20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

- - - - - - - - - - - - - x

CONSTITUTION PIPELINE : Docket No. PF12-9-000

PROJECT :

- - - - - - - - - - - - - x

September 24, 2012

Afton High School Auditorium

29 Academy Street

Afton, New York 13730

Monday, September 24, 2012

The scoping meeting convened, pursuant to notice, at 7:00 p.m., before a Staff Panel:

KARA HARRIS, Environmental Scientist

KEVIN BOWMAN, Deputy Project Manager

with DOUGLAS MOONEYHAN, Cardno ENTRIX

P R O C E E D I N G S

6:00 p.m.

MS. HARRIS: We're going to go ahead and get started. So if you would please, find your seats. Again, real quick. If you wish to speak tonight and you haven't signed the speaker's list, it's on the table in the hallway. Please feel free to sign up.

On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, I would like to welcome you here tonight to the public scoping meeting for the Constitution Pipeline Project. I am Kara Harris, and I'm an environmental scientist in FERC's Office of Energy Projects.

Charlie Brown, the FERC's Environmental Project Manager for the Constitution Pipeline Project, is recovering from surgery and is unable to attend. Here with me tonight from FERC is Kevin Bowman, to my left, the deputy project manager for the project. Tamara Young-Allen with the FERC's Office of External Affairs is also here in the back.

Shahid Anis with OEP, Pamela Romano with FERC's Office of Division Pipeline Certificates is also in attendance in the back. We have with us Doug Mooneyhan to my right, and Lavinia DiSanto in the back from Cardno Entrix, FERC's environmental third party consultants, who will assist us with the development of the environmental document.

Before we get started, please turn off or silence your cell phones. Thank you. We are here tonight to provide some information on the federal process in relation to the proposed Constitution Pipeline Project, and to hear your comments and concerns.

Fundamentally, the purpose of tonight's meeting is to provide each of you with an opportunity to give us your comments, and to tell us what additional environmental issues you think we should address in our analysis of the proposed project. We've already received numerous comments concerning the project, including some suggestions for alternative, for additional alternatives.

Based on comments already received, FERC has requested that Constitution analyze at least two major alternative routes. We included affects land owners for each of these alternatives on our mailing list for the Notice of Intent, which requested comments and announced tonight's meeting.

Your input on these alternatives is one of the things we are hoping to hear tonight. The FERC staff's environmental analysis will result in the production of an Environmental Impact Statement or EIS.

The FERC is the lead federal agency responsible for the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA review of the Constitution Pipeline Project, and the lead agency for

the preparation of the EIS. NEPA requires FERC to analyze the environmental impacts, consider alternatives, and provide appropriate mitigation measures on proposed projects.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Transportation and New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets are currently cooperating agencies. Additional federal, state and local agencies with special expertise are welcome to cooperate as well.

I'd like to take a few moments to further explain the purpose of tonight's public meeting. I'd like to clarify that the proposed project was not conceived by and is not promoted by the FERC or the cooperating agencies. FERC reviews applications for the authority to build and operate interstate natural gas pipelines, and Constitution Pipeline is in the process of preparing an application to submit to FERC.

Once the application is submitted, our obligation is to review that application and prepare an analysis of the environmental impacts. I'd like to point out that FERC does not regulate local natural gas distribution pipelines or natural gas production facilities.

The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation is responsible for the regulation and oversight of local natural gas production facilities. The New York

State Public Service Commission is responsible for the regulation and oversight of natural gas pipeline distribution facilities.

In Pennsylvania, these facilities are overseen by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection. Although we recognize that you may have concerns regarding the production and local distribution of natural gas in Pennsylvania and New York State, FERC has no regulatory authority over these activities, and comments regarding the siting and permitting are best directed to the agencies I just mentioned.

Tonight's meeting is not a public hearing. We are not here to debate the proposal, or to make any determinations on its fate. We are hear to listen to your comments, so that we can consider them in our analysis.

Pipeline proposals sometimes encounter objections. Some are general in nature and some objections are based on potential environmental and safety impacts. Both categories are important to FERC, but they are addressed in different ways.

General objections to the project would be considered during the Commission's Public Convenience and Necessity Review, whereas environmental and safety impacts are addressed by the FERC environmental staff in our EIS.

In our Notice of Intent or NOI, issued on

September 7th, we requested your comments and assigned a deadline of October 9th. However, the end of scoping -- the scoping period is not the end of the public involvement. We will take comments throughout our review of the project.

But for us to adequately address your concerns and analyze them and research the issues, we ask that you try to get those to us as soon as possible. A speaker's list is located at the table in the hallway, and we will use that list to identify individuals wishing to provide verbal comments tonight on the project.

The order for speakers is as follows: Elected officials will speak first; impacted land owners second; and anyone else who wishes to speak third. In addition to the verbal comments provided tonight, we will also accept your written comments. If you have comments but do not wish to speak tonight, you may provide written comments on the comment forms at the back table. You may drop those off with us or mail them in at a later date. Be sure to include the project docket number, PF 12-9.

The Constitution Pipeline Project is currently in our pre-filing process. That is, an application has not been filed at FERC. We consider the pre-filing process to be, among other things, an extension of our scoping process. The scoping process is a learning process. It is where we educate ourselves about the project and the potential

issues.

During the scoping process, we are gathering information. The four general sources that we are using right now are information provided by the Applicant, input from other federal, state and local agencies, our own field work and research of different issues, and the information provided by the public.

Once we gather the information developed during the scoping process and the application is formally filed by the Applicant, we will analyze it and we will prepare a draft Environmental Impact Statement or draft EIS, that will be distributed for comments.

There are two general ways that you can get a copy of the draft EIS. First of all, if you received the Notice of Intent that we sent out, you are already on our mailing list, and will receive a copy of the draft EIS. Secondly, you can fill out the mailing list form at the back table. Please print your name and address, and we will add you to the mailing list.

If you do not do one of these two things, we won't be able to send you a copy of the draft EIS. The mailed version of the draft will be a CD. If you prefer to have a hard copy mailed to you, please indicate that choice on the return mailer included in the NOI.

After the draft EIS is issued, there will be a 45

day public comment period. During that period, we will hold another public meeting similar in format to this one. We will probably come back here to the same facility, if it is available, and ask you to comment on the information provided in the draft EIS.

At the end of the 45 day public comment period, we will begin organizing all the information gathered to date and prepare the final EIS. Once we have issued the final EIS, it is forwarded to our commissioners. The EIS is not the decision-making document. Our five Commissioners at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will use that document, as well as other information, to make a determination on whether or not to grant an authorization for this project.

Next, we will have Cindy Ivey from Constitution give a short presentation on the proposed project.

MS. IVEY: Good evening. Can you hear me? Can you hear me now? Great. Good evening. As Kara said, my name is Cindy Ivey. I'm the Manager of Public Outreach for the Constitution Pipeline Company, which is a joint venture between two natural gas companies, Williams and Cabot Oil and Gas.

In addition to being the majority owner of the pipeline, Williams will be responsible for permitting, constructing and operating the Constitution Pipeline. The

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

proposed 121-mile, 30- inch pipeline is being designed with a capacity to transport 650,000 decotherms of natural gas per day from the production area in northeastern Pennsylvania to well-developed, large domestic markets in New England and New York City.

The capacity that will be transported in this pipeline is the equivalent to serving the energy needs of approximately three million homes per day. The proposed primary route would start adjacent to an existing compressor station in Susquehanna, Pennsylvania, and extend approximately 121 miles across parts of the Broome, Chenango, Delaware and Schoharie counties in New York, and ending at an existing compressor station in Schoharie County, New York.

The company is currently examining a 600-foot wide study corridor, and has asked for survey permission from land owners along this primary route. The 600-foot wide survey corridor allows the company flexibility to make informed decisions regarding the potential location of the proposed facilities.

The company is also studying more than 15 route alternatives, and based on input from stakeholders and agencies, has adopted Alternatives A, B, L and Q into its primary route. Five open houses for the primary route, one for each county, were held in July.

Along with the primary route and several variations, the company is also studying a 80 plus mile major route alternative, referred to as "Alternative Route M," which would route the pipeline closer to Interstate 88. The alternative was developed in response to numerous comments from stakeholders.

The first 45 miles of this alternate would be the same as the primary route, and would potentially affect a different set of land owners who are located closer to Interstate 88 in Chenango, Oswego, Delaware and Schoharie Counties. This alternate would be approximately 127 miles, and would terminate at the same location in Schoharie County as the primary route.

Two open houses for Alternate Route M were held in the area on September 12th and 13th. In addition to the 121 miles of pipeline, the Constitution Project proposal also includes a new 32,000 horsepower compressor facility that would be located in Schoharie County, New York, to receipt metering stations in Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania, and two delivery metering stations in Schoharie County, New York.

Williams proposes to meet or exceed all federal regulations established by the pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, for construction and operation of this project. We are developing an integrity

management plan that focuses on prevention first and foremost, followed by detection and mitigation.

Since 2002, Williams has invested more than one billion dollars in our existing pipelines on maintenance and integrity-related enhancements since 2002. The pipeline compressor station and meter stations are being designed for safety and security measures. A local full-time staff of highly trained individuals would operate, monitor and maintain the pipeline and its facilities.

In addition, the pipeline would be remotely monitored 24 hours a day, seven days a week from Williams Gas Control Central in Houston. Constitution entered the pre-filing process in April of 2012, and filed first drafts of Resource Report 1, which covers the scope of the project, and Resource Report 10, which gives an overview of the company's alternatives analysis in May of 2012.

We plan to file additional drafts of all required resource reports, that's 1 through 12, in November, followed by the formal, filing of our formal 7(c) application in early 2013. Should the project receive approval, the company is targeting a March 31st, 2015 in-service date. Thank you.

MS. HARRIS: Thanks, Cindy. If time allows, after the formal meeting is adjourned, representatives from Constitution will be available with project maps, to answer

questions about the project. Since we have so many people in attendance tonight and signed up to speak, I'm going to go ahead and set the ground rules early.

This meeting is being recorded by a transcription service. So all your comments will be transcribed and placed into the public record. For the benefit of all in attendance and for accuracy of the transcript, when your name is called, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name and affiliation, if any.

You might spell your name for the court reporter if misspelling is likely. Also, please speak directly into the microphone, so that you can be clearly heard by the reporter, the panel and the audience. And just to point out, there are recording devices on the podium. So you should speak towards us, so that you are clearly recorded for the transcriber.

Tonight's meeting is scheduled to end at ten o'clock. We have about 40 people signed up to speak. That gives each person approximately four minutes to provide comments. We do not want to limit anyone's comments, but to get through all the speakers, we will have to set a time frame. Please keep in mind that applause will also reduce the time we have for speakers.

If you have detailed comments, we ask that you would summarize the comments at the podium tonight, and then

give us the full written comments at the table where you came in. Also, if you are a speaker and you feel that your comments were previously expressed, you can simply state your name and your endorsement of those previous comments.

I also want to make sure that we conduct this meeting in a professional decorum. We're here to hear from each of you, and hear your comments on the project, respect each speaker as they provide their comments, whether you agree with them or not. Thank you for your consideration.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Okay. We're going to start with the public officials first. Could Randy Williams with the Town of Windsor please come forward?

MR. WILLIAMS: Good evening. Randy Williams, Town of Windsor Supervisor. I'm here to show support for the Constitution Pipeline Project here tonight. The one item, though, that I wish that you could find to incorporate in your final documents is a road use agreement.

It was nice to hear Cindy talk about following the federal regulations, but we just finished a 9.4 mile project with Williams in the Town of Windsor, along with a compressor station, and we do have a road use agreement in place with Williams for that project.

So I would ask that we have a similar agreement in place for the Constitution Pipeline. And again, I believe that the natural gas is going to be the way of the

future. Certainly in this area, we already see the benefits in Windsor with the assessments and the taxes that the pipelines are paying, and we are working on running natural gas throughout the Village of Windsor, which will certainly be a positive for our community. So again, I am here to support the project. Thank you much.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Mr. Isiah Sutton with Chenango County.

MR. SUTTON: Good evening. My name is Isaiah Sutton. I'm the Director of Environmental Health for Chenango County. I've been asked by the Village of Afton to come tonight, to make the Commission aware that the pipeline runs, by my calculation, about 1,000 feet a mile point 36 and 37, of the Village's primary water source.

The Village of Afton is serviced by a collection, a series of spring basins, seven of them, that are located about four and a half miles from here, south on Route 41. They're called Valonia Springs, delineated on most maps.

That water source is a series of fairly shallow cachements that are specifically sensitive to surface activity, changes in drainage, any I know blasting that may be involved. I'm not sure all that's involved in putting in a pipeline, but definitely a growth concern.

Additionally, if the pipeline is re-routed along

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

Route 88, the Village has service pipeline that serves from those springs, that is in excess of 107 years old. That pipeline is hard to work on. So if changes need to be made, that pipe needs to be removed. Extensive work could need to be done in that area. Thank you for your time.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Okay. Now we'll move to directly impacted land owners. We'll start with Mr. Chris Erickson. Sorry, Mrs. Chris Erickson.

MS. ECKERSON: Hi. My name is Christine Eckerson, E-C-K-E-R-S-O-N. I live at 671 Prosser Hollow Road in Davenport, New York. I understand that you want to focus on environmental issues, so I guess I'll just go right past the fact that if you go through the property, as the alternate and as originally proposed, that it would financially cripple us, cause us to abandon our ideas, which we were beginning for a non-profit agency, and which we were looking forward to doing full-time, because that renewable micro enterprise, as we were going to use on our property, would be wiped clean when they clear the property or the portion of the property for the pipeline.

So once that's disturbed, all of that and everything we've looked forward to for 50-some odd years is going to go away. But in any case, another thing is that one of our neighbors, who's lived in the area all the time,

says that he has found throughout the years Indian artifacts on the mountain, and I'm not sure how important that's going to be to you either.

I do want to let you know, though, that the property that I live on is very wet, is very shallow, has jutting large rocks and a number of springs on the property. One spring needs to be accessible to the neighbors of the property for drinking water. We also have all around our property federal wetlands that are designed, and I'm not sure if any are designated on my property.

All of this is hodge-podged together. A lot of things I found this morning, because we didn't have a lot of time to get this together, and you're only allowing us until October 9th. More time would be better. I don't even understand the process of how they're working with compensating us one time, versus the way I was going to use the land over the years, versus eminent domain, and we haven't had a chance to even find any information. So everything's being very rushed for us.

But our ground is very spongy. Some areas, when you use a light vehicle, will cause water to spring up and run. Then in those tire tracks, it tends to then run straight all the top soil down to bedrock, and then we have runoff from there. We have water that comes in from all three sides, the top of the hill and two sides as we go down

the hill from our neighbors.

All come onto our property, and seem to form a swamp at the bottom of the property. Every time we use, like I said, our utility vehicle, it does create streams and runoff, and even when we walk. So most of the time we do walk. We're afraid if the pipeline starts construction there, that it will disturb the springs, especially with the blasting, and everything will change. The deforestation of the property will change the land forever.

We believe that the springs, the outcroppings, the bushes, the trees, everything keeps the top soil in place and provides an area for all the wildlife that is there. We are afraid that this property is so delicate an ecosystem that if anything is disturbed, that we may lose the species that have been on the property.

We have heard of large cat species on the property. We have personally seen several different types of woodpeckers, hawks. We can hear owls at night. We have seen many species of reptiles, birds, insects, mammals and some of these, we're not professionals, but may be endangered species. We don't know.

This year was very dry, and we were very, very packed with a lot of wild animals. We feel they come there because there is still water, even though there's not water elsewhere. The leaves have fallen off of some of the trees

in the area this summer due to the dry weather, yet our area was still wet.

We're worried that this habitat is in danger. We don't understand why the pipeline was routed. It kinds of hooks up to our property, where it is steep, craggy, all of these things, and it's very -- everything is very critically placed and holds everything in place, and we are very afraid that this environmentally critical piece of land is going to be destroyed.

Keeping it intact allows the usage of the springs. It allows the people to come onto our property to use the springs also. It supports all the wildlife. I'm sure there must be a more stable area that you can find, that isn't as steep, wet or you know, supportive of these animals, that would be easier to place the pipeline.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MS. ECKERSON: You're welcome.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Arthur Langer.

MR. WAGNER: Good evening. Arthur Wagner, land owner, on 63 Cliff Road, Windsor, New York. I want to endorse prior comments that I have sent to FERC through the Internet, and I will also be submitting additional comments, and I won't get into specifics on the environmental impact.

But there are four land owners with approximately 1,000 contiguous acres that would be affected by Alternate

B, which was the initial plan. We've been asked to comment on other alternates. Excuse me, it was Alternate A.

Alternate B is the first time I saw the maps for this evening, so it is difficult to make comments and suggestions on other alternates. But we will be working together, four land owners with those acres from the original plan, to ensure that the pipeline moves to another area.

I'm also recommending that other land owners get together to work as a group, to ensure that they have a satisfactory resolution for the pipeline. We also work as a Windsor Coalition in Warden (ph), and I would recommend that FERC and Constitution work with the Windsor Coalition to ensure that the issues with the pipeline are resolved satisfactorily for as many land owners as possible.

The Windsor Coalition is working for land owners that want the pipeline, and land owners that don't want the pipeline. They know the area, and they're a wealth of knowledge. So that would be my recommendation. Thank you.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Randy Whitbeck.

MR. WHITBECK: My name is Rudy Whitbeck, R-U-D-Y, W-H-I-T-B-E-C-K. I live in Delaware County, and I'm referring to Alternate M. We've lived on our property for 40 years, and I'm a little ill-prepared for this, because we

haven't had a lot of time. That map shows the corridor comes right up, including the road in front of our house, and then it makes a 90 degree turn just past our house.

The corridor includes our driveway, our spring and I suppose I'd like to know if a study can be done, as to how you can legally violate -- this is a violation of my 14th Amendment right to life, liberty and property.

(Applause.)

MR. WHITBECK: Now when you look at where the pipeline is proposed to go, it's straight up a hill. I don't see any way they could do it without blasting, get into the rock, because I've had bulldozers up -- I haven't personally, but bulldozers up there trying to clear trees to do timber, and they just can't move the boulders.

I'd like to have you look at the Title 18 on the Code of CFR, 801.0, that's (a) and (b), and this deals with the Susquehanna River Basin. Now I know that you're talking about environmental impact. Now this has to come across the Oley Outbreak (ph), even to get to where it is on my property. There's got to be runoffs. I don't know what respect this would have, as far as the Susquehanna River Basin, and it definitely has an effect on the water table and the runoff water dealing with that.

I'd like to see in the plan on this 801.5, I'd like to see in the plan where the pipeline is installed,

because according to the information on this CFR, everything has to be planned according to the River Basin Authority. I do have more comments and things that I'm going to submit at a later date, but this is all that I have time for at this time. Thank you.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MOONEYHAN: Anne Stack.

MS. STACK: My name is Anne Stack. It's A-N-N-E, S-T-A-C-K. I am a citizen of the United States of America, and I am also a land owner on Coal Hill Road, and I'm really here speaking in both capacities. I feel that what's going on is an absolute violation of all of our rights as citizens, and more specifically --

(Applause.)

MS. STACK: --as a land owner. Eight years ago, we bought a property on Coal Hill Road, with the dream and the intention of building our retirement home there. In April -- we had been living for the past 16 years in Reno, Nevada. In April, we shipped our belongings east, so that we could come here in August and begin the building process.

We've already scoped out where it's going. We had a septic survey done last fall, and then in May, we got the letter from the unconstitutional pipeline people. So our belongings are in storage. We're living here in a

neighbor's home. It happens to be my brother. He took us in, and we can no longer proceed with our plans, our dream.

The pipeline, the original one, not M, the first one that we are aware of, goes bulls eye through where the septic tank field survey was done. It's also where basically our only access to the property, in terms of development, because we have very limited road access.

So that's my personal dilemma, if you will. But on such a much larger scale, I am so concerned with all of the environmental impacts. If you look at the map and you see where this Constitution Pipeline is proposed to go, dead through an incredibly beautiful, pristine area of the Catskills. It's an absolute violation not only of the human rights, but the rights of all species that have lived here.

(Applause.)

MS. STARK: So there's many things that I will address in writing, my concerns, and that I'd like the scoping to take into place. But one that I would like to address specifically is property values.

Now our property will be rendered worthless in terms of monetary, you know, for us, if this goes through. They said in their frequently-asked questions a little summary, they addressed property values, and they quote "In 2001, a national case study revealed no significant impact on property values or property sales."

What absolute and utter nonsense. Now maybe that was true in 2011, but I believe horizontal fracking, certainly not in Pennsylvania or this region, had been underway back then. So I think that is of absolute vital importance for the scoping investigation, what impact does it have.

I've heard stories about, I think it's national insurance company will insure lands. I've heard stories about, and these are stories, as far as I'm concerned. I don't know if they're validated yet, but how Wells Fargo insures pipeline people but won't insure homeowners. I'm not sure, give mortgages to homeowners who want to build where there's a pipeline. I mean there's just so many environmental disasters.

So I'll wrap it up with that, and just with a plea, as human beings, that you think about the impact on the humans who have lived in this area, and the animals, the birds, and you know, we have such a glut natural gas right now. Look at the destruction in Pennsylvania. Look at those two pictures back there. Just go take a look at them.

It's absolutely heart-wrenching, and it's just the tip of the iceberg of what they do, to the aquifers, to the homes. So thank you for listening, and I pray that you will really hear what the people are asking, to not allow the Constitution pipeline anywhere.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Bob Goellner.

MR. GOELLNER: Good evening. Bob Goellner, 2028 Whitehill Road, Davenport. One thing I would say, it touches on what that young lady said. As far as the environmental impact, it's 121 miles through the forest, 150 wide swath. I mean what more needs to be said? The whole thing is an environmental impact, the entire length of it.

Because it's moving fracking gas, and thanks to natural gas and oil, major contributors to global warming, they're probably, they're obsolete through global warming. We won't need gas anymore. So we certainly don't need another gas line, and we all know where it's going to wind up. It's nonsense. We know it's going to China. We gave them the jobs, and now we're going to give them the fuel to keep the jobs.

(Applause.)

MR. GOELLNER: And again, this more fracking, but that's -- if you're doing the pipeline, you're aiding and abetting the fracking business. I believe it was President Bush and Vice President Cheney, who happens to be one of the big weights of Haliburton, still is, removed the gas and oil companies from clean air and water. I can't imagine why.

They had to be removed from the coverage of the

Clean Air and Water Act, so they could do fracking and run fracking gas, and destroy our properties out of pure greed. That's it. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Barbara Loeffler.

MS. LOEFFLER: Hi, Barbara Loeffler, 1704 Prosser Hollow Road, Town of Davenport. I'm a major land owner in that region. I have 140 acres that will be split asunder, right down the middle. The most useable part of my land will be destroyed from heavy equipment going in. They'll be blasting, which will impact my neighbors.

They're very concerned about their water and they asked me what will happen. I said I don't know what will happen. I just know that trucks will have to go up there. I also have an area very close to the line, where my husband's ashes are interred. A gazebo sits on top of it and he spent 40 years of his life in heavy construction, and I can't envision heavy equipment driving over his final resting place.

This is the place of his dreams, and he didn't live to come here. He died just months before we were going to retire up here. For 30 years of working in the cold and everything else, and he told me we don't own the land. Our job is to take care of the land for the next people that

come along.

If our land is destroyed by this -- this is a desecration across the land that is not necessary for any of us to live. There's nobody -- nobody in this room asked, wrote a letter and said we're desperate for natural gas, and the way it's presenting to us, it's passing through, just coming from Pennsylvania.

I also have a property in Pennsylvania. I'm very familiar with some of the issues that go on there. I don't think there's a person in here that wants to go live in Dimock, Pennsylvania. Is there somebody here wants to live in Dimock, Pennsylvania?

VOICE: No, no.

MS. LOEFFLER: I have talked to people who used to live in Dimock, and they said they lived in a trailer, and they could no longer live there anymore, because the price, because of the pipeline and all the workers that were coming in from elsewhere, it's not employing any of their people, they had to move, because they couldn't pay the new rent.

So I just want to get back to the environmental. Our 140 acres has always been having the hay cut by neighbors and us too. It had an economic impact on me this year because I was going to reintroduce beef cattle. I went to a meeting at Otsego, and the demand in the city areas for

grass-fed beef, which we can supply easily, was very high and would be very profitable, to bring farming back into this area.

I had to cancel my order for the beef cattle, because I'm not going to make an investment in fencing that's going to be ripped out of my prime pasture area. So when they say that it's only going to be a good impact, I don't see a good impact. I see a bad impact.

I had a friend that wanted to come up and retire up here. When she saw all the things that I had spread on my table, she said "You know what? I don't think I want to do this. I'm not going to invest in any land up here. This is kind of scary."

So the economic impact is already, it's not snowballing, but it's there. I know somebody that said no, I'm not going to buy a new washing machine. Maybe I'm selling my house and I'm leaving. So all these little things are going on in people's lives. It has, from the day that letter came, I never swooned, even when they told me I had cancer. I didn't swoon.

But when I saw that map with my property split down the middle, after all the work that my husband put into it, I did. I had to sit down. I couldn't stand up anymore. So I just hope you'll take that into consideration. I have 30 years of my life. I drove a school bus for 30 years, so

that I could keep this place.

I made a decision, after my husband passed, that I would come up here and take care of this land, and I intend to continue taking care of this land.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Giussepe Rudali.

MR. FUDULI: Hi. My name is Giuseppe Fuduli, G-I-U-S-E-P-P-E, F-U-D-U-L-I. I'm a land owner on Coal Hill Road in Juniata, and I'm an immigrant that came to this country 30 years ago. I'm a proud American citizen now, and I worked for the dream.

The dream of working hard for me and my family and my kids, and we had decided eight years ago to buy property up here, to build our dream home in a place that the kids can be in touch with nature and be able to go out and spend time in the woods, and breathe some fresh air, because we don't have that on Long Island, where I live now.

We were able to put a house in, and we spent all our sacrifices and all our money for our future, we put into that home and into this property. When I received that letter, my heart just stopped. I don't know why this needs to be done. To me, it seems like there is plenty of gas around and plenty of supply. The markets show it, that there is a lot more supply than there is demand.

This is totally unnecessary. The only thing it's doing is opening up the area to fracking and to environmental impacts to the nature that we all love, and that we live up here for. Me and my wife's dream would be one day to be able to retire here. That's why we did this, and I don't know.

I don't know where it's going. I see my sacrifices going down the drain. As a matter of fact, this morning I had an appraisal done on my house, because I was in the middle of refinancing, and I happened to have the same appraiser that came seven years ago, when I got my first mortgage on the house.

The value of my house went down, and I said how can it be that this is so much? Well, there is the potential of the pipeline coming around, so we have to take that in consideration when we figure out who we're going to give money to, and take that into consideration in the value of the house.

VOICE: How much has it gone down so far?

MR. FUDULI: Well, from seven years ago, my house has gone down like $100,000 in value. Okay, and I don't know where it's going to go. The pipeline is splitting my property right in half. I own 130 acres up here with the house on it, and it's going through wetlands, it's going through a stream.

There is plenty of wildlife that we're concerned, that we'd love to keep. And also I'm concerned about the health of my family, which is what is my right to protect. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Bob Stack.

MR. STACK: My name is Bob Stack, S-T-A-C-K, and I live on Coal Hill Road, 2536 Coal Hill temporarily, and you already heard from my wife, Anne. She and I share the same opinions and concerns about the destruction of our land, and as she said, we had planned to build a home, a retirement home, and over the last few months this has come in the way.

There are a few other items I'd like to bring up in addition to what she said. One is that in some of the literature that I've read, it talks about this pipeline going through quote-unquote "existing corridors as much as possible." It occurred to me that when this pipeline or if this pipeline goes in, that any new area, any new land that that pipeline goes through suddenly becomes "an existing corridor."

So that means then that any subsequent interstate developments of power line, another gas line, it's going to be all the more easy to bring that in, because again we have

an existing corridor. The bedrock has already been blasted out; the land has been, already been tortured, and so property owners affected by this pipeline are not off the hook, if the one pipeline goes through. They're going to be under the gun forever basically.

The second item I want to bring up is that when FERC evaluates these projects, that they go beyond just a simple dollars and cents engineering studies, how much the land costs on the market, currently how much it's worth, and how much the -- versus how much the pipeline company stands to make, but also to look at something environmentally different, or take a different view of the environment, and look at what value is there to the people who live on this land, who love it and appreciate its beauty and its aesthetic qualities.

These are things that cannot be quantified by engineering studies, in dollars and cents. These are something that can only be held in the hearts of the people who live there. And this is the calculus that these people, the people who live here use. They're not interested in the few thousands of dollars they might get from an easement settlement; they're interested in the beauty of the land and protecting that land, and protecting the beauty.

That's why we came up here to live, and that's why we'll continue to stay and fight for this land. Thank

you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Phil Hulbert.

MR. HULBERT: My name is Phil Hulbert, H-U-L-B-E-R-T. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. My family and I live in East Meredith, New York, and our property has been identified as being included in the pipeline's primary route. We oppose the construction of this pipeline as proposed by the Constitution Pipeline Company.

If in fact it is in the national interest to convey natural gas to New York City and elsewhere in the Northeast, this should be done with minimal disruption to the lives and property of New York citizens. Disturbing 737, 1,530 acres of land for pipeline operation and construction, respectively, is simply not reasonable.

FERC's mailing of September 7th, 2012, specifies topics that will be addressed in the draft Environmental Impact Study, and currently identified environmental issues. I would like to see the EIS address the following aspects of impacts:

1. For all possible alternatives, it's important to address impacts of blasting to homes and other structures including, but not limited to private wells and septic systems. Analysis should include details on the number and

intensity of blasting operations needed to construct the pipeline, minimal setback distances to avoid damage to homes and property structures, and a cumulative assessment of the potential damages due to blasting incurred by the alternative pipeline routes under consideration.

2. For all possible alternatives, analysis of the impacts of pipeline construction and operation on the property values of land parcels of different size, land use and demographics should be conducted. This analysis would speak to the general heading of socioeconomics, which is identified on page five of the September 24 mailing as a topic that will be discussed in the EIS.

A stratified analysis would be desirable, to speak to the variation in property and landowner attributes that would be encountered along the routes under consideration.

3. An analysis of the possible impacts of pipeline construction and operation on property owners' ability to obtain and maintain insurance policies, such as homeowner's insurance, should also be included in the EIS in the area of socioeconomic impact.

Land owners who have never dealt with this scenario before are unsure if they will be able to obtain such insurance policies, and at what cost difference, if any, compared to their current no pipeline situation.

Finally, as an avid fisherman, I would like to point out that recreational fishing opportunities abound within the portions of New York that may be affected by pipeline construction and operation. The EIS should address the individual and cumulative environmental impacts to the bodies of fresh water that would be crossed by the various alternative routes.

These impacts should be assessed based on the construction techniques that are under consideration. For example, would impacts differ if an open trench concept is used to cross bodies of water, as compared to installation underneath the water via drilling in a horizontal direction. The removal of riparian vegetation due to clear-cutting the construction corridor and associated sedimentation are key elements of this assessment, that need to be thoroughly studied and objectively reported. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: William Turick.

MR. TURICK: William Turick, T-U-R-I-C-K. I'm a resident of East Meredith and most of my property is in Davenport. I'd like to thank FERC for the opportunity to have input into the EIS. I'm an affected land owner.

We oppose the construction of the Constitution pipeline. The pipeline will run across 1,000 feet of our

property, and be about 300 feet from our house. Since there is no federal setback, it could be 15 feet from the house.

We do have some issues we would like FERC to address. Issue number one is impacts from blasting in solid bedrock covered only -by a thin layer of soil can affect our water supplies. General observations: There will be disruptions to the underground water channels, since an open trench construction method is to be used. The pipeline can negatively impact the water supply and quality, rendering to land owners water unfit to drink.

We would request from FERC to study effects of blasting on disturbances to water channels and the bedrock foundation, cretinous and seismatic activity resulting from the blasting operations.

Issue number two is effects on flooding from trenching and clear-cutting of forests along steep terrains. General observations: There is likely to be an increase in flooding because of the proposed 125 feet-wide construction corridor.

There are several areas along pipeline slopes that are greater than 30 percent. On our property, the pipeline will drop down one quarter of a mile at more than 30 percent. There will be extensive deforestation with the removal of hundreds of thousands of trees, that will wind up being cut down along this route.

There will be an increase in erosion. There is a threat to the pipeline, since it will not be buried deep enough in rock areas. We request the FERC study the effects of surface disturbance on forest floor and steep terrain, from the removal of top soil, trees, brush and rock walls, and increased flooding.

How much of the soil cover on top of the pipeline is likely to wash away in a heavy rain, leaving the pipeline exposed and unprotected? The erosion problems and landslides, impact on atmospheric levels of carbon dioxide and oxygen before and after removal of trees and vegetation.

Issue number three. Assessment of safety and spill management. General observations: There have been serious explosions, property damage and loss of life in this area. The Fed HUD program has a 400 feet minimum setback from gas pipelines. There is an 800-foot blast radius, posing a risk to homeowners.

The pipeline will be located less than 800 feet from houses, including mine, given that there is no federal setback. Sensing technology can remotely detect leaks within minutes, but it can take hours, even days, to manually shut down the rupture.

Pesticides could be used to maintain the permanent right-of-way easement. There will be a significant and permanent decrease in property value due to

safety risk and fear of safety risk. We request that the FERC study why the federal HUD has a 400 foot setback of its housing projects before pipelines, and there's no federal setback at all for pipelines on private property.

Leak detection. Systems used when the pipeline crosses aquifers and rivers are actually critically important to drinking water. Pipeline corrosion rates and its effect on long-term pipeline integrity. Emergency planning, response and clean-up measures. Banning of pesticides during maintenance of the permanent easement. Property values, before and after pipeline development.

Issue 4. Assurance of proper inspection. General observation: It is unclear how the pipeline will be inspected during construction, and which agency is responsible for the inspections. We request that FERC study what regulations will ensure that inspections are constant enough to ensure the safety of people.

Issue 5, assessment of insurance coverage. General observations: Nationwide Insurance reported it will not insure properties with pipelines and fracking. There will be an increased trespassing by snowmobiles and ATVs on the 125 foot wide clear-cut corridor, construction corridor.

I'd like the FERC to study the effects of the ability of homeowners to maintain and renew their insurance

coverage at current rates, not prohibitive rates. The possibility that homeowners must obtain pollution insurance coverage. Easement agreements, which stipulate the Constitution will compensate the land owner for loss of insurance, and/or an increase in insurance premiums.

(Applause.)

MR. TURICK: Oh gosh. Assurance of -- we did that already. In closing, Delaware County residents have been negatively affected and have not benefit one iota from the New York City watershed, which wiped out whole towns controlled by outside DEP regulations.

The Mossy South power line, which gives us actually not one kilowatt of electricity, and now we have the Constitution pipeline, which I guarantee you will not give us one drop of natural gas. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: William Roche.

MR. ROCHE: Thank you for allowing me to speak with you this evening. My name is William J. Roche, R-O-C-H-E. I am a stakeholder and land owner at 1353 White Hill Road in Davenport, New York, which my wife and I have the privilege of owning 127 acres.

Tonight, I want to speak to the original line that was set down, to the issue and my concern that I'll

speak about tonight, and I've already written FERC on other issues, and I will continue to do so. But tonight, I would like to just speak for a second about the concept of safety, environment and safety.

I've made my concerns available to and both gentlemen were equally responsive and polite, and I' made my response to Richard Bell, the Director of Emergency Services of Delaware County; Mr. Kevin Ritten (ph), Coordinator of Office of Emergency Services for Otsego County, and I have copied it to a Mr. Tom Williams, representative of Williams and Cabot.

Traversing our property and ending at a tower on Tower Road, Davenport, New York, is a bundled cable. The engineer, when we first bought the property some six years ago, said to me I asked him, not what I do for a living, could we move this, and he chuckled. He said do you know what is in that cable?

He indicated that the tower and the Verizon fiber optic cable served Delaware and Otsego County emergency services, state police, ambulance, Verizon, AT&T, Motorola, T-Mobile, NYSEC, local radio and similar significant properties, that in the event of a natural gas rupture and someone wins the lottery all the time, it would be incinerated. These lines would be incinerated. That's a very powerful word. That line would be incinerated.

Now we're just talking about a line, but we're talking about the ability of -- Otsego County initially didn't think they were going to be affected. The concept of the word "affected land owner," my property neighbor may not think that he or she is affected. But in fact, when I finish with this short scenario here, he and his home and his children are very much more affected, never mind nature.

If that natural gas line were to rupture, that line would be incinerated. Given the present routing, it is well within the blast burn radius. A major threat beyond the actual blast area is the thermal radiation sustained from a continued burn in a heavily forested area, of which we're in.

That area is protected by a volunteer service. It's sort of ironic and subtle, almost humorous that we're giving out $25,000 grants, when if a blast occurred, $25,000 I don't think is going to do the job.

In the most credible and worse case scenario, we would lose all our ability to communicate instantaneously. I'm asking FERC to consider this. The proposed route should fall into, I think, along certain segments of the route, especially the V coming up off of Juniata into a high consequence area. The data on the 30-inch pipe operating at 800 psi, with a future maximum psi of 1,440, has a burn area of 525 feet academically.

In the hospital I work at, in my research lab, we have a little sign that says "In God we trust. Everybody else bring data." Well history --

(Applause.)

MR. ROCHE: History is a part of data. So when we look at the 30-inch and let's do apples and apples. When we look at the 30-inch line blast in Belton, Virginia, that was in 1975, the burn radius was actually 725 feet, at less than 800 psi, much less than the potential of this line.

In actuality, the blast burn area was 75 percent greater than the data reported by the Gas Research Institute data reported in Jackson, Louisiana. That was operating at 1,016 psi when it ruptured and was reported to burn an area of 1,450 feet long and averaged 360 feet wide, with the furthest burn in the rupture reported at 950 feet wide. The blast burn radius was greater than 45 percent of the data presented by the Gas Research Institute.

In Lancaster, Kentucky in 1986, the psi was 990 and it burned an area that reported to be 900 feet by 1,000 feet. Two houses, one house trailer and other structures were incinerated. There's that word. It's a very powerful word. We're not now just incinerating the communication line; now we're going to incinerate houses, animals and I think that's what you're asking for, is safety and environment.

The explosion created an asymmetric crater of 167 feet long, 26 feet wide and 40 feet deep, and threw sections of pipe that were recovered 100 feet away from the blast, and measured at 28 feet. It took 60 to 90 minutes to turn off the gas, eight deaths, 38 residences were incinerated.

The fire comprised of water main, it compromised the water main, making it necessary for ordinary citizens to drag hoses 4,000 feet. This can go on and on. There are lists of 30-inch pipeline catastrophes, and I think that when you look at where -- so let's get back to the line.

The line here goes up about 15 feet in the air, and then goes underground. So when the landsman came, he said well, we'll just move the line. Okay. That was my initial proposal years ago, to move the line, and I got chuckled at.

Now if it goes underground, now it goes underground into a transmission, this lines comes up from the road -- in Davenport comes up the road, and is supposedly now going to go under that line. So from what I am understanding is we're told that a propane blast blows this way, and natural gas goes this way.

So one way or another, that line should be considered, and we should consider where we're putting this pipe. My bottom line is we should consider where we're putting this pipe in relationship to people's lives, our

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

forest, our animals, and I hope that you sincerely take that into consideration.

I also would like you to take into consideration that in the proposal of M, that when it transverses behind the Nature Conservancy, there is a huge Nature Conservancy there. In the initial proposed line, if you come off that bank and the erosion will go into that bog, there is no question about it. They've stopped using fertilizers in that area.

Then there are beautiful, beautiful waterfalls in the back of our property, in the back of the Conservatory. There are natural springs that feed from one element into the other, and I would like for you to consider that water empties down into Juniata. On a beautiful sunny day in the fall and you sit there, my wife and I found it for the very first time. It's a little dot on the map, and you could hear it from a half a mile away.

When you get there, it's awe-inspiring to see this water just gushing down the mountain, and to know that in M, it's going to transverse that area. I thank you for your time.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Timothy Camann.

MR. CAMANN: My name is Timothy Camann, C-A-M-A-

double N. I'm a land owner in the town of Sydney in Delaware County, and I have about a half of mile of proposed route on my land. I'm opposed to the pipeline. I request that FERC order the pipeline, Constitution Pipeline, to add to their response to the August 9th request, regarding estimating the facilities and costs necessary to achieve the project objectives of the route, or if the route were to be co-locating along one of the above pipelines.

There were two problems that I had with that. One is FERC's request to the pipeline only asked them to consider any one, and there's a network of pipelines that would allow the gas to get from Schoharie County to the New England markets. And rather than just considering one, I would like them to consider a network, and using as many of them as possible.

Secondly, the pipeline's project objectives are to get the gas to Schoharie County. There's no need for the gas in Schoharie County. That's where a junction of other pipelines is. The gas is not going to be stored in Schoharie County. It's not going to be consumed in Schoharie County. It's not going to be released, if things go right. It's going to be moved elsewhere.

Rather than trying to get the gas from Susquehanna up to Schoharie County and then spread out, why not move it from Susquehanna, either down into the metro New

York area through the Millennium or the Tennessee lines, and then tie into the Iroquois and bypass this land.

(Applause.)

MR. CAMANN: So I request that the FERC reorder that with two changes, not necessarily the objectives of getting it to Schoharie, but getting it to the ultimate markets, whether that's in New England or overseas, and also that they consider using the network, not just one at a time. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: James Worden.

MR. WORDEN: James Worden. My name is James Worden, W-O-R-D-E-N. I am the president of the Windsor Colesville Gas Coalition. I also am representing and working with a group of land owners in dealing with the Constitution pipeline. We appreciate you having the FERC meetings and all the FERC process. It is very intricate process and it has many stages.

However, we are asking for an extension of the October 9th deadline. We feel an extension would not hurt the process. You could still move forward with the other processes of this system. But we do need more time for us to organize and submit our proposals to FERC.

We understand FERC is very appreciative of land

owner concerns, and we thank you for that. One of the main reasons we are asking for is, the extension for is because a lot of the things that were supposed to happen in early July, we had meet with the Broome County office building with the Constitution Pipeline, and they had promised all the towns were going to have maps. All the people were going to have maps, so that everybody knew where it was, and also Line M was not in play at that time.

To this date, many of towns still have not received the maps. So this is really a very short window for us to comment, work on proposals and provide the necessary documents and necessary information, so FERC can make the final decision on allowing or not allowing where this pipeline goes. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Claire Burger. I'm not sure if I'm saying that right. Claire Burger.

(No response.)

MR. MOONEYHAN: Chris Denton.

MR. DENTON: Good evening. Let me -- first of all, my name is Christopher Denton. I represent a number of land owners along the pipeline, in fact along several of the different routes. Let me second remarks of Jim Worden. We very much appreciate you holding a local meeting. It's very

important. None of us would be able to go to Washington, and it does give us an opportunity to inform you of any local circumstances that we may have in New York in this area.

Also let me second the remarks of Mr. Worden concerning the very narrow window before this period closes, including the fact that the maps were not delivered to the towns or to many of the land owners. So they were unable to come prepared. Like an appellate division, people like to be a hot bench. They want to be there and ready, and they couldn't prepare for this meeting.

So we think that the October 9th, which is really only seven or eight business days, really is too short a period before this should close. We recommend at least November and up to December 1st would be appropriate. And as Mr. Worden said, the things which can run consecutively, excuse me, with this same time concurrently, can continue to go ahead.

My concern, although I do represent land owners and I do do oil and gas work, I also represent clients in bankruptcy. I've been a real estate attorney for over 35 years, and have been a title agent for over 30.

I am steeped in real property law and bankruptcy law, and one of the continuing problems that has occurred is bankruptcy, and the fact that the companies are not

condemning the fee interest, but an easement. Now an easement can be returned at any time, can be surrendered, as a matter of law.

Now whether you allow that is an interesting note, but in bankruptcy, if the pipeline company should file bankruptcy, the bankruptcy trustee who takes possession of the assets of the pipeline company is not going to run a defunct pipeline. They're either going to sell it. If there's no market for it, they're going to abandon it in place.

So it's a 30-inch pipeline. A 30-inch pipeline abandoned in place will begin to rust immediately. Once you take all the cathode tubes off it and all the things that prevent rust, the maintenance stops. A 30-inch pipeline, once it rusts, once there are holes in it, groundwater, of which there is a lot in this area, will run into it, and it will become an underground conduit.

It either will put water to an area that it shouldn't go to, or it will fill up the pipeline and accelerating the rusting corrosive process. Eventually, the roof of that pipeline will collapse. When that happens, we'll have a 30-inch subsidence in the soil.

That will have a gully. But it's in the middle of a farm field, whether it's on, traversing a slope or directing down. And a 30-inch gully will produce an

extraordinary amount of accumulated runoff very quickly. The farmer, the land owner who has that will have an extraordinary environmental erosion problem, as well as a silting problem for any creeks that it might run into.

Now the current process does not address what happens if a company goes bankrupt, or simply says we're tired with this project, or sustainable energy actually takes over the world, and they don't need the pipeline. If something like that happens --

(Applause.)

MR. DENTON: --the land owner will be stuck with this issue, and without compensation. The current methodology for eminent domain on an easement is that the land owner is paid eminent domain in New York state on either across the fence methodology or paired sales, which basically means what was the value of the land before the easement went in, and what is the value after.

Well for farm land, which may run $1,000 an acre, and for which afterwards it's perfectly usable as farm land, there may be almost no difference. So the company has taken an economic benefit without effectively paying for it.

In fact, we have lost several cases where New York state has held 40-foot wide easement, 1,000 feet long, is less than an acre. If the property is worth $1,000 an acre, $900 for this easement. Now just add that up, right

along 121 miles, and this is practically grand theft.

(Applause.)

MR. DENTON: Not only that, it's inconsistent with the way the industry actually negotiates these. I've negotiated pipeline easements for over 12 years. Every time we've had a gathering line for which there is no right of eminent domain, the company has been very reasonable.

We get very strong easement protecting the individual land owner, usually about six or eight pages long, including indemnity agreements, insurance, restoration, attorney's fees if we have to sue without them getting theirs, baseline testing of water, soil, air, before, during and after.

A compensation package that in some cases one nine-mile pipeline, with which Mr. Worden was involved, we actually limited the easement to 40 years. A 20-year easement with a 20-year renewal. Now this has environmental impact, because if you make it perpetual, then there is no idea or no contemplated return of this property to its former state.

If you make it limited, as BLM, that's Bureau of Land Management and the Indian tribes do out west, where there is no sovereign immunity -- excuse mer, there's sovereign immunity and there is no eminent domain, they're basically ten-year rental agreements with renewals with a

renegotiation based on appraisals for the next ten years.

So what I'm getting at is that the fact that the pipeline can be abandoned in place as a matter of law, by a bankruptcy court, is an extremely important environmental issue, which needs to be addressed in the environmental impact statement.

If it is not, then the land owner will be left, at some time in the future, with either having basically a pipe dump site, for which he or she is responsible, or if they are compensated, they should be compensated for the current value of removal of that pipeline and the restoration of the land under current rates. Not future rates, but current rates.

Now the land owner could then bank that, so it would be there at the time when they have to use it to take it out. Having a bond isn't going to last for 50 years, and it's not going to last for 40 years, and bonds can be gotten rid of in a Chapter 11 proceeding. That I'm aware of.

So putting in elements that "ensure against this happening," doesn't help. This board or the Commissioners have, in a recent storage facility, gas storage facility certificate in Sweden County, required the company to reimburse the land owners for the gas trapped in a marcellus formation, which they could not drill because it was the cat rock. It was in the order requiring them to pay them in

compensation for that loss of gas.

All we ask is that the land owners be paid for the cost of removal of that pipe, up front, and the cost of restoration. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you. Our goal is to get through everyone on the speaker's list. So if you would, please keep your comments to five minutes or less. It would help the speakers behind you, to make sure we cover everyone by the ten o'clock hour. And also, please keep in mind that your written comments weigh just the same as your verbal comments.

We will read all of them. So it doesn't matter whether you say it at the microphone tonight, or put it in writing. They will always be considered equally.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Anne Marie Gardi (ph).

(Applause.)

MS. GARDI: Good evening. I want to thank you for your prior responsiveness to comments that have been made to you in this process, and I want to encourage you to continue that responsiveness. The first step you can take has been mentioned this evening, but I want to emphasize it.

And it goes to an issue of basic human fairness. Some people in this room, along with proposed pipeline, were notified in May or June, and they received information at

open houses that were held in July.

Other people were notified less than two weeks ago, and the open houses were held less than two weeks ago. They're at a distinct disadvantage. Some of them have spoken about that tonight. But FERC's response seems to be that well, they have until October 9th, and we continue to take comments.

But in fact you don't continue to take comments about the scoping after October 9th, according to your own literature, and your Notice of Intent. This is really very unfair, when you consider what you're going to do, and I believe it is also unconstitutional.

(Applause.)

MS. GARDI: You're proposing to take people's land. You're proposing to take their future away from them. You're proposing to take their very dreams from them, and according to the Fifth Amendment, in order to do that, two things have to happen: There has to be due process and there has to be a public meeting. I don't think you have either in this case.

(Applause.)

MS. GARDI: You don't have due process, because some people have had months of notice, and other people have had less than two weeks of notice. You also don't have due process, because you chose to have three hearings. The

sites of those hearings or two of the sites were at the extreme ends of the 121- mile pipeline.

(Applause.)

MS. GARDI: The third site is not in the middle of 120-mile pipeline; it's within about a third of the southern end of it, and anybody who can look at the map can see that it's not in the middle, and a judge will see that very clearly very quickly.

You know, from the comments that you have received, that most of the people who are opposed to this pipeline live in Delaware County.

(Applause.)

MS. GARDI: You know that 43 miles of this pipeline go through Delaware County, and that the border of Delaware County and Otsego County, which is now affected directly by Alternative M, has no hearing. So you can hand us a due process claim, or you can rectify something you've done wrong.

You can give more time to the people who were just notified, an equal amount of time as the other people got, and you can hold hearings where you have clearly avoided. So that's the first part of the Fifth Amendment, due process.

The second part has to do with need. That part is more difficult to do in a few minutes, and I have, I

trust, some of that in my comments before. But the basic need of this project has to do with Williams' bottom line, and the interest of Cabot to frack in New York state.

VOICES: Yes.

(Applause.)

MS. GARDI: Now Williams also has an interest in fracking in New York State, because they do gathering lines. So while FERC will try to say that it has nothing to do with fracking, this pipeline has everything to do with fracking. That's the only reason why it's coming through this area of New York State, which has both marcellus shale and Utica shale, and which is not within a convenient distance to a gas transmission line, if and when they permit hydrofracking in New York State.

Now I'm sure you're aware that in New York State, there's a supplemental generic environmental impact statement wending its way through the state's environmental process, and that there's talk of a final this year. But who knows? And that that EIS recommends a green completion, and that the EPA has issued regulations that require green completion starting in 2015.

Now a green completion means that in order to drill a gas well, you have to connect to a pipeline first. So this pipeline has, will enable hydrofracking, because companies will drill close to the pipeline first, in order

to assess their holdings.

You'll have to address those things, and you'll have to address the greenhouse gas emission results and the industrialization results, that come from people either putting gas into the pipeline or taking gas out of the pipeline. You may not want to address all of those concerns, but you will have to address all of those concerns.

You'll also have to address whether there is an actual public need for this project, if you were to take the hydrofracking out of the equation, because --

(Applause.)

MS. GARDI: As other people have said, the destination of this gas is not Schoharie County. Yet when you asked Williams and Cabot to study the alternative pipeline routes, which was very responsive of FERC, and I was really pleased when you did that, their response was really a joke.

Because what they did was started constructed $3 billion pipelines to end up in Schoharie County, New York, when where they want to send their gas is to New York City or Boston. So they were going like hundreds of miles out of the way to get to Schoharie County. They would go from Pennsylvania East and then go up to Schoharie County, when their destination is New York City.

VOICE: Why?

MS. GARDI: Why. Yes, why. Is anybody looking at that? Did anybody ask them? Listen, this doesn't make any sense. I mean I looked at it and started laughing.

VOICE: Right. The shortest distance between two points is a straight line.

MS. GARDI: So what is the real purpose of this project? The real purpose of this project is to increase the profits of some companies. There is no need for gas in New York City or Boston right now. There's no consumer demand that is not being met. There is an over-supply of gas --

(Applause.)

MS. GARDI: And these companies need to move that gas, because they're losing money. The only way they're going to start making money is if they start exporting it, so that they can raise the price of gas.

(Applause.)

MS. GARDI: So if FERC certifies this project, what they're doing is they're taking people's land, they're taking people's future, they're taking people's dreams, in order to enrich private interests.

(Applause.)

MS. GARDI: Something that has never happened before is you would certify this for domestic use, and then

the DOE would come in and approve an export facility, and then the gas line, which was approved for domestic use, public need, would go to another country. There is a very good question whether that is constitutional. Thank you.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MOONEYHAN: Linda Bevilacqua.

VOICE: Sorry, we can't hear you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Linda Bevilacqua.

MS. BEVILACQUA: My name is Linda Bevilacqua, B as in Boy, E-V as in Victor, I-L-A-C-Q-U-A. I live in Franklin, Delaware County. I am absolutely opposed to the Constitution Pipeline and hydrofracking. My family moved here to beautiful upstate from Long Island, New York in 1995, to escape pollution, crime, drugs and too much urbanization, as well as to raise our children in a clean, safe and healthy environment.

My husband and I bought a working dairy farm, in hopes of running a family business. Needless to say, there is no money in farming, so my husband was forced to go back to New York City and commute for the next 17 years, to provide income for our family.

I stayed behind here with our four children, raising them alone. We then started a small beef farm, which I ran with the help of my children, and weekend help

from my husband. We made many sacrifices to have a healthier lifestyle for our children. We had a barn fire eight years ago, losing our whole barn and the machinery and equipment with it.

We did not have adequate insurance, and suffered a huge financial loss. We decided to stay and rebuild our barn, and we replaced all of our machinery. We did this because we love our peaceful, serene rural environment.

Allowing the Constitution pipeline here will immensely disrupt our tranquil lifestyle, with the constant generation noise and air pollution. We know the pipeline will ultimately lead to bringing in fracking. My husband and I have done extensive research on this subject, and have been to Montrose, Pennsylvania numerous times.

We have seen the destruction of the rural landscape there. We have not see any economic gains, and have noticed that most, if not all of the workers are from out of state, thus not employing the local population. We have been Brooklyn, Pennsylvania, where there is a 54-acre site which we believe is the beginning of the future Constitution pipeline.

This facility is presently being constructed, even though the air quality permit and the FERC permit have not yet been obtained. Why is this construction not being halted immediately?

VOICE: It's unpermitted.

MS. BEVILACQUA: Please keep this monster Constitution pipeline out of rural upstate New York. There are plenty of existing pipelines which could be utilized to carry the gas. We know Williams is being deceitful by telling FERC it will be going to New York City and Boston, while telling their stockholders the gas will be liquefied and sent overseas, where they'll realize gains at least five times more than in the U.S.

(Applause.)

MS. BEVILACQUA: We are very worried about potential gas explosions, leaks, noise, air pollution and ultimately water contamination. I hereby request that FERC study the cumulative impacts of future hydrofracking in New York State, prior to permitting any further pipeline activities. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Epifanio Bevilacqua.

MR. BEVILACQUA: I'm Epifanio, E-P-I-F-A-N-I-O, Bevilacqua, B-E-V-I-L-A-C-Q-U-A, and the last name, Bevilacqua, means drink water, drink the water. So we don't need to destroy the water. All right. I'm going to get started.

Dear Mr. and Mrs. FERC, I can't believe that FERC

in D.C. and oil and gas companies and politicians are getting away with hydropiping, destroying people's lives, killing people, and no regard to anything, by allowing hydrofracking and pipelines be permitted into New York State. This has to stop now.

(Applause.)

MR. BEVILACQUA: I feel that these activities should be criminalized.

(Applause.)

MR. BEVILACQUA: And not permitted anywhere. We instead need to find alternative recyclable energy, instead of spending money foolishly for natural gas and permitting pipelines that we don't need. People sacrifice to keep their homes, and you destroy their homes and destroy their lives.

How could you even do this? They should be locking everybody up, FERC, the politicians. They should be locking up D.C. They should lock up Dick Cheney and Tom West, they should lock up for doing this. He's criminal. But instead, we just keep on just putting everybody off and just let them do whatever they want.

Where is democracy in this country? We need to change things now. So FERC needs to study. There is no need for the Constitution Pipeline Project. There's already plenty of existing pipelines, places which could accommodate

gas. This is high risk flood areas, two major devastating floods in 2006 and 2011.

We don't need further problems that would increase and allow construction of the Constitution pipeline. Please prioritize the well-being of all working people and citizens of New York State.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Eileen Kline.

MS. KLINE: Okay. I'm Eileen Kline, and I'm here to represent the Delaware Otsego chapter of the National Audubon Society, and before I start, I just want to say that our position, in terms of hydrofracking, is that we don't support that technology.

We believe that it's an unnecessary polluting, invasive technology that has been put in place for the sake of corporate profit, and this pipeline is facilitating that. We believe the construction maintenance and other activities associated with the proposed pipeline of preferred, and/or alternative routes, will have an irreversible negative impact upon deciduous and mixed forest, wetlands, spas, marshes, rivers, streams and woodland ponds, also known as vernal pools, considered the coral reefs of the northeast forests.

These habitats are the breeding and feeding

grounds for numerous species of birds, mammals, amphibians, reptiles, insects and a number of other species, of which some are endangered, threatened or in significant decline.

A number of these habitats are considered too small for state and federal protection. Additionally, due to outdated maps, sensitive areas of concern are not addressed. Therefore, the Delaware Otsego Audubon Society is requesting that comprehensive studies take place, and data collected on the following habitats and species:

Streams, ponds and woodland vernal pools that occur from seasonal changes; classification of wetlands, spas and marshes, in particular the woodland vernal pools that are considered to be vital, a vital part of healthy forest food webs. Migratory and resident birds feeding, breeding, nesting and fledgling cycles, particular attention paid to the declining species of warblers, wood thrushes and their habitats. Hootios, falcons, assiviters (ph), hawks and eagles should be included in this survey.

Owls, feeding, breeding and their nesting cycles; Indiana bats, highly endangered due to white nose syndrome, identification of the few remaining habitats and their breeding cycles. Amphibians and reptiles. Spring and fall surveys of threatened, high concern and declining species. Plants, indigenous species such as orchids, pitcher plants, endangered, highly threatened and of special concern.

Insects, in particular diversity necessary for health food webs. Mammals, identification of species and habitat. Breeding cycles should be included, and all inventoried keystone species should be identified, to ensure healthy food webs.

We recommend using the following resources. Due to the lack of current, accurate state and federal maps, information and regulations that fail to cover small rural areas such as ours, and the lack of adequate numbers of qualified staff at the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

(Applause.)

MS. KLINE: The local chapter of the National Audubon Society and the New York State chapter, the Atlantic chapter of the Sierra Club, Cornell Ornithology Lab, Harvard College Biology Department, SUNY-Juniata Biology Department, Paul Smith College of Forestry, SUNY-ESF and New York Flora Association, we request they do a threatened, endangered and declining species inventory of the proposed areas, as well as a habitat needs assessment for these species.

These organizations have the expertise and are committed to a sustainable Catskill environment. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Katherine O'Donnell.

MS. O'DONNELL: Good evening. My name is Katherine O'Donnell, 503 State Highway 28, Juniata, New York. I live on Franklin Mountain Road, and I am Professor of Sociology at Hartwick College. I have sent previous comments to FERC, and I underscore their importance.

I oppose the industrialization of upstate New York, hydrofracking and the pipeline. As a property owner living by the proposed route end in Otsego County, I do not relish the potential devaluation of my primary investment, my home.

I would like FERC to statistically analyze the impact of pipeline construction, installation, maintenance and continuance on housing value, insurance and sales for the entire 121 mile route.

(Applause.)

MS. O'DONNELL: Furthermore, I would like FERC to statistically investigate the impact of future fracking on housing value, insurance rates and sales along the 120 mile proposed corridor.

I would like FERC to statistically analyze the impact of fracking and pipeline construction, installation, maintenance and continuance on tax base, revenue and community budgets in areas where fracking and pipeline development have occurred, and where they are projected to be in this part of upstate New York.

With respect to environmental impact, I have concerns regarding potential flooding. In spring 2011, I experienced flooding at my house on Franklin Mountain. The New York State Highway Department had just completed construction along the route, and the construction had involved tree removal.

The proposed M route is on the same mountain that was destabilized during the flooding of May 2011. Finally, Franklin Mountain is a major U.S. raptor flight corridor. This includes the American eagle. Therefore, I have grave concerns. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Florence Rhodes. I'm not sure if I'm saying that last name correctly.

(No response.)

MR. MOONEYHAN: Clark, looks like Rhodes.

VOICE: I think he left.

MS. HARRIS: No. He's not here.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Mike German.

MR. GERMAN: Good evening. My name is Mike German. I'm here representing Leatherstocking Oil and Gas, a new gas utility that intends to provide gas distribution service in the southern tier of New York and the northern

tier of Pennsylvania.

Leatherstocking has acquired six gas franchises from local communities in New York State. These franchises are in proximity to the proposed Constitution pipeline, and Leatherstocking is the process of acquiring 13 additional franchises in Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania.

Leatherstocking intends to interconnect to Constitution pipeline, in both New York and Pennsylvania. Leatherstocking has signed a memorandum of understanding with Constitution, relative to working together to facilitate attaching communities along the route.

Without Constitution pipeline, a number of these current communities, currently without natural gas, would have little prospect of getting gas service. In acquiring our franchises, we have dealt with a number of municipal officials and large customers. Leatherstocking has become aware of the economic hardships the lack of gas service imposes on local economies, citizens and businesses.

We have at least -- have had at least two dozen meetings with local government officials and business leaders. From these meetings, we have concluded there is a real economic need for the Constitution pipeline.

Without natural gas, a number of these communities remain economically in peril. The Constitution Pipeline Group has indicated to us, including signing the

previously-mentioned memorandum of understanding, that they want to work with Leatherstocking to facilitate local gas service.

Now Leatherstocking's parent, Corning Natural Gas, has been directly connected to interstate pipeline for natural gas supply since 1904, and for you at the FERC, I believe the Federal Power Commission came into being in the mid-30's, so they were interstate pipelines but they weren't regulated because you guys didn't exist.

During that period of over 100 years, serving a 700 square mile region, that's Corning Natural Gas, we have never experienced an interstate pipeline failure that has done harm to the environment, interruption of gas service, personal injury to customers or residents, or damage to property. That is since 1904.

In conclusion, we believe there is a demonstrated need for natural gas service along the Constitution pipeline route, that without Constitution these communities are unlikely to get their service, and Constitution appears to be ready to satisfy these communities' needs. Thank you for the opportunity to present these comments.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Peter Hudiburg.

MR. HUDIBURG: If FERC is concerned with

environmental impacts, they should also be concerned with health effects. My name is Peter H-U-D-I-B-U-R-G, and they should also be looking at the pipeline full built-out, running through a gas field, where gas will be taken off to feed certain areas, and pumped in from wells developed in other areas in the gas fields.

Therefore, they should be looking at extra compressor stations that would be required. From what I understand of Susquehanna County, they're installing compressor stations or plan to install them every two to four miles. So I think we're a little bit off the beam when we assume that there's going to be only one compressor station involved in the Constitution pipeline.

Now looking at compressor stations, we should be aware of what the Pennsylvania Alliance for Clean Water and Air has documented in their extensive research of people impacted by pollution, air and water pollution from gas wells, from waste pits, and from compressor stations.

Now here are just some of the impacts that the Pennsylvania Alliance has documented. In Carmichael, Pennsylvania, Pam Judy (ph) is suffering from headaches, fatigue, dizziness, nausea, nosebleeds. Blood tests show exposure to benzene and other chemicals. She's 780 feet away from a compressor station.

In Dish, Texas, air pollution has been

1 documented. A major source of that air pollution are the
2 compressor stations. Megan Collins is suffering from sinus
3 issues, difficulty with balance and standing, headaches,
4 fainting, dystonia, atoxia and nausea.
5 Susan Hair in Mesa, Colorado, she's close to gas
6 well and compressor stations. She's suffering from
7 nosebleeds, itching of her eyes, face, coughing, leg nerve
8 inflammation that has hindered her ability to walk and other
9 symptoms.
10 In Blanco, New Mexico, Nancy Pittman is suffering
11 from soft tissue nose, throat and mouth irritation and
12 coughing. She lives close to a compressor station. Lloyd
13 Burgess in Texas. He lives close to a compressor station.
14 His animals are suffering. Horses have become sick, they
15 die, they suffer from neurological defects and blindness, in
16 some cases in both eyes.
17 Another compressor station impact from Dish,
18 Texas, Charles Morgan. He's suffering from constant low
19 frequency roar from the compressors, has twice experienced
20 ruptured right eardrum. A neighbor who lives on the other
21 side of the compressor station confirmed he and his infant
22 daughter also suffered ruptured eardrums. That's from low
23 frequency, constant low frequency noise.
24 Again, in Dish, Texas, compressor stations, 130
25 in the county, no less. So the air pollution is very

serious. Let's see. Sharon Bore (ph) is suffering from headaches, dizziness, ringing of the ears, lack of sleep and her symptoms are shared by many others in the county.

In Jefferson, Texas, Kenneth Bateman and his son live close to a compressor station and high pressure pipeline. The source is noise as well as air pollution, and their symptoms are -- they're suffering from diabetes and other health ailments.

In Branford County, Pennsylvania, Yvonne Schaffer (ph) is suffering from headaches. She lives close to a pumping station and stripping plant, and of course that goes along with the pipelines, and with gas build-up. In Denton County, Texas, John and Jamie Sizeloe (ph) are suffering from headaches, respiratory problems and other symptoms. They live close to Williams' drilling operation and compressor station.

You know, I think that FERC should also look at the performance record of these companies. You know, Cabot does not have a sterling record of performance in Susquehanna County.

(Applause.)

MR. HUDIBURG: In Dimock, Pennsylvania, of course, Cabot gas wells, many people are suffering from headaches, soreness, dizziness. In this specific instance it's great, and Julie Saltner and daughter, they choose to

move out the state.

In Bartonville, Texas, Kelly Grant lives close to a compressor station and a gas well near his house, and he suffers from severe asthma attacks, dizzy spells and headaches. In Hill County, Texas, Brian Beetle (ph) lives close to Williams gas wells, and his goats and llamas are suffering swelling and death.

So there's another instance of bad performance by one of the companies involved in this proposal. In Washington County, Pennsylvania, Stephanie Hollowich (ph) and her family suffered burning eyes, sore throats and other symptoms from range resources, natural gas wells, gas processing plant, compressor station and buried pipelines. All of this comes with pipeline development.

Louis Meeks in Pavilion, Wyoming, he lives close to Icana Wells, Bay Ponds (ph) compressor station, and a high pressure pipeline. His symptoms are diabetes, lesions, sores and neuropathy and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and his wife Donna has endured eight operations for polyps in her lungs. Two of his horses have died.

In Dish, Texas again, Warren and Rebecca Sheffield live close to a compressor station, and their symptoms are multiple chemical sensitivities, vertigo, children easily winded, vomiting, hives, itchy skin, nosebleeds and seizures. So all of these are documented

instances of severe health impacts from gas pipeline and gas field development.

I think that you should be looking at the whole picture. When you're talking about looking at a pipeline going through a particular area, you should assume that in the future, there's going to be major buildup of gas fields. Therefore, there are going to be many other impacts. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: I'm not sure I'm saying this correctly. Pat Lanch. Looks like Pat Lanch.

MS. LASCH: Can you hear me? Yes. My name is Pat Lasch, L-A-S-C-H, and I'm a bit nervous. I don't like speaking in public, although I do like --. Before I start my speech, I want to say I spent two months out in LA, traveling three miles a day, seeing my daughter in intensive care for two months on 12-lane highways, six in each direction.

And it took me three and a half hours to get there. I came home here, looking for my refuge, and going to my animals and my pond to recoup myself, and to collect my well-being again, and discovered that the pipeline was intended to go across the street from my sanctuary.

My heart sank after two months of combating

severe depression and a very seriously ill daughter, to come home to find that my home was no longer a refuge. On top of that, I have concerns, and I forgot my reading glasses. I brought the wrong ones. My land has two wells, a spring-fed pond and about an acre of swamp land.

I'm requesting a study of the effects of blasting on my artesian well, the one that was dug at 37 feet. It gives me water, water when there was no water in the dry spell. What's going to happen to my pond, my catfish? We're in an orange zone for earthquakes. What happens when they really start blasting?

I'm requesting a study of the effects on the environment regarding erosion of all of the trees above, on the downside of where they're going to be putting the pipeline. What will happen to beaver ponds, there's two of them, beaver lakes at the bottom of that ridge? How will the roads bear the weight and frequency of the trips?

And lastly, I'm a retired teacher. I live on a small pension, and what I've done to supplement my income, I'm 68, is to have baseball families rent my home in the summer time. It's been a pleasure. They come, and I had a family say to me "It was so wonderful being here. Our children that weren't in the camp would have had a terrible time being in town. The pond made everything for us."

Concerns regarding explosions, insuring our homes

and the devaluation of our homes need to be studied and properly evaluated. Lastly, I implore all the people here to ask why our representatives have allowed these companies to have proprietary chemicals where they don't have to tell us what they're putting in the ground, if they chose not to?

(Applause.)

MS. LASCH: I thank you on behalf of my parents, my beavers, my deer, my pheasant, hawks, catfish, bass and all of our animal friends and humans on Golph (ph) Road, and even the racoons thank you. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Craig Stevens. Craig Stevens.

MR. STEVENS: Evening folks. Thank you for having this opportunity or providing it for us to speak. My name is Craig, C-R-A-I-G, Stevens, S-T-E-V-E-N-S. I live in Silver Lake Township, Pennsylvania. Why am I here? I feel like a suicide prevention hotline intervener. I'm trying to convince people here in New York State, after watching what my father's ancestral home state. I'm a sixth generation land owner in Pennsylvania.

I happen to be a fifth generation. My mother was born in Oswego, New York. I can't watch what happened in my father's state happen to my mother's home state. As a matter of fact --

(Applause.)

MR. STEVENS: --when we get done shutting the industry down here in New York, I'm going to have some people here come and help me get some surgeons here, help me cut that cancer out of the state of Pennsylvania. We need it.

That's the information I was given by Constitution on May 17th, 2002 (sic). It says right here in it that this -- Constitution Pipeline starts at the Williams Field Services Company, LLC's planned central station in Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania.

Although to this date, we cannot get Williams to admit that that is the start, and that compressor station will be used. We're confused. I have one half mile, 2,400 feet of the -- what was the Laser gathering line put across my property. My family allowed that to happen.

Do not, I repeat do not give any company, let alone Williams, eminent domain capability. If you do, there's 18 enumerated powers in this little document called the Constitution. One of them is Amendment 5, that says "Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation."

How do you compensate people, when the partners they're in bed with, there's water from one of the victim's in Dimock, that's Ray Kimball's water. It's not just the

color that concerns me; it's the three types of uranium that Duke University found in the water, including weapons grade 238. It's the three types of thoranium. I don't even know what thoranium is. I think it's what Thor drinks for breakfast to be strong.

How about barium, radium, strontium, arsenic in high levels; methane contamination. You know what you'll hear the industry say? Cabot didn't do that. That's their partner, 25 percent partner. I have a consent order agreement right here, signed by Dan Dinges, the CEO of Cabot Oil and Gas. The DEP in the state of Pennsylvania found them guilty of contaminating the water in Dimock, and I'm tired of the industry saying that that's all been taken care of.

Here's my problem with it. They agreed and signed this. "Cabot hereby certifies that it has entered in this consent order and settlement agreement freely, under no coercion of any kind, and after consulting with counsel. As identified, Cabot hereby agrees to comply with all of its obligations under this consent order and settlement agreement.

"Cabot intends to be legally bound by this consent order and settlement agreement." Why do they keep going in public and saying they did nothing wrong in Dimock, when their CEO twice signed these documents, to say that

they were guilty. Have they cleaned up their mess after four years? No, they have not.

I'm here to demand that you do not let this pipeline be built at all, until Cabot fix their messes in the state of Pennsylvania, before they try to come and do another mess in the state of New York.

(Applause.)

MR. STEVENS: Now as a partner now with Williams, Williams has been somewhat attentive to our needs on our property, cleaned up the mess left behind by the people they bought from, which was Laser. Now it was very interesting that they only offered us $5 a foot in a lifetime easement on the original agreement, and they thought they were going to get public utility status, to get a certificate of public convenience.

They actually had a lot of my neighbors sign at that low dollar, $5 a foot and lifetime easement, because they told them they were going to get that. They did not get it. You know why? People like me and other neighbors stood up and told the PUC none of this gas is staying where we live, and it's going to go elsewhere.

Look at what they're building right now. This is from my extraction colony neighborhood in northeastern PA. It's not staying there. It's not even staying in New York. It's going straight through this 30-inch line. It's going

to hit Albany and go to two places: Long Island Harbor and Boston Harbor. Oh, it's for New York and Boston.

Hey, New York and Boston, if you need gas, drill in your own backyard and quit drilling in my backyard.

(Applause.)

MR. STEVENS: Now, let's talk about why we won't give eminent domain and let these guys start driving, because you'd never seen anything like installation of pipelines before. It's all kinds of fun. Don't ask my neighbor, John Jones. As a matter of fact, you can't. He was crushed to death by a 40 ton mud truck, when that mud truck driver ran a stop sign and rolled it over on his Subaru on July 29th of last year, 2011.

John Jones was 57 years old. Sitting next to him was his 17 year-old daughter, who was not crushed to death, who got to watch her father die over the next five minutes while he's crushed into the side of the car. That driver was from Texas. That driver got out of his truck, was taken to the hospital, and when he was done, he went back to Texas, has never been heard from again, and is not even in our area to stand trial for what he did to John Jones.

We're tired of this. This is putting lives on the line. When they blew out the creek in my backyard installing this pipeline, they were boring underneath my neighbor's property, not even on my own.

Laurel Lake Creek, which should have been an exceptional value watershed leading into Silver Creek, which by the way goes into the Susquehanna River and goes straight up to Binghamton, they blew the bottom of that creek out on July 29th, turned my beautiful creek on my property and my backyard into the old Mississippi Muddy.

I'm tired of watching this happen to creek after creek, stream after stream and river after river. You know what? It sounds neat and it looks good on paper. They're just going to dig a trench, drop a pipe in. They spent 2-1/2 months on my private property, my 150 acre property.

The owner, Tom Kerran (ph), called it the "nightmare of the entire 33 mile line." We caught them dumping 100,000 gallons of liquid of unknown origin not starting from my property, not emanating from it. They brought these trucks up from elsewhere, thought they were getting away with something by driving it up a dirt road, and dumping these truckloads of liquid of unknown origin, it was the drilling mud and gel, right onto my private property.

Now I called the DEP like you probably would. That's our Department of Environmental Protection. We call it "don't expect protection," because we've never gotten any from them, and we never will.

(Applause.)

MR. STEVENS: I demanded that they come up and look at my property. They did four times and told me there was absolutely nothing wrong, and nothing out of the ordinary had been done. I called up the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission. They came up and said hey, we've just had these floods and more than likely the mud in your creek is from the flooding and the runoff from the flooding.

I said you know, the creeks stay muddy even for days and weeks after the rain stops. So what did the Fish and Boat do? They actually went up, unlike the DEP, and found problems. They filed five criminal charges against Blazer, and fined them $20,000 and collected it.

When they notified me, they also told me that the DEP was planning to do the same thing. I thought hallelujah. Finally, somebody listened. I said why criminal charges? Why criminal charges? We get paid a hell of a lot faster when we file criminal charges against a company, than when we file civil charges.

Now isn't that interesting? Now the DEP and the Fish and Boat found out they did contaminate my creek in the backyard, and they did contaminate my property. What did they do? They cited them and fined them. So when I called the DEP and Fish and Boast and said please come now and clean up my property, since I pay the taxes for your organization, guess what they told me?

We can't. We've settled with the company. We have nothing for you, the deeded, private property owner. Are you kidding me? Are you kidding me? Now here's why I'm here today. I believe in the Constitution of the United States of America. I have rights as a private property owner, and so do every one of the people along this 120-mile line.

(Applause.)

MR. STEVENS: We will not stand by and watch eminent domain be used for the 22 miles, which is 22 percent of the length of this in the state of Pennsylvania, and you absolutely will not give them the right to use it in the over 100 miles that is here in New York State.

Why? For the very reason that their job is to get this property. There is -- this is a FERC line. There is no setbacks, zero. They can run that 30-inch high pressure gas line right underneath a home or the swing set in a backyard where children play, and there's nothing the land owner can do.

Once FERC gives eminent domain, they can put the pipeline wherever they damn well please, without anybody else's permission or the property owner. It will give them a few bucks a foot, because that's what FERC said they could do, and they're going to say "thanks for playing."

When they're done, wait 'til you see what happens

when the first rain happens. We had the floods. Never before in our area, and my family's been there for over 180 years, did anybody in that area see the mud flow that it did after the rains happened.

When you strip the trees -- my forester caught them dumping this liquid of unknown origin on my property. I asked him about what he saw. Where he lives in New Albany, Pennsylvania area, this is a 62 year-old hardened forester, who cried like a baby watching them along the pipeline route, cut a tree he said was probably worth $5,000, if it was kept whole, and they put it through a wood chipper.

We're not interested in our forests, our beautiful wetlands being cut down and put through wood chippers, to make room for a pipeline to do what? Take our resources from our areas, and transport them not only to major cities in the United States, but how about to places like India, Russia, China, Japan and Norway, who right now today are ready to pay top dollar for that liquefied natural gas.

VOICE: It's not going to happen.

MR. STEVENS: Please, FERC. Don't fall for what Eddie Murphy affectionately called, in the "Beverly Hills Cop" movie, the banana in the tailpipe, or I'll say the banana in the 30-inch pipeline, because we're not falling

for it, and we will not stand for it.

You have an obligation to protect us, the citizens of the United States of America, and we are not going to put up with another lie from the industry as to what's happening with this. Thank you very much for your time, and I pray to God you make the right decision.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Nick Albaugh. Nick Albaugh.

MR. ALBAUGH: Nick Albaugh, A-L-B-A-U-G-H, Hamden, New York. I don't know what we're doing here tonight, since you tell us the electronic filings have as much impact as the personal filings do. So taking you on your word for that, I'm going to talk to you face to face, not about technical data. We'll file that electronically.

Everybody has to make a living. Unfortunately, too many livings are dependent on mineral extraction, which today means extreme practices, supported by powerful lobbies, privileged access, legislative subsidies and exemptions, and free-wheeling finance.

None of us can escape our roles in this. In fact, some of our salaries are reimbursed by permitting fees. We can tell ourselves we are only doing our job, but anyone who knows how the industry operates knows better, and as long as we are plugged into this operation, as producers,

regulators, workers in the stream or consumers, the best we can do, as decent human beings, is draw a line somewhere, when that operation runs afoul of basic human values.

That line is clearly drawn here in New York, where a couple of LDCs aside, we reject fracking and its entire infrastructure, including this pipeline.

VOICE: That's right.

(Applause.)

MR. ALBAUGH: We don't want it. We are pledged to resist it, and instead of an industrial wasteland we choose to protect the countryside and a way of life, a transforming economy of alternate agriculture and forestry, animal husbandry and local businesses responsible to their community.

(Applause.)

MR. ALBAUGH: All the specific comments that are filed regarding the ICE reduce to that proposition. This is the opportunity for Williams Cabot to understand the breadth and the intensity of our resistance, and to withdraw this proposal for a speculative asset.

(Applause.)

MR. ALBAUGH: Before they waste millions more, trying to force this folly on a people who will not accept it.

VOICE: That's right.

MR. ALBAUGH: It is also an opportunity for FERC to exercise wisely and in the real public interest, whatever authority it retains, outside the political influence that has corrupted regulation and oversight.

(Applause.)

MR. ALBAUGH: The Superfund started in New York with Love Canal. In that tragedy, industry was comparatively straightforward when it conveyed its toxic property to the municipality. The real onus of the crime lay on the heads of local officials, who as the story keeps repeating itself, felt they were getting something for nothing.

It's the same mentality that characterizes some of our local officials today, in a scenario, however, that's far more complex and corrupt than that in 1953. But we are gaining in the realignment of that attitude, just as we have contributed to the growing public recognition of the nature of fracking, starting in these small towns and counties, going to a state level, to a national level and a global awareness.

Everyone has to make a living. The question is where we draw the line, and to those of you sitting on the stage today, we urge a question. Years from now, when your children and grandchildren ask, as they will, what part you played in the struggle for all creation, how will you

answer?

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you. We have 17 people left that wish to speak, and we only have 35 more minutes. So if you already have your comments written down, you should summarize them and give them to us.

(Voices from audience.)

MS. HARRIS: Your interrupting does not help. It's taking away time. So we're going to call the next person. We're going to call the next person, but please keep in mind, the longer you talk and interrupt, the less time we will have. So at some point, we will have to end. So just please keep your comments short, summarize them, and provide them in a hard copy, and please don't interrupt, so the person can finish the comments that they do have.

VOICE: Add another hearing.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Carol Marner.

(Voices from audience.)

VOICE: Let everyone here be heard tonight.

MS. MARNER: I am from Delaware County, and I'm going to be 75 next month, and all this traveling around is a bit hard for me, and that's what I've been doing, ever since -- I'm not speaking into it -- ever since this whole horror started in 2008.

Before any approval, any new additions to the

nation's pipeline system is decided, the pipeline we now have, dysfunctional and aging and uncharted, must be made functional, dependable and most importantly, traceable. This should be the first mandate of any scoping decision.

It is known that the old cast iron pipes that supplied us with the gas in the country are failing, corroding and needing replacement. Why then allow the pipeline system, which will be taking gas supposedly to inner city pipeline networks, that are old and in danger of falling apart? Why not instead begin a massive replacement of the aging infrastructure before taking on a new one?

And why add to an existing system that is not properly charted? There are thousands of miles of pipelines that are not properly mapped, and many that are lost. Should we not locate them, wherever they are, and before we add on more?

And who is going to regulate and inspect this pipeline, the Constitution pipeline? New York State regulatory agencies are notoriously understaffed. As to federal oversight, whenever one reads the acronym, PHMSA from the U.S. Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, it is usually accompanied by the words "limited" or "lacking" as in the following on the Pipeline Trust website.

"PHMSA's lack of regulatory guidance for pipeline

facility response planning," and "PHMSA's limited oversight of pipeline emergency preparedness." Then there is the exclusionary rule, which cannot improve matters. Federal inspection rules exclude areas from federal regulation as rural, where there are ten houses or less along a mile of pipeline.

This would describe many of the properties in my town of Franklin, New York, currently on the proposed Constitution pipeline route. This is outrageous. We seem to be caught between the devil and the deep blue sea.

An understaffed state inspection system for infrastructure, that like a highway is truly federal because it is attached across state borders, and a federal regulatory agency known for its inadequacy.

And to make matters even worse, as was reported in the Philadelphia Inquirer, as pipeline rules have become stricter, they have required companies to focus their greatest attention on what regulators officially term "high consequence areas," places where the injury or death tolls would be massive, and that is where they have stricter rules in place.

This is madness, which is a nice way of putting it; it is actually criminal. I expect FERC to deal with the very prevailing and catastrophically lax oversight before approving any plans for any new pipeline construction.

Also, I expect FERC to mandate that before any construction is begun, a system of continual, regular, well-trained inspection along the entire pipeline be instituted. I also expect FERC to mandate a system which can provide immediate on-site responders to complaints 24-7.

In PA, we have spoken to people who have waited weeks and even months for a state inspector to respond to complaints about noise, smells, headaches and so forth. Then you will need to mandate that there will be a special training given to all the local emergency services in dealing with accidents.

We have volunteer EMS in towns and villages. They will need to be trained to deal with all the possible and hitherto unknown but now well-known problems; leaks, explosions, fires, and the other day, lost radioactive probes.

Then you will need to mandate that there will be special training given to all the local road crews, to recognize that the immediate remediation on sink holes, sudden unknown discharges into creeks and reservoirs and sediment, runoff on hillsides, all of which have occurred in other places.

There is a world-recognized pipeline integrity specialist, Professor Phil Hawkins, who says that three of the most potentially haunting aspects of the industry is the

issue of an aging population of pipeline engineers, and not being replaced, it seems. The lack of technical research; I guess the companies really aren't spending money on that, and the industry's current reliance on software as opposed to pure engineering.

If this is true, what oversight has FERC provided to ensure that these haunting aspects are removed from our nightmares. It does not seem as if we as a nation are truly prepared to proceed in any way with the Constitution pipeline, much less the development of a huge, new gas infrastructure such as the fracking of the marcellus shale.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Katherine Dawson.

MS. DAWSON: I'm Katherine Dawson. I live in the Town of Gilford in Chenango County. I've lived in Chenango County for 33 years. I've had deep roots here. As an Army brat, I never lived anywhere longer than three years. I lived in many of the states in the 1940's where fracking now occurs, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico.

I lived in New Mexico in the 80's and the 90's, the 70's and the 90's, and I've traveled through many of the other states, Pennsylvania, Wyoming, Utah, Montana. I've spent a lot of time in the Rockies. We used to drive across the country two or three times, as my father was an Army

officer, and that's how we got from one assignment to another.

I've been very close to these places. I lived in dire poverty in Chenango County for 15 years. I could always, I understood what Scarlett O'Hara; at the end of the "Gone With the Wind," she began to plant, and I planted a lot of tomatoes, and I planted a lot of food, and I never had -- I didn't have money, but there was always good food, good water and clean air, except when they burned and people burned their garbage and their furnaces in town. Otherwise, it was okay.

I left the city. I left the country in 1997 to teach in New York City and build up some income and pay off debt, and I did that, and I bought an investment property where my daughter now lives with two children. She has a shallow well; I have a shallow well. I wanted to buy a very expensive property, about $300,000 property, because of the 35 acres that we had walked on for 33 years.

But however, when I retired in 2009, that's when I found out about fracking, and I have nightmares, I would say, three times a week, about things exploding unexpectedly, the very friendliest types of objects explode. So I have a little rap here. Upstate, up here, upstate New York, I'd be needing the High Plains Drifter, a Shane. You know that gunslinger helped out the single mom on the

Plains.

I'd be needing, we all be needing High Plains Drifters. We need dozens of High Plains Drifters and 29 Shanes to run off, run out those natural gas Mafia (Italian phrase), coming to take us out with their legal chemicals and put us on the terrorist list, as they make megabucks for India, China, Japan, Norway and ye olde Americana investors. SOW is our new SOS, and it don't spell female pig. It taps out "save our water, save our water, save our water." Rap this and rap on, and pass --.

(Applause.)

MS. DAWSON: Natural gas ain't the clean energy; that's a corporate lie (singing).

(Applause.)

MS. DAWSON: I'll make this, cut to the chase here. I was influenced by my time in the city. I really didn't like rap, but it got in there, and I wrote that in eight minutes. I mean it just came to me. I oppose the pipeline on the basis I am a biregional person, New York City. I go there once a month, and I live here, have family here.

I oppose the pipeline for all the reasons that people gave, that it relates to hydrofracking. It will help hydrofracking come to New York State. But I oppose it also, that it will bring radon-laced gas from the marcellus shale

and cause countless deaths in New York City from the radioactivity.

I've seen this, reports documented by professors at Hamilton College, etcetera, that the gas on the marcellus shale is radioactive, and it only takes five to seven hours for it to get to New York City, not enough time for the radioactivity to dissipate.

I also oppose it because of the locally, for the extreme environmental devastation, that will disrupt natural habitat and threaten death to people who live within 2,000 feet. They are subject to the infrared radiation, and in the case of an explosion. I mean you just, people I don't need to address. Everyone has addressed in great detail.

But I will also speak on the compressor stations. It will raise the incidence of asthma, fumes. It will cause rashes, nosebleeds. Calvin Tillman, Mayor of Dish, Texas. I don't know why it took him so long. He finally moved out of there. His kids were having nosebleeds every night, little children 7 and 9 years of age.

Just to add to the issue of hydrofracking, a Cornell dissertation recently reported that in Pennsylvania, birth rates are much lower, I think 25 percent lower. Well, birth rate is very important in infants. So if anyone is expecting to have children, this is not, you know, you don't want to be living in Pennsylvania. Well, thank you very

much.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Loddie Marsh.

MS. MARSH: Hi. I'm Loddie Marsh, M-A-R-S-H. I live in Delaware County and I love my 200-acre farm. Our farm borders Carr's Creek, has three ponds, wetlands, NOFA (ph) certification on 1,000 bush blueberry field. It is a beautiful habitat to enjoy, a nature preserve for birds and animals, a treasure which we saved 25 years for, a treasure which is in the proposed pipeline corridor.

I am requesting a cumulative impact study be completed on all the small, low-yielding, two to five gallon per minute yet important springs used as drinking water supplies for both dwellings and livestock uses.

The source and recharge areas for these water supplies are typically fractured sandstone layers of the local bedrock in uplands, which in many places would be crossed by the proposed routes, and would likely require blasting to achieve adequate burial depth.

According to Delaware County Soil and Water, local experience with bedrock quarries has shown that disturbance of bedrock, even at relatively shallow depths, can change subtle ground water flow patterns. Springs emanating from the bedrock can easily be contaminated or

permanently dried up, and these water supplies can be very difficult to replace, if not impossible.

There are so many other negative impact issues regarding this proposed pipeline. I find it unconscionable that we have to deal with an industry capable of generational genocide, destruction and contamination --

(Applause.)

MS. MARSH: --of our land and water, an industry that is exempt from the Safe Drinking Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Superfund, Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

VOICE: It's crazy.

MS. MARSH: Even their ability to obtain adequate insurance is questionable, as is the motivation for this pipeline. The benefit of this pipeline will serve big business, the one percent, the gas companies. The people who want this pipeline and gas drilling want that lease, thinking they'll become shale-ionnaires.

They are so blinded by the possible income, they can't rationalize what they will lose and what damage they will cause themselves and their neighbors by allowing gas companies on their property. Pipeline companies don't have to provide any type of references, pass any courses, show

any safety record, report any past violations or be competent.

How is that possible? Companies in Pennsylvania have extracted so much gas they have started shipping it out on its way overseas. The proposed pipeline will be for exportation. It is not local gas for local people. The profit is not ours. The damage left behind is ours.

Gas companies and the frackers give no thought about our clean, delicious water, of our land, of fresh air, of our peace and quiet, of our community, of our livelihoods, of agriculture, of wildlife, of leisurely drives, of the night skies, of our way of life, of our dreams, of our health, of our future of all of us.

Don't allow our rural beauty to be turned into industrial wastelands. Don't be collateral damage for Williams. Say no to the pipeline.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Cathy McNulty. Cathy McNulty.

MS. McNULTY: Thank you for having this hearing. I'd like to concur with a lot of what's already been said. I'd like to underscore that there are 12 proposed pipelines for natural gas transmission from Pennsylvania to the eastern coast. All are pending approval and using the same target markets.

One other line is also a Williams line, and applying for interstate approval for domestic use. I believe this is duplicitous and will lead to the exportation of gas, as outlined in Williams' communications with their own stockholders. I believe that Cabot-Williams is telling land owners that the pipeline is not dependant on high volume hydrofracking, while telling its stockholders that it's opening up new areas for drilling.

All of this is being done with your complicity, FERC. You are better able than individual citizens to understand the half-truths and deceptions employed in this process. Young FERC representatives basically were apologists for the Cabot-Williams Company, agreeing that the Williams central station was not part of the project, when in fact it is.

Citizens opposed to having their land run over by Cabot-Williams, suggested the I-88 corridor for the siting of the land. When we saw the new route, we found that it was running over 500 new properties, and we didn't want to shift the burden to others. Instead of looking at Cabot-Williams as the perpetrators of theft and manipulators of the federal government for their own profit, they seek to divide land owners and foment disharmony in our communities.

(Applause.)

MS. McNULTY: I believe, like others, if this

project is being sited through rural properties, irregardless of the uses the owners have in mind, irregardless of the wishes of most of the rural residents, who don't wish to live in an industrial environment, and should be the arbiters of land use in their towns.

If the project is intended to promote hydrofracking, then FERC should be required to do a cumulative environmental review of the entire effects of the industrialization of our communities. I object to the fragmentation --

(Applause.)

MS. McNULTY: I object to the fragmentation of farmland. I object to the fragmentation of woodlands and natural habitat. This route goes right through the lands owned by the Nature Conservancy. It also traverses the secondary water source in my village, in my town, in the Village of Sydney. I've heard numerous times tonight about them going through water sources in villages and other sensitive areas.

What the heck kind of maps are these guys using? They're not doing their job at all adequately. I object to the deceit of planning to export gas, while using FERC to take private land by eminent domain. I object to the introduction --

(Applause.)

MS. McNULTY: I object to the introduction of new routes without allowing extra time for citizens to understand the gravity and extent of this land usurpation. I object to FERC holding only three scoping sessions. Every town should be able to come to one.

I object to valuing the land that, the same as you would for a lease, when the pipeline precludes other uses for an unlimited time. Sale or lease is done with the understanding that the parcel of land could be used repeatedly, in perpetuity, for unlimited uses, and could be transferred to descendants. Cabot-Williams will just ruin it, and keep it forever.

If this project is considered narrowly as transporting gas to Boston, as originally proposed, why should New Yorkers or their legislators let Pennsylvania and Massachusetts run over New Yorkers, with no benefit to them whatsoever? Cabot-Williams has stated that no community along the route is large enough, is a large enough market to warrant tapping the line for use in New York, no matter what Mr. German says.

How could our state allow us to be taken advantage of in this way? New York City was added as a market later in the process, and I believe only for public relations purposes, as there are multiple lines serving and proposed for New York City now. Why go north to get south?

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

(Applause.)

MS. McNULTY: I believe this project should be denied because New Yorkers do not want it, and because as proposed, the affected communities cannot use it. I believe this project should be denied because it is not needed, because of the super-fluidity of existing and proposed new lines going to the markets by more direct routes.

I believe this project should be denied because Cabot-Williams is not a trustworthy partner, neither presenting the project in its detail nor its scope in an honest manner. I believe this project should be denied because neither Cabot-Williams nor FERC has any right to rezone huge swaths of New York industrial by decree.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Suzie Winkler. Suzie Winkler.

MS. WINKLER: Suzie Winkler, Burlington Flats, New York. I hope FERC takes into consideration the quality of the Applicant's record in the state of Pennsylvania, as you review their permit application, because at the very least, Cabot Oil and Gas' record is deplorable.

I ask that you do a study on the Applicant's safety record. I want FERC to research all the Applicant's violations, every one of them. I want to find out what they

were fined and what they actually pay. I also want you to determine, from your findings of the records, what sort of environmental damage and degradation we can expect along the 120 mile corridor.

I believe that you'll find that the Applicant has no intention of being a good neighbor.

(Applause.)

MS. WINKLER: Our community deserves a good neighbor. We don't want a picnic. We don't want a rec center. We want our safety.

VOICES: Yeah, that's right.

MS. WINKLER: According to the articles that I'm going to give to whoever I give them to when I leave, safety is not something that Cabot Oil will do. Additionally, I would like to address the following questions: How were the boundaries for the study area, for the project identified? How were the range of alternatives generated for the project? Three, have you included existing utility line right-of-ways in the alternatives, and if not, why?

Four, I'm concerned about the quality of the baseline environmental data that will be collected in order to weigh and balance the impacts of each of the alternatives. I want to know how the collecting is done, who is collecting. I want to know if the data will be spot-checked and by who it will be spot-checked so that it will

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

be accurate.

I want to know what kind of resource mapping will be provided to the general public, and I want you to know that none of us want to be here. We've been at this for years. I don't want this gas. I want solar power on my house, but I'm waiting to build it, because I'm afraid to build, of what you're about to bring here.

I ask you to take into consideration all of our lives, and lastly, before I go, there are people here who are property holders on the line that haven't spoken. You've missed them. So please make sure they all speak.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

MR. MOONEYHAN: Eugene Marner.

MR. MARNER: Thank you for holding this hearing. Not enough, but thank you for this one. My name is Eugene Marner. I'm from Franklin and Delaware County. We, the citizens of New York State and Pennsylvania, are under attack, and it's your job, as agents of the federal government, paid by our tax dollars, to defend us.

VOICE: It's your job. It's your job.

MR. MARNER: We are under attack by a greedy horde of terrorists, who want to tear up our soil, blow up the bedrock on our mountain ridges, and bury amongst us a pipeline, carrying a lethal, explosive gas. In my town of

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

Franklin, the pipeline will pass across a ridge which drains on one side to the Susquehanna River and on the other to the Oley Outbreak Creek, which is a tributary of the Susquehanna.

Cabot-Williams asked us to believe that they're going to do all this digging and blasting without damaging our aquifers and contaminating our water, and the water of the millions downstream of us along the Susquehanna River, who depend upon that stream for drinking water, for life itself.

FERC must examine the geology of the region, the relation of the bedrock to the aquifers and the potential for contamination of both aquifers and streams. Furthermore, the proposed pipeline route crosses one of the most important Eastern flyways for migrating raptors. FERC must examine the impact of the pipeline not only on birds, but on all wildlife for whom habitat will be fragmented.

Why has Cabot-Williams chosen to put a pipeline right through the agricultural center of New York State, where dairy farms, orchards, vineyards and tourism are vital economic activities? They claim that they want to take the gas to eastern markets. As others have noted, why then do they not simply use the existing Millennium and Tennessee pipeline rights-of-way, which are close to the starting point and actually go from west to east, to where the say

the gas needs to go?

The pipeline under discussion here goes from south to north, and not to the markets Cabot-Williams claim they expect to serve. That means, so it seems obvious that the pipeline is being constructed through this virgin territory, so that the gas companies will be able to move the gas they hope to extract from the leased properties along the route of this pipeline.

That means that the pipeline will eventually be accompanied by many compressor stations, gathering lines, well pads, waste water ponds, massive truck traffic and road damage, toxic chemicals, horrific health impacts and all the rest of the well-documented destruction that comes with hydraulic fracturing.

FERC must examine the impact of these activities on our area, since the pipeline will bring them on. Of course, Cabot-Williams denied that this pipeline is intended to move shale gas from New York to market. We're full up, they say, fully booked for five years. A FERC representative at one of the open houses told me that all you need to see is a contract for transporting gas, and then you will believe that the pipeline is not intended to enable the fracking of New York State.

Forgive me, but that is not putting on the public service mantel of a regulator, but rather the dunce cap of

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

the village idiot.

(Applause.)

MR. MARNER: If you do your job and regulate this pipeline, you must know what you're regulating, and FERC must thoroughly explore the claims of Cabot-Williams, that this pipeline is not intended to enable the fracking of New York.

If I were to take a jug of chemicals using in hydrofracking and pour them into the Susquehanna River, I would quite rightly be arrested and probably charged with terrorism. Yet this terrorism is precisely what these invaders are threatening to do to us, and what they have already done to the neighboring Pennsylvania and indeed to the Susquehanna River.

This pipeline will scar 120 miles of countryside, industrialize a rural area, and they did the water supplies and health of the citizens and impoverish all the land owners, whose property will become uninsurable and unsaleable. FERC must examine the economic consequences to the people who live in the areas to be despoiled by this pipeline.

It seems obvious that an unbiased study of the environment on economic impacts of this proposed pipeline must result in denial of the permit, and I call upon you to do so.

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: April Leggett. April Leggett.

MS. LEGGETT: Hello. My name is April Leggett. I live in Afton. Leggett is L-E-G-G-E-T-T. I'll be very brief. One of my biggest concerns as the chairman of the Flood Mitigation Committee here in Afton, is that the Susquehanna River and its basin is the largest, most flood-prone river, not in the county of Chenango, not in the state of New York, but in the entire country.

The Susquehanna River floods, creating on average $150 million of damage a year. We also have hurricanes here. We also have earthquakes here. All of those can create damage to pipelines, and that is a concern I wanted to stress. There are many others; they've already been addressed.

But I want to point out those very serious ones that I have concern about, among others. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Hazen Reed.

MR. REED: Can you hear me?

VOICE: Yes.

MR. REED: My name is Hazen Reed, and I live in East Meredith, New York, with my family, my wife Susan

Muether --

MS. HARRIS: Would you please speak directly into the microphone.

MR. REED: And my two six year-old boys, who have been very patiently waiting and listening to this commentary. I thought it important for them to hear the kind of things that are being said in their land. I thought it important for them to hear what these gentlemen, these people want to do to their land.

I thought it important that their governing body see them in person, so that they knew exactly who they were voting against, or hopefully for. I am concerned for the well-being of our community, and I am concerned for the opportunities for my boys.

What I really want to know is will FERC allow history to repeat itself? Inferior education, below average graduation rates, non-local workers, increased crime rates, exhausted public services, destroyed local infrastructure, devastated natural environments, skyrocketing cost of living, crushing housing costs, constricted economic diversity.

Of the hundreds of studies of gas pipelines and extraction, two examples stand out. Colorado suffered a boom-bust development cycle in the 1970's and the early 80's, when industry abruptly stopped work on May 2nd, 1982,

what you I'm sure all know as Black Sunday. Five counties experienced drastic repercussions, and have yet to recover, nearly 30, over 30 years ago.

Similarly, the community of Sublet County, Wyoming was told in an 1998 Environmental Impact Study to expect one transmission line, and a total of 400 wells over the next 20 years. Over 400 wells were drilled in the first three years of that project. 3,100 more have since been drilled. Dozens of additional collection lines have been added. Who's lying to who?

A 2007 independent study of Sublet found the population expanded 24 percent from 2000 to 2006, four times the national rate. Enrollment in local schools dropped, suggesting new residents were all transient. Rental fees increased by 90 percent, making it impossible to find housing.

Damaged local roads, increase in serious felonies, emergencies, arrests, all taxed local services. Residents now leave, citing regularly quality of life issues. Lost economic diversity, reduced local tax revenues, all contribute to a negative climate.

In June 2012, economists at the Ohio State University studied boom-bust cycles such as these for gas, transportation and development. They said, and I quote, "To avoid the vicious cycle of the resource bust, you must apply

an appropriate level of severance taxes on companies that extract and transport shale gas.

"Use these funds collected to pay for both the immediate costs of industrial activity and development, as well as long-term costs, particularly to help boost education and economic diversification. They go on to stress that a boom in one sector of the economy such as shale, gas and oil extraction, and transportation, leads to sudden growth and low skill, but proportionately high wages.

Young workers, often high school students, take these gas jobs instead of completing school, instead of taking advanced courses, and instead of advanced study. Other industries typically avoid such regions like these because the work force is both unskilled and yet demanding high wages.

In the case of the Constitution pipeline, the public must be assured that all cumulative costs are paid for by the industries that are benefitting from this resource. We ask FERC to study, and to avoid provide on an annual basis, public reports covering the cumulative cost of reduced economic diversity made by the quashing of other industries, reduced graduation rates from local high schools, and related educational underperformance issues, as well as affected services and infrastructure that you've heard about here tonight.

FERC, require Constitution Pipeline and all companies involved in gas extraction and transmission, to make this region one of educational excellence, a success story, instead of one more in the history of devalued land and wasted human potential. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Will Peter Donnelly will come on up? We need a moment while the court reporter changes his paper. If you would, just wait just one moment, please.

MS. HARRIS: Just wait a second. Okay, go.

MR. DONNELLY: Well good evening, and I'm glad I waited. My name is Peter Donnelly. I live at 445 Prosser Hollow Road in Davenport. Six years ago, my wife and I purchased 11 acres, with the intent of building our dream house, with the plan of retiring here in Davenport.

I've been working almost every weekend for the past six years and I'm almost finished. I've named the property "Seven Ridges." When I sit on my deck, my view is of seven different ridges. I will now change the sign to "Seven Ridges and a Pipeline." I have learned more here tonight than I can contribute. The question of why the pipeline here has always bothered me, but thanks to a well-versed group of people, I understand why now.

I wanted to bring a few items up that I've wanted

to address. Property values going down because of the pipeline and the loss of total use of my property. Yet I will always have to pay property taxes at full value. I am concerned with the total lifetime of the pipeline.

What if the pipeline goes dormant? Ten, twenty, thirty years from now, things will change. Gas will not be in demand. What happens to the pipeline? A dormant pipeline needs just as much maintenance. Who will do that maintenance on a dormant pipeline? The answer is no one.

I have been told there will be no fracking, but there appears to be no guarantees. In fact, it probably is inevitable. Fracking will occur. Fracking will definitely occur. I also wanted to make a statement on easement negotiations. You are encouraged, you are urged to get on board early to get the best deal.

In fact, I received mail from FERC stating once eminent domain takes effect, your negotiation value is worthless. Eminent domain means pennies on your dollar. Eminent domain means robbery, robbery of your property values, robbery of your rights. In my opinion, this is a lose-lose proposition, and adds no value to the citizens of Delaware County, but will cause discord between neighbors, friends and family. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

MR. MOONEYHAN: Judy Robinson. Judy Robinson.

(No response.)

MR. MOONEYHAN: Kim Michels.

MS. MICHELS: Hi. My name is Kim Michels. K-I-M, M-I-C-H-E-L-S. I'm a land owner. My family and I owned 97 acres. I'm pretty appalled by the threat our health and homes and rural way of life that is being not only tolerated, but endorsed by some government officials.

I've done quite a bit of research over the last three years, and my concerns with the pipelines start with the products that will be carried through them. Natural gas sounds so innocent, and if left undisturbed, it probably is. According to studies by Tracy Bank and Lauren Forson of the University of Buffalo, the marcellus shale natural gas reservoir is enriched in uranium and other sensitive materials.

Fracking may alter pH and eH conditions, causing many of these metals to become locally mobile within the subsurface. In addition, when the millions of gallons of water used in hydraulic fracturing come back to the surface, it could contain uranium contaminants, potentially polluting streams and other ecosystems, and generating hazardous waste.

The uranium and the hydrocarbons are in the same physical space, and are not just physically, but also

chemically, bound. That, I would think, is a very real concern that the natural gas going through these pipelines containing uranium, and in addition, their daughter products.

That's pretty frightening, especially when you consider the fact that these pipelines are notorious for leaking. I noticed Mike German came up earlier, talking about how, you know, their company is so great and no harm has ever come to anyone. You know, I hear all the time like oh, everything so safe, regulations are so great on the pipelines.

I checked into them a little bit, because they wanted to have their pipeline go through our town of Powder Tree (ph), and in 2010, they had to repair 139 leaks, replacing 358 service lines and 6-1/2 miles of gas main. In 2009, they had to repair 190 leaks, replacing 459 services and 10.6 miles of gas main.

And you know, I mean this is one company. You hear this over and over again. State after state, the story is the same. Unless somebody calls them on it, they don't bother to fix the leaks if they don't have to, and they're often given all kinds of time to take care of it.

In addition to uranium and thorium, another major concern that I'm surprised you never hear about is hydrogen sulfide gas. Berkeley University had done studies on this,

and there are case after case involving oil and gas wells, compressor stations, with releases of hydrogen sulfide gas, and adapting from PG&E, who by the way is still operating, despite that huge scandal, lawsuit with the Erin Brockovich case. I read that they were actually in Pennsylvania now.

That's pretty horrifying. They pay a fine, and what they did to those people is a crime. Why are they not in jail? Why are they even allowed to still operate?

(Applause.)

MS. MICHELS: Well mainly, I just want to draw your attention to the whole issue of hydrogen sulfide gas. The health effects, for starters, it's highly flammable, and when it comes in contact with air, it's explosive. I don't know if that's what causes the explosions in the gas lines, but it's a huge issue.

The health effects are numerous. In a single breath, if the concentrations are high enough, you can die in one breath. If somebody tries to give you mouth to mouth resuscitation, they could end up suffering the health effects too.

You know, they actually put -- according to PG&E, this is actually just something that's actually contained within the natural gas going through their pipelines on a regular basis, they try -- the gas industry tries to control this with the use of biocides. Apparently, it's like

bacterial and chemical reactions that make it, that bring this, make the wells go sour, which can happen at any time during the life of the well.

They've been using biocides, which is environmentally unsafe, very expensive. It can cost up to $50,000 per gas well for the gas industry. Now, they've, there's something new, the use of bacteria and bacteriophages to try and control this. That's even more frightening, I think, than the biocides. Now you're adding all kinds of mass amounts of bacteria and bacterial viruses into the equation.

Bacteria evolved very quickly, you know. God only knows what in addition to all these chemicals and radioactive materials and heavy metals. Now we have, we've introduced massive amounts of bacteria and bacterial viruses into the equation.

The whole thing is just absolutely frightening, and on the issue of the exploding pipelines and the pipeline industry, I just wanted to quote a man by the name of Frank Cain (ph). He says "They lie, they're arrogant and they're outrageous." This man is from Bellingham, Washington. There were children playing in a park when one of these natural gas pipelines exploded. Everybody had told them how safe it was and everything.

These children, when this happened, the heat was

so intense their bodies turned orange. Their skin was actually dripping off their fingers. Some of these kids lived for 14 hours in horrible pain before they died. The one thing this man had asked was that his son did not, had not died in vain.

I hope that you'll pay attention to that story, the horror that this man went through, and not let it happen here, or to anyone else. There's so many things that in your position you are aware of. I'm asking you, begging you if I have to, be a whistleblower. You may end up losing your job, but you'll be saving a whole lot of people.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Howard L. Hancur.

MR. HANNUM: Howard Hannum, H-A-N-N-U-M. I am a small farm owner and taxpaying land owner from Trout Creek, Delaware County, New York. First of all, I'd like to voice my displeasure on behalf of all of the disenfranchised residents of Delaware and Otsego County, New York.

(Applause.)

MR. HANNUM: We'd like the FERC to immediately add a separate scoping hearing in Delaware County. We'd also like to see a separate Otsego County scoping hearing added immediately to the list as well. We'd like the FERC to show sensitivity in this matter, and give ample time for

preparation for those two proposed hearings.

There is something in the government called "reasonable accommodation," and reasonable accommodation must be adhered to in respect to the disenfranchised residents of Delaware and Otsego counties of New York.

My issue I speak to tonight has to deal with an Environmental Impact Study in the area between Otsego County and Delaware County, along the 121 mile proposed pipeline route. This area is of particular concern, because it seems to be in the affected areas of both of the published proposed routes for the project.

I specifically refer to the area in and around Monkey Run Road in the Davenport-East Meredith area. I object to this project, because the Ammens Pond Bog (ph) is on the National Register of Nature Preserves. Beavers have begun returning to the region for the first time in nearly 15 years, and it is widely speculated that a pipeline constructed through the region would certainly spell the end of the beavers at that point.

Lilies, indigenous orchids and other vegetation unique to that region, would also become instinct. What I request from the FERC is a comprehensive study on that region, with a special concern to the Monkey Run Road area, and I would like to know exactly which species we are eliminating.

Beavers, bats and birds unique to that area need to be included in the study, and I would like the study to be a cumulative impact study, including future construction on this 30-inch open access, 121-mile line. Please give the extent of the estimated endangerment with regard to the following:

A, pipeline construction, including any blasting and dynamite needed for the rock in that region, and the effects on that region at the time of completion. B, future speculation in the way of drilling, which includes gathering lines and well pads, and as well as evaporating storage ponds and their effects on the bog region when they are complete.

C, compressor stations and construction of those compressor stations, and the impact on the air quality in the bog when the compressor stations are completed and constructed. And D, any and all roadway and access way construction, and the elimination of trees and shrubs and all vegetation removed that is unique to this particular nature preserve, and the effects on that region.

Beavers are returning to the Ammens Pond Bog and the Cabot-Williams partners are coming through with a useless pipeline to disrupt this beautiful nature preserve. We, the concerned residents of Delaware County, offer as an alternative the use of the existing lines already in place

along the northern parts of Pennsylvania, which will easily and expeditiously carry the Susquehanna, Pennsylvania product to New York City and the Boston markets.

There is already in existence a current New York line, which also carries product to the same markets. Those aforementioned lines in Pennsylvania and New York are not fully subscribed, and we see no reason to add another one.

I offer the same study sources previously stated and offered as study agents by the exquisite Irene Kline just moments ago, and Suko (ph), Hartwick and Delaware-Otsego Audubon Society, is source for this study. The National Audubon Society has spelled doom for this region if a pipeline is constructed through this area. We would like to keep it as a nature preserve, and that is why we speak on behalf of the beavers of Delaware County, New York tonight.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Robert Beards. Robert Beards.

MR. BEARDS: Hello, I'm Robert Beards from Masonville. I'm a land owner, and I want to thank the panel for coming in tonight, being as patient as you have. We've got a real antagonistic audience here and I hope you'll be patient with me. You've been very calm up there; that's pretty good.

But I might be the most antagonistic of all

actually, because I usually find that with these kind of panels, government panels, inspections, regulatory commissions and stuff like that, that it's really just to placate an annoyed public. And basically what usually happens is that the regulatory agencies, in most cases FDA, CDC, SEC as we all know, they're already captured by the very entities that they're purported to regulate. I even see our transcriber here nodding his head on agreement, so I appreciate it. [Reporter disagrees, shaking head.]

(Laughter.)

MR. BEARDS: The food czar of the country in charge of our food supply is a former Monsanto executive, a perfect example. Forget about the SEC. Okay. So I have no reason to believe that whatever you write up is going to pay head to anyway. I understand one of you is actually a private contractor. I don't know how he's going to be even employed over there, and that the other ones, basically your panel is four levels below the Commissioners who are going to make this decision, this political decision, okay.

If FERC has any intention to do anything other than what the huge and very politically connected gas industry desires, it's probably already decided what's going to happen, no matter what the public says here tonight, and they've had some pretty good arguments.

But that doesn't matter, because logic doesn't prevail in these cases, okay. That's just the state of things these days, but anyway, I've got a few quick notes, if I might. Before we ran another giant fossil fuel project over fellow citizens, consider the judgments awarded against ExxonMobil for the Valdez have yet to be paid.

The coast of Alaska is still littered with oil. Forget about the Gulf of New Mexico and the stories that they tell. Oh, it's great now. Eat the shrimp, enjoy those. Right off the batt, the lovely spokeswoman for Williams-Cabot started right off today disingenuously telling us that so many decahectares of gas or whatever it is is going to supply three million New Yorkers with that amount of gas.

However, pretty much they're not going to give me a sworn affidavit that that gas is for New Yorkers, because they're going to want to export it. Otherwise, let's see that affidavit. Try to get Williams-Cabot to give you a sworn affidavit that it's destined for New York.

The other thing, the right of way. They're trying to best to go over existing right-of-ways. Well, what about the 88 corridor. Have it go right down 88; that way we can -- no private land owners are going to be affected, and we can choose whether we want to traverse that or not.

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

We can stay clear of it if we feel it's safe or dangerous, or could ride right over it, if we think it's safe. The existing corridor already has a right-of-way. The reason they try to avoid it, it's a lot cheaper to pay a land owner five or fifteen bucks a foot to own that land forever. That's incredibly cheap, considering the value of how many decahectares or whatever of gas, you know, and the land owner still has to pay the taxes at full value.

Insurance, take a look at the stockholders statements these gas companies put out. They're not insured. There's no guarantee that this is going to be insured, and who's going to cover this damage? They'll just have Bernanke print some more, I guess.

Let's see. Everybody's pretty much said stuff that I think, let's see. I might have a little bit left. Okay. If you're going to be around, I don't know where you guys are from, if it's daytime and sunny out there, you might want to look outside your car as you're driving around.

Pretty much, no matter where your car is up here, when you look out the window it's beautiful. That's why people stay here. That's why they live here.

(Applause.)

MR. BEARDS: Just about every comprehensive plan, when they survey the township, people foremost want to

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

preserve the rural nature of upstate New York.

(Applause.)

MR. BEARDS: I guess that's about enough to say. I hope you guys will write up a nice statement. I hope that you'll try to use the right-of-way that's already existing, if it's still safe and still great. Hey think about it.

If there is an accident, where do you want the accident to be? In the middle of the woods somewhere, next to a few private homes, or right on the highway, where the emergency equipment can get right to it? You could just put up a roadblock, nobody's bothered. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Rema Loeb.

MS. LOEB: Hello. I'm Rema Loeb. I live in Afton or my land is in Afton, and I'm a land owner, yes. I've watched this kind of thing for four and a half years. You cannot separate the pipeline from the material it's carrying, and from all of the activities extracting that material.

I hope you look closely when you are in Pennsylvania, and see not just what the gas corporations want you to see. Talk to some of the people who have suffered already, the loss of interest, of money and their homes and lands, even worse, the health effects.

There's a man from our BEC who was the well inspector, who says it's not a matter of if the gas wells would leak, but when and when our water will be impacted. Perhaps our children and grandchildren will live with this tension. Why? We paid for our land. We pay our taxes. We're all good citizens. This is an outrage.

If eminent domain is used, it's a lie. It's not for the benefit of the public. It's for the benefit of the gas corporations and the politicians that sit with them. Furthermore, I want to offer a couple of facts that I haven't heard mentioned yet, Gastown.

A fairly well known corporation in Canada, has admitted publicly all pipelines and compressors leak, and what they leak is more than the methane. You cannot live, and I'm quoting health authorities here, you cannot live near a pipeline or a compressor and not suffer negative health effects, sooner or later.

So what you're doing in effect is killing people. It might take a year, it might take ten years, you know, maybe 20 or 30 years. Endocrine disorders, cancer, children with horrible, horrible asthma. That's been mentioned, you know. And the gas here, as you've heard, much of it is radioactive. Now this is wrong. This is just wrong.

We're counting on our government. We pay you for -- we pay our public servants, yes. That's still what it's

supposed to be. We pay our public servants to protect us, and by the way, I don't know if you know, the Millennium had an interesting event about a month ago.

You can build the best pipeline and compressor station in the world. Lightening hit that compressor station, and it blew up. Fortunately, they were able to put out the fire, and I think it was three or four hours. Our volunteer firefighters can't do that. They can't even get to those areas. They're not allowed, and I wouldn't want them to be exposed in that way.

This is wrong. You're taking a group of people, mainly rural, some smaller urban areas, taking a group of people and saying we're worthless. We're nothing. We're just one more sacrifice, and if you let this pipeline go through, you're just as guilty as our governor or the governor of Pennsylvania, or any of the others, who don't have to live with it themselves. They don't have to watch their families suffer.

Please do the right thing. Use the conscience that God gave you. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Earl W. Colley.

MR. HUSTON: I'm not Earl, but Earl has left.

MS. HARRIS: Well, we have someone else on the

list.

MR. HUSTON: I'm the next person after Earl.

MR. MOONEYHAN: William Huston.

MR. HUSTON: Yes, that's me. My name is William Huston. I'm from the town of Union. The place where I live takes water from a well that is right, it's a shallow well underneath the Susquehanna River, and it's influenced by the river.

I want to begin my testimony with four syllables. I encourage you to say it with me. Ah-O-M and space. Ahhhhhhoooooooooommmmmmmmm. Now there's very little that I can add that hasn't already been said. Life cycle impacts of the full shale gas buildout, cumulative impact study.

The environmental impact assessment for the Constitution pipeline must include all essential components of a 121-mile, 30-inch high pressure pipeline. So I examined Williams/Cabot's, Williams slash Cabot. I've examined their pre-file proposal, and I found something really odd. Do you want to hear what it is?

So I have some schooling, but basically this doesn't take a lot of schooling. This is basic physics, basic common sense. A pipeline has a lot of engineering involved with it, and a pipeline has certain components to it. One is the steel tubing, you know, this long or some pipelines aren't made of steel. They're made of other

things, but basically the shell of the thing.

Pipelines also require welds. That's part of the physics of it. So I looked at the design, and I'm looking for an initial compressor station, which is a required part of the design. You cannot move gas in a 30-inch high pressure pipeline 121 miles without an initial compressor. FERC accepted a defective proposal and did not blink an eye. What's up with that?

These people, if we have a system of law. That's my basic question. Do we have a system of law? If we do, I mean I'm a Buddhist and a Yogi, and I try to practice non-attachment and I don't believe in jails, I don't believe in punishment. I don't think that's really appropriate, because that's adding violence to violence. I don't think that really works.

But if we have a system of laws, do we -- these people are criminals. This project is illegal 100 different ways. They are building right now a massive site. They've got a measly little DP 5 no impact permit in Brooklyn Township, Pennsylvania, which just happens to line up perfectly with the beginning of their map of the Constitution pipeline.

Ahh, and by the way, what's the company that's building the compressor, that's got nothing to do with the Constitution? By the way, what's that missing component

that Constitution doesn't have an initial compressor? It's Williams. Oh, but it's a different branch of Williams.

They're not, they're -- but it's a win-win deal. It's really a deal made in heaven. his other branch of Williams just happens to be building a compressor, and this other branch just happens to be building a 30-inch high pressure 121 mile pipeline. Why don't we just get these two together?

It's fraud. It's fraud. It's fraud. Do you understand that? Take this back in your report to your managers that are making these decisions, how many levels up? Take it back. This project, what's today's date? September 24th. Here ye, here ye, on this date, this project is dead. This project is done. Go back to Houston. You're not building a pipeline here. Where are you? You're not building a pipeline here. It's done. Go back home. Go home. Go home. Go home.

I do have some technical comments about the pipeline, about the -- so one of the interesting things about the Williams Central Station that's being built in Brooklyn, PA. Like I said, it's illegal 100 different ways. One way is I was over at my friend's house. She lives in the area, and you know what I witnessed? I witnessed a truck with a big trailer. It's a triaxle. It's the biggest semi made, one of the biggest. It's a Kenworth triaxle.

You don't see triaxles every day. It's a big truck, and it had a big trailer, and it was a dirt road. On that trailer was a crane. The total weight of this truck and the trailer and the crane were 90 tons.

You know what we did? We stopped them and we said "Where's your permit to go on a dirt road with a 90 ton truck?" You know what the guy did? He ran. He got in his truck and he drove off, and we have it all documented. We've got it all documented on tape.

This project is illegal 100 different ways. Let me tell you another -- these people have contempt for the law. They're criminals. If we have a system of law, I think we do, then they're criminals. They have contempt for the law, and it is despicable that they call this thing the Constitution. It is a desecration of the sacred documents that define our democracy. They are subversive of democracy.

We the people on this day demand that Williams-Cabot cease and desist this illegal and unpermitted activity now, and we demand from you, FERC, that you uphold the law.

And one more thing. This is more to do with that Williams Central Station, which is part of -- it's an essential component. Are you hearing that, you're getting that, of a 121 mile, 30-inch high pressure pipeline. You need a massive compressor, and they just happened to leave

it off.

Maybe it was a mistake. Maybe it was an honest mistake. Just like the Constitution, I'm sorry the Millennium pipeline, which is oh by the way, very similar. High pressure. I think it's around 120 miles maybe, maybe a little longer, and it was built when, 2005 when they did the big expansion of the Constitution.

It just so happens they are proposing -- FERC, you all probably know about this. The Millennium pipeline is proposing two new compressor stations, one in Hancock on Hungry Hill Road, and the other in Minisink. These are massive compressors, 10 to 15,000 horsepower compressors.

So what, did they just -- is it a design flaw? I want to talk to the Millennium engineers. Why, did they just happen to forget that they needed these compressors all along? Is it a design flaw, or is there something going on, like fracking, that they want to start charging Millennium with fracked gas from PA and from New York, yeah.

That's what this thing's going to do, and if you ask these people, they're like oh, we're going to have one. I guess that compressor all the way up in Schoharie County, I guess it's going to suck the gas (sound) like a big straw 121 miles, because they've left out the initial compressor. That's absurd.

The other thing is they are applying for a minor

use permit. They're doing an air quality permit for this Williams Central Station. This is very relevant to this project. They are using obsolete conversion factors for greenhouse gas emissions for methane. They're using a factor of 21 times, and I believe it's over 100 year time horizon, and in reality it's 105 times over a 20 year time horizon.

So what they've done is a major use permit, I can't even figure this out, but this is what -- these are the numbers. 100,000 tons of greenhouse gas emissions per year, that defines the threshold for a major use permit. 100,000 tons of CO2 equivalent, and William-Cabot came in with their air quality permit, and they said well, it's not 100,000 tons.

By the way, they're using the obsolete conversion factors. It should from 21 to 105. It's like five times, one-fifth of what it should be. They're saying it's not 100,000 tons per year; it's 98,801. Somebody else does it. That's cool, right? It's a -- and the name, we had an impolite expression, but it's a red hair short of a major use.

When I think about minor use, a minor source of greenhouse gases, I think of a lawn mower. 100,000 tons per year? So what they're doing is, this is let's say 101 ways that this project is illegal. This is what they're doing.

They're segmenting the project before they --

They've got the plan in their hands. They've got brilliant engineers, very highly paid, best in -- the best grads from the engineering schools, and they designed this thing and they said their big head down there in Houston, he said, he said you know what? Give me that pair of scissors over there, and we're just going to cut this right off the beginning of it.

We don't want this as part of the whole thing, because these FERC people, they're pretty smart, and they're going to see that this thing needs to be scoped as part of the Constitution project. So let's just cut that off right now, and maybe the people at FERC will be sleeping and they won't even realize it.

Listen very carefully. We the people do declare on the date, this project is dead. Cease and desist right now. Cease and desist. Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MR. MOONEYHAN: Margaret Lettis. Margaret?

MS. LETTIS: Good evening, can you hear me? Hi. My name is Margaret Lettis. I'm a resident of the Town of Middlefield, Otsego County. I'm here tonight to say I'm against the pipeline for various reasons that have been said already this evening. I've been in the fight against

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

fracking for about three and half years now.

If this pipeline goes in, it will be the infrastructure for the beginning of fracking in New York State, which the majority of residents do not want, because it is not safe, period. The pipes for getting the gas out of Pennsylvania are already in place. They're already there.

The Millennium is down there. Somebody else can help me out with names, but we do not need this pipe up here. It's a fraud, it's a scam. That's what's going on. Williams-Cabot, I've been to Pennsylvania several times, have seen the destruction of Dimock and surrounding area. It's enough to make you puke.

They're lying, they're lying to all of us. Upstate does not want fracking. We do not want it here. We don't want it in Pennsylvania either. Having the pipeline go through New York state is aiding and abetting in the raping of Pennsylvania. I do not want any part of it. I don't want my granddaughter, who is two years old, to be part of this or anybody else in my family or my friends in New York State to be part of this. Thank you very much.

I do have one more thing. We need another place to have another meeting. It's almost eleven o'clock. I have to be at work at 7:00 a.m. Thank you.

(Applause.)

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

MS. HARRIS: Thank you. As I mentioned before, this meeting is being recorded and transcripts will be placed in the public record. The public record is available on our website, which is www.ferc.gov.

From that page, select the e-Library link and input Docket No. PF 12-9. You can use e-Library to access everything that the Commission does with this project, as well as all of the filings and information submitted by the Applicant.

On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, I want to thank you for coming tonight. This meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned.)

20121010-4009 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/10/2012

Document Content(s)

0924constitution.TXT.....1-136