13 domain. Therefore if easement negotiations failed to
14 produce an agreement a condemnation proceeding could be
15 initiated where compensation would be determined in
16 accordance to state law.

17 What they do not say to the landowner is the
18 content of the FERC's Certificate Policy Statement, which
19 was clarified in 2000 to say the "policy statement
20 encouraged project sponsors to acquire as much of the
21 right-of-way as possible by negotiations with landowners and
22 explain how successfully doing so influences the
23 Commission's Assessment of Public Benefits and adverse
24 consequences". In short, FERC is providing implicit
25 encouragement to landowners to settle with the company

1 rather than going through eminent domain proceedings.
2 However, it neglects to tell them that FERC uses the
3 proportion of negotiated rights-of-way agreements as an
4 indicator favoring approval of the project.

5 Second, in the EIS, FERC determined that the
6 Project would result in some adverse and significant impacts
7 which "would occur during construction and operation of the
8 projects and occur on vegetation and wildlife." This is
9 while FERC maintains that all of those impacts could be
10 sufficiently mitigated if their proposed fifty-five
11 conditions are carried out. However, many of the conditions
12 involve submission by Rover of additional information and
13 plans and instructions to "coordinate with landowners
14 regarding mitigation compensation" or instructions to
15 develop long-term monitoring plans.

16 The question remains open whether these
17 conditions will be satisfactorily carried out and whether
18 the adverse conditions will be adequately mitigated. The
19 sheer number of conditions and the emphasis on monitoring
20 followed by some vague future mitigation if this doesn't
21 work, does not really breed confidence that the adverse
22 impacts can actually be avoided.

23 Third, cumulative impacts and the need for
24 programmatic EIS. FERC continues to take a limited view of
25 cumulative impacts. While acknowledging ten planned

1 proposed or existing FERC-related natural gas transmission
2 projects in the region, FERC limits consideration of
3 cumulative impacts only to segments within ten miles of the
4 Rover Project. FERC should instead be considering the broad
5 impacts of the numerous projects that are emanating from the
6 Marcellus Shale Region, many of them duplicative. We would
7 note that the Council of Environment Equality recommended
8 the use of a programmatic EIS when several energy
9 development programs proposed in the same region of the
10 country has similar proposed methods of implementation and
11 similar best practices and mitigation measures that can be
12 analyzed in the same document.

13 Fourth, the lack of public convenience and
14 necessity. You've already heard comments tonight about
15 Rover being essentially a producer-driven project with
16 little demonstrated market pull. In many cases, the
17 producers are financially questionable and may not have the
18 financial strength to comply with their twenty-year
19 commitments. The market for natural gas appears to be
20 diminishing in Michigan in particular and the U.S.
21 Department of Energy in 2015 stated that only fifty percent
22 of current U.S. Pipeline capacity is being used and better
23 utilization could reduce the need for new pipelines.

24 Finally, FERC's issuance of a Certificate of
25 Public Convenience and necessity is supposedly based on

1 balancing of public benefits versus possible adverse
2 impacts. We should not be putting the safety, economic
3 value and environmental health of local property owners and
4 communities against pipeline projects which are neither
5 viable or needed. Thank you.

6 (Applause)

7 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number twenty-two is Katie
8 Johnson.

9 MS. JOHNSON: Good evening, Cody and Christine.
10 Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Thank you also to
11 the committee for preparing such a thorough study. My name
12 is Katie Johnson and I live in Pinkney, Michigan. The E.T.
13 Rover Pipeline is scheduled to be installed right next to my
14 house. Our house is located in the incineration zone.

15 In my comment tonight I won't dwell on how the
16 pipeline is expected to negatively impact the habitats of
17 our ecosystem, or how it is going to come within fifty feet
18 of fifty-five residences or how Rover is now a neighbor of
19 mine. What I would like to state tonight is how the
20 Environmental Impact Study showed me how grossly misaligned
21 the E.T. Rover Pipeline project is with the mission and
22 goals of FERC.

23 The mission of FERC is to assist consumers in the
24 obtaining reliable, efficient and sustainable energy
25 services at a reasonable cost through appropriate regulatory

1 and market means. To achieve this mission, FERC pursues the
2 goal of promoting safe, reliable, secure and efficient
3 infrastructure. After reading the Environmental Impact
4 Statement it is clear to me that construction of the E.T.
5 Rover Pipeline is not a reasonable cost nor is it an
6 efficient infrastructure decision. My neighbors in the
7 audience have testified to the enumerable risks of the
8 project that jeopardize the safety of Michigan residents.

9 In a similar vein, I would like to emphasize the
10 risk of groundwater pollution and the unsatisfactory
11 response by Rover to mitigate this risk. The Environmental
12 Impact Study states along the twelve thousand acres impacted
13 by construction one hundred and nineteen public or private
14 water supply wells, mine being one of them are within one
15 hundred and fifty feet of the Rover Project. The study
16 indicates that Rover has agreed to perform pre and post
17 construction monitoring for well yield and water quality but
18 how will these reviews be conducted? How often. At what
19 cost and to whom? As a resident whose well is within range
20 I would like more information on how this monitoring will be
21 conducted in order to feel safe.

22 Lastly, FERC's responsibility is to provide for
23 an efficient infrastructure. As a consumer of natural
24 resources, I would appreciate respect to this goal. Rover
25 has asserted that the objective of this pipeline is to

1 deliver natural gas to the U.S. Consumer and has stated
2 existing pipeline routes do not adequately satisfy this
3 objective. The EIS affirms that Rover cannot achieve their
4 goal of delivering natural gas to consumers through
5 alternative routes. I would ask FERC to challenge this
6 statement.

7 As stated by previous commentators, Marcellus and
8 Utica Gas are already being transported to markets in
9 Michigan, Canada and the Gulf through existing pipelines
10 such as Nexus and Vector. Moreover, a department of Energy
11 study found that average natural gas pipeline utilization
12 between 1998 and 2003 was only fifty-four percent. So not
13 only is there existing infrastructure but on average that
14 infrastructure is only used at about fifty percent capacity.

15 DTE and Consumers Energy forecast a 0.2 percent
16 annual decrease in electric sales until 2026. With the
17 demand for natural gas on the decline combined with the
18 existence of under-utilized, preexisting infrastructure the
19 Rover Pipeline does not align with FERC's mission and goals.
20 Many commentators tonight have emphasized the need for jobs
21 or the positive economic impacts but I emphasize, although
22 important, these impacts are temporary. It does not make
23 sense to make a pipeline that is half as tall as I am which
24 will remain buried in the ground for over sixty years just
25 for a temporary gain. Disrupting our community, risking the

1 safety of our residents and damage to the environment to
2 create a pipeline that will only be utilized half of the
3 time to deliver into an every declining market for gas is
4 not a responsible use of our resources and FERC's time.

5 As one of our last lines of defense against
6 unnecessary intrusion to our rights as private citizens, I
7 implore FERC not to let market forces and popular opinion
8 permanently decide the fate of so many here in Michigan.
9 Please explore these questions in alignment with your
10 mission when making your decision, thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number twenty-three is John
13 Ford.

14 MR. FORD: First of all I want to thank you all
15 for having us here tonight. My name is John Ford and the
16 E.T. Rover Pipeline is coming across my property in
17 Manchester Township. I have done some research on the E.T.
18 Rover and Nexus Pipelines and I found that one or both of
19 these pipelines are under-subscribed with gas shippers at
20 this time. Will these pipelines ever be used? As previous
21 speakers have said, there doesn't seem to be the opportunity
22 for the gas to be used. Why do we need to put in pipelines?

23 It is my opinion that only one pipeline is needed
24 in Michigan if any, and why are we pursuing two? With the
25 recent public safety failures in Flint Michigan of the EPA

1 and MDEQ, I have great concerns that FERC is putting
2 corporate money over public safety and the concerns of
3 citizens. I am not in favor of either of these pipelines
4 and I will yield my remaining time to the next speaker.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker twenty-four is Laura Mebert.

7 DR. MEBERT: Good evening. Can you hear me well?

8 MR. BOWMAN: Yes.

9 DR. MAYBERT: My name is Dr. Laura Mebert. I am
10 an assistant Professor of Social Science at Kettering
11 University. I have five concerns about Rover that are not
12 adequately addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact
13 Statement, some of which have been touched on previously but
14 which I would like to elaborate on.

15 First, I would like to reiterate the point that
16 there is no market need for Rover in Michigan. I am
17 concerned that within the Draft EIS Rover's claims about
18 future natural gas demand in Michigan rely on outdated
19 statistics to make its case for a market segment pipeline
20 north of Defiance, Ohio. As noted by one of the previous
21 speakers, some of the statistics cited are over nine years
22 old and there outdated numbers greatly overstate the need
23 for natural gas in Michigan. Current statistics show that
24 electric and gas use in Michigan are actually declining and
25 are predicted to continue to decline. The same holds true by

1 the way for Ontario which would be the destination for most
2 of the gas transported by Rover. Furthermore, the
3 mid-continent independent system operator counts storage as
4 another form of pipeline capacity. Michigan has the largest
5 gas storage capacity in the U.S. Which negates the need for
6 any backup for peak demand. So in short, there is no
7 credible evidence of demand-driven need for Rover in
8 Michigan or Ontario. Second, moreover there is no need for
9 Rover due to the abundance of alternatives as have already
10 been eluded to. The proposed Rover and Nexus Pipelines
11 follow almost the exact same route. They are part of a
12 wider spider-webbing of new natural gas pipeline projects
13 that are crisscrossing our country on the heels of the
14 fracking boom.

15 FERC has a responsibility to consider the
16 cumulative, net implications of all these new pipelines
17 together. Kelsey Warren, the CEO of Energy Transfer
18 partners recently claimed on a call with investors that the
19 natural gas pipeline industry was, in his words,
20 overbuilding. His claim is supported by the assessments of
21 industry analysts and constituents who suggest that neither
22 Rover nor Nexus is needed.

23 FERC must rationalize Nexus, Rover and all other
24 pipelines being considered. A 2015 Department of Energy
25 Report, and I believe this is the same statistic cited by

1 other commentators found that only 54% of current pipeline
2 capacity is being used, so rational, common sense use of
3 existing gas pipelines through better capacity usage,
4 increased pressurization, partnering and so forth can meet
5 the needs of the target markets without any need for Rover.

6 Third, so therefore Rover's reason for wanting to
7 build a pipeline is, in my view, inadequate. As noted by
8 earlier commenters this is a supplier-driven pipeline rather
9 than one that is driven by market demand for natural gas.
10 Natural gas markets globally are being flooded because of
11 the proliferation of fracking around the world. There is
12 insufficient market demand to justify Rover. To cite FERC's
13 own criteria there is no public convenience or necessity for
14 Rover.

15 Additionally, I am concerned about the financial
16 ability of Rover and its shippers to actually make use of
17 the pipeline once it is constructed. Travers, which is
18 privately held and owns a thirty-five percent stake in Rover
19 is in financial trouble as is Rover's anchor producer
20 shipper and as are most of its other producer shippers many
21 of whom have had their credit ratings downgraded recently.

22 Many of these companies will not be able to be
23 financially strong enough to comply with 20-year
24 commitments. FERC has a responsibility to ensure that if it
25 gives Rover the green light to begin digging up people's

1 land to lay pipelines that there is a very good reason for
2 it. A very clear need for it and credible evidence that the
3 project will be financially sound enough for the pipeline to
4 be fully used.

5 There is good reason to believe that Rover and
6 its suppliers may be too financially shaky to see this
7 project through so therefore Rover should be required to
8 reveal the actual names of all their suppliers in order to
9 ensure transparency and to allow FERC to determine if Rover
10 shippers really meet minimum financial requirements.

11 Fifth and finally, the department of energy
12 reports that few new natural gas pipelines are needed to
13 fulfill the Nation's Clean Power Plan. President Obama has
14 also made it clear that the Federal Energy Policy needs to
15 take climate change impacts into consideration. Rover's
16 estimated greenhouse gas emissions are expected to be the
17 same as the Keystone XL Pipeline that the Obama
18 Administration rejected last fall. FERC has a
19 responsibility to include consideration of environmental
20 impacts, due to climate change in its environmental
21 assessment of the project. Thank you very much.

22 (Appause.)

23 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker twenty-five is William
24 Blaine.

25 MR. BLAINE: I didn't come here tonight with

1 plans on speaking but I'm not going to go at this at an
2 environmental impact but the impact on the people. It makes
3 me sick to my stomach that this country and the people in
4 this country allow a private company to just come in and
5 steal my property. They're stealing my property and their
6 telling me what they're going to pay me for my property but
7 I continue to have to pay the property taxes on the piece of
8 property that I can't do what I want with. It makes me sick
9 to my stomach and it should make everybody in here,
10 everybody in here that agrees with this project, I guarantee
11 you, you do not have this pipeline coming through your
12 property.

13 (Applause.)

14 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker twenty-six is Bryan Dever.

15 MR. DEVER: Hello, my name is Bryan Dever. I
16 appreciate you letting us have some time here to speak with
17 you all. First off, I'm not a scientist, I'm not a lawyer
18 and I've always heard a lot of reports. I got the report in
19 a CD and my computer crashed. I don't even know what it
20 says to be honest with you. When I talked to Rover I asked
21 for simple answers. I haven't got any. I either get
22 ignored and no answer, I get conflicting answers or I get
23 something the size of a phone book.

24 This is a company that may treat politicians
25 great, unions great. I can tell you they crap all over

1 homeowners. We've been lied to, we've been threatened,
2 we've been sued, we've been trespassed against. Please do
3 not grant a company like this eminent domain to steal our
4 property. I can't tell you what the environmental impact is
5 going to be. I can tell you that my wife and I own ten
6 acres in Lima Township. We bought it because of its beauty.
7 We bought it because of hundred foot trees in the back and a
8 pond that will be gone.

9 They use words like restore. I want to see the
10 size of the truck that's going to transplant a hundred foot
11 tree. I'm in construction and I do remodeling. I can tell
12 you that what we build now as far as energy efficient homes,
13 whether we are remodeling or building, we are using more
14 efficient insulation. We are using more efficient
15 mechanicals, furnaces, hot water heaters. We're using
16 alternative energy. It stands to reason we are going to
17 need less gas, not more. Less gas. When your furnace is
18 ninety-seven percent efficient instead of eighty, it stands
19 to reason we need less.

20 We have a company that has lied to us homeowners
21 and how learning tonight that they've basically lied to you.
22 They are using outdated data to prove their necessity. I
23 don't know how to fight it. I know how to swing a hammer.
24 I don't know how to fight these people. We can only rely on
25 you. We can rely on you to stop this madness. Thank you.

1 (Applause.)

2 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number twenty-seven is Kathy
3 Shoan.

4 MS. SHOAN: My name is Kathy Shoan. Well,
5 William Blaine, I did not intend to speak either. When
6 reviewing the comments tonight from chemists, contractors,
7 pipeline installers, electricians, etc., please take into
8 consideration for them it's their livelihood and it's all
9 about jobs. I wonder how much they really looked at the
10 environmental impact of the rover pipeline. I think you
11 need to consider that. Jobs are a wonderful thing. I know
12 why they're here but how about putting all of these people
13 to work by fixing the decrepit infrastructure that we have
14 in Michigan?

15 (Applause.)

16 Heck, I think we can just send them all to Flint.
17 Demand for natural gas is decreasing. We've heard it over
18 and over. Frank Zaski spoke so well to that and I would
19 like to give him a few of my minutes because I really don't
20 like being up here. I agree with I think it was Patricia
21 the landowner. It's just an overwhelming thing if you're
22 just a little person in a big old fishbowl trying to fight
23 this.

24 I would like to bring up my concern about clean,
25 natural gas. I don't know. I think it's a misnomer. I do

1 know the front end process really worries me. Hydraulic
2 fracturing or fracking is environmentally degrading. We see
3 contamination of groundwater and if we're in Michigan, we
4 live here, I'm born and bred. If Michigan is anything, it's
5 groundwater. We're surrounded by the Great Lakes. This gas
6 is coming from the Utica and Marcellus Shale Field. People
7 out there are being destroyed by the process so I really
8 think that we need to look at how we're getting this "clean,
9 natural gas".

10 They use carcinogenic chemicals that they are not
11 required to report under the Clean Water Act. We see an
12 increase in earthquakes, Oklahoma. They used to be at the
13 bottom of the list for earthquakes. Now per land mass I
14 believe they exceed California. What's the difference here?
15 It's fracking. Fracturing for natural gas. They have more
16 than one earthquake every day. I have friends that live in
17 Oklahoma. It's shaken them to their roots.

18 I worry about the release of methane from
19 fracking. I worry about climate change. By building
20 pipelines to Canada and the Rover takes it down to Texas to
21 liquefy it and ship it out of the country. Why are we doing
22 this? It's not even intended for Michigan. So please look
23 at all of these people. They want to be put to work. They
24 want jobs. You know you really need to screw it nice.
25 Who's making comments? I do thank you for your time. I

1 pity the landowners.

2 How many landowners are here tonight? You know,
3 I think I am towards the last speaker. It's intimidating
4 coming up here. These people out here, they don't feel like
5 they have a voice, like they can be heard and they are just
6 regular old people, just trying to get by and their land's
7 getting taken with eminent domain. It's just not right. My
8 heart breaks for these people. Thank you.

9 (Applause.)

10 MR. BOWMAN: Speaker number twenty-eight is Karl
11 Klement.

12 MR. KLEMENT: Good evening. The good thing about
13 being towards the end, most of my points have already been
14 taken up but there's two things that were never mentioned.
15 One is, the pipeline informed planning alliance recommends
16 for this, I'm talking referring to the market portion of the
17 pipeline, recommends a thousand foot setback from buildings
18 and structures. Yet, FERC and the DEIS is allowing fifty
19 feet in some places. My home in particular, a hundred and
20 twenty-five plus or minus a foot or so. How can you allow
21 them when their own industry is suggesting to keep it back a
22 thousand feet? How can you allow them to bring it closer to
23 the homes?

24 My second point, infrasonic low frequency noise.
25 This is the noise generated by the pipe itself 24/7 when

1 it's in operation. FERC knows this exists but yet they are
2 not making pipeline companies do anything about it. Why is
3 that? We live in a quiet area. The only thing that I hear
4 in the evenings when I open my windows in the summer are
5 crickets and frogs. Not the constant rumble of a diesel
6 engine, which is what most people say this approximates to.
7 Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. BOWMAN: Next speaker is Earl Harding.

10 MR. HARDING: I would like to pass on the
11 speaking.

12 MR. BOWMAN: Our thirtieth speaker is Joe
13 Vellardita. Speaker number thirty, Joe Vellardita?

14 (Silence)

15 MR. BOWMAN: Okay, well, that's the last speaker
16 I have signed up to speak so if there's anyone that did not
17 sign up to speak and would like to do so, I would like to
18 offer that opportunity for anyone at this time. And if you
19 would, please do state your name and well it for the record.

20 MR. BENNETT: Sure. My name is Keith Bennett,
21 K-E-I-T-H B-E-N-N-E-T-T. It was mentioned in the speeches
22 here how you may be taking people that have settled with the
23 pipeline as a vote for this thing going through and I can
24 tell you in my case and in probably a lot of my neighbor's,
25 the words eminent domain basically forced us to give up our

1 right to our land and we all feel like we have had it stolen
2 from us. The people that represented us, we have no
3 confidence in them, so our last bastion here because our
4 voices are nil to the vibration of all the jobs and Rover
5 and everything else that you guys here, you don't catch what
6 the landowners are going through.

7 I have neighbors that are getting sick, actually
8 physically ill because of the worry they have, because this
9 is going to go so close to their house, through their
10 property that they bought fifty years ago and planted trees
11 on for retirement. So there's an environmental impact there
12 that's getting overlooked. The beauty that they were going
13 to enjoy is now being taken from them. So I hope you guys
14 consider the landowners. Hopefully you can put some faces
15 and some names to these voices and have that affect your
16 decision. Thank you.

17 (Applause)

18 MR. MCCARTER: Hello, my name is Daniel McCarter.
19 That's D-A-N-I-E-L and then McCarter is spelled
20 M-C-C-A-R-T-E-R. I don't have much to add beyond what has
21 already been said by others who oppose this pipeline, but I
22 would like to reemphasize that this has certain parallels
23 with the Keystone pipeline that was stopped thankfully.
24 This is going to Canada ultimately and it's going to just
25 allow cheap, natural gas to go to Canada. It will also

1 promote fracking which as has already been stated has caused
2 earthquakes, it harms groundwater, it involves methane leaks
3 in many cases and it threatens our climate.

4 I'm not a landowner in the areas that will be
5 effected. I live in Ann Arbor but I know that if I were a
6 landowner I would be very troubled and upset. As far as the
7 jobs that will be created, as has already been said there
8 are plenty of other better ways to create jobs. The Flint
9 water crisis, the need for more mass transit in this
10 country, the need for better infrastructure. I would far
11 prefer to see that as an option to create more jobs. Thank
12 you.

13 (Applause)

14 MR. WILDS: Good evening. My name is Robert
15 Wilds W-I-L-D-S. I'd like to thank the committee for the
16 opportunity to speak this evening. I'm here representing
17 the International Union of Operating Engineers. I have been
18 involved in the pipeline industry for thirty years. I have
19 been sitting back here listening to comments about safety,
20 putting a new pipeline creates safety issues and I hear the
21 same people saying there are already pipelines in,
22 transporting gas. That's old infrastructure. Studies have
23 shown from 2001 to 2012 releases from pipelines have reduced
24 sixty percent. Part of this is due to new infrastructure,
25 pipelines being built, not relying on old infrastructure.

1 Transporting this through old infrastructure compared to
2 new, I would take the new as far as safety.

3 I've heard the comment increase the pressure.
4 Increasing pressure you're compromising the safety of the
5 pipeline right there, when you increase the pressure,
6 especially of an old line. Doesn't it make sense to install
7 a new pipeline that uses the most up-to-date materials and
8 procedures and be a much safer pipeline than an old one? If
9 I had my choice between an old one and a new one, I'd take
10 the new one. I do have pipelines run through my property
11 and a few years ago it was updated from one that was put in
12 1950 and I think four years ago it was put in, it was
13 updated. Definitely a relief for me. With that I'll leave
14 my comments at that. Thank you for the opportunity to
15 speak.

16 (Applause.)

17 MR. WHARAM: My name is Tom Wharam. Spelled
18 T-O-M W-H-A-R-A-M. I live at 8716 Neil Road. When I signed
19 the contract with the Rover Pipeline under coercion of
20 eminent domain, they said that they would not remove the
21 trees. They were going to send them all through a chipper
22 which goes in exact opposite of what is in the FERC
23 agreement appendix G4 page 11 item 14, paragraphs A, B and C
24 that state that the trees essentially, the final usage of
25 the trees is determined by the landowner and I'm kind of

1 curious how FERC is going to resolve the issues when they do
2 not meet what they say.

3 Mike Gray, the representative of E.T. Rover
4 Pipeline stated specifically they would not allow me to keep
5 any of the trees. They were all going to the chipper. It
6 seems like there is one more lie that's being told by E.T.
7 Rover.

8 (Applause)

9 MR. DUECHON: George Duechon. I'm a third
10 generation farmer. I'm a third generation pipeliner. I
11 live here in the state of Michigan and I approve the Rover
12 Pipeline. The integrity of the pipelines we build is far
13 better than anything that was put in the ground fifty, sixty
14 years ago. Environmental impacts are minimal and we need
15 this pipeline to help rebuild the infrastructure people talk
16 about in this state. Our pipelines are failing and we need
17 to replace them and the Rover does that. People not seeing
18 that does not help us, doesn't help our cause, doesn't put
19 food on my table or other people's tables and it doesn't
20 make it safer for the public if we keep old infrastructure
21 in. We need to replace the old with the new and we need to
22 build the Rover Pipeline. Thank you.

23 (Applause.)

24 MR. BOWMAN: Is there anyone else that would like
25 to speak at this time?

1 MR. FORD: My name is John Ford and I was up here
2 earlier and in my research I came across some information
3 that we only have 14 to 20 years of natural gas left in our
4 country. Why are we building fifty-year pipelines? We've
5 already taken the easiest and most cost-effective gas out of
6 the ground and from here on out it's going to get fewer and
7 fewer and more cost is going to be needed.

8 Natural gas is a limited time fuel until we get
9 to renewable energy. Why are we building fifty-year
10 pipelines for twenty years of gas? Or less if we start
11 shipping it overseas.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. LAIER: My name is Don Laier. I'm here to
14 represent Lima Township.

15 MR. BOWMAN: Could you spell that last name?

16 MR. LAIER: Laier, L-A-I-E-R. The problem I have
17 with Rover LLC is they're very bad at communicating with our
18 Township. We've had Enbridge come through our township.
19 They come up front, told us what they're going to offer the
20 Township for all damages during the construction and wear
21 and tear on our roads. Another thing, Rover is scared to
22 death of Washtenaw County Road Commission. They will not
23 step up to the plate, give our township any commitments to
24 what's going to happen.

25 Another thing that really sucks is we come up

1 here, I'm a landowner, they're going right through the
2 middle of my farm, I'm up here bitching at you and all of
3 these idiots here from the union are up here and they're
4 getting paid for that by Rover. Now why aren't we getting
5 paid for that? Another thing, these people that we're
6 dealing with, they are a bunch of liars and I've made an
7 offer, a counteroffer to Rover in December. They accepted
8 it. A few days later, they called up and said "Sorry, we've
9 made a mistake. We can't honor that." Now I do not feel
10 that is doing justice to the American people. That's about
11 all I got to say.

12 (Applause.)

13 MR. BOWMAN: Anyone else at this time. Well if
14 not, the formal part of this meeting will close. I will
15 quickly mention the FERC's website within the FERC website
16 at FERC.GOV there is a link called e-library and within that
17 link you can find everything related to Rover and its
18 affiliate projects using the three docket numbers that are
19 CP15-93, CP15-94 and CP15-96. Those numbers are also in the
20 informational pamphlets outside of the sign-in table.

21 Using those docket numbers you can gain all the
22 filings associated with the Project, filings by the
23 applicants, comments by individuals, and issuances by the
24 FERC. So on behalf of the FERC, thank you for coming here
25 tonight. Let the record show that the meeting closed at

1 8:03p.m.

2 (Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 8:03

3 p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25