

CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF NEW YORK

----- X

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MINUTES

Of the

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION JOINTLY
WITH COMMITTEE ON WATERFRONTS

----- X

April 1, 2015
Start: 01:07 p.m.
Recess: 04:16 p.m.

HELD AT: Council Chambers - City Hall

B E F O R E:

DONOVAN J. RICHARDS
Chairperson

DEBORAH L. ROSE
Co-Chairperson

COUNCIL MEMBERS:

COSTA G. CONSTANTINIDES
ERIC A. ULRICH
RORY I. LANCMAN
STEPHEN T. LEVIN
CHAIM M. DEUTSCH
COREY D. JOHNSON
DANIEL R. GARODNICK
PAUL A. VALLONE

A P P E A R A N C E S (CONTINUED)

Richard Thomas
Councilman
Mt. Vernon

Patrick Robbins
Communications and Development Coordinator
Sane Energy

Kevin O'Keefe
Sane Energy

Kim Fraczek
Outreach Coordinator
Sane Energy

Clare Donahue
Sane Energy

Bruce Ferguson
Catskill Citizens for Safe Energy

Marjorie Shaab
Damascus Citizens for Sustainability

Jose Sogard
Metro waterfront Alliance

Cindy Zipf
Clean Ocean Action Organization

Andrea Leshak
Natural Resources Defense Council

Matt Gove
Surfrider Foundation

Windy Burn
United for Action

Jennifer Scarlet
Bronx Climate Justice North

A P P E A R E N C E S (CONTINUED)

Mary Jenkins
League of Woman Voters

Edie Kantrowitz
Friends of Clearwater

Dave Dahl

Anthony Rogers-Wright
Policy and Organizing Director
Environmental Action

Denise Katzman
EnviroHancement

Mav Moorhead
NYH20

Alex Beauchamp
Northeast Region Director
Food and Water Watch

Tara Klein
Office of State Senator Hoylman

Max Wise
Office of Assembly Member Linda B. Rosenthal

Catherine Scopic

Judith K. Canepa
New York Climate Action Group

Ann Lazerous

Foress Tapple

John Corey

Pete Stubin

A P P E A R E N C E S (CONTINUED)

Aileen Sheil
Chairperson for Board of Directors of NYPIRG

Elena Sunna

Annie Wilson
New York Environmental Law and Justice

1 COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION JOINTLY
WITH COMMITTEE ON WATERFRONTS 5

2 [gavel]

3 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: We are officially
4 ready to begin. So good afternoon I am Council
5 Member Donovan Richards, Chair of the Environmental
6 Protection Committee. And today this committee
7 along with the Waterfronts Committee chaired by
8 Council Member Debbie Rose to my right or to your
9 left will hear from experts in members of the
10 public on resolution 549 calling on Governor Andrew
11 Cuomo to veto that application by Liberty Natural
12 Ga LLC to construct the Port Ambrose LNG terminal
13 off the cost of New York Liberty Natural Gas LLC
14 has proposed the construction of a Deep Water Port
15 Facility called the Port Ambrose Liquefied Natural
16 Gas LNG terminal which would be used to import
17 liquefied natural gas. Deport Ambrose LNG terminal
18 will consist of a submerged buoy system located in
19 federal waters within the New York bite,
20 approximately 19 miles off the cost of New York
21 City. Liquefied natural gas would arrive at the
22 Port Ambrose LNG terminal in vessels which would
23 connect to the submerged buoy system and transfer
24 natural gas into a 22 mile long pipeline connecting
25 to the existing... lower New York bay lateral

3 pipeline serving New York City and Long Island. The
4 applicant claims that this project will provide
5 additional natural gas applied and save consumers
6 millions of dollars a year. The project must be
7 approved by the United States Department of
8 Transportation Maritime Administration MARAD and
9 the United States Coast Guard. Pursuant to federal
10 law the project approval is subject to the review
11 under the National Environmental Policy Act or
12 NEPA. And Pursuant to NEPA an environmental impact
13 statement has been prepared. Consistent with the
14 Dept of Port Act a determination must be made on
15 the project within 330 days from the date the
16 notice of application appeared in the federal
17 register. The governors of adjacent coastal states
18 have the, authority to approve or disapprove of a
19 project. However this timeline has been affected by
20 the extension of the public comment period on the
21 draft environmental impact through March 16th, 2015
22 and more recently by a suspension of the timeline
23 entirely. On March 17th MARAD in the coast guard
24 suspended the regulatory timeline stop clock
25 because they have not received from Liberty
National Gas LLC information necessary to complete

3 development of the final EIS and make a
4 determination of financial responsibility. While
5 the city council has not weighed in or submitted
6 any formal comments on the environmental impact
7 statement as of now numerous environmental concerns
8 have been raised in the environmental impact
9 statement and in comments on the impact statement
10 by state and federal regulators. According to the
11 EIS there could be more, be water quality impacts,
12 operation of the project should result in sediment,
13 can result in sediment disturbance and turbidity
14 caused by rise of right movement in buoy anchor
15 chain movement as well as accidental releases of
16 petroleum products LNGN or other chemicals. Impacts
17 upon biological resources could occur from an
18 increased vessel, traffic, noise, lighting, marine
19 debris, routine discharges, LNG spills, inadvertent
20 spills bottom settlement disturbance, marine
21 facilities in mainline presence and seawater
22 intake. Construction operation and decommissioning
23 of the project would have some impacts on threat,
24 on threat import endangered marine species
25 including marine mammals, sea turtles, fish, and
protected or endangered marine and migratory birds.

1 Construction of the project would result in impacts
2 on threatened and endangered species from routine
3 discharges, increased vessel traffic, noise,
4 lighting, marine debris, bottom sediment
5 disturbance, entanglement, inadvertent spills, and
6 noise. Fish habitat would likely be harmed by
7 construction, operation, and decommissioning of the
8 project including some impacts on threatened or
9 endangered marine species such as marine mammals,
10 sea turtles, fish, and birds. The project would
11 result in impacts on the threatened and endangered
12 species from routine discharges, increased vessel
13 traffic, noise, lighting, marine debris, bottom
14 sediment, disturbance entanglement, inadvertent
15 spills and noise once again. Finally noise levels
16 amounting to harassment of marine mammals were
17 found to be possible according to the environmental
18 impact statement. Numerous New York state assembly
19 members, state senators, and members of the city
20 council as well as local residents, community
21 groups, and environmental advocacy organizations
22 opposed to port Ambrose LNG terminal pose and have
23 called on Governor Cuomo to veto. As we all know
24 the Port Ambrose LNG terminal could increase New
25

2 York City's reliance on natural gas which can emit
3 methane when it is extracted, transported, stored,
4 and consumed. In the intergovernmental panel on
5 climate change has stated that over a 20 year time
6 frame methane has a global warming potential that
7 is as much 86 times greater than that of carbon
8 dioxide. Furthermore renewable options will likely
9 be limited by the siting of this facility as the
10 Bureau of Ocean Energy Management and Agency of the
11 United States Department of Interior stated in its
12 scoping comments on the Port Ambrose LNG terminal
13 application. That is concern that the proposal to
14 construct a LNG port is in the same area proposed
15 for a large win facility which could result in
16 serious conflicts therefore the council is holding
17 this hearing on resolution 549 so often members of
18 the public the opportunity to voice their opinions
19 or additional concerns about this proposed facility
20 while the time clock is still stopped. Now let's
21 hear from some of the exerts and advocate's and
22 members of the public. But before we do that we
23 will hear from my chair of the Waterfront Committee
24 Ms. Debbie Rose, Council Member Debbie Rose.

3 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Thank you so much
4 Chair Richards. And good evening. But no not
5 evening yet. Not, we've, we've, we've had long days
6 but... But it's afternoon still so good afternoon. I
7 am Debbie Rose. I'm the chair of the city council's
8 Committee on Waterfronts. And I'd like to thank
9 very much my colleague Council Member Donovan
10 Richards who is the chair of the Committee on
11 Environmental Protection for agreeing to hold this
12 hearing jointly. I'd like to welcome the advocates
13 in the members of the public to our hearing which
14 will focus on the proposed project to build a
15 liquefied natural gas terminal 19 miles off the
16 coast of New York City and resolution number 549
17 which would call upon Governor Cuomo to veto the
18 proposed project. While the city has no direct role
19 in the development or permitting process associated
20 with this project federal law specifically the
21 deep water ports act empowers the governors of
22 states that are adjacent to the area where the
23 project is proposed to be constructed with the
24 ability to veto the application. Chair Richards has
25 already detailed the specifics of regarding this
proposed project and resolutions provisions. But I

3 would like to echo some of the concerns that I and
4 many of my colleagues in government have raised
5 regarding this project. While the possibility of
6 Port Ambrose Terminal delivering an increased
7 supply of natural gas to the region at a more
8 stable, at more stable prices is promising on paper
9 some of the potential hazards deserve serious
10 consideration and reflection. Specifically can we
11 ensure that the terminal will not be used for
12 exploiting gas thus subjecting the region to
13 fracking in the future. Can we ensure that no major
14 or permanent harm will be done to aquatic life,
15 water quality, air quality, maritime safety, or the
16 economic wellbeing of our city's residents. And
17 will this project limit the construction of future
18 alternative energy developments in the area. If the
19 answer is no to any of these questions then this
20 project should not be allowed to go forward. We as
21 a city and state have worked too hard too long to
22 clean up our waters, minimize pollution, and
23 provide for long term protection of our natural
24 resources. The desire to move away from a reliance
25 on petroleum based fuels in order to combat the
harmful consequences of climate change remain a

2 driving force for policy makers on a local level. I
3 question whether this project is necessary in light
4 of other alternatives that may result in providing
5 New Yorkers with cheaper and more efficient energy
6 that does not produce greenhouse gasses and
7 mitigate the possibility of major environmental
8 damage in the case of an accident or damage due to
9 severe weather. I hope that this hearing will
10 provide more insight regarding the complexities,
11 potential benefits and consequences of Port
12 Ambrose, the Port Ambrose project. And I say thank
13 you again and welcome and I want to thank the, the
14 environmental protection committee, legal counsel
15 Samara Swanson, Swanston, Bill Murray Policy
16 Analyst and Kate Sealy Kurt the financial analyst
17 and my Committee on Waterfronts Chris Satori
18 legislative council, Patrick Movahil policy
19 analyst, and Alia Ali finance analyst. And I thank
20 you all for being here and I will turn the mic over
21 to Chair Richards.

22 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. And
23 before we begin testimony. I want to acknowledge
24 some of our colleagues who've joined us; Council
25 Member Costa Constantinides from Queens, and also

2 Council Member Eric Ulrich from Queens. With that
3 being said I'll call the first person to testify
4 Mr. Richard Thomas who is a city councilman in the
5 town of, in the city of Mt. Vernon. And I will say
6 before we begin that you know here we practice
7 respect and if we disagree with people it's okay.
8 No booing. No expressions of disgust. Let's respect
9 everyone and respect everyone and respect each
10 other. And Mr. Thomas you may begin. And Samara
11 Swanson will swear you in.

12 SAMARA SWANSON: Would you please raise
13 your right hand? Do you swear or affirm to tell the
14 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth
15 today?

16 RICHARD THOMAS: Absolutely.

17 SAMARA SWANSON: Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: ...begin Mr.
19 Thomas.

20 RICHARD THOMAS: Thank you Council
21 Member, Chairman Richards and thank you Chairwoman
22 Rose and other council members that join us here
23 today. I'm, I'm speaking on behalf of my residents
24 in the city of Mt. Vernon and last night I was with
25 a senior who has, struggling with cancer receiving

3 chemotherapy and she was talking to me about my
4 city's taxes, the water bill has gone up
5 astronomically, the way things are, her con-ed
6 bill, her gas bill. And when I look at this project
7 and I see it from my resident's perspective brief
8 sidebar Mt. Vernon we're four square miles just
9 under 100 thousand people and we have and we host
10 an oil refinery and asphalt refinery, cement, we,
11 we, we host other heavy industry. We have among the
12 highest emission rates in the region and one of the
13 hospitals, major hospitals is actually doing the
14 study and I'm working with them in collaboration.
15 We just had a huge 32 inch pipeline installed in
16 our town. It's going through neighborhoods on the
17 south side where many low income families reside.
18 And in the discussion about environmental justice
19 is, has been extremely acute in my city. And the
20 voices that are involved with this discussion today
21 in my view really have a very limited connection to
22 the reality with respect to what Port Ambrose is
23 bringing to the table. And you don't have to look
24 too far. You look at Boston, Boston, Massachusetts.
25 It has had an LNG terminal everit [phonetic] on
land for more than 40 years. And it, this past

2 winter quadrupled its delivery of LNG and the price
3 of natural gas in, you know receiving in Boston
4 Harbor on land around people was cut more than half
5 of what it was here in New York state. And
6 listening to my residents say hay we need a break,
7 we need a break from taxes. We need a break from
8 electricity taxes. We need a break from gas costs.
9 That's something that think is pretty significant
10 and we should really consider when we look at Port
11 Ambrose being 26 miles off the coast of the
12 Rockaways, 19 miles off the coast of Long Beach.
13 It's nowhere near human population. And when you
14 increase supply you reduce the cost. That's just
15 what happens. And I also have another hat that I
16 wear. I, I am an executive Director of an energy
17 coalition. It's a statewide group called New York
18 Area. And, and Liberty Natural Gas is a member of
19 our coalition. And one of the things I can tell you
20 is I have some material that I'll leave with the
21 Sergeant of Arms. And the bottom line is we believe
22 this project should move forward and we hope you
23 guys just consider the information that has been
24 put before you. Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. And I
3 have a few questions. So first one and I welcome
4 you from Mt. Vernon...

5 RICHARD THOMAS: Mm-hmm.

6 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Have you guys
7 considered, have you asked liberty natural to move
8 it closer to your community?

9 RICHARD THOMAS: The answer is no
10 because it's 26 miles off the coast of New York
11 State.

12 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay. [cross-
13 talk] But, but do, but do you have any locations
14 near your vicinity or within your region... [cross-
15 talk]

16 RICHARD THOMAS: Well what we do have is
17 as I mentioned before an oil refinery which
18 receives all the fuel oil in the region. We have,
19 it was actually the only operating refinery because
20 it is inland they're, after Superstorm Sandy so we
21 receive the bulk of that. So we have an immense
22 amount of energy and infrastructure in our city.

23 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: How many jobs do
24 you project this project would create?

2 RICHARD THOMAS: During construction
3 it's my understanding about 900.

4 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Say that again?

5 RICHARD THOMAS: During construction it
6 is supposed to generate my understanding 900.

7 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: 900 jobs. And,
8 and... Alright I don't want to get personal...

9 RICHARD THOMAS: It's okay.

10 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: ...here. So was
11 your community affected by Hurricane Sandy?

12 RICHARD THOMAS: Absolutely.

13 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay.

14 RICHARD THOMAS: Absolutely.

15 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Can you speak of
16 your experience with that and how did your
17 residents you know fair during this storm in
18 particular, in particular your low income
19 residents?

20 RICHARD THOMAS: So Mt. Vernon has a
21 hybrid system. We have above and below ground
22 material, electric infrastructure. So we were back
23 online within seven days when the power went out.
24 But we did have a bunch of trees go down and knock
25 down power to large aspects of the community. But

2 our gas system operated reliably and given that the
3 mixed system above and below ground we were able to
4 respond and have our lights back on rather quickly.

5 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: So do you think
6 natural gas or methane in particular has played any
7 role in, and as we've seen and we've heard
8 obviously sea level rises a, is, is real, it's
9 going to be a reality and it has become a reality.
10 And obviously the impacts of methane and natural
11 gas in communities like Mt. Vernon and, and
12 Rockaway and Staten Island in which my colleague in
13 particular our communities were hit the hardest in
14 New York City. And we believe that you know this
15 natural gas has played a significant role and, and
16 would, has started to happen. And would you agree
17 that we are going to see more of these frequent
18 storms as we move forward because of the humans,
19 human impacts on, on climate change.

20 RICHARD THOMAS: Well one of the things
21 I can... [cross-talk]

22 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And do you think
23 LNG, how do you believe this will better the
24 environment.

3 RICHARD THOMAS: Well among the choices
4 out there that we have with the system that we have
5 today gas is among the cleanest in the fossil fuel
6 portfolio. And then, and when you look at some of
7 the communities that were impacted along the
8 coastline those that were using oil, burning
9 furnaces, absorb water, in some of those facilities
10 have not been able to replace those oil burning
11 furnaces. And they have brought in rental oil
12 burning furnaces to stay warm during the winter.
13 And those furnaces emit a lot more emissions than
14 many other forms of power. And if those facilities
15 were to have access to gas and you have thousands
16 of, of, of residents and also businesses seeking
17 more access to gas to reduce the amount of
18 emissions they're exposed to as well as seeking
19 opportunities to lower their cost. So when it comes
20 to the connection between fossil and, and climate
21 change there's, there's a lot of science and, and a
22 variety of opinions out there on which way things
23 are going. I think the, the latest report by vice
24 that was on HBO was very telling but when, when it
25 comes to our options, our solutions, I don't see
how this project is really connected to that large

3 of discussion. I see it as an opportunity to bring
4 supply into the region on time when we need it. And
5 I think it's going to play a huge roll in terms of
6 lowering the cost and during this winter in
7 February, middle of February when it was, demand
8 was at its highest. The cost of natural gas in New
9 York spiked about 38 dollars and the average price
10 in New England was 17 dollars. So that's a huge
11 spread and, and who's going to come up with that
12 difference? The seniors are really suffering on
13 this.

14 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: So you, you spoke
15 of import. What would it take to, for this facility
16 to, to turn into export.

17 RICHARD THOMAS: From what I understand
18 it's not...

19 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: ...easily...

20 RICHARD THOMAS: Yeah. From, from what I
21 understand it's not designed for export. And from
22 what I understand based on what the US Coast Guard
23 and the federal officials said that they have to go
24 through an entire new application process.
25

3 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: So let's, let's,
4 so we've, we've heard that obviously that opinion.
5 So let's take, put that aside for a second.

6 RICHARD THOMAS: Sure.

7 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: What would it
8 take if, if you know, you know people had a change
9 of heart all of a sudden what would it take for us
10 to turn it into export facility? How, what is the
11 capability of that happening here?

12 RICHARD THOMAS: Well one of the things
13 I can say is the shell exploration nationwide has
14 really fundamentally shifted the dynamics in the
15 oil markets globally. And the united states has
16 really become a major player at the table unseating
17 OPEQ to a certain extent. And I think that the more
18 we have the ability to influence the price of oil,
19 gas, on a global basis the stronger we become, the
20 less reliant we become on importing oil from
21 overseas. And if you know we can grow our economy
22 through exporting at some point down the line I
23 think that may be a good thing for the country.

24 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: So has that been
25 in, and you know and I, no you're, are you
representing Liberty in any... [cross-talk]

3 RICHARD THOMAS: No I'm not... [cross-
4 talk] I'm just, I'm talking as a, as a council
5 member...

6 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And they're a
7 member of your board?

8 RICHARD THOMAS: they're a member... not
9 of my, not of my board, they're a member of our, of
10 our energy coalition. But I'm speaking as an
11 economist and as a council member from the city of
12 Mt. Vernon and who's chairman of legislation public
13 works looking at it from an infrastructure
14 standpoint.

15 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay. I will
16 allow Debbie Rose to raise questions. It gets
17 interesting.

18 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Thank you. Your,
19 your concern which is a concern of, of all of us
20 especially in elected office is about you know how
21 much bills cost, the cost of living in New York
22 State is for all of our constituents. So you said
23 that in terms of supply and demand that this would
24 increase the supply and therefore would bring down
25 the, the cost substantially. But we've already seen
a substantial reduction in the cost of natural gas.

3 So how much more significant do you think this
4 project would lower the, the cost of the bills that
5 we see now?

6 RICHARD THOMAS: Sure. So the research
7 conducted by the ICF international, the same group
8 that contributed to the New York state energy plan
9 found that it will lower the price of natural gas
10 overall in the region about four percent. And based
11 on the design of the project from what I understand
12 it will only be utilized when it's needed. And we
13 all have o demand from our cable providers. We also
14 have the experience of going shopping during black
15 Friday, some of us that you know want to shop
16 during that day. But the supply arise as it is you
17 know diminished. And that's the same concept from
18 what I understand about Port Ambrose it's going
19 when we need it. And there was a time in the middle
20 of February where the price of electricity
21 generation eclipse a thousand dollars an hour, a
22 thousand dollars a megawatt hour. And at that time
23 New York state independent system operator ordered
24 facilities in New York City in Long Island down
25 state New York to switch to oil and if they could
burn coal. They made the order because the cost of

3 natural gas hit a certain point where it became
4 uneconomic to use it. So when you have a scenario
5 where you can lower the price which is what
6 happened in Boston. Boston quadrupled the amount of
7 imports they received in LNG. And in fact the Wall
8 Street journal reported that environmentalists are
9 calling for more LNG in Boston trying to mitigate
10 the need to bring in other pipes into the region.
11 So at the end of day it, it, when you bring in
12 supply when you need it you, you decrease the
13 demand by meeting it so the price overall falls.

14 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: But in order to
15 increase the, the supply wouldn't fracking also
16 have to increase?

17 RICHARD THOMAS: Well fracking already
18 happens in the state, it happens vertically.
19 There's already gas exploration in New York. It's
20 all over the country. It's just the technique of
21 going horizontal is happening in other places. And
22 the, so you're absolutely right. There is some form
23 of fracturing the earth below. But when you put it
24 in the context this project it taps into existing
25 infrastructure on the sea floor and ads capacity

2 into the system to lower the overall price of gas
3 in the region.

4 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: And as you know
5 the governor vetoed that, that idea in New York
6 state...

7 RICHARD THOMAS: Yes.

8 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: ...that we would not
9 allow you know fracking. I just, I want to ask you
10 are you aware of any other energy conversion
11 projects that are being proposed?

12 RICHARD THOMAS: Well two things. I
13 just, full disclosure I was in the governor's
14 office at the time. I was a regional director of
15 government affairs in the Hudson valley under
16 governor Patterson when he vetoes that project. And
17 it was much closer to land. It was designed
18 fundamentally different than what this is today.
19 And this project again is, is from what I see is
20 nowhere near as remarkably similar to the one
21 before. And I think it's important to keep those
22 distinctions and with respect to the, the other
23 part of, of the question I just say you know in
24 trying to keep things in perspective this project
25 definitely seems to, to tap into existing

3 infrastructure. And it seems to bring in the
4 necessary resources on time and we need it lowering
5 the price with, with very limited impact to human
6 population. And, and, and I think it's important to
7 also note that one of the utilities abandoned their
8 project in the same area because of the cost.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: You do know that
10 the infrastructure for this particular Port Ambrose
11 project does not exist yet?

12 RICHARD THOMAS: But the pipeline does,
13 the pipeline that's there that they're going to put
14 the supply into does and that's the same pipeline
15 that supplies gas into Boston. It's, we are the
16 second stop to the end of the line and that
17 basically you can, you can almost see that based on
18 the, the increase of imports in Boston cutting the
19 price almost I half, the average price in half is,
20 is pretty tremendous.

21 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: So there is a
22 project, another energy conversion project that...

23 RICHARD THOMAS: I'm sorry. The, the
24 project from what, for not, from, that I know about
25 is the clean heat program in New York City where
you're converting more buildings to, to to natural

2 gas. And it recently won a national award for that
3 policy. But, but that's the only other project that
4 I know about.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Right. No... Well
6 I'm talking about the, the proposed project using
7 wind turbines to create energy.

8 RICHARD THOMAS: Yes.

9 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: And, and it too
10 would be an offshore project and it would provide
11 energy to meet the demand of, of our consumers.

12 RICHARD THOMAS: We're...

13 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Do you... Do you
14 think that, that this project could meet the
15 demands, lower the, the bills of consumers much as
16 the LNG project you're supporting?

17 RICHARD THOMAS: First I think the two
18 can co-exist. And I think that the... project
19 definitely merits significant consideration.

20 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Would we need...
21 [cross-talk] for two projects?

22 RICHARD THOMAS: I, I, I believe we do
23 in the sense of making sure we have a more
24 resilient and robust infrastructure. And when you
25 consider the reports back from last year that one

2 of the major utilities, one of the major partners
3 in that project abandon that project because of its
4 high cost, its uneconomic feasibility. It becomes a
5 real question as to whether or not that project
6 ever happened. But when he, when you look at the
7 two they can coexist and frankly the, the Port
8 Ambrose project takes up far less space and is far
9 less disruptive than adding a couple hundred wind
10 turbines over a broader surface area. Each, each
11 turbine requires its own blasting, its own
12 disruption. And if you are concerned about that
13 impact you can take a look at you know some other
14 infrastructure projects on the Hudson River that is
15 going across just a mile wide and it's also
16 impacting the aquatic life and river keeper is
17 actually very up on that project focusing on it
18 very well.

19 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: But the, the
20 environmental impact is much more negligible for
21 the wind turbine project than the, the LNG.

22 RICHARD THOMAS: I don't, I mean we have
23 to compare numbers on that one. I think when you're
24 only taking about a submersible buoy versus a
25 couple hundred turbines that we believe should be

2 there and it should be a role for when is just the
3 two are on different tracts and I think that y0ou
4 know the two can definitely coexist.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER ROSE: Okay. No I'm going
6 to give the mic back to Council Member...

7 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: So I will say
8 that you being disingenuous when you, when you say
9 that advocates are supporting, or put in Boston in
10 particular and I, we know advocates in Boston as
11 well and, and we know advocates in Boston as well
12 are calling for investment as well.

13 RICHARD THOMAS: Okay.

14 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: So I don't think
15 you should make blanket statements that advocates
16 are certainly...

17 RICHARD THOMAS: Well I'll go back to
18 the Wall Street Journal and just double check...

19 [cross-talk]

20 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Well the Wall
21 Street Journal doesn't speak for...

22 RICHARD THOMAS: Okay.

23 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: ...for every
24 advocate.

25 RICHARD THOMAS: Okay fair enough.

2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And then secondly
3 you spoke of the clean heat program in which we're
4 in the process of obviously phasing and, and that
5 also was your correct halfway but we're not pushing
6 people to natural gas on that project. We're
7 phasing people off with number six and they have
8 thee, the choice right now to choose between number
9 four to, and obviously natural gas but I wouldn't
10 be very clear that we're not pushing... we're in no
11 hurry to push people towards natural gas.

12 RICHARD THOMAS: Okay.

13 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And honestly I
14 know Costa was here and we're trying to push people
15 towards biodiesel as well you know and, and more
16 renewable fuels rather than natural gas. So that's
17 just you know the goal of New York City in
18 particular as we... to reduce our carbon emissions by
19 80 percent by 2050. So I think, I mean there's
20 nothing left to really say to you. And I, we
21 appreciate you certainly coming to testify and, and
22 we, you know we respect your opinion, we disagree.

23 RICHARD THOMAS: Thank you. Yes.

24 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: You know but you
25 know we, we are trying to move New York City in

2 particular towards a renewable future and I don't
3 think this project certainly is pushing us in that
4 direction.

5 RICHARD THOMAS: thank you. And again
6 you know I look forward to engaging in, and being
7 involved in dialogue. Thank you for the curtesy
8 and, and yes I think the one project definitely
9 should move forward it's just... would love to
10 provide any more perspective you'd like. And again
11 thank you for the courtesy and the time.

12 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you so
13 much. Thank you. We also were joined temporarily by
14 Council Member Daneek Miller and, and we're also
15 joined by Council Member Paul Vallone. Alrighty the
16 next individuals will have, who are, testify are
17 from Sane Energy and that is Patrick Robbins, Kevin
18 O'Keefe, Kim Frasier [phonetic], and Supree Donahue
19 [phonetic]. Hold on one second..

20 SAMARA SWANSON: Can you please raise
21 your right hands. Do you swear affirm to tell the
22 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth
23 today?

24 PATRICK ROBBINS: Thank you very much
25 Council Member Richards for introducing this

2 resolution and thank you to the council for
3 inviting us to have this conversation today. I'm
4 speaking on behalf of Sane Energy Project. And I'm
5 here with my colleagues from Sane Energy Project as
6 a media coordinator and I'll be, we will be
7 speaking to the conflicts that this project poses
8 with the proposed development of offshore wind.
9 Before we begin I just want to make one quick
10 clarification the pipeline that this, that the Port
11 Ambrose project would connect to is in fact the
12 Rockaway lateral pipeline. I believe that was the
13 pipeline that the gentleman from Mt. Vernon was
14 referring to. And that does not in fact make
15 landfall in Boston or supply Boston. In fact that
16 pipeline which is at capacity currently makes
17 landfall in the city of Long Beach where there is
18 unanimous opposition to this project from the city
19 council of Long Beach. And this is the city that
20 would be supposedly supplied by this project should
21 it you know be used as an import facility. The
22 only, one other thing I wanted to mention is that
23 you said that shifting to export may ultimately be
24 a good thing for our county should this project
25 shift to export natural gas overseas. I, I find

3 that odd in the context of the concerns that you
4 mention for your constituents which are very real
5 concerns in terms of gas prices and everything
6 else. But should be converted to an export facility
7 we would be competing with foreign markets which
8 would actually drive our prices up. I wanted to
9 just clear the air on that. And I'll move into
10 discussing whether or not these can coexist, the
11 wind project and Port Ambrose. My colleague Kim
12 Fraczek will discuss the effects on the Marine
13 environment. Kevin O'Keefe will be discussing the
14 impacts from climate change and my colleague Clare
15 will be discussing risks to ocean risks from ocean
16 acidification and security issues. So the Port
17 Ambrose liquefied natural gas port is proposed to
18 be cited in the middle of a lease area where the
19 bureau of ocean energy management is considering
20 developing to 700 megawatts of wind power. 700
21 megawatts would power approximately 200 thousand
22 homes every year. This is one of the larger lease
23 areas available off of Long Island. The green
24 triangle that you can see here, that's the wind
25 lease area. The red dots are Port Ambrose and the
dark blue curve here is an undersea, is an undersea

3 canyon which you know would not be, which would..
4 exclude the ability to cite anything there. You can
5 see these triangles here, the sort of rays coming
6 off the shore. These are existing transportation
7 lines and buffer zones. So as you can see there's
8 actually very little ocean real estate that is
9 available to, to build in in this area. So can
10 these projects coexist? Not according to the
11 natural resources defense council According to Kit
12 Kennedy their director of Energy and transportation
13 we can have either the off shore wind projects or
14 the LNG facility, not both. This is because the
15 Port Ambrose Buoys, the red dots here would be
16 cited in the prime real estate location for
17 offshore rent. Because of the varying levels of
18 flatness of the ocean floor there are certain
19 locations that are ideal for wind turbines being
20 simultaneously flat enough and at an economically
21 viable distance from shore. And Port Ambrose is
22 currently cited directly in the middle of the best
23 location for offshore wind. If Port Ambrose would
24 then preclude wind from being developed we have to
25 weigh which of these choices would be a better,
would have a better long term outcome. So first I

3 want to examine the job's potential of both
4 projects. This is a map of wind and, wind potential
5 and just to put things in context Long Island is
6 considered the prime territory on the eastern
7 seaboard in terms of wind power potential. The
8 department of energy estimates that by 2030 the
9 development of 54 thousand megawatts of offshore
10 wind in the US would create more than 43 thousand
11 permanent operations and maintenance jobs and
12 approximately 20 jobs per annual megawatt. There
13 have been different figures thrown around for the
14 job creation potential of Port Ambrose. Liberty has
15 projected 800. We heard 900 today. I've heard other
16 figures as well. Let's for a moment take Liberty at
17 their word on that 800 construction job figure.
18 Just looking at the specific lease area for Port
19 Ambrose there's really no comparison. And the only
20 construction that would actually happen on Long
21 Island would be the building of the pipeline
22 itself, the undersea pipeline that would connect as
23 I mentioned to the Rockaway Lateral. The unions
24 that would handle trenching would find work whether
25 a liquefied natural gas port or a wind farm was
built. The buoys themselves would be built off site

3 over the course of two years there have been
4 different locations discussed possibly in upstate
5 New York but most likely in Rhode Island. By
6 contrast the creation of an offshore wind industry
7 if it were to begin in New York would require the
8 development of a huge deep water port probably on
9 the north shore that would require carpenters, dock
10 builders, steel workers, ongoing installation, and
11 maintenance careers and so on. Projections for this
12 scenario are 40 thousand permanent jobs. This is
13 why John Durso the president of the Long Island
14 Federation of Labor has been continuously calling
15 for the development of an offshore wind industry I
16 Long Island. If we compare estimated jobs to actual
17 jobs where offshore wind has already been built we
18 see that compared to the US where we have no
19 turbines in the water in Europe offshore wind is
20 already a serious booming business between 2005 and
21 2013 more than 15 billion worth of investments were
22 made. At the end of 2012 total installed capacity
23 of offshore wind from 10 European countries was
24 nearly 5,000 megawatts. There were about 58
25 thousand direct jobs created with gross, with
growth expected up to 191 thousand in 2020. Not

3 only are jobs a huge benefit of offshore wind we
4 also want to respect the opinion of the public
5 that, where this, where this area would be built
6 and you know what the actual desires are of this,
7 of this area. And we already seen that there's
8 strong opposition to Port Ambrose along the south
9 shore of Long Island with, and stronger opposition
10 overall with approximately 83 thousand comments
11 filed against it and multiple calls from city,
12 county, state, and federal officials. As you can
13 see here Offshore wind has wide support among New
14 York and Long Island voters. This, these two
15 figures here show the percent of Long Island Voters
16 who would support expanded use of renewable energy
17 sources and percent of those who would support
18 offshore wind power if it cited at least 15, 12 to
19 15 miles off the coast which wind in this area
20 would be. We at Sane believe in respecting the, you
21 know respecting the wishes of the communities where
22 these projects would be built. And that seems like
23 a clear indicator that, that wind is how we should,
24 how we should proceed. I'm going to turn over to my
25 colleague Kim Fraczek to discuss the effects on the
Marine environment.

3 KIM FRACZEK: Thank you for the
4 opportunity to be heard. Okay. Port Ambrose works
5 with Buoys rising to click into the ship. The ship
6 pivots on the buoy moving with current and waves,
7 the wave tethers and flexible hose are in constant
8 motion scraping the sea be never allowing recovery
9 of the Marine Ecosystem. The flexible gas line
10 seems a particularly vulnerable connection. As a
11 reminder of scale these ships are the length of the
12 empire state building. The radius of affected area
13 would be twice that for each ship. And those yellow
14 buoys are huge, approximately five stories tall.
15 Imagine if this port suffers the same fate as the
16 Boston contract accelerate energies gateway port
17 has not received a delivery since 2008 all that
18 ecological damage for nothing and they're not
19 denying sitting there unused. The Boston Globe
20 reported that in July 2014 that a whale watching
21 boat snagged a tether line 13 miles from the shore.
22 Any underwater construction impacts on marine life
23 but comparing LNG versus wind the long term effects
24 are quite different. The basis of wind turbines
25 have been shown to act as artificial wreaths. They
begin to grow barnacles and small organisms which

3 attract little fish which attract larger fish
4 etcetera creating a vibrant ecosystem. Wind farms
5 may actually begin to function as fish sanctuaries.
6 Ironically offshore wind could be the solution to
7 destructive overfishing as well as climate change
8 that will be the death knell of the fishing
9 industry. Also of note Professor Mark Jacobson's
10 study which shows that wind farms can actually
11 reduce the impact of hurricanes by absorbing the
12 force of wind also comparing the companies
13 involved. On one hand you have a mysterious paper
14 corporation. On the other hand you, on the other
15 hand you have deep water wind which has shown a
16 remarkable ability to engage stakeholders they
17 worked closely with fisherman on the Rhode Island
18 project to reach agreement on sighting and deep
19 water has agreed the time of the construction of
20 their pilot project so as not to interfere with
21 whale migration patterns. Liberty has shown no such
22 sensitivity. I'll turn it over now to my colleague
23 Kevin O'Keefe our Long Island coordinator.

24 KEVIN O'KEEFE: We're going to cover the
25 effect on climate wind versus LNG on the left you
can see CO2 and on the right you can see methane,

2 the comparison of CO2 is bad and methane is 80, 86
3 times worse. We need to be aware that LNG is a
4 supercharged climate-changer. The New York City
5 Council has agreed to an ambitious plan to reduce
6 greenhouse gasses by 80 percent, by 2050. Any
7 chance we get to prevent new greenhouse gases from
8 entering the atmosphere is important. Just for this
9 comparison on the left like I said there's Carbon.
10 And where... already past to 400 parts per million.
11 And then there's methane. Ethane is 86 times worse
12 for warming than Carbon Dioxide. LNG is 40 percent
13 worse for our climate than shell gas. It's 40
14 percent worse than regular natural gas due to the
15 amount of energy required to freeze it, ship it,
16 and re-gasify it. Once again LNG is a super charged
17 climate changer when by contrast creates combustion
18 free clean renewable energy. The only chance we
19 have to turn back climate impacts. Many of us
20 including Chairman Richards personally experienced
21 the effects of Superstorm Sandy and hopefully now
22 we understand the relationship between climate
23 change sea level rise and the storm surges. This is
24 a quick illustration of those effects on one of New
25 York's most popular beaches, Jones Beach. This

2 first slide right here shows current sea level.

3 Where the area is circled on the slide that is
4 Jones Beach. You can see the Meadowbrook and the
5 one tour parkways that connect to the beach itself
6 both provide access to the very island. With lots
7 of storm absorbing smaller islands in the bay in
8 between these islands are of course home to
9 prolific bird life and create a unique ecosystem.

10 So what happens to this area with climate change?

11 This is what we're looking at a predicted sea level
12 rise by 21 hundred. I know it's 85 years away but
13 we have to think long term when it comes to climate
14 change. This is, this is the same view with a one
15 meter which is a three feet of sea level rise. That
16 is the amount of sea level rise predicted as

17 inevitably the end of the century. Even if we stop
18 burning all carbon today the effect of greenhouse
19 gasses we have already produced will continue to
20 warm the planet and raise sea levels. Notice that
21 you lose about half the barrier islands and lose
22 the smaller bay islands and altogether of course
23 the causeways would have to be raised or abandoned.

24 Our next slide is what we consider weather chaos.

25 This is a three meter sea level rise which would be

2 the equivalent of a nine foot storm surge. Sandy
3 produced surges of 12 feet and higher. You can see
4 the barrier island and causeways are completely
5 obliterated in the shoreline of the main island
6 changes dramatically. I'll hand it over to Clare
7 Donahue.

8 CLARE: Okay so one of the most dire
9 impacts of climate change has an enormous impact on
10 both the coastal economy and our actual survival
11 ocean acidification. Basically as carbon levels
12 increase in the atmosphere the oceans absorb that
13 carbon that not only warms the water temperature it
14 actually changes the chemistry of the water to make
15 it more acidic. Acidification has had an impact
16 already making beaches more prone to jellyfish
17 which impacts the coastal economy. But the big
18 worry is the disruption of our food chain.
19 Acidification deters the ability of small
20 shellfish from hardening their shells making them
21 less likely to grow to maturity and reproduce
22 creating such a large scale disruption at the
23 bottom of food chain bodes very badly for us at the
24 top of the food chain. This an illustration of the
25 economic impacts of acidification. The, the red

3 areas show the areas that are most vulnerable to
4 ocean acidification and you can see that Long
5 Island and the, Long Island Sound are extremely
6 vulnerable. The purple indicates what timeframe
7 that impact will hit. So the, the bad news is that
8 Long Island is in trouble. The good news is that we
9 have until about 2070 to reverse these effects.
10 Main is already feeling the impacts of ocean
11 acidification with their very cold waters warming
12 substantially already. So if, if we have time to
13 mitigate this the thing to do is to stop building
14 anything that creates additional climate change and
15 start building infrastructure that lessens it. So
16 acidification alone is a great argument for not
17 building Port Ambrose. Now I'll shift gears and,
18 and just talk about the security risks. I know
19 Chair Richards is very familiar. He's known for
20 quoting that, the fact that LNG should, shouldn't
21 be impacted by terrorists and, and cause a release.
22 It could create a fire that melts steel at a
23 difference of 12 hundred feet. There, there has
24 been many studies citing LNG as a desirable
25 terrorist target. In, in addition to ramming and,
and exploding it in position the worst fear of the

3 experts from Sam Dale Labs is that the, the tankers
4 themselves could be hijacked and then towed into a
5 populated area, say New York Harbor and then used
6 as a giant bomb threat. So that's quite frightening
7 to us. The, the other security risk that, that
8 occurred to me because I grew up in Rosedale
9 basically in the landing path of Kennedy Airport is
10 how close these buoys are to JFK. You can see this
11 map. The buoys are at the end of the yellow line.
12 The yellow line is the new pipeline that they want
13 to build. The existing gas pipeline, I'm sorry the
14 Patrick referred to it as the Rockaway lateral,
15 it's the Williams Lower Bay Lateral. That is the
16 existing pipeline that lands in Long Beach. So you
17 can see how close it is to JFK. What, what we did
18 when we looked at this if you can go to the next
19 slide Patrick, my nephew is a pilot and I asked him
20 to find me, what are the flight patterns for JFK,
21 how close do the planes come. So all of the landing
22 planes for JFK come down the east coast and they
23 are three hubs that they come to and they're sort
24 of brought one, one at a time in, to land at JFK.
25 The Yankee hub you can see is very very close to
Port Ambrose. So I, I found this to be a big

3 concern. It was not covered at all in the draft DIS
4 so... Thank you all so much for inviting us to
5 testify and for sponsoring this you know resolution
6 and we really hope that this has an impact on
7 Governor Cuomo. Thank you council.

8 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you so
9 much. Appreciate your testimony. Oh oh before you
10 go so my colleague Corey Johnson has joined us
11 just, this is what we practice here. We've come a
12 long way here. So my colleague... and before you do
13 that just wanted to ask one question before we go
14 to Corey as well. So are you concerned that this
15 particular facility will limit renewable energy
16 choices? And any one of you can answer that.

17 PATRICK ROBBINS: Absolutely. That's a
18 major concern of ours. We know that the council has
19 adopted goals of moving, mitigating its emissions
20 and mitigating the city's emissions 80 percent by
21 2050 and we feel that in order to achieve that goal
22 it's absolutely incumbent on us to build out
23 renewable energy supply for this area as much as we
24 can. And this project would simply make offshore
25 wind in the same area nonviable.

2 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Great. I'm going
3 to go to my colleague Corey Johnson. Council Member
4 Corey Johnson.

5 COUNCIL MEMBER JOHNSON: Oh it's okay.
6 You can call me Corey. Thank you Chair Richards,
7 thank you Chair Rose for holding this really
8 important hearing today. I really don't have a, a
9 question. I just want to make a, a statement which
10 I'm sure many of you will agree with. But I think
11 it's important to really just hit home. 300 million
12 dollars, the cost, 300 million dollars. I can think
13 of as can many of you a good way to invest that 300
14 million dollars towards something that is not
15 destructive and dangerous for our region and for
16 our environment. And the reason why and I'll
17 continue to say this because I really believe it's
18 true that the state health department and the
19 governor decided to not allow hydraulic fracturing
20 to move forward fracturing in our state, probably
21 actually didn't have much to do with all the facts
22 that were presented. I think it had to do with the
23 impact that activists around the state put on the
24 governor over the last many many years. Now I'm
25 very proud that I was arrested with two of you,

3 Patrick and Kim in November of 2013 protesting the
4 spectra pipe line which unfortunately is there and
5 as we've talked about I actually think could be
6 dangerous coming under the Whitney museum under the
7 west side highway, under the Hudson river, truck
8 traffic moving over it all the time. But the reason
9 why we continue to fight and the reason why this
10 council is having this hearing is because we
11 believe that grassroots activism matters and that
12 letting people in power know that just because you
13 have moneyed interest on your side doesn't mean
14 it's the right thing to do and the people are not
15 on your side. And so I want to congratulate you all
16 not just for your activists and all you've done so
17 far but also being so well equipped with the facts
18 because that is what matters, the facts. And I
19 think you've shown that here today and you've shown
20 that throughout your activism. And as I said at the
21 press conference that Chair Richards and I went to
22 you let me know when we get arrested next and I'll
23 be there. And I really am deeply appreciative of
24 your work and I look forward to continuing to fight
25 with you all to ensure that this disaster of a

2 project does not move forward. Thank you chairs for
3 allowing me the time to make a statement.

4 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you Council
5 Member Johnson. Thank you guys for your testimony.
6 Well, well put together presentation. And may the
7 median note that there are politicians getting
8 arrested for positive things. Alrighty [phonetic]
9 with that being said we're going to move on now.
10 We're going to hear from Bruce Ferguson from the
11 Catskill Citizens for safety, for safe energy
12 Center, Marjorie Shaab from Damascus Citizens for
13 Sustainability, Roland Lewis from the Metropolitan
14 Waterfront Alliance, and Cindy Zipf from the Clean
15 Ocean Action Organization. You may begin. If
16 everyone can identify themselves...

17 BRUCE FERGUSON: Hi, I'm Bruce Ferguson
18 from Catskill Citizens for Safe Energy. Thank you
19 for holding this hearing and thank you for the
20 opportunity to testify today. Before I'm, move into
21 my testimony I'd just like to clear up one point
22 that was raised earlier about the structure of a
23 deep water port like Port Ambrose. Whether it's
24 built for export or built for import it's
25 identical. It's buoys in a pipeline. The only

2 difference between import and export occurs on the
3 vessel. Some are built to liquefy gas and export
4 it, some are built to re-gasify it and import it,
5 no difference between the port what's so ever,
6 identical. I think after you've considered the
7 evidence today you're going to conclude if you
8 haven't already that a Port Ambrose is a dangerous
9 speculative venture that has no place in New York's
10 future and will play no meaningful role in the
11 energy market here. This might have made sense 10
12 or 20 years ago but now it's meaningless. As the
13 energy information agency points out the, the
14 domestic shale gas boom that's going on in this
15 country right now has all, is eliminating or has
16 already eliminated the need for LNG imports.
17 They're down by 90 percent across the country and
18 they're going to country and they're going to
19 continue to decline. Moreover this decline in
20 imports is not a temporary thing. The shale gas
21 booms that we're seeing is predicted to last and
22 expand past 2040. In other words the Shale boom
23 will outlast the useful life of Port Ambrose. You
24 can considered the likelihood of Port Ambrose
25 succeeding by looking at the five existing LNG

2 import terminals that already exist on the east
3 coast. At one imports dropped by 78 percent in a
4 single year. At another they're down by 90 percent.
5 And both those facilities are now turning to gas
6 exports in order to survive. A third facility in
7 Boston Harbor, the one referenced by the councilman
8 from Mt. Vernon did import more LNG this winter but
9 it is also in steep decline. A 2013 article in the
10 Boston Globe reported that it had seen quote a huge
11 drop in imports as domestic supplies have soured
12 unquote. It's hanging on because of, it has a major
13 climate locked into contract. It does not expire
14 for years to come. The councilman did not mention
15 the two deep water ports in Boston Harbor that are
16 very similar to Port Ambrose. Both stopped
17 importing LNG in 2010 because they could no longer
18 compete with cheap domestic gas. They're, so those
19 are all five facilities that exist. None of them
20 are doing well. One's out of business already. Two
21 are going to exports. If none of these can survive
22 why do we suppose Port Ambrose will make it as an
23 LNG importer. It does not make any sense at all.
24 The sponsors will tell you it's because New York
25 has delivery bottlenecks but it does not. Those

1 issues had been addressed in recent years. In 2013
2 the Spectra Pipeline doubled the amount of gas
3 coming into Manhattan and in a few months the
4 Rockaway Lateral will begin delivering an
5 additional 647 million cubic feet of gas a day into
6 Brooklyn. These two new projects together will
7 supply three and a half times as much gas as Port
8 Ambrose could hope to deliver even supposing they
9 could import LNG at prices New York consumers would
10 be willing to pay. Delivery bottlenecks are severe
11 in New England but even back to back cold records
12 were not enough to bring back the... ports in Boston
13 Harbor. One set down in 2013 and the other received
14 just a single shipment of LNG in December 2014 that
15 was the first shipment it received since 2010, one
16 shipment, five years. What is certain about Port
17 Ambrose is that the threatens to displace a
18 proposed wind farm that could provide the region
19 with safe sustainable energy for decades to become.
20 And on the off chance that it did receive a vessel
21 here in five million cubic feet of LNG would likely
22 be a terrorist target hopefully not an irresistible
23 one. The cost of protecting the region from a
24 catastrophic attack is likely to far outweigh any
25

2 benefit that an occasional shipment of LNG would
3 bring to consumers. The environmental degradation
4 associated with the port is guaranteed. The danger
5 and risk are guaranteed. There's no evidence that
6 Port Ambrose needs this project for gas. Thank you.

7 MARJORIE SHAAB: Thank you really so
8 much for holding these hearings. I'm going to be
9 more emotional. I spend a lot of time on our
10 comments from Damascus Citizens for Sustainability
11 and of course we ask that the resolution be passed
12 and we ask Governor Cuomo please oppose this
13 terminal Port Ambrose. The reason all my, our
14 documents are site, we have citations. We have
15 backups. So I'm going to talk about the emotional,
16 but it's not emotional. The real missing factor how
17 come the people don't count. Liberty natural gas is
18 a limited liability cooperation which means that
19 it's members, the people or whatever are not
20 liable. Now if there is something unfortunate that
21 might happen they are not liable. Now they had a
22 firm do an independent risk assessment and the firm
23 said it did not attempt to predict the number
24 estimated fatalities or injuries or say an usual
25 event. Don't the people count? Don't our human

3 communities count? Isn't there a important asset to
4 our life? This is why we're also active because
5 we're worried. Bring back the people. Think about
6 the people. I found an SCC filing for West Face
7 Capital which owns Liberty National Gas and I have
8 proof... documents that they do own Liberty Natural
9 Gas LLP, Limited Liability Corporation. And from
10 the SCC filing the main promoter is west face
11 capital, no first name. I don't think they have a
12 first name. The main investment manager, main note,
13 investment manager, West Face Capital. I don't
14 think they put... I, they don't have a first name. A,
15 the executive officer we got a name Gregory Boland,
16 another executive officer, we got a name John
17 Maynard. They say... I mean it's just, just, it's a
18 private equity fund. It qualifies for exceptions
19 which means as long as we don't have a website, a
20 real website we can sell, you know we can get
21 investors in this thing. So I'm going to say please
22 you know... it's emotional. It's the people and this
23 is why our movement is growing because we want a
24 future and thank you very much.

24 JOSE SOGARD: Good afternoon. My name is
25 Jose Sogard. I'm the director of Policy for the

3 Metropolitan Waterfront Alliance. I'm here standing
4 in for Roland Lewis the President of the Alliance
5 who sends his apologies. He got called away. I'd
6 like to read a, a brief statement on behalf of our
7 alliance. We are a bi-state coalition of over 800
8 community and recreational groups, educational
9 institutions, businesses, and other stakeholders
10 committed to restoring and revitalizing the New
11 York and New Jersey waterways. NWA strongly
12 supports resolution 549 calling on Governor Cuomo,
13 Governor Cuomo to veto the Port Ambrose Liquid
14 Natural Gas Terminal Project. The draft
15 environmental statement for this project fails to
16 sufficiently address concerns about health and
17 safety of the waterways and potentially conflicts
18 with the proposed offshore wind energy project
19 which would, would provide clean energy
20 alternatives not to mention more jobs for New
21 Yorkers. Approval of the Port Ambrose project would
22 likely jeopardize the operations of a proposed
23 offshore wind farm which would provide cleaner
24 energy and more sustainable full time jobs. Liquid
25 natural gas despite clever marketing bias
proponents is a non-renewable fossil fuel the

3 burning of which pollutes our air and contributes
4 to climate change. An application from the Long
5 Island New York City offshore wind collaborative
6 the partnership between NYPA LIPA and Con-Ed
7 currently stands before the bureau of Ocean Energy
8 Management for 350 megawatt offshore wind and
9 energy project. The DEIS does not account for the
10 overlapping footprints of the Port Ambrose terminal
11 and the wind energy project which could impede the
12 placement of wind turbines and cause conflict in
13 shipping lanes between support vessels for each
14 project. The applicants themselves project that the
15 Port Ambrose facility would support only five
16 permanent full time jobs once the terminal was
17 completed and that it's construction would support
18 600 temporary full time equivalent jobs. The
19 offshore wind project may instead generate more
20 than 85 new jobs and 2300 temporary construction
21 jobs according to its components in addition to
22 many more maritime support jobs servicing turbines.
23 Port Ambrose poses a direct threat to the health
24 and biodiversity of water resources in the New York
25 bite which serves important ecological and economic
functions for our region. As a home to many species

3 of marine life and a critical location for
4 recreational boating and fishing industries
5 operating the facility will require over 1.1
6 billion gallons of seawater each year pumped up
7 from the ocean. This project can injure or kill
8 large marine life that becomes trapped in the metal
9 screens, disrupts food sources for threatened and
10 endangered species and generally disturb the sea
11 floor with debris and discharge. Additionally
12 insufficient consideration has been given to the
13 possibility that major accidents or spills could
14 release large amounts of hazardous materials that
15 could be dispersed along currents, along, across a
16 wide area. Finally the port authority of New York
17 and New Jersey has raised important concerns
18 regarding a possible impact to existing vessel
19 traffic patterns during both construction and
20 operation phases at Port Ambrose. The construction
21 of the mainline transit system would cross through
22 the Ambrose... traffic lane in the Hudson Canyon to
23 Ambrose traffic lane. They've stated that the
24 location of the project submerged turret loading
25 buoys or STL buoys lies between two major traffic
separation schemes utilized by marine traffic

3 entering and existing the Ambrose channel and the
4 port of New York and New Jersey which could cause
5 great conflict between Port Ambrose operations and
6 other maritime uses. We urge this city council to
7 pass this resolution on behalf of all New Yorkers
8 and send a clear message to Governor Cuomo that the
9 proposed Port Ambrose LNG terminal would be an
10 unnecessary unhealthy and wasteful edition to our
11 waterways. Thank you for the opportunity to present
12 this testimony and for holding this hearing today
13 and we welcome any questions.

14 CINDY ZIPF: Thank you. Thank you Mr.
15 Chairman my name is Cindy Zipf. I'm executive
16 director of Clean Ocean Action and I want to thank
17 you for introducing this very important resolution
18 and I want to thank you for introducing this very
19 important resolution and for those of the council
20 that have supported it and for those that haven't
21 quite yet we hope that we can convince you to, to
22 join and, and support the resolution. Clean Ocean
23 Action is a regional coalition of or, of boating,
24 diving, swimming, fishing, community groups that
25 are based from Cape May out to Montauk. And I've
shared with you a map of our shared waters. The

3 fact that need, New York and New Jersey share this
4 remarkable water body is very rare in the world.
5 And we've done a lot of harm in the past. We were
6 the ocean dumping capital in the world in the olden
7 days. We had medical waste washing up on our
8 beaches and raw sewage. And we worked very very
9 hard to get the harmful industries out of the ocean
10 and support only clean ocean economies. And we've
11 come such along long way. And that is why we
12 continue to fight to keep the ocean wild and free
13 from harmful industry. Few people outside our
14 region understand the extraordinary ecological
15 value of the shared waters that we have. Because
16 the gulf stream brings up warm water from the
17 Caribbean and the Labrador current that's way up
18 north, brings the Coldwater species and we have the
19 beautiful Hudson-Raritan Estuary that brings in
20 fresh water. These remarkable water resources
21 support over 350 species of birds, 300 species of
22 fish, 24 species of whales and dolphins, four
23 species of seals, five species of sea turtles
24 there's only seven on the planet and five of them
25 hang out around in our, in our waterways. According
to US fish and wildlife service the New York bite

3 which is what the area's known has one of the
4 highest diversities of marine mammals and sea
5 turtles reported anywhere in the united states. Not
6 that we can claim fame to extraordinary wildlife.
7 And some of these are extremely endangered such as
8 the Atlantic, north Atlantic right whale in which
9 there's only about 400 species, 400 individuals
10 left. This vibrant ocean resource supports an
11 enormously important, the livelihoods of many many
12 people in New York and New Jersey. It's a
13 multibillion dollar coastal tourism and fishing
14 industry. According to the mid-Atlantic fishery's
15 council for example over 717 thousand anglers in
16 New York that spend 648 million dollars as far.. In
17 commercial fishing over 44 thousand livelihoods
18 support sales of 5.3 million dollars. And in New
19 Jersey we also have important commercial and
20 recreational fishing. Of course tourism employs
21 thousands and thousands of people. These shared
22 remarkable waters are now fare, facing this risk
23 from Liberty Natural Gas Port Ambrose. The port
24 would be active all year, it could be active all
25 year long. Port Ambrose expects to receive 45
deliveries. A full tanker could take from four to

2 eight days to unload all the gas which means these
3 massive tankers as was mentioned this, as, though,
4 as tall as, as long as the empire state building is
5 tall would be, could be offshore for all, almost
6 345 days. That's 345 days that would make it a
7 risky, a risky activity off our coast. As was
8 mentioned it could challenge navigation. I also
9 want to point out that liquefied natural gas is
10 very carbon intensive because you need to cool it
11 down to minus 260. You need to get it into a ship
12 and then travel far distances burning more fossil
13 fuels and then heat it up with even more fossil
14 fuels. So the carbon footprint of liquefied natural
15 gas is not green. It's in fact it's closer to coal
16 than it is, than it is domestic natural gas. I just
17 want to point out a couple of the other facts
18 concerning the impacts. The one billion gallon,
19 over one billion gallons of water, it's hard to
20 imagine what that is but if you could imagine 55
21 miles of Olympic sized swimming pools that's the
22 use of water. And you're talking about the
23 entrainment the sucking in and, and maiming and
24 killing over 86 million eggs and 11 million larvae
25 of those marine life that we, that we just talked

2 about throughout the lifetime of the port. It's
3 also going to be vulnerable to hurricanes out where
4 the Port Ambrose facility is being proposed there
5 were roughly 30 foot wave heights during Superstorm
6 Sandy. Again these combined risks are, are
7 unacceptable and for what to bring us an energy
8 that we don't need. The, even the federal
9 government says we don't need it. The Energy
10 Information Administration says that we're going to
11 be down to zero for LNG imports by 2018 and that
12 goes out to 2040. There's no need for this project.
13 So in, in short I'll just wrap it up by saying we
14 strongly support the resolution. We urge the
15 council to pass it out of committees quickly so
16 that we can get it to the full council and get it
17 quickly to Governor Cuomo so we can veto the
18 project. Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. And I
20 want to acknowledge before you, before I just raise
21 a few questions want to acknowledge my good
22 colleague from Brooklyn Council Member Steve Levin
23 whose joined us. So I'm going to lose my mind for a
24 second. You know I'm, I'm going to totally remove
25 my name off the resolution and I am not going to be

2 a sponsor on this anymore. You really got quiet in
3 here for a second. April fools. Alright. Okay... So...
4 April fools. So I wanted to just go back to, to
5 part of your testimony again and, and I wanted you
6 to go a little bit back into conversion and, and,
7 and the, the, what is the capability of them
8 obviously retrofitting or, or to export...

9 BRUCE FERGUSON: The, the Port...

10 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: ...and how easy can
11 it be done?

12 BRUCE FERGUSON: It's as easy as
13 bringing ship A into the port instead of ship B.
14 Nothing has to change. The pipeline flows in the
15 opposite direction. The buoys come up and instead
16 of gas coming in one direction it goes out the
17 other. And incidentally Liberty Natural Gas likes
18 to say it's, it's a very complex process... reverse
19 pipeline flow. They do it all the time.

20 CINDY ZIPF: Can I, can I add to that?

21 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Mm-hmm.

22 CINDY ZIPF: I'm sorry. One of the, one
23 of the other assets that the company that owns
24 Liberty Natural Gas is has an, an agreement with
25 Hoge [phonetic] International which is an LNG

2 transportation shipping company. One of the things
3 that they've been very proud of is that they've
4 been investing heavily into building ships that can
5 do just that, can liquefy natural gas right onboard
6 a ship. They may be one of the first or one of the,
7 top few that will be able to do that. So the
8 company that Liberty Natural Gas is hooked up with
9 is the ones that are building these ships to
10 liquefy as Bruce was saying.

11 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And you spoke on
12 sea turtles and our marine life. What would be the
13 impact on them in the case of a spill? What would
14 LNG...

15 CINDY ZIPF: Well you know the, the LNG
16 is, is, it's been cooled down to minus 260 degrees
17 so if there is a spill it's going to be, the liquid
18 will start coming out and it's more of a cryogenic
19 effect but the gas wants to, wants to move quickly
20 want, the liquid wants to move quickly into a
21 natural gas form. And so all you need's is, is a
22 spark, a fisherman out there with a cigarette
23 filter or some sort of spark and it could ignite it
24 depending on you know what's in the way of that.
25 There could be extensive loss of life.

2 BRUCE FERGUSON: The, the, just the
3 explosive, explosive vapor cloud from LNG that's
4 released into the atmosphere you're talking about
5 ships that hold five million gallons of LNG. It's
6 going to expand by 600 times when it gets to
7 ambient air temperature. You can do the math on
8 yourself and get the sense of how many hundreds of
9 millions of, of, of cubic square feet of explosive
10 vapor cloud you'll have on your hands there. It's
11 massive.

12 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Well there are
13 proponents who have said that you know obviously my
14 gas prices are going to go down...

15 CINDY ZIPF: Mm-mm.

16 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: ...and my heating
17 bill is going to go down. What would you say to
18 that?

19 BRUCE FERGUSON: Gas sells for five
20 times as much or two times as much in Europe in
21 Asia as it does in the United States. No exporter
22 is going to bring gas here and compete with the
23 price of cheap domestic gas that we have today. And
24 that's going to carry on not today and tomorrow.
25 It's going to go on for the next 20 years. There's

2 no future for imported LNG in this country because
3 we have too much cheap domestic gas.

4 MARJORIE SHAAB: I just wanted to add in
5 our comments there's a press release from Hoge
6 touting their new gas, liquification vessels. And
7 that was made the end of February.

8 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Well thank you
9 guys so much for your testimony. Thank you. Alright
10 next, the next four panels, panel, panelists will
11 be Andrea Leshaw [phonetic], Leshay [phonetic],
12 Leshale [phonetic] from Natural, from the Natural
13 Resources Defense Council, Matt Gove from the
14 Surfrider Foundation New York City Chapter, Windy
15 Burn from, for United Faction, and Jennifer Scarlet
16 from the Bronx Climate Justice North.

17 SAMARA SWANSON: Do you swear or affirm
18 to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
19 the truth today?

20 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: ...if you can just
21 say your name and the organization you're
22 representing.

23 ANDREA LESHAK: Good afternoon. My name
24 is Andrea Leshack and I'm with the Natural
25 Resources Defense Council. NRDC is a national

3 environmental advocacy group based here in New York
4 City and we've been proud to work with the New York
5 City Council in the past on various issues. Today
6 we're pleased to provide testimony in support of
7 the resolution before the council to veto to call
8 on Governor Cuomo to veto the Port Ambrose
9 facility. There are three main reasons why NRDC
10 opposes the Port Ambrose LNG facility. First is
11 that the Port Ambrose Facility would pose a
12 significant obstacle to the proposed NYPA offshore
13 wind project that we've already heard about. The
14 NYPA offshore wind project could provide up to 700
15 megawatts of clean electricity to residents of Long
16 Island and New York. That's enough power to power
17 almost 250 thousand homes. Furthermore the offshore
18 wind project would provide immense benefits
19 including regional economic benefit to the region.
20 The proposed Port Ambrose facility as we've heard
21 will be in the same general area. It would be in
22 the, the lease area that the NYPA offshore wind
23 project is proposed for. And the Port Ambrose
24 facility would be in the upper third of the upper
25 third portion of the lease area. And that's the
area that's likely the best suited for turbine

3 construction. So in effect the Port Ambrose
4 terminal would compete directly with the offshore
5 wind project for the prime area. And that, that
6 would make construction and operation of the
7 offshore wind project all but impossible. The
8 second reason that NRDC opposes the Port Ambrose
9 LNG terminal is because there's simply no need for
10 the LNG import terminal as we've heard the
11 increasing production of US domestic natural gas
12 has diminished any need for importing LNG. And
13 simply it doesn't make sense to have an, an import
14 facility in this region right now. The third reason
15 that NRDC opposes this project is that simply it'd
16 be moving New York in the wrong direction. Instead
17 renewable energy sources that nobly lack any of the
18 environmental and climate impacts of LNG have the
19 potential to meet a significant portion of New
20 York's energy needs. With the expansion off the New
21 York Sun Initiative and the huge potential for
22 offshore wind right off the coast of Long Island
23 and New York City we can meet the needs of New York
24 energy needs with renewable energy. In conclusion
25 with Earth Day approaching and the upcoming release
of Plan NYC report NRDC believes that passing this

2 resolution would send a positive message that New
3 York City's ports and values renewable energy
4 solutions to New York's energy needs. Thank you for
5 the opportunity to testify.

6 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

7 MATT GOVE: Alright my name is Matt Gove
8 and I'm representing the Surfrider Foundation's
9 chapter right here in New York City. We have
10 thousands of members in what I like to all our
11 beachfront community here in the city. You might
12 see the on the subway with their surfboards heading
13 out to the Rockaways all year around. We like to
14 think of ourselves sometimes as kind of Canaries in
15 the coal mine because we're out in the water all
16 the time, we see the trash, we get sick if there's
17 bad water quality. We notice when beaches are
18 disappearing. And we, we're really not very
19 interested in this project. We would really like
20 you to ask to, ask the governor to veto this
21 project under his authorities. And I think it's
22 really important that New York City takes a stance
23 and says something because this is going to be
24 right in your backyard and if anything goes wrong
25 you'll be, you'll be right here. I was going to go

3 over all these environmental facts but you're heard
4 them all already. There's going to be lots of
5 impacts to critters large and small. We've heard
6 about the entrainment entrapment ship strikes all
7 that stuff. But all that stuff, all those
8 environmental impacts are before an accident, you
9 know after an accident we don't even really know
10 what'll happen. You know it's a dangerous thing.
11 Older folks might recall the tragic accident in the
12 1970s on Staten Island where 40 people were killed
13 from an LNG explosion. So that's a real thing.
14 Since I'm skipping everything... think I just want to
15 go to the end. That really we just think this is a
16 bad deal for New York. We get about six permanent
17 jobs in the end of it. And for those six permanent
18 jobs we get kind of this giant dangerous fossil
19 fueling structure that nobody seems to want and
20 we'll be locked into that for years to come. So
21 thank you once again for having this hearing. It's
22 very important and we do ask you to pass the
23 resolution.

24 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

25 WINDY BURN: My name is Windy Burn. I'm
from United for Action. Today I'm reading the

2 testimony for a Ling Tsou whose grandchildren are
3 visiting from Taiwan. She's been fighting against
4 fracking and against climate change for our
5 children, for our grandchildren and for generations
6 to come. My name is Ling Tsou. I'm found, co-
7 founder of United for Action. I wish to thank
8 Chairman Richards for introducing resolution 549
9 and for holding a hearing on this today. Liberty
10 Natural Gas proposes to build Port Ambrose, an LNG
11 port about 17 nautical miles southeast of Jones
12 Beach. LNG and Port Ambrose are not needed in New
13 York now or in the future. The downstate New York
14 and Long Island Market has abundant supply of
15 natural gas from domestic sources. Natural gas in
16 the United States is cheaper than anywhere else in
17 the world. There are two Deepwater LNG ports
18 already built in the Boston Harbor that if not
19 imported gas since 2010 nearly every LNG port
20 facility around the United States has applied for
21 permits to switch to exports. Why would Liberty
22 Natural Gas want to build an LNG port facility when
23 there is no, absolutely no need. Here even though
24 Liberty Natural Gas has been promoting the
25 construction of Port Ambrose is creating many local

3 jobs the company promises only five permanent jobs
4 from this project yet the construction of Port
5 Ambrose would jeopardize the hundreds of currently
6 existing jobs from recreational and commercial
7 fishery and tourism. Moreover this project would
8 interfere with the development of an offshore wind
9 farm proposed to be built in the same area.

10 Construction of the offshore wind farm would, could
11 potentially create 40 thousand jobs. Let's all work
12 together to promote the creation of jobs from clean
13 renewable energy and not from the dying dirty
14 fossil fuel industry. LNG and Port Ambrose are both
15 dangerous and deadly. Being a New York City
16 resident the threat of terrorism is very real. I've
17 seen and experienced firsthand the impacts of
18 terrorism had on our community. Port Ambrose is
19 located near the three major airports and many
20 smaller airports in the New York City Metropolitan
21 area. It is clearly a potential terrorist target.

22 Any terror attack or LNG explosion off the shore of
23 the most densely populated metropolitan area in the
24 country would be catastrophic. Port Ambrose would
25 further increase New York's reliance on national
gas, natural gas, a methane emitting fuel which is

3 86 times worse than carbon dioxide at trapping heat
4 in our atmosphere over a 20 year period. The
5 greenhouse gas emissions from the construction and
6 operation of Port Ambrose will aggravate climate
7 change and intensify extreme weather conditions
8 such as hurricanes and storms. Port Ambrose
9 threatens our health, air, ocean climate, economy,
10 and environment. This project has no demonstrated
11 social and economic benefits. As a New Yorker I
12 urge Governor Cuomo to exercise his authority to
13 veto Port Ambrose. Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. You
15 may begin.

16 JENNIFER SCARLET: Thank you. Thank you
17 so much for this opportunity. My name is Jennifer
18 Scarlet I am here on behalf of 90 members of a new
19 grassroots climate justice organization, Bronx
20 Climate Justice North. We are in alliance with
21 environmental justice organizations in the South
22 Bronx including Bronx Climate Justice South, South
23 Bronx Unite, and Concrete Green. I do note the
24 words over your heads.. "Government of the People by
25 the people for the people" by president Lincoln.
And I am so grateful to you Chair Richards for your

2 leadership on this issue and on so many issues and
3 to all of the council members who have already
4 supported resolution 549. Bronx Climate Justice
5 North and our allies, all 90 of us have just
6 published in the Riverdale press up in the Bronx
7 today an open letter to Bronx elected officials
8 calling on them to support your resolution and to
9 let the Governor know that they oppose Port
10 Ambrose. The main thing I'd like to say is because
11 you've heard all of the wonderful testimony here
12 today including from my friends at Sane Energy
13 Project is that this kind of battle is an egregious
14 waste of time by every single person in this room
15 including all of you. There at a time when we're at
16 a turning point in history and we should all be
17 working on shifting to what my organization would
18 argue should be 100 percent renewables by 2030. We
19 are tied down fighting projects like this which is
20 just unconscionable. So thank you again very much
21 for your support and we strongly in, in the
22 strongest possible turns urge Governor Cuomo to
23 veto Port Ambrose. Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you all for
25 your testimony. Thank you. Alrighty I'm calling the

3 next panel, Mary Jenkins from the League of Woman
4 Voters, Anthony Rogers I think this is right from
5 Environmental Action, David Doll, Dave Doll from
6 Sane Energy, I think... right etcetera, and Edie
7 Kantrowitz from the United, from United for Action.
8 And we've also been joined by my colleague from
9 Manhattan Council Member Dan Garodnick. So Samara
10 Swanson will swear you in.

11 SAMARA SWANSON: Can you please raise
12 your right hands. Do you swear or affirm to tell
13 the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
14 truth today?

15 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. You
16 may begin. Just hit your button.

17 MARY JENKINS: My name is Mary Jenkins
18 and I represent the League of Women Voters of the
19 city of New York. As the council knows we are a
20 nonpartisan organization and we do take positions
21 on issues after thorough study. Last year we held a
22 public event where we invited a representative from
23 Liberty Natural Gas and also one from Clean Ocean
24 Action to present the pros and cons of this issue.
25 And this is a position that we have taken as a
result of our study. The League of Women Voters of

2 New York State and the League of Women Voters of
3 New York City strongly support New York City
4 council's resolution 549 calling on Governor Andrew
5 Cuomo to veto the application by Liberty Natural
6 Gas for Port Ambrose liquefied natural gas
7 Deepwater port. In September 2012 this application
8 was made yet the financial status of Liberty
9 Natural Gas and its owners and their identify
10 remains incomplete. The public has the right to
11 know this information to evaluate whether the
12 company can support such a large investment to
13 conduct and operate the port pipeline to liquid
14 natural gas regasification vessels staff offices
15 etcetera and whether it carries sufficient
16 insurance or on hand cash reserves in case of
17 accidents or malfunctions. Further the public
18 should have access to a port operations plan to
19 demonstrate navigability of the two almost 1,000
20 foot long liquid natural gas regasification vessels
21 among planned windmills for the same area of the
22 ocean and at all times without significantly
23 interfering with commerce. The plan should also
24 address their ability to operate under severe
25 weather conditions. Before approving or

2 disapproving this application we have requested the
3 United States Maritime Administration to adopt its
4 proposed policy to require a separate application
5 for an import port with an independent
6 environmental impact statement if the owners of an
7 import port wish to switch it to an export port.
8 Security and safety concerns of a liquid natural
9 gas port outside the port of New York and New
10 Jersey are serious. First LNG tankers have been
11 listed as potential terrorist targets by the
12 Department of Homeland Security since 2003. LNG
13 secondly is highly flammable. If I, if ignited it
14 can kill people and damage steel and in the
15 independent risk assessment phase one of the draft
16 environmental impact statement a large break in the
17 storage tanks can be caused by a vessel moving at
18 standard speeds that inadvertently strikes an LNG
19 regasification vessel calling on the Deepwater port
20 or by an intentional vessel hit. The result could
21 be two fold. First the LNG would float on top of
22 the water and a pool of LNG would form. If ignited
23 the fire could kill or burn the 156 crew members
24 and damage the liquid that natural gas,
25 regasification vessel or those on the ship that

3 strikes. Secondly if the if the pool of LNG is not
4 ignited a vapor cloud would form and could spread
5 rapidly including to a second liquid natural gas
6 regasification vessel that the other buoy or into
7 the Ambrose to Nantucket traffic lane depending on
8 the wind direction. If the cloud were ignited the
9 fire would flash back to the source of the spill
10 likely causing death or serious burns to all
11 individuals it encounters either aboard the LNG
12 regasification vessel or aboard nearby vessels.
13 Other forms of terror scenarios such as acts of
14 war; for example hijacking attacks by planes,
15 torpedoes, missiles, drones, preplaced explosives,
16 etcetera are not discussed in the independent risk
17 assessment phase one. And we strongly recommend
18 that they be considered with a risk assessment and
19 appropriate response in phase two. The League of
20 Women Voters of New York state joined by the League
21 of Women Voters of New York City ask council
22 members to pass resolution 549 in 2015 calling on
23 Governor Andrew Cuomo to veto the application by
24 liberty natural gas for Port Ambrose LNG Deepwater
25 port. Thank you so much for bringing this, having
this hearing and bringing this to public attention.

3 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. Next
4 person.

5 EDIE KANTOWITZ: Hi, my name is Edie
6 Kantowitz. I'd like to extend my thanks for having
7 this opportunity to speak today. I, I'm president
8 of New York City Friends of Clearwater and I'm a
9 board member of United for Action. But I'm speaking
10 today just as an individual and I'm going to be
11 probably repeating a lot of the things that have
12 been said already. But I think that it is very
13 important that we take to heart all of these
14 reasons why it is so important this project not
15 proceed. The proposed Port Ambrose LNG project does
16 not serve the public interest. It is unnecessary
17 and extremely dangerous and that's why I want to
18 give the strongest support to city council
19 resolution opposing the project and asking Governor
20 Cuomo to exercise his veto. Liquefied natural gas
21 as the other people have said is highly flammable.
22 It presents an serious explosion risk and we have
23 just a few days ago seen in the east village just
24 how devastating and tragic methane explosions can
25 be. LNG is even more dangerous than regular natural
gas. It's also worse for the climate than regular

3 natural gas. But in addition to the potential for
4 ordinary accidents these facilities are such a
5 obvious and desirable target for tourist groups who
6 have already indicated that they have interest in
7 attacking LNG tankers in facilities. In the worst
8 case scenario an LNG tanker could be hijacked and
9 brought to the densely populated areas on the south
10 shore or even in New York Harbor and detonating it
11 there could cause thousands of deaths, an incident
12 worse than what we've seen. It's just unthinkable
13 okay. The proximity to JFK airport in the
14 commercial shipping lanes in the harbor also
15 contribute to making this a totally unacceptable
16 location... such a dangerous facility. So why would
17 we want to place it, a, a giant bomb in our harbor
18 where the fuse is just waiting to be lit. Even if
19 we don't have a catastrophic accident the LNG port
20 will have many adverse environmental impacts
21 impacting negatively on marine life, on the fishing
22 shipping and recreation industries, massive amounts
23 of seawater containing plants and eggs and larvae
24 and marine organisms will be drawn into the port
25 during construction and operation and then
chemically treated water will be discharged putting

3 a toxic burden on the marine ecosystem. The
4 dredging involved in the construction process will
5 kill shellfish such as lobsters, crabs, clams,
6 scallops, and disturb the sea floor habitats that
7 they rely upon. Endangered marine mammals such as
8 the Right Whale, the Fin Whale, and the Humpback
9 Whale not to mention the sea turtles will be
10 exposed to excessive noise and disruption of their
11 migration roots. And this assault on the ecosystem
12 is all for no good reason because we don't need
13 this LNG. There is a... shale gas in this country and
14 everyone knows it. Natural gas is already heaper in
15 this country than almost anywhere in the world and
16 net imports through LNG to this country are
17 currently near era. Liberty Natural Gas is now
18 trying to greenwash the project by saying that it
19 will provide frack free gas from Trinidad and
20 Tobago to help meet peak demand needs. Well that
21 really sounds like an April Fool's joke because the
22 facts clearly show how likely it is that Port
23 Ambrose will become an export facility instead.
24 It's clear that this project exists solely for the
25 benefit of Liberty Natural Gas and not for the
benefit of New Yorkers. It is unlikely to create

2 local jobs. And we know that by continuing to rely
3 on fossil fuels like shell gas and LNG we are
4 continuing to accelerate climate change and to
5 invite more Superstorm when we could be focusing
6 instead on making the transition to renewables and
7 to the wind farm that we would like to see built in
8 the same spot as Port Ambrose. So again strongest
9 support for this resolution and the request that
10 Governor Cuomo will veto Port Ambrose.

11 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

12 DAVID DAHL: Good afternoon. My name is
13 David Dahl. I work with many different
14 ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS. It's interesting my great
15 great grandfather was a lumber baron up in New
16 Hampshire back in the 1880s and he was clear
17 cutting up in those years which caused all the silt
18 to run into the rivers killing the local trout and
19 the locals got pretty upset with hi. And I, I'm
20 just thinking in my own perspective I, I watched
21 the Ken Burn's special recently on, on the, the
22 dust bowl which basically was caused by arrogance
23 and ignorance and greed. We destroyed... you know we,
24 they went in to farm a place that shouldn't have
25 been farmed. And when things started to go bad they

3 farmed harder. You know that was, that was the
4 thought process. So it was another awful mistake
5 that a lot of people paid dearly for and the
6 environment was really destroyed. And then I look
7 at my own lifetime and... 3 mile island and all these
8 different you know things that have happened with
9 the nuclear industry and I just saw a show last
10 night about the Navajo nation and how they were
11 subject to this also because they, on their
12 property uranium was dug and they were given a
13 pittance to go out and dig out poison out of the
14 ground so that we could make nuclear you know bombs
15 and, and nuclear reactors. So we just keep on
16 making mistakes on and on and on. And we saw
17 Hurricane Sandy and how because of our arrogance
18 and lack of paying respect to our environment and
19 our world what happens when we don't do that. So it
20 seems to me we're ready to put another nail on our
21 own coffin because of green and arrogance and
22 ignorance. And to do this again... And, and instead
23 of going for solar energy and wind power and things
24 that are shown to not hurt anybody... there've been
25 no solar panel explosions, there've been no solar
panels that have destroyed the whole gulf with a

3 leak from oil. All these things that are, all these
4 examples of what we've done wrong and mistakes and
5 we don't seem to want to change our ways or at
6 least some of us don't want to seem to change our
7 ways due to greed and ignorance. So I'm hoping that
8 we can get smart. I appreciate you bringing this
9 resolution forward. And hopefully common sense will
10 prevail.

11 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

12 ANTHONY ROGERS-WRIGHT: Chairman

13 Richards and distinguished council members thank
14 you for giving me this honor to submit oral and
15 written comments on our resolution 549. My name is
16 Anthony Rogers-Wright. I am the Policy and
17 Organizing Director with Environmental Action. We
18 are a nongovernmental environmental policy and
19 research organization. Prior to my time with
20 environmental action I had 10 years of experience
21 preparing environmental documents for various
22 multinational companies including environmental
23 impact statements and I specialize in
24 socioeconomics and environmental justice mitigation
25 strategies. Before I get into my statement I just
want to speak to something that you asked

3 Councilman Richards about. The facility of turning
4 this from an import facility to an export facility
5 we talked about the infrastructure process but in
6 terms of the administrative process what you have
7 to understand is that there were three levels of
8 environmental documentation going from lowest to
9 highest. There's the categorical exclusion. There's
10 the environmental assessment or finding of, of no
11 significant impact. And then there's the
12 environmental impact statement. Administratively
13 all that Liberty would have to do I believe is
14 prepare what is called a categorical exclusion
15 which is virtually similar to the environmental
16 documentation that would be required to build a
17 treehouse in your backyard. So it would be very
18 very easy for them to do it. Now Mr. Chairman
19 pursuant to Section 1502.1 of the national
20 environmental policy act an environmental impact
21 statement shall quote serve as an action forcing
22 device to ensure that the policies and goals
23 defined in the act are infused into the ongoing
24 programs and actions of the federal government. It
25 shall provide full and fair discussion of
significant environmental impacts and shall inform

3 decision makers in the public of the reasonable
4 alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse
5 impacts or enhance the quality of the human
6 environment. Further section 1502.1 stipulates an
7 environmental impact statement is more than a
8 disclosure document. It shall be used by federal
9 officials in conjunction with other relevant
10 material to plan actions and make decisions. Now I
11 was trained that this means that it is my
12 responsibility when I made these documents to
13 author documents that are objectively informative
14 and legally defensible. Unfortunately the DEIS for
15 Port Ambrose fails base, both of these tests
16 profoundly and uniformly and specifically with
17 respect to socioeconomics. And I really want to
18 talk about that for a second. The mass, the vast
19 majority of the socioeconomic analysis is done by
20 Tetra Tech on behalf of Liberty is vague and quite
21 frankly languorous. As a result the public and
22 decision makers like yourselves are not properly
23 informed about the direct and indirect impacts that
24 this project would have on communities and local
25 and regional economies. At such it is warranted to
conclude that Liberty Natural gas and Tetra Tech

3 the preparers of the DIS perpetuated the culture of
4 oxification which opens up the analysis in the
5 entire document quite frankly to numerous legal
6 challenges and questions of integrity. Mr. Chairman
7 take your district for example. According to the
8 2010 census your district is very rich in diversity
9 and minorities people of color account for over 75
10 percent of its population therefore it would
11 qualify as an environmental justice population that
12 warrants specific and localized analysis including
13 consultation with leaders like yourself to develop
14 and implement safeguard to protect your
15 constituents. And I don't imagine that liberty nor
16 Tetra Tech reached out to your leaders or other, to
17 yourself or other leaders in your district. One
18 more thing that I want to point out and this is
19 very very important, as you will see in the
20 comments that were distributed by clean ocean
21 action they did something which I refer to as
22 mendacious mathematics or ambiguous arithmetic. And
23 they were aggregating all of the, the people who
24 make up the population of the, the region of
25 interest as they call it they left out Hispanics as
the aggregate number of people who would make up

2 minorities or people of color therefore trying to
3 circumvent the environmental justice process. Now
4 this is important because pursuant to the
5 environmental protection agency's region to
6 guidelines for conducting an environmental in,
7 justice analysis. EPA's Office of Environmental
8 Justice has defined the term minority for
9 environmental justice purposes to include
10 Hispanics, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders,
11 African Americans, American Indians, and Alaska
12 Natives. As such the table that references these
13 populations 3.91 I believe in the document does not
14 include these Hispanics and other people as
15 minority populations and that just makes no sense
16 to me. It's like pretending that they don't exist
17 and we know that Hispanics definitely exist and not
18 just because of telemundom [phonetic]. So overall
19 this DIS it overlooks your community and other
20 community and this is a pernicious precedent that
21 puts peoples' health and lives at unnecessary risk.
22 And I said I could go on and on but the clean ocean
23 action comment has already been submitted to you.
24 And tactics such as these are bereft of integrity
25 and warrant a veto from the governor. So I

3 appreciate you, I applaud your leadership, and I
4 think I speak for all of us. I'm ready and willing
5 to assist you in any way that I can to secure
6 passage of Resolution 549. Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you so
8 much. Can you just speak a little bit, so just sum
9 up... You know obviously we heard your
10 disappointments with the EIS, can you sum up
11 quickly and what would you have liked to see in
12 the, in the environmental impact statement.

13 ANTHONY ROGERS-WRIGHTS: Yes sir so when
14 I've prepared environmental just... analysis in the
15 past we don't look at the regional population.
16 Because as you well know effects and impacts are
17 real as at the local level. You can go down one
18 block and then go to another block and it's an
19 entirely a different story. So first of all I would
20 have liked to have seen them include Hispanics as
21 people of color. That would have been nice number
22 one. Number two I would have liked a more localized
23 number one. Number two I would have liked a more
24 localized analysis which went to the census tract
25 or census block group level so you have a much more
informed idea of what the local population is like.

3 And once this would have happened they would have
4 seen that this is an environmental justice
5 population and prepared what's called a community
6 impact assessment to properly assure that leaders
7 like yourself were consulted, people in the
8 neighborhood were consulted to minimize if not
9 mitigate potential impacts disproportionate,
10 disproportionately.

11 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. I
12 think that's, you, that was well said.

13 ANTHONY ROGERS-WRIGHT: Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Just thank you
15 guys thank you for your testimony. Thank you.
16 Alrighty our next panel is Jessica Roff from the
17 Catskill Mountain Keeper, Mav Moorhead from NYH20
18 and PCS, Denise Katzman from EnviroHancement, Alex
19 Beauchamp from Food and Water... let me get it right,
20 say it again, I... Beauchamp. Okay I always, see I
21 chopped it up.

22 SAMARA SWANSON: Can you please raise
23 your right hand? Do you swear affirm to tell the
24 truth the whole truth and nothing but the truth
25 today?

CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: You may begin.

3 JESSICA ROFF: Hi, whoops, there's a bar
4 under there. Hi, my name is Jessica Roff. I work
5 for Catskill Mountain Keeper and I want to thank
6 you Council Member Richards for calling this along
7 with the Committee on Waterfronts and the rest of
8 your Committee on Environmental Protection.
9 Obviously it's really important today to have this
10 opportunity to testify on an extremely important
11 matter for New York City New York state, the United
12 States, and frankly the planet. We're here to talk
13 about Liberty Natural Gas which we've heard is a
14 shell corporation in the Cayman Islands and its
15 proposal to build a liquefied natural gas port just
16 miles off the coast of New York. Most disturbingly
17 just offshore from the communities that were most
18 ravaged by Superstorm Sandy and still working
19 through a cover from that climate change driven
20 disaster. It all comes down to one critical fact.
21 There are numerous reasons why Port Ambrose is a
22 terrible idea, many of which you've already heard
23 and there are no reasons to actually build this
24 expensive dangerous piece of fossil fuel
25 infrastructure that will continue to shackle us to
what must be the fossil fuel past instead of moving

3 us forward to a clean safe local job producing wind
4 energy future proposed for the exact same location.

5 Given the information already covered by my many
6 extremely knowledgeable colleagues I will address
7 an issue that doesn't get enough discussion.

8 Emergency response and preparedness and the
9 unfunded mandate to first responders mostly in
10 Sandy effected areas, in that context I want to
11 talk about a word that should make all of us very
12 nervous. It is guidance. Because it seems that in
13 dealing with possible emergencies, disasters,
14 accidents, and terrorist threats all we have is
15 guidance not binding regulations or concretized
16 plans. In my past life I was a government attorney
17 and I worked on a lot of international negotiations
18 on behalf of the United States government. One of
19 the Department of State's favorite things was the
20 word should because it has lots of wiggle room.

21 They hated the word shall. We spent hours talking
22 about shall. That was never something we wanted to
23 agree to because it's binding. And I'm betting you
24 can all guess what is in most of the documents
25 related to the policy around Port Ambrose and other
fossil fuel infrastructure. Not even the

3 communications are mapped out for dealing with
4 these kinds of emergencies. And that doesn't
5 require the kind of training or funding or anything
6 else that actual emergency response requires. At
7 John J College over the winter I was at a
8 presentation about the guide for communicating
9 emergency response information for natural gas and
10 hazardous liquid pipelines, mouthful. It was
11 sponsored by... of the pipeline and hazardous
12 material safety administration, the study was. And
13 if you don't know about the report you should. I've
14 include I sent it to Samara before this hearing
15 because it's 30 plus pages and I wasn't going to
16 print it out for you all right now. But basically
17 it's focused on pipelines but the presorts also
18 talked about how it applies to oil trains and other
19 infrastructure issues and obviously Port Ambrose
20 will actually connect to pipelines. The report
21 highlights the importance of communication relating
22 to all types of emergencies and planning for the
23 communication well before an emergency occurs. The
24 study and report also provide guidance and
25 recommendations and are completely non-binding. And
basically what it shows is that there really is no

3 communication. At least there's nothing that's
4 standardized, mandatory, regulated or any other
5 word that could be reassuring. In fact the things
6 that are also, the things that are not being
7 communicated are the things that are supposed to be
8 communicated about are also not standardized,
9 equilibrated, tested on a uniform schedule, or
10 anything else. So the biggest concern about this
11 for me also was that there was no clear chain of
12 command that's figured out ahead of time for most
13 of these emergency situations. And let's keep in
14 mind that pipelines have actually been used and
15 regulated for a very long time. On the contrast to
16 that the tankers that are supposed to come up to
17 Port Ambrose are pretty new because they're dealing
18 with using actual natural gas as their fuel source.
19 So guess what this is unregulated surprise. There
20 are no established regulation specifically for
21 vessels receiving LNG for uses fuel. The coast
22 guard quote filled the gap by quote recommending
23 appropriate safety measures in a policy letter on
24 February 19th. It's called guidelines for liquefied
25 natural gas, fuel transfer, operations, and
training of personnel on vessels using natural gas

3 as fuel. They are not concise, any of these guys
4 are they? So it will come as no surprise that this
5 letter is also full of guidance on recommendations
6 and should and I've emailed a copy of that document
7 to you all as well. When I was a government lawyer
8 I also worked a lot of mutual aid agreements in
9 Indian country where jurisdiction turns on a dime
10 and agencies are poorly staffed and underfunded and
11 everything is really dependent on literally where
12 you are standing. And these all also include
13 specific training for first responder agencies that
14 are involved. We've all heard about how the coast
15 guard is not prepared to take on the ever expanding
16 security issue of the ever increasing number of LNG
17 facilities in this country and because Port Ambrose
18 is going to be a deep, is proposed to be a deep
19 water port will also be dealing with moving
20 tankers. To me this raises massive concerns over
21 emergency response agencies and their jurisdiction
22 because we're talking about New York City, New York
23 state, and federal jurisdiction and all of those
24 things. And I haven't heard any discussion of
25 mutual aid agreements in the context of Port
Ambrose or of any of the rest of these

3 infrastructure projects. And one in particular that
4 should be really concerning is obviously the
5 Rockaway Lateral Pipeline which goes through New
6 York City land, federal wildlife, federal parkland,
7 open ocean, state land, and buildings on the
8 historical registry. If you can't figure out that
9 mishmash of jurisdiction I certainly can't. And so,
10 and for the record were protesting there and when
11 the police were called I specifically spoke to them
12 which I always do whenever the police are called on
13 us to find out if they knew what was going on and
14 they thought it was a sewage pipeline. And I said
15 wow that's really disturbing because you guys are
16 going to be the first ones that show up in the
17 event of an emergency and it's a question of when
18 not if there will be an emergency. And as you all
19 remember the last time we were here at City Hall on
20 March 16th when the federal comment period closed
21 the fire department had a huge press conference or
22 had the opportunity to talk to a number of
23 firefighters afterwards and I learned a bunch of
24 disturbing things from them. First I learned
25 there's only three marine FDNY units in the entire
city of New York. Two of them, I think two are in

3 Manhattan and one is Brooklyn. They are not in
4 Queens. They are not near where Port Ambrose is
5 going to be. In addition there's only one hazmat
6 unit for the entire population of eight million
7 people. I'm sure there's no hazardous materials
8 that we have to deal with ever in this city. So
9 that's terrifying. And the, off the, and the
10 firefighters that I'm speaking with have never
11 heard of Port Ambrose and they were actually from
12 Queens. I've also spoken with a dispatcher who said
13 the only training or discussion he had overheard
14 about this was a table top training which means
15 that people sit around and talk about it. They
16 don't actually get trained in implementation or
17 anything like that. And there was not talk of
18 continuing training or for their, of further
19 information about this. So this raises a question
20 of if and when the necessary training is undertaken
21 who is going to pay for it. Companies like Liberty
22 build dangerous fossil fuel infrastructure with
23 impunity. They don't pay the true cost of doing
24 business and they certainly don't pay the cost of
25 emergency response injury or clean up. How is that
okay. Where is the money going to come from and how

3 are we going to standardize the training. Pipeline
4 and other fossil fuel infrastructure accidents are
5 known as high impact low probability incidents
6 that, that means that Emergency responders don't
7 train on them the same they way, that they would
8 for say a multiunit apartment building which is a
9 common occurrence fire in New York City. So here in
10 New York City at least we have some of the best
11 funded, best equipped, and best trained emergency
12 responders but that's still not sufficient. And
13 also the proximity of Port Ambrose to most of the
14 cities in Long Island should worry people because
15 there are one, there are actually volunteer
16 firefighters out there. There are limited
17 resources. They are not well equipped. They are not
18 well funded. In fact we know that Long Beach has
19 not properly applied for their next year's funding
20 for their fire department. And so there's a huge
21 issue right there. And these questions should
22 always be a threshold test and not afterthoughts.
23 So we're at a critical junction right now as the
24 ocean levels and temperatures rise and hundred year
25 floods happen more frequently than every 100 years.
And now is the time we need to commit to renewable

3 energy future and as you Chairperson Richards are
4 fond of saying divorce from our fossil fuel past.
5 It's time to build an offshore wind farm instead of
6 Port Ambrose because that would create clean jobs,
7 safe jobs, would not exacerbate climate change,
8 would allow for the ocean floor and ocean
9 ecosystems to not only recover after construction
10 but to thrive, would help New York City meet its
11 goal of being an 80 percent greenhouse gas
12 emissions reduction by 2050, and would contribute
13 to coastal communities' resiliency because as Mark
14 Jacobson of Stanford has found wind turbines can
15 reduce peak wind speeds by up to 98 miles per hour
16 as well as decrease storm surge by up to 79
17 percent. Now is the time to invest in the future
18 with renewable energy. There's nothing about Port
19 Ambrose that looks to our future... dangerous path
20 and brings no benefits to New York. Thank you to
21 the City Council for taking on this important issue
22 and to Chairperson Richards for your leadership.
23 City Council has to pass this resolution and
24 Governor Cuomo has to veto Port Ambrose.

25 DENISE KATZMAN: Thank you Jess. Denise
Katzman EnviroHancement. Thank you to the EP

2 Committee for holding this hearing. And thank you
3 to Howard Goppeter [phonetic] who my testimony's
4 dedicated to. He alerted to the fact that today's
5 April Fool's day is when the city's LNG moratorium
6 ends. And he told me this last year and he's a
7 lawyer and he has a great sense of humor and I said
8 now you can't play with me because you know that's
9 April Fools and he said no this is serious. It's
10 when it ends. The reality that LN... the, excuse me,
11 the primary goal of LNG terminals is export. The
12 industry never reveals the truth pertaining to
13 export which equals violating the false claims act
14 titled 18 US code section 287. Port Ambrose
15 violates, also violates the public convenience and
16 necessity rubber stamp since the terminal will be
17 for export. The public trust doctrine is a vitally
18 important piece of legislation that can also be
19 used to kill this terminal once and for all. There
20 has been a huge decline in LNG due to oils death
21 spiral and most recently the accelerate energy LNG
22 terminal in Texas which is a planned eight million
23 ton for year entity has been put on hold until
24 later this year. LNG projects all of them require
25 form purchasing prior to the final investment

1 decision which is known as FID along with signed
2 agreements for 85 percent prior to FID. The federal
3 clean water act, clean air act, and NYPA... speaking
4 of NYPA which was in the letter dated March 17 US
5 Department of Homeland Security from the US Coast
6 Guard and... to the CE, COO of Liberty. In December
7 0-14 the federal council on environmental quality
8 gave a, gave draft guidance on GHGs pertaining to
9 NYPA. The proposal directed federal agencies to
10 consider climate change and GHGs along with the
11 impacts of climate change for the for all proposed
12 projects seeking NYPA's requirements because the
13 sole purpose of NYPA is to take a hard look not a
14 false look, a hard transparent look. And this give
15 NYPA a stronger backbone. Holistically massive LNG
16 vessels in conjunction with the terminal operations
17 will turn New York state into New Jersey sidekick
18 for the state with the most toxic sites. Back in
19 February of this year there were, there was a,
20 there was a media piece regarding the Republican
21 Congress and the ten top regulations that they want
22 to kill. I'm just going to quote the top five; One
23 clean power plant, two endangered species act,
24 three ground level ozone standards, methane
25

2 regulations for oil and gas, five renewable fuel
3 standard. Cyber-attacks are chronic issues with
4 combustible fuel. That's a part of terrorism
5 because LNG terminals are joy rides for cyber
6 terrorists. And it was briefly mentioned prior.
7 It's called FLNG and it's the new kid in town.
8 It's, it's totally putting every port that's on
9 land onto these massive LNG vessels. It's currently
10 happening in Japan. And the, the industry is
11 getting a bigger buck for the facilities being
12 totally on the vessels versus on ground. And I, I
13 just want to give a shout out to a 50 year
14 anniversary that hardly anyone knows about it, it
15 takes place on, it took, it took place on February
16 8th. It was given to us by former president Lyndon
17 B. Johnson. And back then when he got into office
18 almost immediately he said quote this generation
19 has altered the composition of the atmosphere on a
20 global scale through radioactive materials and a
21 steady increase in carbon dioxide from the burning
22 of fossil fuels. Air pollution is no longer
23 confined to isolated places. And within his first
24 year he wrote new environmental protections. And
25 recently the Department of Energy for its FY 0-16

2 energy efficiency and renewable energy budget is
3 giving 44 percent to solar which is 336 million,
4 over nine percent increase to bioenergy 246
5 million, 36 percent increase for wind 145 million,
6 six percent increase for fuel cell technologies
7 which also includes hydrogen 103 million, and 75
8 percent for geothermal 90 which is 96 million, and
9 10 percent increase for water at 67 million. So...

10 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: I'm... [cross-talk]
11 wrap up.

12 DENISE KATZMAN: Yeah. Yeah yeah yeah
13 yeah. One other thing that Liberty has said the CO,
14 CEO has said that this is not fracked gas and that
15 it will lower the energy bills of down state by
16 325 million. And at one time in the history of this
17 state there was a governor that vetoed an LNG
18 terminal. It was back in '08, it was Patterson.
19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

21 MAV MOORHEAD: Thank you so much for
22 proposing the resolution 520, 549. I'm Mav
23 Moorhead. I'm with NYH20 as well as DCS. In
24 addition to severe water contamination as a result
25 of methane and radium that are technologically

2 engineered by the fracking process as well as air
3 contamination resulting from methane and radon 222
4 distribution with gas to our cities in the
5 northeast through nearly constructed pipelines who
6 are now confronted by the gas industry's latest
7 spin on the necessity of the Port Ambrose LNG
8 facility. Job creation would only be temporary.
9 Permanent job creation would amount to single
10 digits. Claims that the gas supplying Long Island
11 is necessary in response to the winter's recent
12 cold temperatures is brought into question since
13 the plans for this project were initiated many
14 years ago. Claims for cheaper gas don't resonate
15 because the cost of this LNG Port would ultimately
16 fall into the consumer fall onto the consumer in
17 the classification of delivery charges substantial,
18 substantially bringing the cost of the gas up
19 considerably. Long Island Power Authority recently
20 stopped the proposed power plant in Brookhaven
21 because Long Island's future energy needs would
22 already be accounted for and be covered for scores
23 of years to come. The extreme hazards more than
24 outweigh the gas and... contrive benefits that the
25 developer Liberty National, Natural Gas espouses.

3 The huge LNG tankers pose substantial risk if
4 ruptured. The resulting gas vapor from such a
5 rupture, from such a hugely, a largely voluminous
6 source would be catastrophic. There's no way of
7 extinguishing this source of explosion. This makes
8 for a terrorist target like no other being adjacent
9 to major populated areas. The New, the New York
10 City Harbor one of the most populated shipping
11 lanes in the US and in addition adjacent, a major
12 of air service from three airports could be
13 severely devastated from any attack on any one of
14 these LNG megaships which are slated for export of
15 gas to foreign countries. The environmental
16 consequences would be evident in ecosystems that
17 would consistently be affected by the connecting
18 pipelines on the ocean floor. Existing toxins
19 already dumped would be disturbed and cause, cause
20 toxic issues to marine life not to mention the con,
21 constant venting of methane gas into the air from
22 these many tankers leaving port. The LNG
23 domestically produced gas is not providing for US
24 or Long Island needs for the future but is slated
25 for gas industries highest profit margin export.
Gas LNG sales on the force, on the foreign market

2 for at least seven times higher than the present US
3 national market glut sales for presently. The
4 resources devoted to this already heavily
5 subsidized industry would be best applied to wind
6 farms. Mark Jacobson, a Stanford Professor, states
7 that 40 percent of our power needs to come from
8 offshore wind power in order for the New York
9 state, for New York state to be 100 percent
10 renewable. A substantial percentage of citizens
11 from New York and Long Island are supportive of the
12 offshore wind farms. If financial resource is
13 driven to this Port Ambrose facility are considered
14 the path to inevitable renewable sustainable energy
15 would be unnecessarily stalled for years to come,
16 certainly a goal of the gas industry, much of the,
17 much to the detriment of New York and New Jersey
18 residents. Thank you again for this...

19 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. Thank
20 you.

21 ALEX BEAUCHAMP: My name's Alex
22 Beauchamp. I'm the Northeast Region Director for
23 Food and Water Watch. I'm here to speak in support
24 of resolution 549. I want to thank Chairman
25 Richards and the committee for the resolution and,

2 and for the opportunity to talk here today and
3 discuss the short sightedness of the Port Ambrose
4 LNG project. And I'm going to focus on need. Simply
5 put there's no convincing demonstration for the
6 public need of this project. Liberty's projections
7 of growth and natural gas demand for the New York
8 metropolitan region are based on a report from ICF.
9 ICF is an enormous energy consulting firm and
10 importantly they have a huge self-interested stake
11 in expanding natural gas use across the country and
12 around the globe. Such self-fulfilling projections
13 are pessimistic and grim. More importantly they
14 sell New Yorkers short. They completely
15 underestimate the progress our region can and as
16 we've heard over and over again from so many folks
17 giving great testimony progress that we must make
18 in eliminating demand for fossil fuels like... prove,
19 proven clean energy solutions... must remake our
20 energy system around energy efficient technologies,
21 conservation measures, and most importantly
22 renewable energy sources such as wind and solar.
23 The Port Ambrose project would not only be a
24 conduit for more fossil fuels and thus more climate
25 pollution it would also displace offshore wind

2 energy capacity as we've heard over and over again
3 today. Much to mine and evidently several other
4 peoples' amusement just a couple weeks ago liberty
5 Natural gas, the firm behind this project embraced
6 the state of New York's fracking ban which has
7 surprised me and touted LNG imports as some sort of
8 alternative to fracking. The idea that we'll
9 replace natural gas with natural gas is sort of
10 beyond me. But it's really just the latest twist in
11 the many, many, many reincarnations of this
12 project. With the state's fracking ban Liberty
13 Natural Gas evidently sees an opportunity to claim
14 the natural gas from Trinidad and Tobago which has
15 only had about eight years' worth of proven natural
16 gas reserves is actually needed but this gas in
17 this project is not needed contrary to liberty
18 natural gas is sudden appreciation for the problems
19 of fracking. We have every reason to believe that
20 the facility would join the many others proposed on
21 both costs to export not import fracked natural
22 gas. That's because as other folks have mentioned
23 LNG exports not imports are the current market
24 trend. Exports are about maximizing oil and gas
25 production through widespread and intensive

2 drilling and fracking as a society we cannot accept
3 this as a nation we have to choose a different
4 course. And for that to happen Governor Cuomo
5 should veto the Port Ambrose facility and the
6 council should, should pass the resolution.

7 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you all for
8 your testimony. Alrighty we'll now hear from Tara
9 Klein who's representing State Senator Brad Hoylman
10 and Max Wise who's representing Assembly member
11 Rosenthal. And we'll also call up Judith Canepa
12 from New York Climate Action Group and also Captain
13 Scopic from the People's Climate Movement of New
14 York.

15 TARA KLEIN: Alright hello. My name is
16 Tara Klein... [cross-talk]

17 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Hold on one
18 second.

19 SAMARA SWANSON: Can you please raise
20 your right hand? Chair? Please raise your right
21 hands. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth,
22 the whole truth, and nothing but the truth today?

23 [background comments]
24
25

2 TARA KLEIN: Thank you. My name is Tara
3 Klein. I work for the Office of State Senator Brad
4 Hoylman. I'm joined by my colleague...

5 MAX WISE: I'm Max Wise. I work for
6 Assembly Member Linda B. Rosenthal.

7 TARA KLEIN: We apologize that our
8 bosses could not be here in person today. They are
9 up in Albany finishing up the budget. We did pass
10 the budget so...

11 MAX WISE: Last night.

12 TARA KLEIN: Before I begin reading, we
13 begin reading their statement I'd like to add that
14 our office has spearheaded a letter to Governor
15 Cuomo asking him to veto this project. We are
16 joined by 50 other state legislators I this effort.
17 So now we'll begin reading the, our testimony.
18 Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony
19 to the city council committees on Environmental
20 Protection and waterfronts regarding the
21 application by Liberty Natural Gas LLC to build a
22 liquefied natural gas deep water port facility
23 called Port Ambrose roughly 19 miles from the New
24 York shore. We oppose this unnecessary and
25 environmentally irresponsible project. And we

2 therefore support resolution 549 calling on
3 Governor Cuomo to veto the application. The
4 construction and operation of Port Ambrose would
5 have a strongly negative ecological impact on its
6 surroundings, discharge millions of gallons of
7 chemically treated seawater, and require the
8 dredging of miles of sea floor. Port Ambrose would
9 further aggravate environmental degradation by
10 increasing New York's reliance on natural gas, a
11 methane emitting fuel. According to the
12 intergovernmental panel on climate change the
13 leading international body for the assessment of
14 climate change, methane, a dangerous greenhouse gas
15 is 86 times more effective than carbon dioxide at
16 trapping heat in our atmosphere over a 20 year
17 period. This is of course in addition to the
18 potential havoc wrought to New York's coastline if
19 an extreme weather event such as another Hurricane
20 Sandy were to damage a vulnerable offshore facility
21 of this type. Moreover Port Ambrose could pose a
22 grave security risk for New York. According to the
23 Council on foreign relations liquefied natural gas
24 facilities are a potential terrorist target. Any

2 explosion or fire from an LNG facility in the New
3 York Harbor would be catastrophic.

4 MAX WISE: This project also has the
5 potential to interfere with the development of a
6 far more environmentally responsible wind farm that
7 has been proposed for the area. The bureau of Ocean
8 Energy Management an agency of the US Department of
9 Interior in its scoping comments on the Port
10 Ambrose application stated that it is concern that
11 the proposal to construct an LNG Port in the same
12 area proposed for a large wind facility could
13 result in serious conflicts or at a minimum
14 complicating factors that may impact the overall
15 viability of one or both projects. We and many of
16 our constituents fear that this would be, it would
17 not be a worthy tradeoff. Furthermore Port Ambrose
18 is an unnecessary project according to the 2014
19 draft New York state energy plan, domestic
20 production of natural gas is at its highest level
21 in four decades and a need for substantial increase
22 volumes of imported LNG has diminished for the near
23 term. The draft energy plan further states that
24 this saturation of supply and natural gas is caused
25 imports to decline every year from 2007 through

3 2012, a year in which two of the 12 act of LNG
4 import terminals in the country receive regular
5 shipments. In 2011 even New Jersey governor Chris
6 Christy vetoed an application for a, an LNG port by
7 Liberty off the coast of New Jersey stating that
8 offshore LNG poses unacceptable risk to the state's
9 residents, natural resources, economy, and
10 security. We urge Governor Cuomo to veto this
11 project and continue to defend New York state's
12 precious environmental assets. Thank you for your
13 consideration of our comments.

14 Thank you Legislative Council Samara
15 Swanston and Chair Donovan Richards for all you do
16 to support the improvement of our environment and
17 work toward a just transition to renewable energy.
18 Thank you also for your excellent participation in
19 the recent Peoples Climate Movement New York
20 Legislative Form March 16th. My name is Catherine
21 Scopic. And although I'm a member of several
22 environmental groups such as Peoples Climate
23 Movement, IMAC Interfaith Moral Action on Climate
24 shut down... now and WHEA the West Harlem
25 Environmental Action I'm speaking today as a
citizen. I'm here to say yes to a wind farm at Long

1 Beach Long Island. The location is just right for
2 such a wind farm. The intensity and persistence of
3 wind as well as water depth make it a perfect
4 location for a wind farm and we need the renewable
5 energy it would produce sustainably. Today being
6 April first would that someone would tell me that
7 the dangerous insane idea of putting an LNG port
8 near to so densely a populated area is someone's
9 idea of a black humored joke and that this idea
10 will go away tomorrow and forever. Unfortunately it
11 is not a joke but it could go away tomorrow and
12 forever. And I ask you to please do all you can to
13 ensure that Governor Cuomo veto this dangerous
14 destructive ill-conceived idea. And I thank you for
15 your resolution to do so. With all the anecdotal
16 evidence we have and all the scientific data and
17 research such as the recent IPCC report, that's the
18 intergovernmental panel on climate change, we know
19 that any and all bringing of fossil fuel will
20 eventually destroy life on this planet therefore
21 any and all industries such as this proposed LNG
22 port that supports the extraction, transport, and
23 burning of fossil fuels may be viewed not only as
24 immoral but as evil. For whatever reason people do
25

3 such a thing be it greed, money, control, or
4 whatever I ask that they reconsider. I ask that
5 they do consider the many lives that would be lost
6 in an ensuing explosion as we know this industry,
7 as we have seen is more likely to encounter than
8 not be it through mechanical or human error. Our
9 nation is a democracy. We stand together for a
10 humane, sustainable,, democratically owned
11 democratically operated energy system that serves
12 all people equitably. There is no room for industry
13 fossil fuels in this just transition to a new
14 economy, the new world we are creating, the new
15 world we are demanding. Thank you.

16 JUDITH CANEPA: My name is J. K. Canepa
17 but I wrote my full name Judith K. Canepa and I'm
18 with the New York Climate Action Group, the
19 Coalition against the Rockaway Pipeline. And those
20 are the two most pertinent jobs that I've taken on.
21 Councilman Richards I, I just wanted to say that
22 the level of discourse at these hearings, at the
23 LNG hearings in, on Long Island and here and on
24 March 16th. It is so high the, the layers of the
25 onion as we keep peeling the onion and we go deeper
and deeper on the subject of jobs or need or safety

2 has been so well presented that I very, I have very
3 little to add on those things. So I'm going to take
4 the opportunity and liberty to go a little... excuse
5 me for the word liberty, to go a little off topic.
6 But first I just wanted to say the few little
7 things on the subject that I wanted to add and one
8 is that, and this is something I've learned from
9 you, is that if there were an accident or an
10 incident that the waters would burn for miles,
11 miles. That's pretty compelling thought. And also
12 if there is something, they call it, they're
13 calling a safety one where within the safety zone
14 you know outside of, of the area of the proposed
15 LNG Port they call it the safety zone. So if a
16 ship, the length of the empire state building, a
17 moving bomb were to have an incident how can we
18 predict what the safe distances are for the other
19 shifts and how can they move quickly enough to get
20 out of the way of something that massive and, and
21 that explosive. We haven't even figured out after
22 all these years how evacuate, how to evacuate
23 people in the case of, of an Indian point incident.
24 How are we going to be able to predict what's going
25 to happen in these waters. And speaking of these

1 waters the, the EIS states that there are only two
2 kinds of whales that might be in the water, don't
3 worry about them because the sound vibrations will
4 disturb them for a while and then they'll rebound
5 but there's another whale that comes into our
6 waters and people in the Rockaways may know about
7 the, the right whale because the right whale has
8 been seeing in, in the area where the Rockaway
9 Pipeline was just built. The right whale has no set
10 migration patterns. The Right whale is a very rare
11 perilously close to extinction whale and she moves
12 through the waters on her own schedule. She doesn't
13 have a set pattern. She doesn't have a set
14 schedule. So I, these are the little bits and
15 pieces that I wanted to add. And then I want to go
16 off topic. Alexis Tocqueville, he was a political
17 essayist. He said in a democracy the people get the
18 government they deserve. Well that's terrifying.
19 I'm, I'm not well known for complimenting
20 politicians but I think that in New York City we're
21 getting the government we deserve finally. I think
22 the Sane Energy Project did a great presentation
23 and I've heard, heard from other groups here that
24 really give great presentations but a lot of us are
25

1 just folks. We're the public. We came in to groups
2 because we were moved to do that. We were raising
3 our kids and making dinner and going to the movie.
4 And somehow we started to become aware of the
5 enormity of what's happening on this planet. And
6 for not, for not any other reason than survival of
7 our children and of life on earth we got pulled
8 into the struggle and we became experts and we got
9 to know what we were talking about. We did the
10 research in a secretive government. We met in a, in
11 a, in a government that supports the secrets of
12 industry. We learned so much about this issue.
13 Endless hours went to hearings. We, and each one of
14 us seems to be giving a different piece to the
15 story. It's unbelievable. I don't sit down with my
16 colleagues and say I'll talk about this and you
17 talk about that. It just seems to happen. So as a
18 group of people who care so much despite ourselves
19 we have to care. I thank you for giving us the
20 government that we deserve at least right here in
21 New York City. Thank you very much.

22
23 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. Thank
24 you all. And I want to thank once again Senator
25 Hoylman and Assembly member Linda Rosenthal who

2 have really organized... for us. And how many
3 senators again are against us on the record?

4 TARA KLEIN: We had 50 on this letter
5 and I understand there was another contingent that
6 also... [cross-talk] support this effort.

7 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Okay great. Thank
8 you so much. Okay so before we get to the next
9 panel I also wanted to just read for the record
10 that Danny Ruscillo who is a representative in the
11 Rockaways, a community leader in the Rockaways
12 submitted testimony for the record. I just wanted
13 to read that in. Alright we'll hear from the next
14 panel now, Forress Tapple, Annie Lazerous, John
15 Corey Rockaway Beach, Pete Stubin Rockaway Beach, I
16 like your outfit by the way.

17 SAMARA SWANSON: Can you please raise
18 your right hands. Do you swear or affirm to tell
19 the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
20 truth today?

21 [background comments]

22 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: You may begin.
23 You would like to begin?

24 PETE STUBIN: Honorable Chair, committee
25 members, council members... Thank you very much for

2 sponsoring holding this hearing for Port Ambrose
3 are, for Resolution 549. I'm here as a Rockaway
4 resident. I live on Beach 123. And I'm here as a
5 hundred percent backer of Port Ambrose. I fully
6 believe in the concept of natural gas as an energy
7 product for New York City. We rely too much on
8 crude oil and not enough on gas. Our across the
9 nation our utilities have been converting for years
10 from crude oil to natural gas. They have been
11 blowing up the smoke stacks of their facilities to
12 use natural gas for two reasons principally. It's
13 50 percent cheaper and it's 30 percent cleaner than
14 crude oil. Now we've all hear, you've heard a lot
15 of testimony this afternoon about, and it should be
16 very scary. A lot of testimony about a proposed
17 wind farm off the shores of Nassau Suffolk Brooklyn
18 and Queens. I was astounded to hear the numbers
19 this afternoon. These turbines.. and we see them
20 across the nation. They're very popular in states,
21 the central states, the planes, the high planes.
22 These turbines are approximately each one 25
23 stories high and 35 stories wide, each one. I was
24 presuming this wind farm would be some dozen or two
25 dozen turbines. They are proposing to heat 200

2 thousand homes. They are proposing hundreds of
3 these wind, wind turbines for offshore Rockaway.
4 Now let's remember Martha's Vineyard, they have
5 been fighting this for decades, the concept to
6 propose an alternative to natural gas that is 30
7 percent cleaner and 50 percent cheaper than crude
8 which we presently use. And to propose the
9 alternative of these, this wind farm is, I wish
10 you'd all think about it. Each one of these
11 turbines would need to be anchored to the ocean
12 floor, each one. The Port Ambrose hub would take up
13 a food space about four percent of the foot space
14 needed for these turbines to heat 200 thousand
15 homes. We're in a city of over eight million
16 people. The, we rely right now on the bay way
17 refinery in Port Elizabeth New Jersey. If
18 terrorists sought to do some fanatical destructive
19 stuff that we all have suffered from for the last
20 15 years there is a natural site for the energy
21 wise speaking in Port Elizabeth, the bay way. The
22 bay way was built in 19, begun in 1907 by John D.
23 Rockefeller himself. It is archaic. You go out the
24 Holland Tunnel, take the New Jersey Turnpike South
25 and you go right by it. Day and night. That

2 facility imports crude oil at, well up until a few
3 months ago at 100 dollars a barrel we have natural
4 gas at three dollars. We need the natural gas. I
5 know my good friend the State Senator representing
6 the Rockaways, Joe Addabbo is a supporter as
7 probably many other state senators are of rejecting
8 Port Ambrose. But in proposing the alternative of
9 the wind farm when those shore birds start washing
10 up on Fire Island and Rockaway and Coney Island and
11 West Hampton Beach because one of the problems with
12 these wind farms is bird destruction. And if these
13 wind farms create sanctuaries for fish as it was
14 proposed this afternoon another thing it scared me
15 quite a bit it will naturally attract the shore
16 birds. This will be an, this will create havoc
17 among people who are concerned with the
18 environment. Thank you very much. I'm sorry I went
19 over.

20 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. Next
21 panelist.

22 ANN LAZEROUS: My name is Ann Lazerous.
23 I do oppose Port Ambrose. But as a heavy duty
24 birder who often goes to Jones Beach I have a lot
25 of reservations about the wind farm as well. It

2 needs to be done safely. You can have internalized
3 blades. I do know a lot of those birds out there
4 because I'm out there a bit. And you need to have
5 guidelines what, have the bubbles on them. And this
6 just seems to massive for me for too little a
7 return. So now I'm going to say why I oppose Port
8 Ambrose. It's a liquid natural gas facility that
9 has been proposed to be built 50 miles off the
10 shore of Long Island. When methane is chilled to
11 minus 260 degrees it becomes a highly volatile
12 potentially explosive liquid. In other words you
13 could have one of these fires that are, they are
14 over a thousand degrees beyond a traditional fire.
15 This, this facility is hugely long like the length
16 of the empire state building sort of lie down
17 horizontally. And Port Ambrose has presented as an
18 importer of natural gas but the United States is...
19 natural gas and these companies are looking for
20 opportunities to export this fossil fuel. Prices
21 for methane abroad are higher than domestic prices.
22 This facility can easily and will be used as an
23 export facility. Liquefying and reversing to vapor
24 form of natural gas is fossil fuel intensive. Port
25 Ambrose is a stimulus to the fracking industry in

3 the Marcellus. And what are the dangers and
4 problems with Port Ambrose. The facility is within
5 a few mile of three international airports in
6 densely populated areas. It is located near highly
7 trafficked navigational areas including tankers
8 carrying chemicals and petroleum. A collision could
9 be disastrous. And we did have an explosion 1973 in
10 Staten Island where at least 40 people were killed.
11 A little spark can really set it off. Hundreds of
12 thousands of boats and ships navigating the area of
13 the proposed LNG. And during Hurricane Sandy wave
14 heights with nearly 30 feet high. We are expecting
15 more intense hurricanes. Scarce resources will be
16 spent for security. LNG tankers plus the operation
17 and construction of this facility will destroy
18 billions of fish eggs and other... and marine life.
19 And you never know when you build these things what
20 the ultimate effect would be because I do have 15
21 credits in ecology. Avian life will also be
22 severely affected. Because if you have polluted
23 fish, that is if the fish survive then you go up
24 the food chain and bio magnify in the tissues of
25 whatever eats those polluted organisms. The quality
and safety of the fish caught in this region will

3 also be questionable. Whale species such as fin and
4 humpback and dolphin species and other marine
5 animals well I would just say they are all
6 affected. And who owns Liberty Gas? Ultimately we
7 really do not even know. It's kind of like a James
8 Bond story.

9 JOHN COREY: Councilman I just thank you
10 very much for allowing me to come speak and testify
11 on a... entity liquid natural gas plant that's posed
12 off the cost of my hometown and yours you know you,
13 you represent the most amazing strip of land in New
14 York City. The big question I have and that's never
15 been answered is what happens during the storm. You
16 know we've had two major storms in a row a couple
17 of years back and where do you park it. I mean I
18 think what I've heard is they're going to put an
19 East Rockaway inlet right next to Far Rockaway. You
20 know that's basically the plan if they were
21 defueling they've basically it would sit there
22 during a storm, ride out a storm and it would be
23 very dangerous right next to peoples' homes, and
24 that's one question I really worried about. You
25 know the, the, I can you know add a lot but a lot
of people have said.. things so far. But the, I'd

2 like to also say that community board 14
3 environmental committee which I am a member of at
4 community board 14 has come out very much against
5 the liquid natural gas off the coast of rockaway.
6 We really have to consider also after the hurricane
7 Sandy we lost all our evacuation signs and DOT is
8 still going to take a year to replace them. So we
9 don't even know where to go. So if there was a
10 problem with, with this port and it have, would
11 have to basically bring the ships close to the
12 Rockaway peninsula we'd really have to worry,
13 people don't even know where to go to this day. And
14 you know unfortunately with information there's
15 still people on the peninsula, we know this is
16 happening. You know a lot of great people have come
17 out to the Rockaways and presented you know... time,
18 you know we listen to everybody. But the important
19 thing to realize is that the pulse of the people
20 and the people who do know and who've attended
21 meetings and I attend 90 percent of all meetings
22 majority of people are very much against it, the
23 people who know, you know. And, and, and it's more
24 about the lack of knowledge of what it is and who
25 they are as this woman just said. You know it's

2 like we don't, we don't know who's doing things to
3 our environment, who's doing things to our
4 neighborhoods. You know it's like a lot more needs
5 to come out, a lot more needs to be said. And I'm
6 surprised that you know Governor Christie is on
7 record as saying he will never let this happen
8 while he's in office and here's somebody that
9 really should come out you know if he's a man of
10 his word should come out and obviously what you
11 guys are doing in the city council is amazing and
12 hopefully the resolution will be passed and the
13 governor will definitely heed the warnings. Thank
14 you.

15 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

16 FORESS TAPPLE: Hi my name is Foress
17 Tapple. I'm with Friends of New York City Friends
18 of the Clear Water. I'd like to ask permission, I
19 wanted to sing a song, a protest song, and I'd like
20 ask permission to stand up, it's a little bit
21 easier to project when you stand.

22 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Alrighty I'm...

23 FORESS TAPPLE: Thank you.

24 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: I'll join in if I
25 know it. Do it near the mic though because you have

2 to be on the record so... So... yeah we'll, we'll,
3 don't, don't move the mic off.

4 FORESS TAPPLE: Okay I'll put it over
5 here. Is that alright?

6 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Alrighty, you may
7 begin. This is your chance.

8 FORESS TAPPLE: So this is a protest
9 song. And this, this thing I've got created here is
10 supposed to be a picture of the ocean and I'm
11 saying if you can't read it's... [off mic] ...our seas...
12 [on mic] So, and the fish up here wanted to say
13 hello to all you people too... I got to work on
14 getting the fish to move properly. Okay let's see
15 if I can... [maracas shaking] [off mic] [singing]
16 Liberty Liberty Liberty Liberty...

17 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Stand, stand in
18 the mic sir. You...

19 FORESS TAPPLE: Oh yeah...

20 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: You gotta, you
21 gotta be...

22 FORES TAPPLE: I'm a, I'm a street
23 singer so I can project...

24 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Don't swim off.
25

2 FORESS TAPPLE: ...but they need it for
3 the record. Liber Liberty Liberty Liberty Liberty
4 Liberty Natural Gas you're taking liberties with
5 the truth we think you are... [maracas shaking]
6 Tyrannical titanic-al your tyrannosaurus rex.
7 [maracas shaking] Lay down your weary fossil bones
8 let climate change take a rest. [maracas shaking]
9 Liberty Liberty Liberty Liberty Liberty Natural Gas
10 taking liberties with the truth you're a, you're
11 tyrannical liberties past. [maracas shaking]
12 Corporations, corporate castles in the sky
13 pipedreams in the sea. That's not liberty Liberty
14 Liberty... Corporate castles in the sky pipedreams in
15 the sea. That's not liberty liberty liberty liberty
16 to me... [maracas shaking] [speaking normally] Thank
17 you.

18 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. Oh
19 that was great. And I guess you have a guard now.
20 Apparently you've just been signed by Liberty
21 Natural Gas. But we don't know if you'll last with
22 them. So I, thank... Thank you all for to testify.
23 John I had a question for you. So you, so you mean
24 to tell me that Liberty wants to build something
25

2 right off the coast of your community and they
3 haven't reached out? We haven't heard from them or...

4 JOHN COREY: [off mic] I, I haven't,
5 I've been to the...

6 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Speak into the
7 mic.

8 JOHN COREY: [off mic] Sorry. [on mic]
9 I've been to the, in, in the, in the Hilton I was
10 at the, the hearings there and they did have people
11 representing. But one person did speak to I, I
12 asked them I said what happens if you're defueling?
13 Where do you bring it? He says most likely East
14 Rockaway inland or to the inland near, near Short
15 Beach just off the cost of Nassau County. And, and
16 that's a big question. It's, You know I mean like I
17 just can't seem to get the answers, anybody to
18 email the, you know if, if you have a ship full of
19 LNG where do they put it if a storms come... coming
20 or just rough seas. I mean they're not just going
21 to bring it into lower Hudson Bay or you know it's
22 going to go along the Rockaways sea shore, Long,
23 Long Beach Sea Shore but what happens if it washes
24 up and maybe explodes. Who knows? I'm just saying
25 it, you know it's, it's obviously a worry but

2 there's no answers. I mean please someone give us
3 answers. That's, that's the questions that you know
4 that, that people really worry about.

5 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And do you think
6 it's insensitive that they are putting this
7 proposal forth off the coast of Long Island and the
8 Rockaways and as families are still rebuilding
9 their communities and homes? [cross-talk]

10 JOHN COREY: Oh of course...

11 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: What would your
12 opinion be on...

13 JOHN COREY: We all know about Build it
14 Back. I can go on a tirade about that but you know
15 people are totally still not back in their homes
16 and it's just, it's, there's many other things that
17 could be done specifically you know, you know for
18 the people of the Long Island Seashore from
19 Brooklyn to you know Suffolk County. But you know
20 but, but putting something like this, especially
21 something as volatile that, so they could, you know
22 they could just cause... I mean any minor little
23 issue is, is a concern. We just shouldn't have to
24 live with besides you know of course people want
25 you know that it would take away in this questions

2 about you know wind farms versus you know liquid
3 natural gas. You can go on and on. But the answers
4 aren't answer, the questions aren't answered. And
5 you know to answer the question specifically you
6 know let the people rebuild first and then start
7 talking about things but come with, with true
8 answers first. They don't have the answers and
9 that's a big problem.

10 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Sir you want to
11 make a statement?

12 PETE STUBIN: May I?

13 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Yes.

14 PETE STUBIN: The ships would in the
15 case of a storm ships will go out to the open seas.
16 They will not come into a harbor area. With, they
17 will ride out the storm in the open seas. And with
18 respect that John and...

19 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: ...positive this?
20 Are you a representative of any...

21 PETE STUBIN: No.

22 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: ...of the
23 companies? Okay.

24 PETE STUBIN: No sir not at all. No
25 Donovan Richards. I'm simply a resident that knows

2 that natural gas is better than crude. And New York
3 state has the highest electric rates in the nation.
4 We reason we do is... and these rates are not a
5 problem for the people here on Wall Street who pay
6 their monthly bills it's the, it's a problem for
7 the people in my neighborhood and your neighborhood
8 who pay these bills. And these bills are higher in
9 New York than any other state in the continental
10 United States. One of the principal reasons being
11 because we rely on expensive and can I say dirty
12 crude. So I think this is a good answer. I,
13 certainly solar is the ultimate..

14 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: So you're open to
15 solar?

16 PETE STUBIN: Of course.

17 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: We getting
18 somewhere today.

19 PETE STUBIN: Yes certainly.

20 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: What about
21 geothermal?

22 PETE STUBIN: ...haven't thought it out. I
23 think it's, sounds like a great idea. This, the,
24 the computer power in this little machine used to
25 be in a room with a dozen computers. And some may

2 soon solar, solar technology will be improved just
3 like the cell phone has been improved or, or intel
4 technology has been improved and solar will make
5 complete sense. Wind farms off Rockaway, Far
6 Rockaway Atlantic Beach Long Beach makes no sense
7 at all.

8 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Well we can argue
9 that but I, I will go to Council Member Ulrich.

10 PETE STUBIN: Oh.

11 COUNCIL MEMBER ULRICH: Thank you. I was
12 here earlier. I left for a series of meetings with
13 some of the not-for-profits that are doing programs
14 in the Rockaways. And then I came back. So I'm
15 sorry I missed the testimony but I did follow it
16 online across the street and I saw when you guys
17 took the, and gals took the, the days I wanted to
18 come back and thank you first of all for coming to
19 City Hall. It's not the first time you've been
20 here. You come regarding Build it Back issues,
21 regarding Parks Department issues, regarding
22 Buildings Department issues, and here you are
23 testifying regarding Port Ambrose project. And I
24 think it shows the level of civic pride that many
25 of my constituents have in the Rockaways and the

3 interest that they take in issues not only that are
4 going to impact them but the rest of the city. So I
5 want to thank you. I also want to let you know that
6 I am a cosponsor of the, the bill that Donovan
7 Richards is proposing which is in opposition to the
8 Port Ambrose project. And the reason why I'm
9 against it, although I am predisposed to support
10 economic development and pro-business policies as,
11 as a, as a republican is that I, I don't think that
12 that, that those, those potential benefits outweigh
13 the potential environmental hazards that this
14 project would present. LNG for me is, is
15 particularly perplexing given the reason that this
16 state and this country already have an abundance of
17 natural gas and supply of natural gas and why, why
18 we would be interested in importing and exporting
19 and as a result of building an LNG facility really
20 is beyond me. And, and I don't know what benefits
21 it would have for people other than saving them a
22 few dollars on their bills. I want to save people
23 money on their bills but I don't want to ruin an
24 entire coastline, god forbid something totally
25 catastrophic were to occur. And I, I'm just fearful
of that and as someone who represents the Rockaways

2 knowing that the beach and the coast and the
3 boardwalk when it, when it is rebuilt is one of our
4 greatest assets out there. I would hate to see it
5 be jeopardized and put in any danger because an
6 LNG, not to mention all the truck traffic and all
7 the other things that would go along with that. So
8 I, I just don't think from a quality of life
9 perspective, environmental perspective this is a,
10 and from an energy perspective, domestic energy I
11 should say that this is a smart, this is a smart
12 idea or a good location. So I'm, I'm opposed to it
13 and I've been very public about that and I'll
14 continue to be. And I remember when I first took
15 office six years ago they had a presentation at
16 PS114. Some of you might have been there regarding
17 liquefied natural gas, LNG sites that they were
18 proposing off the coast of New Jersey. This was
19 almost seven years ago. And the activist came out,
20 environmental, the people from the industry, the
21 lobbyist, it was a packed audience. And when I saw
22 some of the pictures from some of the catastrophes
23 that have happened around the world regarding LNG
24 sites that was really a very strong selling point
25 for me to say you know there's got to be a better

1 way. So I don't pretend to have all the answers. I
2 don't know what all the answers are. If I did we'd
3 be paying a dollar for a gallon of gas at the gas
4 station and people wouldn't be paying as much in
5 the con-ed bills but as far as LNG 22 miles off the
6 coast of Rockaway I don't think it's a good idea. I
7 don't think it's a good idea for the environment. I
8 don't think it's a good idea for my constituents
9 and quite frankly I don't think it's a good idea
10 for Rockaway's future. Because I think Rockaway's
11 future right now is at a, is at a crossroads. And
12 we can go in a much better direction and we can
13 create jobs and improve transportation and have
14 sustainable economic development and housing that
15 is sustainable and, and puts us in a new trajectory
16 for you know not having the problems that we've
17 been dealing with for the past 50 years or we can
18 go down the same path that we're on now and that
19 we've been on where, where housing and jobs and
20 transportation and, and so many other issues plague
21 our constituents. So I think that this is a
22 defining moment, for the Rockaways. And this
23 project is just one of the things that we must
24 confront and I don't know that, I don't believe
25

2 that having Port Ambrose LNG site off the coast of
3 Rockaway and, and, and the Long Island sound, not
4 the Long Island sound, off the coast of Long Island
5 is going to be a game changer in a positive way. I
6 think we'd have the, the opposite effect. So that,
7 I respect people who feel differently. I understand
8 that they have valid arguments but I just don't
9 think that LNG is right for Rockaway you know or
10 our area. So that's kind of where I'm at. Thank
11 you.

12 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. Thank
13 you all for your testimony. Well said Eric.
14 Alrighty our last panel we're going to have Aileen
15 Sheil from NYPIRG, Annie Wilson from the New York
16 Environmental Law and Justice Project, and Elena
17 Sunna from Glen Oaks... Thank you Eric for that
18 testimony. That was powerful. Shows we have
19 bipartisan support on this issue as well.

20 SAMARA SWANSON: Can you please raise
21 your right hands. Do you swear or affirm to tell
22 the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
23 truth today?

24 [background comment]

25 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: You may begin.

3 AILEEN SHIEL: Great. Thank you. Good
4 afternoon my name is Aileen Sheil. I am the
5 Chairperson for the Board of Directors for NYPIRG,
6 the New York Public Interest Research Group as well
7 as a student at Queens College. NYPIRG is a student
8 directed nonpartisan not-for-profit research and
9 advocacy organization. Our Board of Directors
10 consist of college and university students elected
11 from campuses with NYPIRG chapters from throughout
12 the state. We thank Council Members Richards and
13 Rose for holding this hearing and applaud the
14 growing list of 23 co-sponsors of resolution 549
15 calling on the governor to veto the application by
16 Liberty Natural Gas to construct the Port Ambrose
17 LNG terminal. NYPIRG has serious concerns about
18 Port Ambrose, a potentially dangerous and polluting
19 project that would send New York in the wrong
20 direction. To meet the climate change goal shared
21 by New York City, New York state and scientists we
22 need to keep fossil fuels in the ground and invest
23 in renewable energy. Students stand with the city
24 council in urging the governor to veto Port
25 Ambrose. New York's liquefied natural gas and
petroleum gas act pass after the tragic LNG

3 explosion on Staten Island which killed 40 workers,
4 recognizes that LNG is an extremely volatile highly
5 flammable and dangerous substance that can cause
6 severe damage when released under unfavorable
7 atmospheric conditions. Such danger has no place
8 just miles from New York Harbor one of the busiest
9 ports in the world. Furthermore natural gas is a
10 climate killer. LNG is primarily made of methane
11 which is 86 times as potent as carbon dioxide over
12 a 20 year period. Port Ambrose' vaporization
13 operations alone would admit 183,420 tons of CO2
14 equivalents per year. The UN's intergovernmental
15 panel on climate change recently stated that given
16 the threats posed by greenhouse gasses the best
17 strategy is to keep fossil fuels in the ground.
18 It's time to take a new path. Run away from fossil
19 fuels and towards renewable energy. While there is
20 consensus that we need to move away from fossil
21 fuels New York still lags behind its commitment to
22 renewable energy. New York state is well behind its
23 renewable portfolio standard that calls for 30
24 percent of our energy to be supplied by renewable
25 sources by 2015. We must do better. Offshore wind
has only a fraction of the life cycle greenhouse

2 gas emissions of fossil fuels and much of the air
3 pollution reductions are felt locally. Offshore
4 wind is just the kind of clean renewable energy
5 that can help New York meet its climate produce,
6 pollution reduction goal of 80 percent by 2050 and
7 our renewable energy goal a 50 percent by 2025.
8 However large scale wind farms cannot move forward
9 unless Port Ambrose is prohibited. The proposed
10 Port Ambrose site would directly compete for
11 limited leasable ocean surface with wind
12 installations such as the one previously proposed
13 by the Long Island New York City offshore wind
14 collaborative. Our climate change goals are only
15 doable with renewables. Additionally I don't see
16 how hijack a wind turbine. Students are standing up
17 in opposition to Port Ambrose because our
18 generation has the most to lose. The effects of
19 climate change will play out over the course of our
20 lives. Port Ambrose would be dirty and dangerous in
21 the short term and obsolete in the long term. It is
22 critical that the governor enable New York to leave
23 behind dirty fossil fuels and move forward with
24 clean renewable energy like offshore wind. We thank
25 the council Committees on Environmental Protection

2 and Waterfronts for hosting this hearing. We urge
3 you to pass the resolution without delay and move
4 forward for a full council vote before this year's
5 earth day April 22nd. Thank you.

6 Hi, good afternoon. Thanks for holding
7 this hearing and giving us the opportunity to
8 speak. And it's really great that the committee and
9 the city council will be deciding on opposing the
10 Liberty Natural Gas Facility off of New York. And
11 this is an in conceived project. It's
12 counterintuitive. It's unnecessary. It presents
13 catastrophic risks. And with New York's growing
14 energy efficiency and renewable energy economy it's
15 absolutely foolhardy to expand the fossil fuel
16 infrastructure. And I wanted you to know that last
17 night on BAI there was a call for listeners to
18 telephone the governor and ask him to veto the
19 application for Port Ambrose. And in this time in
20 New York City with the community solar projects
21 sort of developing a Local Law 84 for which
22 benchmarking reports will be due in May and all the
23 initiatives that are taking place. It's truly
24 refreshing to know that there's a strong stance

2 being taken by this body and also by the, others
3 involved. Thank you very much.

4 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you.

5 ELENO SUNA: Thank you for holding this
6 hearing today. Ansell Adams photographer and
7 environmentalist said it is horrifying that we have
8 to fight our own government to save the
9 environment. Perhaps finally at least in New York
10 City thanks in large part to efforts of this city
11 council that may no longer be true. I thank you for
12 introducing resolution 549. I hope the council
13 passes this. I also hope Mayor de Blasio speaks out
14 against Port Ambrose and sends a message to
15 Governor to veto it. My name is Elena Sunna. I was
16 born in Manhattan and grew up in eastern Queens.
17 I'm very concerned about the direction our country
18 is going in in terms of energy choices. All of the
19 above is no longer viable at this climate tipping
20 point. It's imperative to move entirely away from
21 fossil fuels and nuclear and follow the road maps
22 to 100 percent renewable energy such as the
23 solution's project. Please see the card attached to
24 my testimony. Not only that, it's imperative to be
25 aware of what entities we are entrusting our land,

3 water, safety, and energy future to. Who is Liberty
4 Natural Gas. A portfolio company of a fund advised
5 by West Face Capital, a Toronto Canada based
6 investment management firm. Is Liberty Natural Gas
7 a company with a bank account in the Cayman Islands
8 or are they entirely a bank account in the Cayman
9 Islands. Do they have the interest of New Yorkers
10 truly at heart or do they talk big while caring
11 only about profits? Research on West Face Capital
12 reveals a coldly calculating hedge fund that will
13 do anything to be profitable. This Liberty CEO
14 recently said Port Ambrose is entirely consistent
15 with Cuomo's ban on fracking because they plan to
16 import non fracked gas from Trinidad and elsewhere.
17 That statement is so out of touch with New York and
18 our potential it could be a cartoon. In Trinidad
19 where people suffer from gas related health
20 problems and forced relocation it's 2,235 miles
21 away from New York. And New Yorkers know it is time
22 to move beyond fossil fuels and work together to
23 build a renewable New York. That is the deeper
24 meaning behind the fracking ban. The true
25 alternative to fracking is renewable energy. The
insanity of directing energy and resources into a

2 Deepwater port to receive gas that travelled over
3 2,000 miles by huge dangerous tanker ship when we
4 have the ability to roll up our sleeves and
5 generate a hundred percent of our state's energy
6 needs for all purposes from wind water and sunlight
7 only makes sense from the view of those who profit
8 from that gas and its transport. Also like to add
9 that offshore wind farms, weekend hurricanes, and
10 wind farms offshore can be built at distances and
11 in ways that are safe for birds. Fossil fuels kill
12 far more birds than offshore winds. Please do not
13 forget for a moment when hearing claims from
14 Liberty as far as reducing energy bills remaining
15 an import terminal and coexistence with the wind
16 farm please do not forget that they will say and do
17 whatever they need in order to get in the door
18 without accountability to the people of the regions
19 they operate in. Six LNG terminals that began as
20 export, I'm sorry that began as import have
21 switched to export. When it becomes more profitable
22 to transport fracked gas when it becomes more
23 profitable to export gas from the northeast to Port
24 Meridian and the UK than to export gas from
25 Trinidad to New York. Liberty west face OLNG

2 Excalibur Energy, whatever their name is will
3 change their tune and go where the money is. They
4 will have a PR team explain things without any
5 sense of accountability to what they're saying
6 right now and to us. We're truly at a crossroads in
7 our energy choices. Please trust those who care
8 deeply about New York, not the PR stunts of a
9 Toronto Hedge Fund. I'll close with a few words
10 from a paper titled the political economy of
11 natural gas in Trinidad and Tobago. After the
12 construction phase LNG plans offshore gas
13 developments and chemical facilities are not
14 significant generators of employment when
15 operating. The problem is that the overriding
16 concern of corporations is net gain which will
17 inevitably be privileged over the long term
18 capacity building of its host nation. Liberty or
19 wherever your name is the coastal waters of New
20 York and New Jersey will not be your host nation.
21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you so
23 much. And I thank, I want to thank all the
24 advocates. And certainly just want to echo you know
25 why this is obviously important and wide, why we

2 are taking such a, a huge stance. And obviously I
3 think my colleague on the other side of the
4 Rockaways certainly spoke very well on this issue.
5 And that is about protecting our communities. And
6 we know what sea level rise and the effects of
7 greenhouse gas emissions that it is feasible that
8 communities like the Rockaways and parts of Long
9 Island to be wiped off the map based on our rely,
10 heavy reliance on fossil fuels. So just, just to
11 name a few things, once again as you guys have put
12 it and many people have put it today does not make
13 sense. It just does not make economic sense. It
14 eventually will become an export facility. Bottom
15 line other reason to obviously security risk. We
16 are very close to JFK. Matter of fact it's hard to
17 get out of Rockaway now by traffic so imagine more
18 trucks coming in which also will be adding to our
19 problem of emissions. Methane which is very potent,
20 which is the most potent greenhouse gas we know is
21 a huge issue. And if you don't believe me look at
22 what happened in the east village just last week.
23 We've set this goal and a standard of, of trying to
24 reach 80 percent carbon reductions by 2050. And
25 this project certainly sets us back from that goal.

2 So unless you know the industry is speaking of wind
3 and solar and other renewable energies we are not
4 talking about moving our country and our city
5 forward. And once again we know that we're going to
6 see more frequent storms and higher sea level rise
7 and I was just a little while speaking outside on
8 how Antarctica saw a 63 degree day a few days ago.
9 And now we can vacation there and not be worried
10 about you know certainly being frostbitten. But
11 that's a problem because the glaciers are melting.
12 So this is why and, and, and then I haven't heard
13 anyone except one council person we heard from
14 today who's spooking [phonetic] in support of this
15 project. I think every senate democrat has
16 certainly opposed this project including the head
17 of the, the republican caucus Dean Skelos who's
18 opposed to the project as well. So when you add
19 all, a culmination of all these things together up
20 it just makes sense to not have this project
21 happen. And I think that the Governor obviously,
22 and we believe the Governor has an opportunity to
23 get this right once again. And the, obviously this,
24 the fracking ban and obviously us moving to, to
25 alleviate our coast of this project could not

1 happen without the people in this room, the
2 advocates who have spoken very loudly and clearly
3 at just about every event that we've held and every
4 hearing at least I've attended on this issue. And
5 you will continue to have to speak out on this
6 issue until the very end. I can tell you I believe
7 that this body will stand with you on the right
8 side of history as we, as we've consistently done
9 on environmental issues. And I look forward to
10 obviously passing this resolution in a few weeks so
11 that we can send a clear message that this
12 application should be vetoed and if Chris Christy
13 vetoed... I'm in... me that Governor Cuomo would not
14 veto this application. And we'll be watching very
15 closely obviously on this issue. I want to thank
16 some people who've organized around this and
17 obviously the council to our Committee of
18 Environmental Protection Ms. Samara Swanson.

19 [applause]

20 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Thank you. Our
21 analyst Bill Murray.

22 [applause]

23 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: Our new financial
24 analyst Chris Sutter, did I get it right? Suttery
25

2 [phonetic]? Oh sorry I got it, I messed up he's the
3 council to the Waterfronts, I don't know. After
4 four hours everything blurs.

5 [applause]

6 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: My staff Jerel
7 Burney, Mercedes Buchanan, Janell Edwards, and
8 Diana Aries who's here as well and all of my
9 colleagues who've signed.. We still have more work
10 to do. We still have to ensure that New York City
11 reaches this goal which in hindsight I won't be
12 around probably in 2050 but I hope to be. But we're
13 at least preparing our future generations to live
14 in a society where they don't have to worry about
15 floods. They don't have to worry about if their
16 communities will exist in the, in, in the case of
17 fossil fuels overtaking our particular environment.
18 So I want to thank everyone who's come out and we
19 look forward to passing this resolution.

20 [applause]

21 CHAIRPERSON RICHARDS: And I just want
22 to also mention that Liberty Natural Gas is also
23 submitted testimony for the record. Thank you.

24 [gavel]

C E R T I F I C A T E

World Wide Dictation certifies that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. We further certify that there is no relation to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that there is interest in the outcome of this matter.



Date April 21, 2015