

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

PUBLIC HEARING
IN THE MATTER OF
TEMPORARY DEWATERING PERMIT
FOR TRANSCO EXPANSION PROJECT
COMPRESSOR STATION 203
PERMIT #203

HELD AT: CHESTERFIELD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
30 SADDLE WAY
CHESTERFIELD, NEW JERSEY
DATE: TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 2016
TIME: 5:00 P.M.

GUY J. RENZI & ASSOCIATES, INC.
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS & VIDEOGRAPHERS
GOLDEN CREST CORPORATE CENTER
2277 STATE HIGHWAY #33, SUITE 410
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08690
TEL: (609) 989-9199 TOLL FREE: (800) 368-7652
www.renziassociates.com

1 MS. PFLUGH: Good evening, everyone,
2 and welcome to the Department of Environmental
3 Protection's public hearing regarding an application
4 for a Temporary Dewatering Permit for the Transco
5 Expansion Project, Compressor Station 203. My name
6 is Kerry Kirk Pflugh. I'm the manager of
7 Constituent Services, the Commissioner's Office at
8 the Department of Environmental Protection. I'll be
9 moderating the hearing tonight.

10 The purpose of the hearing this
11 evening is to obtain input from interested parties
12 and the general public on the Transco Expansion
13 Project, Compressor Station 203 Temporary Dewatering
14 Permit application. We ask everyone who testifies
15 to be mindful of the fact that this application is
16 solely for a Temporary Dewatering Permit necessary
17 for the construction-related dewatering of a
18 compressor station. No permanent water withdrawal
19 has been proposed, and the environmental and public
20 convenience aspects of this project as well as any
21 other pipeline project are not part of this
22 application nor subject of this hearing.

23 Notice of this hearing was duly
24 published in the April 10, 2016 Burlington County
25 Times in accordance with NJAC 7:19-2. As published,

1 the public comment period remains open until May 3,
2 2016. At the conclusion of this hearing, the
3 hearing officer may determine whether this deadline
4 should be extended to afford additional time to
5 submit written comments.

6 Serving as our hearing officer this
7 evening is Mr. Joe Miri, right here, with the New
8 Jersey Geological and Water Survey. As the hearing
9 officer, Mr. Miri is responsible for reviewing the
10 draft staff recommendations regarding the
11 application. He is also responsible for listening
12 to the comments from the public and the information
13 presented by the applicant during the hearing.
14 After the close of the public comment period,
15 comments and any additional information received
16 through May 3rd will be evaluated. A staff report
17 addendum will be prepared and forwarded to the
18 hearing officer addressing any substantive changes
19 to the draft staff report and draft permit
20 documents.

21 In accordance with NJAC 7:19-2.9, the
22 hearing officer will review the application,
23 comments received, the hearing transcript and the
24 staff report addendum. The hearing officer will
25 prepare and submit written findings and

1 recommendations in the form of a hearing officer's
2 report to the decision maker for a final decision on
3 the application for a permit. The decision maker is
4 typically the division director or assistant
5 director in the Division of Water Supply &
6 Geoscience.

7 Before we begin, I wanted to make
8 clear that procedures that will be followed for
9 tonight's hearing. The deposition is conducting
10 this hearing to gather input and pertinent
11 information from interested parties and the general
12 public. The information will be used to inform the
13 departments final permit decision. In order to be
14 successful in gathering your comments and in order
15 for the Department to be able to respond to those
16 comments, it is essential that this hearing be
17 conducted in a orderly fashion.

18 As such, all persons present are
19 asked to sign an attendance sheet available near the
20 entrance. Persons wishing to speak at this hearing
21 have been asked to indicate that desire on the
22 attendance sheets and complete a speaker's card.

23 The matter before us is not a
24 contested case, because the department has not
25 rendered a final decision on the permit application.

1 Questions raised during the hearing will be recorded
2 and responded to with the release of the final
3 decision on the application and after a thorough
4 review of the comments and information received.

5 To ensure that the department has an
6 accurate record of this hearing, we have a
7 stenographer present. We ask those interested in
8 speaking to sign in. If you wish to be notified of
9 the final decision, please include an email address
10 or your mailing address on the attendance sheet.
11 Your name will be called and you will be invited up
12 to the mike to make your testimony. Each speaker
13 should begin their testimony by clearly stating and
14 spelling their name and providing an affiliation, if
15 appropriate. In order to show respect to all
16 speakers, I ask that those in the audience remain
17 silent while testimony is being taken. I also ask
18 that you turn off any cell phones or disable the
19 ring tones on your cell phone at this time.

20 Due to the number of people who wish
21 to testify, we will have to limit each speaker to
22 three minutes. If you have a written copy of your
23 testimony that you can leave with us or the
24 stenographer after your testimony, that would be
25 beneficial to ensure that we have accurately

1 captured your remarks. Written testimony carries
2 the same weight in the decision-making process as
3 verbal testimony. All written comments given to the
4 stenographer will become part of the record.

5 Whenever possible, if a particular point has already
6 been made, rather than taking up your time repeating
7 it, you may wish to just indicate that you agree
8 with the previous speaker on such and such a point.

9 The traffic light here on the table
10 will help keep track of your time. If you wish to
11 speak beyond three minutes, we ask that you complete
12 another speakers card and if there is time at the
13 end of the hearing, you will be called to speak
14 after everyone else has had their chance.

15 As a courtesy, I will call elected
16 officials to speak first. After elected officials,
17 I will attempt to call speakers in the order in
18 which they registered to testify. If you have not
19 yet signed up to speak and wish to do so before the
20 end of the hearing, please complete a speaker's card
21 and give it to any staff here to assist you.

22 Tonight the hearing will take place
23 in three parts. First, we will have the applicant
24 give a brief overview of the project and the
25 dewatering associated with this project. Then Terry

1 Pilawski, Chief of the Bureau of Water Allocation
2 and Well Permitting, will provide a broad overview
3 of the Temporary Dewatering Permit application and
4 the draft staff recommendations. Then those who
5 wish to speak will have the opportunity to do so.

6 Just one additional point, the
7 traffic light is set for three minutes. It starts
8 out it's green. When you have one minute remaining,
9 it will be yellow, and then it will turn red when
10 the time is up.

11 A VOICE: Objection from the floor on
12 the applicant's presentation.

13 MS. PFLUGH: Our first speaker for
14 the applicant for Transco is Mr. David Martinkeweiz.

15 MR. MARTINKEWEIZ: Hi, good evening
16 everyone. I'd like to start off by thanking
17 everybody to take time out of their considerably busy
18 schedules to come and participate in the hearing.
19 Certainly it's part of a great democratic tradition
20 that we have in this country, and thank you for your
21 time.

22 Secondly, I'd like to also thank DEP
23 for hosting this hearing and taking the time to
24 allow us to provide a brief presentation of the
25 project in the permit at hand. So with that, I'd

1 like to go ahead and provide a brief overview of the
2 project and the company.

3 Transco is an interstate gas line.

4 A VOICE: We can't hear you. Could
5 you speak closer into the mike?

6 MR. MARTINKEWEIZ: Transco's pipeline
7 system consists of over 10,000 miles of pipeline
8 with over 50 compressor stations. We transport
9 roughly 10 percent of the natural gas that's
10 consumed within the United States and serve about 60
11 percent of New Jersey's natural gas market. The
12 guard state project, which is this individual
13 project is intended to enhance the reliability of
14 New Jersey natural's local distribution company here
15 in New Jersey.

16 The project facilities at hand
17 consist of a Greenfield compression station and
18 meter station in Chesterfield, New Jersey, with
19 construction starting in beginning the 2016 and
20 being complete by the end of 2017.

21 I'd like to go ahead and provide a
22 brief overview of where the facilities are. They
23 are at the southeast intersection of the New Jersey
24 Turnpike and County Road 528. This is a rendering
25 of what the compressor station will look like in its

1 completed state.

2 With that, I'll go ahead and hand it
3 offer to Heather to provide some additional
4 information on the dewatering permit.

5 MS. BREWSTER: As you know, we are
6 here tonight to take or DEP is going to be taking
7 comments regarding the permit that we have in front
8 of them, which is the Temporary Dewatering Permit
9 BW-002 which is tied to construction-related
10 dewatering activities, and that permit was submitted
11 in December 7, 2015.

12 The construction of the compressor
13 station, which includes associated station piping
14 and other appurtenances for the actual building
15 itself, there will be construction activities that
16 need to deal with dewatering. So there's a
17 certain -- there are certain elements that we based
18 on our assessment and knowledge of the site that we
19 understand we will have water that we will encounter
20 and need to address with dewatering. That is the
21 application that we have in to DEP. So
22 construction-related water use, trench dewatering,
23 this is required since we would exceed 100,000
24 gallons per day or 70 gallons per minute, for
25 pumping capacity from a single source or combination

1 of sources in the same municipality, which is what
2 is regulated by DEP.

3 This is an overview of what got put
4 into our application in terms of what we looked at
5 for our construction activities. So over the course
6 of the project, which is approximately 17 months of
7 which ten months will -- is the duration of where we
8 expect to actually have dewatering. There will be
9 30 excavations that will be needed to facilitate
10 construction, and those excavations will range in
11 depth from 2 feet to 13 feet.

12 Excavation dewatering is anticipated,
13 as I stated, to occur ten out of those 17 months.
14 Obviously, there's other site preparation activities
15 that occur within the 17-month time period that
16 doesn't involve dewatering.

17 So the information that went into our
18 assessment of the application and providing the
19 information that we needed to come up with what we
20 felt would be the dewatering activities, we looked
21 at several sources of information. Geotechnical
22 investigations have been completed on-site, so with
23 that comes very detailed information on the geology
24 that's present on the site, the soil types, which
25 talk to permeability and how the water is sitting at

1 this site.

2 So that information was looked at
3 from extensive studies that were done on the site.
4 In addition to, infiltration testing was also done
5 on the site to address storm water construction and
6 design, so that obviously was information that was
7 looked into for all of our technical assessment.

8 So we assessed our construction
9 excavations, open trenches, perimeter trenches, box
10 excavations, box excavation associated with building
11 a compressor station, you are going to have areas
12 with footings and things, you are going to have a
13 rectangular square excavation that could encounter
14 water and need to be dewatered. We looked at the
15 lay of the land where we proposed to do these
16 activities and where they sit within the site.

17 So in addition to that, we have to
18 look at an estimated rating of the effluents from
19 these excavations that will have to be dewatered, an
20 estimated dewatering rate for those excavations, and
21 we completed a database search for all private wells
22 within a quarter mile of the site boundary, and that
23 is, there's a database that DEP has available where
24 we could identify those locations.

25 So we did identify 21 existing

1 private domestic and/or irrigation wells within a
2 quarter mile of the project site. Those wells range
3 in depth from 55 to 225 feet, and so all of that
4 information went into the application that is in
5 front of DEP.

6 So this is the figure that was
7 provided in our application that shows the site, all
8 of our proposed excavation activities and those
9 wells that were identified within a quarter mile,
10 and the legend explains the activities. We had
11 Excel spreadsheets that link each activity to the
12 excavation and duration which was all laid out in
13 that application.

14 This is a figure just blown in that
15 gives you every excavation. There's a total of, I
16 believe we indicated 36 associated with the project.
17 They are all identified on this figure within the
18 application and detailed information provided on
19 every one.

20 So in terms of the analysis and as it
21 relates to dewatering, based on the amount of
22 dewatering that needs to occur on-site, the
23 effluence to groundwater would not extend beyond the
24 boundaries of our facility. The excavations on-site
25 as we indicated the greatest depth would be 13 feet

1 into a local water-bearing unit that is separated
2 from the Magothy aquifer, which you can see down on
3 the bottom here in which most private wells are
4 located, and there's a thick 50-foot plate layer,
5 the Woodbury clay layer in between where our
6 excavations are, are going to occur to a depth of 13
7 feet, and all of the private wells identified are at
8 a depth of beyond that within the lower Magothy
9 aquifer, so, as noted, construction dewatering will
10 occur at a more shallow depth than the drinking well
11 aquifer.

12 In addition, based on the relatively
13 low dewatering rates, the potential intermittent
14 nature of our withdrawals and the availability of
15 construction methods that would minimize the volume
16 of dewatering that will occur, it's not expected
17 that the proposed withdrawal would adversely impact
18 the groundwater resources in the area, so that was
19 our finding.

20 Transco will adhere to the New Jersey
21 DEP's permit requirements to investigate any
22 potential complaints. We will have a resolution
23 complaint drafted as part of that requirement and
24 just a reminder that operation of the compressor
25 station does not require the use of water. It's

1 just during construction that we will have the need
2 to do temporary dewatering, so we feel that it does
3 not have the potential to impact wells at any
4 distance. It did not require, as I stated,
5 groundwater for operation.

6 A VOICE: What was that?

7 MS. BREWSTER: That it does not
8 require groundwater for operation, the actual
9 facility itself. This is our information regarding
10 the docket associated with this project as well as
11 the certificate that was issued on April 7th of 2016
12 and Williams' contact information.

13 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you.

14 A VOICE: Seven minutes.

15 MS. PILAWSKI: Good evening. My name
16 is Terry Pilawski, Bureau Chief of the Bureau of
17 Water Allocation and Well Permitting. With me this
18 evening is Jennifer Myers, Section Chief, Andy
19 MacDonald, staff permit reviewer, and Ken Komar and
20 Akin Ode, assisting with the registration.

21 Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line
22 Company, LLC filed an application with the
23 Department of Environmental Protection on December
24 8, 2015 and an amended application on February 16,
25 2016 for approval to divert a maximum of 7 million

1 gallons of water during any month at a maximum rate
2 of 6,830 gallons per minute from a series of
3 approximately 34 trenches between 2 feet and 13 feet
4 deep. The trenches will mainly be located in
5 Chesterfield Township with a small portion in
6 Bordentown Township, Burlington County.

7 Diversion is for the purpose of
8 temporary dewatering for the construction of
9 Compressor Station 203 and Chesterfield Meter
10 Station along with associated tie-in piping,
11 electrical conduits and other appurtenances.

12 The proposed diversion is in Delaware
13 River Basin. A Temporary Dewatering Permit is
14 required, because dewatering will continue for
15 approximately ten months during construction. The
16 diversion will be pumped from a series of
17 approximately 34 trenches, 2 feet to 13 feet deep.
18 According to the applicant's engineering report,
19 groundwater is encountered at the site from 1 foot
20 to 10 feet below grade. Excavation at the site will
21 vary from 2 feet to 13 feet below grade, and
22 dewatering is expected to occur to a depth of 13
23 feet below grade.

24 The anticipated total length of the
25 project is 7,659 linear feet, consisting of

1 perimeter trenching for foundations, box excavation
2 for foundations and storm water and line trenching
3 for piping and duct bank. The maximum length of
4 open trench will be minimized by sequential
5 trenching and backfilling operations. The average
6 diversion per foot length of open trench is
7 estimated to be 914 gallons per foot.

8 There are no public water supply
9 wells within a one-mile radius of the project.
10 Within one quarter mile radius of the project
11 records and documentation were found on -- in
12 department files for eight private domestic wells.
13 According to the applicant, there are four potential
14 pollution sites located within a one-quarter mile
15 radius of the dewatering activity, although none of
16 these sites are identified on the DEP Known
17 Contaminated Sites List.

18 Issuance of the Temporary Dewatering
19 Permit at the requested diversion rates will allow
20 for construction of the Transco Expansion Project,
21 Compressor Station 203 and the Chesterfield Meter
22 Station and the associated tie-in piping and other
23 appurtenances.

24 Based on the expected maximum
25 withdrawal rate, the characteristics for an

1 unconfined aquifer and the limits of dewatering, the
2 zone of influence is expected to be less than 14
3 feet deep and extend less than 400 feet from the
4 dewatering activity. Given this and the fact that
5 the diversion is temporary in nature, known records
6 indicate that adjacent wells are screened at depths
7 greater than this, and the applicant is required to
8 have a contingency plan in place should anyone be
9 adversely impacted, the diversion is considered just
10 and equitable to other water users in accordance
11 with N.J.A.C. 7:19-2.3(g)2.

12 As the diversion is temporary in
13 nature, it is not expected to exceed the long-term
14 natural replenishment of groundwater in the area, or
15 adversely affect any river or stream in accordance
16 with N.J.A.C. 7:19-2.3(g)3.

17 I might be going a little fast for
18 the stenographer. The diversion is not expected to
19 contribute to the spread of groundwater pollution
20 due to there being no identified known contaminated
21 sites within one-quarter mile radius of the
22 dewatering activity according to the New Jersey DEP
23 Known Contaminated Sites List.

24 This staff recommendation is for the
25 issuance of the Temporary Dewatering Permit subject

1 to specific permit conditions and requirements with
2 an expiration date of three years from the date of
3 permit issuance.

4 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you, Terry. At
5 this time we will begin the testimony portion of our
6 hearing. If I could just ask speakers, I hope you
7 can all see it the podium and the mike there. If I
8 call your name, you come up there to speak.

9 The first speaker is Assemblyman
10 Robert D. Clifton, New Jersey Legislature, 12th
11 District.

12 MR. CLIFTON: Thank you. Robert
13 Clifton, representing Chesterfield in the New Jersey
14 General Assembly, 12th Legislative District. I'm
15 here tonight on behalf of my district and running
16 mate Assemblyman Ron Dancer in opposition of this
17 diversion. Our offices have received hundreds of
18 letters and phone calls regarding the negative
19 impact this project will have on Chesterfield
20 Township and the surrounding communities.

21 We feel that FERC and the BPU did not
22 do a comprehensive examination of the potential
23 negative impacts of the compressor station, as well
24 as the pipeline. And they will have on this area
25 and the residents. We recognize the installation of

1 utility and gas lines are essential to providing
2 energy to homes and businesses. However, the rapid
3 increase of pipelines outside the existing utility
4 rights-of-way is making New Jersey the pipeline
5 capital of the northeast.

6 With the cooperation of providers a
7 new gas main route could follow existing electric
8 transmission lines. It makes more sense than
9 tearing through local neighborhoods to construct gas
10 lines. Despite our efforts to include common sense
11 safeguards, it is apparent FERC is determined to
12 move forward with this project.

13 Public safety needs to be a priority.
14 We should be proceeding very cautiously when
15 pipelines begin running through the most densely
16 populated state in our country. As a result, my
17 running mate, Ron Dancer, and I have included, have
18 introduced a six-bill package designed to protect
19 residents in communities from the potential dangers
20 of natural gas pipelines, which we will include in
21 writing, for the record. This pipeline is too close
22 for comfort. When completed, it will be one of the
23 highest pressurized interstate gas lines to be
24 installed in New Jersey.

25 It is very disappointing that FERC

1 has arbitrarily disregarded our arguments and is
2 allowing the project to proceed. We hope that the
3 NJDEP will take the comments submitted here tonight
4 from all the residents who are going to be
5 negatively impacted and carefully consider the full
6 impact of this project. We urge the NJDEP to oppose
7 this diversion. Thank you very much.

8 MS. PFLUGH: The next speaker is
9 Heather L. Demirjian, who is a Township of
10 Chesterfield attorney, followed by Matthew Mulhall,
11 an expert for the township, followed by Jeremy
12 Liedtka, the mayor of Chesterfield Township. If you
13 could just line up.

14 Heather, go ahead.

15 MS. DEMIRJIAN: My name is Heather
16 Demmirjian from Parker McCay here on behalf of the
17 Township of Chesterfield. I'll be presenting a
18 statement followed by the township's expert, Matthew
19 Mulhall, M2 Associates, Inc., and followed by a
20 statement by Mayor Jeremy Liedtka.

21 Due to the complexity and importance
22 of this matter, the township has asked for an
23 extension of the public comment. The township
24 is opposed to the dewatering permit and has retained
25 Matthew Mulhall to assist the township in

1 evaluating the numerous issues presented by
2 Transco's application for this permit. In addition
3 to our comments here this evening, the township will
4 be submitting separate written comments to the
5 Department. The Department not only has the
6 authority to regulate Transco's dewatering
7 activities but a basis exists for the department to
8 deny Transco's permit, because Transco has failed to
9 provide sufficient and complete technical
10 information to support its permit application.

11 From a legal perspective, Transco's
12 dewatering activities have the potential to
13 significantly impact surrounding areas, including
14 the water table and freshwater wetlands. It is not
15 appropriate to issue this dewatering permit until a
16 full analysis of impacts to wetlands and other
17 surrounding areas and to water quality is conducted,
18 and an individual freshwater wetlands permit and
19 NJDEP permit is issued.

20 Mr. Mulhall will now speak to the
21 technical issues and concerns presented by Transco's
22 permit application.

23 MR. MULHALL: Good evening. I'm
24 Matthew Mulhall. I'm here as a professional
25 geologist, professional hydrogeologist, with many

1 years of experience in New Jersey. I want to first
2 of all thank the DEP for the time and effort they've
3 put in on this application.

4 In a very short time frame this
5 application was prepared or permit was prepared.
6 First off, the first element of what -- of concern
7 from a hydrogeological standpoint is the fact that
8 the diversion rates have been adjusted several
9 times. Initially they were 7 million gallons a
10 month. Then they became -- excuse me, 6.4 million
11 gallons a month. Then they became 7 million gallons
12 a month. Then in February they became 305 million
13 gallons a month. Now they are back to 7 million
14 gallons a month. The data within the AECOM report
15 shows if all 34 trenches were being dewatered at the
16 same time, the maximum amount of water they would
17 need to pull out would be 6.4 million gallons a
18 month. They show that this project will be
19 conducted over basically seven months of dewatering,
20 starting with month one which was originally going
21 to be in March. Month two would have been in --
22 would be May, through September. That information
23 was provided on Addendum A, Table D-5 with the
24 application and Table D-6 within the AECOM report.

25 There's questions as to the

1 reliability of the information submitted to the DEP,
2 because these pumping rates have varied so much.
3 There's nothing in the data that would support a
4 pumping rate of 7 million gallons a month.

5 Another issue that's a significant
6 concern is that the AECOM report did not depict
7 wetlands on the property. There is, based on GIS
8 mapping available from the NJDEP, there are
9 significant elements on or about the property. This
10 is the head waters for Sucker Run. Some of the
11 excavations appear to extend either into or very
12 close to wetlands, and they could have an adverse
13 impact.

14 I'm going to expedite this. I see
15 the yellow light is already on. The application --

16 A VOICE: Take your time.

17 MR. MULHALL: The next issue is the
18 fact that the application is asking for 6,830
19 gallons a minute. This is a number that has changed
20 four times, three times in the permit application
21 phase. It was originally 90 million gallons a month
22 -- 90 million gallons a minute -- excuse me, 90
23 gallons per minute. Then it was changed to 156
24 gallons per minute and ultimately ended up at 6,830
25 gallons a minute, based on pump capacities.

1 Diversion pumping rates and diversion
2 values should be established based on need. The
3 need is shown in the AECOM report is at the maximum
4 monthly diversion would be in the third month of
5 operations, and that would be about 2.7 million
6 gallons, and in order to pump that and keep the
7 trenches dewatered, the AECOM report suggestion that
8 a pumping rate of 63 gallons per minute, not 6,830
9 gallons a minute would be appropriate.

10 MS. PFLUGH: Sir, your time. Time.

11 MR. MULHALL: Okay.

12 MS. PFLUGH: You can complete this at
13 the end.

14 A VOICE: You didn't tell Transco
15 that.

16 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you, sir.

17 MR. MULHALL: We are going to be
18 submitting comments in writing to you, but the
19 bottom line item is we think the adverse impacts to
20 the wetlands, the adverse impacts to the pumping
21 rates and everything else, there's no need for this
22 permit to be approved as is.

23 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you.

24 MS. PILAWSKI: The water allocation
25 rules do require that the hearing contain a

1 presentation from the applicant so that you have
2 full broad explanation of the project.

3 A VOICE: What was that?

4 A VOICE: That's a shame.

5 MS. PFLUGH: Just please just all
6 speakers remember not only to say your name but to
7 please spell it for our stenographer, and before you
8 start, I'd like to also call up the next three
9 speakers. Mayor Jill Popko from Bordentown, Jim
10 Cann, Bordentown Township Committee, and Bill
11 Harrison.

12 We'll start the time after you spell
13 your name.

14 MR. LIEDTKA: Jeremy Liedtka,
15 L-i-e-d-t-k-a. I'm the mayor presently. My
16 comments are twofold tonight, as the mayor and
17 personally. As the mayor, I'm gravely concerned
18 with the wells of, our private wells of the public
19 residents. Many were not listed on the application.
20 I just found out recently they had to be within a
21 quarter mile. Many of them are hand dug 35-foot
22 wells, so I'm not sure if Transco is privy to this
23 info, but it's out there. I think they should do an
24 infield study on our public wells.

25 A VOICE: Yes.

1 MR. LIEDTKA: Secondly, I'm concerned
2 for two Green Acre parks in close proximity to
3 Transco's property. Less than 500 feet to the north
4 we have a park in Chesterfield Township that has
5 wetlands, athletic fields and also the new Turnpike
6 reforestation process that the Turnpike paid grants
7 to do this to. A lot of money was spent in these
8 parks, and don't want to see them go to the wayside.

9 To the south Bordentown Township has
10 a park similar to ours, excluding athletic fields.
11 The wells are a top priority, and Transco should do
12 infield studies to see if they would be affected.
13 Transco should have a plan in place if someone was
14 affected. Residents should not bear the burden and
15 worry something's going to go wrong with their
16 wells. Transco should have the solutions in place
17 before a problem arises.

18 Now personally, we are the immediate
19 property owner to Transco to the east. The stream
20 that Matt Mulhall described runs in between our
21 property. That's the property line. That was our
22 playground as kids. We would go there fishing
23 catching frogs, and now it is my kids' playground.
24 We are gravely worried about this stream and the
25 dewatering and worried it's going to dry up and the

1 stream won't be there. I don't know how it cannot
2 be affected by dewatering so close to that stream.
3 I don't know how they can mitigate that.

4 Secondly, we are farmers also. We
5 have a farm field right next door, within feet of
6 where they are going to be dewatering. If they pull
7 the groundwater down, the ground then dries, and
8 with the compactibility of the silt and clay
9 structure of our soils in this area, they are going
10 to become compacted and hard. Any rain that is done
11 on this land will now run off. It will not perk
12 back into the ground. Any significant rain will
13 then become runoff and no affect, no recharge back
14 into the farmland or the aquifer.

15 With all the important concerns, I
16 cannot see how this application can move forward
17 without more studies and more data. There are major
18 inconsistencies in the application, as stated by our
19 professionals, and there has not been enough time to
20 do a significant study. This whole project has been
21 rushed from FERC through the BPU. They've asked for
22 accelerated time, and it just needs to slow down,
23 and I hope you guys do the proper job and please
24 give us the time and the extension. Thank you.

25 MS. PFLUGH: Is Mayor Jill Popko

1 here?

2 MS. POPKO: Thank you. This is a
3 travesty. There is no reason -- rhyme or reason for
4 this project to go through. J-i-l-l P-o-p-k-o,
5 Bordentown Township. In particular, it seems that
6 Transco has not done the proper due diligence and
7 letting our town, Bordentown Township, even know
8 about this project. They never notified us. They
9 have never come before us to let us know that we
10 could go before FERC as intervenors.

11 In the meantime, now what we have is
12 a project that is -- has been threatened to eminent
13 domain on our property. It's Green Acres. There is
14 wildlife and vernal pools in which they plan to
15 dewater our property and take them through eminent
16 domain. This is an outrage. There's absolutely no
17 reason for it.

18 For one reason in particular, Penn
19 East has not even gotten their approval, so what is
20 going to feed this compressor station? Nothing.
21 Absolutely nothing. So we've got a huge compressor
22 station with nothing going into it.

23 This permit for dewatering in which
24 they have just stated here today, is not expected to
25 affect groundwater or wetlands, not expected to.

1 Well, I expect a lot more than that. I have every
2 expectation that the people will be drinking clean
3 water here in this community. I have every
4 expectation that wildlife will be preserved, in
5 particular, if it's endangered. And I have every
6 expectation that the NJDEP will look through their
7 rules and regulations at Section 401 of the Clean
8 Water Act and make particular certain concern of
9 what this company is going to be doing.

10 I watched this raping of pristine
11 land, and I just am appalled. As we all know, this
12 is a travesty. Thank you.

13 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you.

14 MR. CANN: Jim Cann, C-a-n-n. I'm a
15 Bordentown Township Committeeman. I just want to
16 state for the record the township and its residents
17 are unequivocally opposed to this project and the
18 Garden State Pipeline. It's nature. It's not an
19 economic necessity. It's not needed. We already
20 know that the existing pipelines, if necessary,
21 could provide 50 percent more gas than is needed by
22 the residents of New Jersey, so there is absolutely
23 no economic reason. The environmental impacts, not
24 even discussing the public health issues that these
25 types of facilities give rise to, just means to me

1 as DEP Environmental Protection, you need to be
2 slowing this down. You need to be taking a much
3 harder look at this, and while you read statements
4 from the Transco Williams reports, I think one of
5 the things that I wanted to hear tonight is exactly
6 what your investigation is going to involve. When
7 are you going to be out to the land? Are you going
8 to have geologists? Are you going to have
9 hydrologists, given the number of schools in
10 proximity to this facility? Given the number of
11 private wells in proximity to the facility? Given
12 the number of homes near this facility? I think
13 it's incumbent upon you -- and the wetlands and we
14 have park -- as Mayor Liedtka properly stated, we
15 have parks in this area. They wanted an easement
16 from us. We don't want to give it to them, because
17 this is not necessary. This is not needed. We
18 don't need to be Pipeline USA.

19 So I think that's a question you need
20 to answer. It should have been part of your
21 presentation is what exactly are you going to do.
22 Are you just going to review what they provided?
23 Because what they provided to FERC was faulty, was
24 incorrect. So if you are going to make your
25 decision based on information that this group

1 provided? It's a fool's errand. You are making
2 your decision based on information that, in my
3 opinion, is probably totally incorrect.

4 This needs to be slowed down. This
5 needs to be slowed down. This needs to be carefully
6 reviewed, and Section 401 of the freshwater Act,
7 needs to be reviewed by all of DEP and actually
8 researched thoroughly before you give rise to this
9 type of a monstrosity. Thank you very much.

10 MS. PFLUGH: Next three people are
11 Peggy Hallion, Andrea Katz, and Jeff Tittel. Go
12 ahead, sir.

13 MR. HARRISON: Bill Harrison,
14 H-a-r-r-i-s-o-n, with Genova Byrnes. I'm the
15 attorney for Bordentown Township. We want to join
16 in Chesterfield's request that the property hearing
17 be extended. We will be submitting written comments
18 detailing the environmental concerns here, but one
19 matter, in the interest of keeping to the three
20 minutes, I want to make the department aware of, one
21 of the parcels involved in this application is owned
22 by Bordentown Township. It is subject to Green
23 Acres restrictions. Bordentown Township is
24 precluded by law from authorizing any non-recreation
25 conservation use of that land.

1 That is what is being proposed here.
2 I would argue that the -- that Bordentown Township
3 certainly has no intention of going through the
4 procedures which require approval by both DEP and
5 the State House Commission before any recreation and
6 conservation lands can be diverted for that purpose.

7 And without debating whether Transco
8 has the ability to do that, no one has initiated
9 those proceedings, and I would strongly argue that
10 the Department of Environmental Protection is
11 precluded from granting any approval that would
12 authorize a diversion of dedicated parklands for
13 non-parkland use without DEP and the State House
14 Commission having already approved that, and so this
15 application should be put on hold, unless and until
16 the diversion is approved by DEP and the State House
17 Commission. Thank you.

18 MS. PFLUGH: Peggy Hallion?

19 MS. HALLION: Hello. I'm Peggy
20 Hallion, H-a-l-l-i-o-n. I am a member of the
21 Chesterfield Elementary School Board of Education
22 and I welcome you to our beautiful school. I hope
23 the temperature is comfortable. You are experienced
24 the results of our environmentally friendly
25 geothermal heating and air-conditioning system. As

1 a preservation friendly township, we pride ourselves
2 on protecting the environment for the next
3 generation by our actions, education and example.
4 As members of the New Jersey Department of
5 Environmental Protection, I assume you feel the
6 same. Our system has two hundred wells drilled on
7 our property. Each is approximately a hundred feet.
8 My questions are, how much water is going to be
9 displaced? I saw the little presentation we had.
10 That didn't tell me anything. How is the dewatering
11 going to affect the operation of our system? Thus
12 the operation of our school? Has anyone looked into
13 this? What was the conclusion? Where is the
14 written report so that the Board of Education can
15 evaluate it? How low is that aquifer going to go?
16 Second, what guarantee do we have
17 that if something happens to our system, who is
18 going to be held legally and financially
19 responsible? This is our major concern to the Board
20 of Education as well as to the parents and the
21 residents of Chesterfield Township. Thank you.

22 MS. PFLUGH: Andrea Katz?

23 MS. KATZ: Good evening. My name is
24 Andrea Katz, A-n-d-r-e-a K-a-t-z. I am a board
25 member here at Chesterfield Elementary School and

1 I'd like to echo some of the sentiments that were
2 made earlier. This community, we do not want this
3 project at all, and I think that is made loud and
4 clear by how many people are in this room. They
5 stopped what they were doing at 5:00. That's hard,
6 it's the middle of dinnertime. We stopped what we
7 were doing. We filled this room. We brought our
8 kids. That should be made clear to you that we
9 don't want this project. I am asking for your help
10 in slowing this down and stopping this project all
11 together.

12 I want to know from the DEP what --
13 is this going to be safe for my kids? I don't
14 believe it is. I want you to show me that it is. I
15 want to know what studies you are doing to prove
16 that this is going to be safe for my family.

17 I live about a half mile away from
18 the compressor station. I want to know when my kids
19 go into my backyard they are going to be safe. They
20 are going to be kept healthy. I want to know what
21 the impacts are going to be on the wildlife from the
22 long-term dewatering. You can't tell me there's not
23 going to be any impact on the wildlife. There is,
24 and I want to know what those impacts are going to
25 be.

1 And I am a board member here of this
2 beautiful school. We are a mile away from that
3 compressor station. How are we supposed to evacuate
4 our children if something happens to that compressor
5 station? We don't have buses on-site. What do we
6 do? So I need you to tell me that we are going to
7 be safe, and if we are not going to be safe, I need
8 you to stop this project. Thank you.

9 MS. PFLUGH: Jack Tittel, and the
10 next three people following Jeff, Agnes Marsala,
11 Martha Veselka, I'm sorry if I mispronounce it and
12 Richard Bizub.

13 MR. TITTEL: Thank you, Jeff Tittel,
14 J-e-f-f T-i-t-t-e-l, Director, New Jersey Sierra
15 Club. I just want to make sure I mentioned
16 yesterday or on Friday on Earth Day we filed suit
17 against the Southern Reliability Link, because we
18 believe that the Board of Public Utilities violated
19 their own law, as did the executive director of the
20 Pinelands Commission, who ignored the law, ignored
21 the Commission and ignored the public, and so the
22 reason I'm mentioning that is you could end up
23 permitting a substation for a pipeline that will
24 never be built. You may also be building a
25 substation for another pipeline that may never be

1 built, because we've been fighting Penn East, and we
2 got DRBC to hold their own independent hearings, and
3 that's going to hold that project up for two years.

4 I'm here today because I want to talk
5 about the Crosswicks double cross. This pipeline
6 and this compressor station is unneeded, unnecessary
7 and dangerous. It's going to have significant
8 impacts to groundwater, to streams, to vernal pools,
9 and then you have to deal with the runoff issue.
10 Not only the runoff from where all that water is
11 going to go, enough water for a town the size of
12 Crosswicks, you know, every day getting discharged
13 onto other people's property, picking up
14 contaminants, but then the storm water impacts from
15 this compressor station, the air pollution impacts
16 from this compressor station, but more importantly
17 you are the Department of Environmental Protection,
18 you are not the compartment. You cannot look at
19 this in a vacuum. You have to look at the related
20 impacts from the Southern Reliability Link cutting
21 through the Pinelands and impact to all those
22 streams. You have to look at environmental impacts
23 Penn East, but more importantly, you need to make
24 sure that you look at the 401 permitting process
25 which needs to be cumulative, not just one little

1 spot. It has to be the entire impact of this
2 project from groundwater to streams to wetlands to
3 everything else. What we are concerned about is
4 that this pipeline is just another example for
5 Transco to try to bring gas from the Marcellus Shale
6 Region to market somewhere else that could end up
7 being Europe. As we say, Transco gets the money,
8 Europe could get the gas, and we get the pipe.

9 The point that I want to make is what
10 I think, you know, critical, is that Transco's
11 record of 50 incidences at your compressor stations
12 in the last ten years, water and gas don't mix. Our
13 own governor may be falling into the footsteps of
14 being a fossil fool, but your job is to protect the
15 environment, protect the people, protect the valley.
16 Do not frack Crosswicks or the Pinelands. Thank
17 you.

18 MS. MARSALA: My name is Agnes
19 Marsala, A-g-n-e-s M-a-r-s-a-l-a, and I reside at 68
20 Old York Road, Chesterfield, New Jersey. I'm also
21 the president of People Over Pipelines, a local
22 organization. I've lived in the Bordentown
23 Chesterfield area my whole life, and while I
24 recognize the need for economic growth, I'm saddened
25 about I some of the changes I've seen. And we are a

1 farming community, as been said, and as such, we
2 depend heavily upon an abundance of clean water.
3 The effects of draining this site will be felt
4 throughout our community.

5 Firstly, it would affect the local
6 water resources, but beyond that, it will set in
7 motion a 28-mile series of trenching, dewatering and
8 discharging for the massive pipeline that will run
9 through many other sources of clean water, as Jeff
10 just said, namely the Southern Reliability Link or
11 the SRL. The "Public Interest" Transco sites in
12 Section 1.3 of its application, is as flimsy and
13 self-serving as it is vague. There are numerous
14 studies by reputable agencies, most recently one
15 conducted by Skipping Stone, a national firm with
16 expertise in energy market services, that completely
17 refute Transco and New Jersey Natural Gas's
18 contention that this project provides enhanced
19 reliability and resiliency to NJNG's service in
20 Monmouth and Ocean Counties.

21 NJNG Senior Vice President of Energy
22 Delivery, Craig A. Lynch, testified before the BPU
23 that in over 60 years the company has never
24 experienced a transmission failure, so I contend the
25 system needs no improvement. In fact, the system

1 currently has more methane gas than customers can
2 use. Superstorm Sandy's effects on NJNG's service,
3 although touted throughout Transco and NJNG filings,
4 would not have been mitigated, or indeed lessened in
5 any way by the SRL. The methane was turned off at
6 the distribution level, because many customers'
7 homes were no longer in need of it; they were
8 destroyed, under water or on fire. Shutting off the
9 methane was a prudent safety call.

10 The only public interest served by
11 these projects is the corporate greed of Transco
12 Williams and NJNG, and I for one do not consider
13 them public. Just because they call themselves a
14 public utility doesn't make them a library.

15 And where will the discharge go?
16 Stating in their application they will use New
17 Jersey Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Best
18 Management Practices is just not enough detail for
19 this community. What does that mean? Bales of hay?
20 How do we make sure they're discharging this vast
21 amount of water with God knows what mixed in
22 properly if there's nothing but a vague plan? This
23 is a huge tract of land, and dewatering and
24 discharging so many millions of gallons of water
25 will affect the abundant wildlife in the area. Some

1 of that wildlife is on Open Space land, paid for by
2 the taxpayers. How can dewatering a Green Acres
3 Open Space tract be in the public interest? As
4 taxpayers we approve funds for such tracts because
5 we want them to remain open and green.

6 We are currently at the start of a
7 dry spring and hopefully we will get more rain but
8 not too much. And that's another problem, the
9 increasingly unpredictable drought/flood cycle. Did
10 AECOM take into consideration that precipitation
11 patterns are becoming more violent and
12 unpredictable? Do they take into consideration
13 future conditions? We rely on groundwater, and as
14 we get more prolonged droughts, it's easier to
15 deplete the groundwater sources. Further, a lot of
16 our septic systems are old and can't take the
17 stress, which would lead to untreated waste in the
18 groundwater.

19 We already have restricted use for
20 some local farmers, yet Transco proposes to draw
21 down the local water table, putting those farmers
22 operations at risk. Droughts also lead to increases
23 in pollens and other allergens. That is certainly
24 not in the public interest.

25 Life is changing and we need to

1 adapt, and one way it is to protect our water and
2 wetlands. We need all the clean water sources and
3 carbon capturing organisms we have, and more. We
4 need to change our mindset to not be looking so much
5 towards the past but toward the future, and that
6 future is full of conditions that are somewhat
7 unknown, and more extreme.

8 MS. PFLUGH: Ma'am.

9 MS. MARSALA: We need to reduce our
10 exposure and vulnerability to future changes, and
11 there's not a lot of disagreement on what needs to
12 be done. We have to find the political will to do
13 it and figure out whose job it is to take the lead
14 on different tasks.

15 I know the thinking is that this is a
16 federal project and with the FERC issuance of the
17 certificate of need that this is a done deal, but
18 the C.O.N. is predicated on Transco obtaining all
19 necessary permits, including a Clean Water Quality
20 Certificate.

21 MS. PFLUGH: Ma'am.

22 MS. MARSALA: All right. I just want
23 to say I believe the DEP should only issue an
24 individual freshwater wetlands or open water fill
25 permit if regulated activity does not cause or

1 contribute to a violation of any applicable state
2 water quality standard. And your mandate is to
3 protect all existing uses, all living things, in
4 stream and their aquatic and aquatic dependent
5 habitat, and the numeric and narrative water quality
6 criteria designed to protect physical, chemical and
7 biological integrity, and so I urge you to take that
8 lead --

9 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you.

10 MS. MARSALA: -- and help New Jersey
11 adapt to help New Jersey adapt to an uncertain
12 future by denying this permit.

13 MS. VESELKA: Martha Veselka,
14 V-e-s-e-l-k-a. This is the first time the DEP has
15 had a public review, and I appreciate it. This gas
16 compressor station is one component of a \$150
17 million Penn East and Southern Reliability Link
18 project. I believe it's not good public policy and
19 may be unlawful to not have a public hearing on the
20 whole pipeline and compressor station.

21 Additionally, by not reviewing the
22 entire project now, we are left to guess what the
23 receiving gas infrastructure in eastern New Jersey
24 will be. According to U.S. representative Tom
25 MacArthur, a few times he has said the gas

1 transmission line is for export. What were the
2 infrastructure of the export facilities be? Where
3 will they be? Have the environmental effects of the
4 construction and operation of these facilities been
5 analyzed? There will be cumulative effects for this
6 entire project.

7 In accordance with the New Jersey
8 Geological & Water Survey Technical Memorandum 12-2,
9 plans for diversion/construction/operation must be
10 just and equitable to other water users affected
11 thereby, and the water
12 withdrawal/construction/operation does not adversely
13 affect other existing withdrawals, either ground or
14 surface.

15 Please show us evidence the DEP's
16 evaluating the pipeline compressor station
17 infrastructure as a whole, including future export
18 facilities' impact to the environment.

19 Next, as recommended in the New
20 Jersey Water Survey Technical Memorandum 12.2, DEP
21 regulates all major groundwater divergence of
22 freshwater and non-freshwater that may impact
23 freshwater. Major diversions are defined as those
24 capable of withdrawing 100,000 gallons or more a
25 day. Before the DEP issues a permit, an applicant

1 must show the diversion will adversely impact other
2 groundwater users or the natural environment and
3 waterways of the state, now and in the future. I
4 ask that an aquifer test be done on groundwater at
5 the compressor station of aquifers affected on the
6 pipeline and in the future project or export
7 facility area as well.

8 Next, what is the effect of toxic
9 substances, specifically VOCs, which include benzene
10 MTBE and vinyl chloride and radionuclides and
11 uranium from dewatering construction and operation
12 of the compressor station and pipeline on my well?
13 The current Chesterfield Township MUA water report
14 indicates susceptibility for Chesterfield's wells
15 from VOCs is high and indicated that the
16 susceptibility for radionuclides is high in
17 Chesterfield today. This report does not take into
18 effects any of the new construction and operation of
19 the pipeline and compressor station.

20 A high rating means the potential
21 contaminant level is equal or greater than 50
22 percent of the safe drinking water standard. What
23 analysis has Transco and SRL done concerning these
24 projects contamination of VOCs and radionuclides in
25 our aquifer and wells? How has DEP analyzed this

1 information? Have they updated this report with the
2 impact of the dewatering, the construction and the
3 operation of the pipeline compressor station? Then
4 has the DEP evaluated Transco and New Jersey Natural
5 Gas's pollutant effects on our drinking water and
6 vulnerability?

7 MS. PFLUGH: Ma'am, your time is up.

8 MS. VESELKA: Finally, I implore the
9 DEP to purchase hazard insurance to cover
10 remediation and cleanup in case of contamination.
11 Thank you.

12 MS. PFLUGH: Next three people, Roger
13 Schneider, Jamie Zaccaria and John Kocubinski.

14 MR. BIZUB: Good evening, Richard
15 Bizub, B-i-z-u-b. I'm Director for Water Programs
16 at Pinelands Preservation Alliance. There's four
17 topics I hope I can get through tonight. If not,
18 we'll certainly submit a written.

19 The first is potential impacts to the
20 wetlands and the streams. You know when you look at
21 the reports that were submitted, you notice that the
22 saturated zone on top of the Woodbury clay is not
23 very thick. This is the zone that's identified in
24 the reports as stratum number one. The thickness
25 ranges from about 5 to 23 feet, but on average is

1 less than 12 feet throughout the site and in some
2 places much thinner than that. So some of the
3 piping that's going to be and excavation that's
4 going to be dewatered ranges from 9 to 13 feet deep
5 below ground surface. So a significant portion of
6 the water column on top of the Woodbury clay will be
7 dewatered. This is the water bearing zone that
8 provides base flow to the two streams and associated
9 wetlands. Even though groundwater that is removed
10 by dewatering is going to be land applied on-site
11 and in theory will recharge the water-bearing zone,
12 losses to the streams and wetland systems can be
13 significant if evaporative loss aren't kept to a
14 minimum, especially during the summer and early fall
15 when more than 30 percent can be lost through
16 evaporation transpiration.

17 This application is certainly
18 temporary, but it's not short duration. It's ten
19 months, so there needs to be more specifics in the
20 application about how evaporative losses will be
21 minimized.

22 The next item is that this site and
23 surrounding area has been farm prior to 1931.
24 That's about as far back as I can go in looking at
25 historic aerial photos, so there's a good

1 possibility that there's tile drains on the site,
2 and that really needs to be looked into through the
3 Burlington County Soil Conservation District and
4 other agencies. If there are tile drains and they
5 are not figured into the equation, then the
6 dewatering calculations can be way off.

7 The other item is that this is a
8 dewatering application, and in Delaware River Basin,
9 and this is under the purview of Delaware River
10 Basin Commission also, and looking through the files
11 there's no documentation that DRBC was even
12 contacted or received any approval, so for this
13 application to be deemed complete, it needs to have
14 Delaware River Water Basin Commission approval also.

15 I do have some other items but I'll
16 submit them in writing. Thank you.

17 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you.

18 MR. SCHNEIDER: My name is Roger
19 Schneider, S-c-h-n-e-i-d-e-r. I'm not too smart in
20 all these dewatering and all that stuff, but I do
21 know if they pump water out of the ground it has to
22 be taken off the property. Has to be pumped into
23 something. Where is all this water going to go that
24 they take out of the ground? The quality of life
25 that the people have out here in Chesterfield and

1 Bordentown are going to be affected tremendously by
2 this project. All the traffic is going to come
3 through Bordentown, all of it. All the heavy
4 equipment, everything that they bring in here is
5 going to come down 528. It's going -- my property
6 borders 528. It's going to come right by my house,
7 50 foot off that road. My house shakes when a
8 regular truck comes down that road.

9 What restraints are we even going to
10 put on these people if this project is allowed for
11 the noise levels that are going to be created out
12 there for the people? We have a lot of large
13 population that lives within a mile of this project.
14 We have two schools. Our first responders in
15 Bordentown, our first aid, our fire department are
16 just over a half mile away. I live three-quarters
17 of a mile away, and I'd just like to beg the DEP to
18 help us and really do their work and look at all the
19 water issues that are going to be there and help us
20 stop this project. I beg you to help us.

21 Thank you.

22 MS. PFLUGH: Jamie Zaccaria? Is
23 Jamie here? No? Okay. John Kocubinski?

24 MR. KOCUBINSKI: Thank you very much.

25 MS. PFLUGH: Hold on.

1 MR. KOCUBINSKI: K-o-c-u-b-i-n-s-k-i.

2 MS. PFLUGH: Give me one moment. The
3 next three speakers that we want to also call up
4 after you are Glen Schulkin, Patricia Caruso and
5 Rita Romeu. Thank you, sir, I'm sorry.

6 MR. SCHNEIDER: I'm a resident, 950
7 Province Line Road. I'm also a township
8 committeeman in North Hanover Township, and
9 therefore a resident of North Hanover Township.

10 In regard to the application, we have
11 been going to and I say we, the groups opposing
12 obviously this infrastructure, public safety, health
13 and welfare is paramount, which, in essence, covers
14 the impact this project will have on the aquifer,
15 wetlands, streams, which also includes farming
16 operations in our region. In our region, North
17 Hanover, Chesterfield, we have preserved substantial
18 acres to the tune in North Hanover more than \$10
19 million of local, county, state monies. What could
20 possibly be the impact if there were a drought or if
21 there is a drought? I know there's restrictions on
22 draw from streams for irrigation and wells for
23 irrigation. So with that said, what could possibly
24 be the negative impact that this dewatering effort
25 could have on farmers, which is basically our

1 industry out here, okay? So we need to seriously
2 look at that, and I know there's been facts brought
3 up tonight about what is DEP going to do to review
4 the information, simply not taking the information
5 submitted and saying yeah, this looks good or
6 whatever, but, in fact, going out, doing the
7 appropriate and proper testing.

8 Again, I'd like to know what data
9 will be presented, and has the applicant really
10 identified any negative impacts that may occur?
11 Didn't seem like there was anything listed in their
12 presentation as to potential negative impacts. I've
13 got to believe in the real world that all things
14 have a potential or possibility of negative impact.

15 So, again, all I ask is that you take
16 a look at the history of the area, the farming, the
17 environment and the aquifer and what's going to be
18 the impact to the aquifer to recharge systems, to
19 the streams, and do the appropriate proper analysis
20 and perhaps this will be information that would
21 prevent this from happening. Thank you.

22 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you. Glen
23 Schulkin?

24 MR. SCHULKIN: Hi, Glen Schulkin,
25 S-c-h-u-l-k-i-n. I'm the lucky ticket holder of

1 being right across the street from this project with
2 four of my neighbors. It seems to me that not only
3 were we originally told that in the paperwork
4 submitted there were no wells within a quarter of a
5 mile and then there were no wells within 400 yards,
6 and then there are now, all of a sudden there's all
7 these other wells, so the couple words that I wanted
8 to mention and then I wanted to read something to
9 you quickly, there is a number of areas where they
10 discuss so eloquently that "we do not expect," and I
11 think if you look through their paperwork, you will
12 see "we do not expect." What the hell does that
13 mean? Are you serious? We do not expect three of
14 the most intelligent people that we have that led
15 off any meeting, and I've been here 27 years, so not
16 only was I not told the property was sold, no
17 representative came to my house, no paperwork came
18 with us, yet we were told we didn't have a well nor
19 my other four neighbors, and by the way, these wells
20 are between 30 and 200 feet of this property. These
21 are five wells. We'll be dead. I'm 70 years old.
22 I will be dead by the time you figure this out.

23 So let me tell you another thing
24 about inconsistencies. Inconsistencies are all the
25 things that they've changed over and over and over.

1 Well, there's another word for inconsistencies and
2 those are outright lies. No blast zone, yet the
3 Bordentown Register said the blast zone was over a
4 mile. None of these pipelines and/or pumping
5 stations or whatever you call them, terminals or
6 compressor stations have ever blown up. Yet four
7 months ago when Lee Rudner -- Radner, a lawyer that
8 represents this company, but not hired by the
9 company, came to us and I asked very simple
10 questions. Has anything ever blown up? No, never
11 happened.

12 Three months ago in North Dakota,
13 this exact project was three-quarters of the way
14 built, and it blew up where it knocked windows out
15 of houses and artwork off walls over a mile away.
16 The Bordentown Register said that within one to
17 three miles, and I know you only care about water
18 quality, but how do you differentiate water quality
19 and air quality where the two mix together and we're
20 told that every kid in that school that comes out
21 for playtime will get bloody noses? There will be
22 fertility problems throughout the whole entire
23 township. People will get sick. When I asked that
24 question, they told me that there is not one person
25 in the United States that they had to in any way do

1 anything directly to move them or -- well, you know
2 what? They all signed nondisclosure agreements.
3 People moved out of their houses.

4 MS. PFLUGH: Sir, time.

5 MR. SCHULKIN: Okay, and wells. I
6 just want to read to you to let you know that the
7 courage that we need from you was done by the
8 Governor of New York three days ago. Governor Como
9 and state officials made a special Earth Day
10 announcement Friday denying the critical permit for
11 the controversial Constitutional Pipeline. The New
12 York State Department of Conservation rejected a
13 water quality certificate needed for this pipeline,
14 gas pipeline, and DEC said construction would affect
15 streams and acres of valuable forest land. I was
16 told there's no streams --

17 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you, sir.

18 MR. SCHULKIN: Not only is there a
19 wetland there, but the stream behind my house has
20 endangered turtles, 20 kinds of, we have an ex-mayor
21 here whose brother got prosecuted for killing
22 endangered turtles, but we shouldn't worry about
23 those turtles now? We have nesting pairs of bald
24 eagles. We have wildlife in this stream. She said
25 there was no streams. I said what about the stream

1 that goes under right onto your property and meets
2 three other streams? What about the 140 acres of
3 forest area that touches this property and around
4 this property?

5 MS. PFLUGH: Sir, thank you. Your
6 time is up.

7 MR. SCHULKIN: Thank you. So in
8 closing, let me say that when she said that there
9 would be no release of methane gases, this Lee
10 Rudner, Lee something, that is part of their
11 company, once a month they release five miles of
12 gas, I forget what it's called, a burnout, and there
13 will be thousands of pounds of ash coming down on
14 their property and around that will go into the
15 water, into the aquifer, into my drinking water.

16 MS. PFLUGH: Sir, thank you.

17 MR. SCHULKIN: And I hope I lose
18 weight from this. It might be the only way I'm
19 going to lose weight.

20 MS. CARUSO: Hi, my name is Patricia
21 Caruso, C-a-r-u-s-o. I'm the member of the People
22 Over Pipelines, and I also live in Upper Freehold.
23 I'm not here tonight to talk as a scientist or an
24 environmentalist or an engineer or geologist. I am
25 here tonight to talk to all of you in my most

1 important role, and I think everyone in this room
2 would agree, that of a parent.

3 As a visual, I wanted to just bring a
4 30-inch model of the pipeline. I know we are all
5 bright enough and we know what a 30-inch pipeline
6 is, but I think it's important to keep this in mind
7 as I speak.

8 I am deeply concerned about the
9 safety of my family. This 30-inch over 700 pound
10 per square inch pipeline would have more than half a
11 million pounds of pressure in it. If this explodes,
12 we all know catastrophic results would occur. This
13 would run directly in front of our house that my
14 husband built himself 20 years ago.

15 My three children have fished for the
16 past 15 years in the small stream that runs in front
17 of our house. In addition, deer, fox and other
18 small animals drink from this stream on a daily
19 basis. How will the aquatic life and wildlife be
20 protected if this compressor station and pipeline
21 are built? Sadly the stream will become
22 contaminated and/or dry up.

23 There will be many toxic chemicals
24 used during the horizontal drilling of this
25 pipeline. How will you protect us from the damaging

1 effects of that? What will happen if our wells are
2 contaminated?

3 According to N.J.A.C. 7:19, a permit
4 is a privilege, not a right. Who is protecting the
5 rights of the thousands of people who are not
6 supporting this dangerous and unnecessary project?
7 Despite attending weekly meetings over the past year
8 to prevent this disaster, our voices are not being
9 heard. We are being silenced by wealthy
10 corporations such as NJNG and Transco. Their main
11 goal is to profit financially, another example of
12 corporate greed, regardless of the safety, water and
13 environmental risks.

14 Please do not rubber stamp this
15 project and grant Transco the permits that they
16 need. Please be leaders. Make the ethical, moral,
17 professional and appropriate decisions and deny the
18 permits that Transco requires. Protect the
19 citizens, water supplies, aquatic life, wildlife and
20 environment. New Jersey is starting to become known
21 as the Pipeline State, not the Garden State.

22 How is this dangerous, unnecessary
23 project in the public interest? And as the previous
24 speaker indicated, we have to rejoice that New York
25 State Department of Environmental Conservation

1 recently rejected the proposed pipeline by denying
2 them the 401 water quality certificate. Please
3 listen to our concerns and follow suit. I am
4 pleading with you. Thank you very much.

5 MS. PFLUGH: Rita Romeu?

6 MS. ROMEU: Hi, my name is Rita
7 Romeu, R-o-m-e-u, and I reside at 433 Ellisdale
8 Road. I want to thank you for having this hearing,
9 because this is one of the few opportunities the
10 community has really had to speak out on this issue,
11 seeing as BPU does not have a public comment
12 provision and FERC does not have hearings either.

13 I'm going to come at this from a
14 slightly different angle. I know a lot of very
15 valuable things have been said already that I will
16 touch on too, but I have several neighbors who are
17 farmers as well as some friends who are business
18 owners and specifically home builders in the
19 township. Being a business owner myself, I felt it
20 was very important to express some of the concerns
21 of the business owners of Chesterfield.

22 I've talked with several of my farmer
23 friends about their concerns with this proposed
24 dewatering portion of the project as well as other
25 business owners, including a home builder. Many of

1 their concerns are very similar to what some of the
2 residents have already expressed, but I want
3 everybody to keep in mind that in Chesterfield,
4 farming is really our main business. Farmers depend
5 on a regular water supply, both from area wells,
6 area creeks and streams. My former neighbors
7 irrigate from creeks and ponds, and of course they
8 depend on their wells for maintaining their farm
9 businesses.

10 Some of the questions that they had
11 are that I feel are very important is, you know, is
12 Transco digging a pond in the wetlands for the
13 discharge? Where is the discharge going to go? Who
14 is going to monitor all of the chemical levels in
15 the water during this process? And where can we all
16 go to look for a detailed description of the project
17 that isn't vague?

18 Other concerns that they have are how
19 will the diversion of water impact farm irrigation
20 wells and ponds in Chesterfield Township which has a
21 large block of preserved farmland along with our
22 neighboring township of Upper Freehold? How will
23 surface water flow be impacted, including potential
24 adverse impacts to creek and pond aquatic life,
25 including, as some of my friends have on their

1 property, beavers, fish, water fowl and important
2 plant species such as native milkweed, which is
3 critical to survival of the Monarch butterfly, so we
4 would like to see how these issues have been
5 addressed in the application and are going to be
6 addressed by DEP.

7 Some of the builders and realtors
8 I've talked to had some different concerns. One
9 builder reminded me that one time a few years ago
10 when many wells dried up in the township, not only
11 was it very unfortunate for the residents, but the
12 DEP denied builders any permits to dig new wells at
13 that time. So surrounding wells go dry, what will
14 be the impact on builders' permits? Has this issue
15 been looked at and addressed? We were also
16 interested in finding out if a water conservation
17 and drought management plan had been submitted by
18 Transco, and if so, where we can find that?

19 So in general, everybody that I spoke
20 to, myself included, just felt that there were too
21 many unanswered questions for this really to move
22 ahead, and we implore you to take the time to really
23 research this and communicate with us.

24 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you. Bill Wolfe?
25 Following Bill, the next three will be Glenn Ashton,

1 Ronnie Wassall and Steve Benowitz.

2 MR. WOLFE: Good evening, Bill Wolfe,
3 W-o-l-f-e. I live in Bordentown. Thank you,
4 everybody, for coming. This is really a great
5 turnout, and the testimony has been spectacular. I
6 really appreciate it, thanks.

7 The hearing officer's introductory
8 statement left some important information out that I
9 think people should be aware. This permit is issued
10 pursuant to the Water Supply Management Act. The
11 legislation has deemed that the water resources of
12 the state are publicly owned, held in trust for the
13 citizens of the state, not out-of-state
14 corporations. That's a very important fact. And I
15 take exception to that, your failure to note that.
16 It's your statutory charge from the legislature.

17 Secondly, the summation of the
18 department's findings left out very critical
19 findings the department is obligated to make under
20 the regulations at NJAC 7:19-2.3 where it's the
21 applicant's burden to demonstrate that the project
22 is in the public interest. That means everything,
23 everything that people said today is about the
24 public interest, because it's things the public
25 cares about.

1 And the hearing officer tried to
2 narrow that testimony to just merely the compressor
3 station, and the applicant themselves got up and
4 presented the whole damn project. So nobody should
5 be under any illusion that the Department, and I
6 think it demonstrates bad faith on the Department's
7 part to even attempt to narrow the scope of the
8 public's testimony, and it's in writing as well in
9 the public notice on the hearing. And I think it
10 fails to reflect the statutory mandate the
11 Department is obligated to enforce. And that should
12 be intolerable. And I'm glad nobody was intimidated
13 by that nonsense and people spoke their mind and
14 what they care about.

15 There are several permits still
16 pending on this project. I'd like to affiliate
17 myself with Matt Mulhall's comments on the technical
18 basis. The department still has a wetlands permit
19 outstanding, and that's going to deal with the
20 dewatering of the wetlands. Some of the hydro
21 modifications is really premature, really give high
22 geological demonstrations on top of the
23 inconsistencies and just basic data. And I too read
24 the application, and it said there are no streams,
25 so I thought I was a little bit fuzzy headed, but I

1 guess not. Other folks picked up on that.

2 Lastly, from big picture standpoint,
3 this is a fossil fuel infrastructure project of a
4 regional scale. Starts in the frack fields of
5 Pennsylvania and is importing gas through the Penn
6 East Pipeline which is then connected through this
7 compressor station and then to the Southern
8 Reliability Link and the South Jersey Gas Pipeline
9 and then at the tail end of the project is the BLE
10 Link Power Plant and some say a re-powering
11 operation at Oyster Creek.

12 So this is a massive, massive \$2
13 billion plus infrastructure project. To try to
14 compress, dewatering permit application is ludicrous
15 on its face, and I'll close with saying the wetlands
16 regulations number one explicitly prohibit
17 segmentation that you are doing here tonight.

18 MS. PFLUGH: The next speaker is
19 Glenn Ashton, but we are going to take a pause for
20 about five minutes for our stenographer. She needs
21 a break, so five minutes and next will be Glenn
22 Ashton.

23 (A brief recess is taken.)

24 MS. PFLUGH: Ladies and gentlemen, we
25 are going to get started. I ask you to take your

1 seats. Glenn Ashton is our next speaker.

2 MR. ASHTON: Glenn Ashton,
3 A-s-h-t-o-n, and I live in Bordentown, New Jersey.

4 My concerns are many for this
5 senseless project. It only puts more money in deep
6 pockets. The particular concern I'm asking you
7 about tonight is whether the water diversion
8 required to build the compressor station is just
9 inequitable to our county, our environment and
10 wildlife and impacted area as is required by your
11 guidance documents. While I'm not an expert by any
12 means about the effects of dewatering on the
13 environment and wildlife, it is apparent that
14 Transco has done an inadequate job of identifying of
15 number of wells within a half mile of the compressor
16 site. It concerns me in light of the danger that
17 this project, and particularly the compressor
18 station, presents to our towns, that other serious
19 mistakes in their data may have been made.

20 We have been sold out by so many, the
21 New Jersey Board of Public Utilities, FERC and many
22 of our elected officials who have ignored the facts
23 and the dangers this project presents only to serve
24 their self interests. We are appealing to you to
25 review the Transco application with the study

1 consideration it deserves and carefully, consider
2 carefully the impact it has on our residents in
3 doing so.

4 The reasons given for the
5 construction of this Penn East, Southern Reliability
6 Pipeline along with the Transco Compressor Station
7 have shown to be false, and our citizens will not
8 only suffer the adverse effects of this
9 construction, but we now know for sure what we had
10 suspected all along, we are going to pay for it.

11 This must be stopped. We need to
12 follow the precedent recently set in our neighboring
13 states that have shut down pipeline projects as
14 being against the best interest of the state. The
15 Constitution Pipeline in New York and the Kinder
16 Morgan Pipeline in Massachusetts and New Hampshire.
17 Paraphrasing Roger downs of the Sierra Club's
18 Atlantic Chapter from a recent New York Times
19 article, "We need to put the protection of our water
20 and climate before flawed energy projects that do
21 not serve the public interest."

22 I and many others in our community
23 implore you to follow the precedent of the New York
24 environmental regulators and reject this permit on
25 the grounds that it does not meet the standards

1 needed to protect our citizens and natural
2 environment. Thank you.

3 MS. PFLUGH: Ronnie Wassall?

4 A VOICE: I believe he left.

5 MS. PFLUGH: Steve Benowitz? Steve
6 Benowitz? Okay, the next three people are Katherine
7 Marlin, Tim Serpico, and Vincent Carabin.

8 MS. MARLIN: Hello, my name is
9 Katherine, K-a-t-h-e-r-i-n-e, and Marlin, like the
10 fish, M-a-r-l-i-n. I live at 31 Bordentown
11 Chesterfield Road in Chesterfield. This is a
12 blown-up picture of the proposed site, and our home
13 is right here. It looks like a little black dot.
14 It's pretty hard to see, and here is my neighbor
15 Glenn's house right here. He spoke a little
16 earlier.

17 This whole project has been a
18 nightmare, and this is our only opportunity to speak
19 openly to someone who hopefully is truly listening
20 and with all due respect just not trying to check a
21 box. So thank you very much for allowing us to
22 speak tonight. I appreciate it.

23 As mentioned, our home is across the
24 street from the proposed site that could potentially
25 be dewatered should this move forward, and property

1 line to property line is less than 50 feet. Our
2 well and septic system are only a couple of hundred
3 feet from the site, an eighth of a mile according to
4 page 45 in the application document. However, on
5 page 44, it states there aren't any wells within a
6 quarter mile of the site. Obviously that statement
7 is incorrect. And that's just one example of
8 contradicting statements in the application, because
9 tonight apparently there are 21 wells within a
10 quarter mile. So how many more contradiction
11 statements are noted in the application?

12 Dewatering is, in general is
13 concerning. It is very alarming and they are
14 requesting to remove at least 70, that's 7-0 million
15 gallons of water. However, I learned tonight that
16 that's also inconsistent. So it is very alarming.
17 What will the impacts be to our home? To our water?
18 To our septic? To our neighbors' homes? Wells?
19 Septics? And our community's aquifer as a whole?
20 Especially in the case we have a drought. I'm very
21 afraid we will not have water.

22 If this permit does get approved, I
23 am formally requesting the state protect us and
24 demand Transco Williams to test our water before and
25 after the dewatering occurs. I know our water has

1 not been tested yet. Has the aquifer been tested?
2 What happens in the scenario our well does dry up
3 and our water is contaminated? Who is responsible?
4 Who is to pay to fix this and what are we supposed
5 to do? What is the so-called contingency plan that
6 was mentioned tonight?

7 We have a stream that runs through
8 our yard. That stream is the home to a very wide
9 variety of fish and wildlife. What will be the
10 impact if that stream is dry? What will happen to
11 the wildlife that depend on that water source for
12 life? Our home and address are specifically noted
13 in various areas of this application. Dewatering is
14 a possible threat to homes and water systems in the
15 area. If we are pointed out, we must be at a higher
16 risk. If there were no risk, we wouldn't be here.
17 The compressor station project, including and
18 beginning with dewatering and through its future
19 operation, is not in the public's interest. I
20 assure you this is true, because we are the public
21 and we are not interested.

22 So I urge you to please, please deny
23 this permit. Thank you, and thank you everyone for
24 coming.

25 MS. PFLUGH: Tim Serpico.

1 MR. SERPICO: I filled out the wrong
2 card. I'm sorry.

3 MS. PFLUGH: Vincent Carabin. I'm
4 going to call three people up. Jarrett Elsea, Dan
5 Caruso, and Belinda Blazic. Go ahead.

6 MR. CARABIN: It's Vincent Carabin,
7 C-a-r-a-b-i-n. A lot has been said tonight about
8 not expected to and I think that gentleman there
9 John was saying not expected to, not expected to do
10 this or that. Well, I want to give you a little
11 history lesson. Williams, the parent company of
12 Transco, back in 2003 they paid \$20 million to
13 settle claims of reported false data to manipulate
14 the natural gas market in the U.S. They also
15 settled with California for \$900 million. To me
16 that's, you know, that's a lot of money. Then they
17 agreed to pay 290 to settle a class action lawsuit.
18 Okay, so that's the part I call thievery, when you
19 start fixing prices, that's stealing where I come
20 from.

21 Let's go a little further. 2009,
22 they were fined a million for failure to monitor
23 corrosion adequately with the Virginia pipeline
24 explosion in 2008. Transco didn't report a leak for
25 four days. Okay? Then they had one in 2010, 2011.

1 They were fined 275,000 over failing to implement or
2 maintain storm water measures to prevent potential
3 pollutants during plant construction. That was in
4 Colorado. State inspectors notified Williams of the
5 violations and told them to take immediate action.
6 According to the report, Williams didn't do anything
7 about it for seven months. Then they were fined
8 again for failure to conduct their own annual
9 inspections.

10 Then they had one in 2012 in
11 Pennsylvania. They restarted -- they had an
12 explosion at a compressor station. This is the
13 company that doesn't have any explosions, by the
14 way. Within 24 hours they started pumping frack
15 gas, despite a request from the Pennsylvania
16 Department of Environmental Protection not to do so.
17 DEP states they make it very clear, but because it
18 was not an official order, no fines were issued.
19 One ton of methane released.

20 Okay, let's go a little further.
21 2013, in Colorado, groundwater is contaminated with
22 benzene. Benzene is cancer-causing and breaks down
23 bone marrow. 2013, William Transco rejects U.S.
24 Army Corps of Engineers safety recommendations in
25 connection with a proposed Rockaway lateral natural

1 gas pipeline, claiming the requirements were a
2 needlessly delay the project and would force cost
3 overruns, God forbid.

4 Then they had one, this is most -- I
5 see the caution light, they had one down in June and
6 this was in Louisiana, they had an explosion. This
7 was \$350 million expansion, 700 contract workers
8 were present, two people killed, ages 29 and 47. 70
9 injuries, 62,000 pounds of toxic chemical released,
10 okay?

11 So my question is, what the hell are
12 we doing here? What are we doing here? Are we
13 serious that we even deal with people like this?
14 They steal. They lie. What am I missing? Is there
15 something that I'm not getting?

16 MR. ELSEA: J-a-r-r-e-t-t E-l-s-e-a.
17 I live on 94 Hunters Way, and I'm a hydrogeologist,
18 and yesterday my wife and kids asked me to look into
19 the dewatering permit, so I tried. I called Andy
20 MacDonald at the DEP and asked for the draft, DEP's
21 draft permit and the applicants application, and I
22 noticed a few things that were concerning, first of
23 which the BWA 002 submitted in December was on an
24 outdated form. Your form was revised in November of
25 2015. They submitted first in December of 2015 the

1 wrong form, the out of date form. New form requires
2 a pdf to be submitted and other -- not much
3 difference in technical information, but some. They
4 administratively they used the wrong form. You
5 should probably for that reason alone extend this
6 period of public comment.

7 And as a result of that, the pdf I
8 received was from the DEP's, which limited services.
9 They scan the hard copy and most of the figures you
10 can't read, because they are blacked out, and the
11 tables aren't legible because you can't see the
12 whole thing, so Andy told me this is the same
13 document sent to my township and their experts, and
14 how are we going to do a complete review if they
15 can't even read the report? There are a whole list
16 of things that are unacceptable. That's
17 administratively.

18 Technically under your own rules and
19 requirements and technical guidance, one, the
20 hydrogeology report is incomplete, inadequate under
21 your own standards. TP 12-2 wasn't, I mean if you
22 had a pre ap meeting and told him the aquifer
23 testing wasn't required, you shouldn't have. And I
24 see that their dewatering counts are on brain size
25 analysis many of your own guidances you don't even

1 accept, so I could make a calculation with the same
2 parameters they put in their report and have a much
3 larger zone of influence. They just said it wasn't
4 going off-site.

5 What I could see in the figures, you
6 got 36 areas, a lot of them near the boundary of
7 your site, your wetlands. They did the spreadsheets
8 with just one at a time, one excavation at a time.
9 We know they are not -- you are not going to dewater
10 one at a time, and you are going to have combined
11 effects and you are going to have a much larger zone
12 of influence, so they -- it's an inadequate report
13 by your own standards. It's the wrong form.

14 And I'm going to submit some comments
15 but I respectfully request that you meet with me.
16 I'd like to see at the very least before next week
17 it's end of this comment, the actual report, not a
18 blacked-out version, so I can make a more complete
19 review, and I think you should really consider doing
20 a more complete review too. Seems like you are
21 ready to pass, you have the application, package,
22 you are ready to green light this thing, but I think
23 you really need to reconsider, and I'd like to have
24 some, I request a meeting with you guys before next
25 week.

1 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you.

2 MR. WASSALL: My name is Ron Wassall.

3 MS. PFLUGH: Sir, you have to sign
4 in.

5 THE WITNESS: I was called but wasn't
6 in the area. I had to go to my mother. She's 82
7 years old. Sorry had to leave.

8 MS. PFLUGH: What is your name?

9 MR. WASSALL: Ron Wassall,
10 W-a-s-s-a-l-l.

11 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you.

12 MR. WASSALL: I've been a long-time
13 resident here in Chesterfield Township for over 50
14 years. I have an 18-foot irrigation pond. My first
15 well from this agency put in their development in
16 here, is 1,277 feet from this company putting this
17 in. I measured it this morning. My well is 22 feet
18 deep, and I'm taking water from 18 feet. If this is
19 not going to affect my water table for my living in
20 this home, who's going to protect me from you
21 (sic)?

22 I'm here. I'm taking care of two
23 handicapped women in my house right now. My mother
24 is 82, blind and handicapped, can't walk. The
25 police have been there. Thank you for the police

1 squad we have in the township. I'm here asking for
2 help from yous (sic).

3 This cannot happen. This is going to
4 take my lake that I have in the back with my aquatic
5 life and I have two wells on my property, and I am a
6 farmer here, and I do drip irrigation, and I brought
7 the proof tonight, but I'm not going to present it
8 to you. Thank you.

9 MS. PFLUGH: Dan Caruso? Dan Caruso?
10 Is he here?

11 MR. CARUSO: Good evening, Dan
12 Caruso, 201 Province Line Road. I'm mistakenly
13 filled out the card, but I'll speak anyway. I'm a
14 professional engineer by trade, by profession, and
15 I've dealt with the DEP on numerous projects,
16 wetlands, stream encroachment, and I've had some
17 projects of parking lots next to a stream where they
18 want to put a little bit of asphalt instead of
19 gravel. It's taken them three, four years to get
20 approvals for that type of a project.

21 I will say on this, I will say as
22 another department of the DEP, I looked at this
23 project, it's taken, five, seven years to get their
24 approvals. So I hope that you've really looked at
25 the data that's been submitted and make the right

1 choice. A lot of lives depend on it. Thank you.

2 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you. Belinda
3 Blazic. Patty Cronheim, Carol Cann and Nicole
4 Bencivengo.

5 MS. BLAZIC: My name is Belinda
6 Blazic, B-l-a-z-i-c. I live at 228 Bordentown
7 Chesterfield Road. Our home is located
8 one-and-a-half miles from the project site. We rely
9 solely on well water, so I'm extremely concerned
10 about the impacts that the proposed diversion will
11 have on our water resources.

12 The original application submitted by
13 the applicant for this project stated no wells
14 existed within a half mile from the water diversion
15 site. Subsequently an addendum was submitted by the
16 applicant and received by the DEP on February 3,
17 2016 identifying 20 private wells, not 21. Table 8
18 of the resubmission references eight wells within a
19 quarter mile. That's Exhibit A.

20 When, in fact, members of the People
21 Over Pipelines canvassed the area using addresses
22 from the applicant's addendum as a guide to
23 determine the properties within a half mile range
24 from the site, they had identified 35 residential
25 private wells within a half mile of the project

1 site.

2 Exhibit B, which I will give you when
3 I'm done, it should be noted that the environmental
4 assessment report that was submitted to FERC by
5 Transco dated November 2015 stated on page 17,
6 Exhibit C, "We received comments on potential
7 impacts on residential cisterns, wells and septic
8 systems in the project area. However, no public or
9 private supply wells were identified within 150 feet
10 and up to one mile respectively, of or from any
11 construction area associated with either Station 205
12 or 203. An unoccupied residential home that
13 contains a private well is present at the Station
14 203 property. This home has been acquired by
15 Transco, and the existing well would be abandoned in
16 accordance with NJDEP requirements. No seeps or
17 springs are present at the project area. Therefore,
18 we do not anticipate any significant impacts on
19 cisterns, wells or septic systems in the project
20 areas."

21 So in response to the environmental
22 assessment report, numerous comments were submitted
23 by residents stating that this information is
24 inaccurate and that almost all residents around the
25 construction site and along the gas pipeline route

1 do indeed have wells and septic systems.

2 In response to residents' concerns,
3 Transco addressed the issue by submitting a response
4 to FERC stating that only one well was located
5 within 150 feet.

6 With that being said, I'm concerned
7 that the applicant and professional engineer have
8 not provided accurate and sufficient information to
9 the DEP for review to ensure compliance and
10 accurately address the water resource impacts that
11 could occur from this project.

12 Number one, I would like to know if
13 the applicant conducted an aquifer test to generate
14 sufficient information to allow evaluation of the
15 groundwater diversion's potential impacts. Number
16 two, Transco submitted an application for a 30-day
17 permit to begin this project. Since this permit,
18 1322 will take, could take up to 180 days, was this
19 permit issued? We want to know that.

20 MS. PFLUGH: Ma'am, time.

21 MS. BLAZIC: Okay. Just real quick,
22 there was one thing I really wanted to just mention.
23 I'm also concerned about the wetlands because the
24 diversion site, I have wetlands around my home, and
25 it's my understanding that the wetlands provide

1 valuable water quality protection to retaining and
2 cleansing surface runoff to water bodies. Given
3 that, Transco will be removing up to 7 million
4 gallons of groundwater in a given month, water in
5 the wetlands could be lowered by the loss of
6 groundwater flow to the wetlands. So that's another
7 concern I have.

8 And I'll leave it with the rest of my
9 comments.

10 MS. PFLUGH: Patty?

11 MS. CRONHEIM: Good evening. My name
12 is Patty Cronheim, and I'm with Rethink Energy New
13 Jersey, C-r-o-n-h-e-i-m. And looking at the
14 dewatering permit, we found that based on the
15 significant amount of water proposed to be pumped,
16 that there will be a drawdown on the hydrology of
17 the wetlands and the base flow of surface water
18 present on the site. These impacts will therefore
19 affect regulated resources that include wetlands and
20 surface waters and therefore need to be fully
21 analyzed in order to completely understand the
22 severity of the impacts on regulated resources. The
23 impacts to regulated resources including wetlands
24 and waters are avoidable impacts that should be
25 directly associated with Transco's selection of the

1 site, since it is the presumption of the NJDEP that
2 non-wetland alternatives exist. These impacts, no
3 matter how short the duration, conflict with the
4 Federal 401 Freshwater Protection Act as well as New
5 Jersey's Water Quality Standards. The New Jersey
6 Water Quality Standards set forth the State's
7 obligation to, and I quote, "maintain and enhance
8 the chemical, physical and biological integrity of
9 its waters to protect the public health, to
10 safeguard aquatic biota and protect scenic and
11 ecological values," and the context of this
12 application, the diminishment of flow will not
13 safeguard the aquatic biota of these streams.

14 Since Transco's proposed the second
15 phase, all will be subject to the requirements of a
16 401 Freshwater Wetlands Individual Permit. Any
17 drawdown related impacts must be subject to a
18 detailed alternatives analysis that clearly shows
19 that there are no other alternatives that would have
20 a less diverse impact on the aquatic resource
21 systems or involve a freshwater wetland or state
22 open water.

23 FERC's certificate of public
24 convenience and necessity should not be viewed as
25 being analogous to satisfying the public interest

1 requirement of an individual freshwater wetlands
2 permit. The application for a FERC certificate
3 describes the purpose and commercial need for the
4 project, the transportation rate to be charged to
5 customers, proposed project facilities and how the
6 company will comply with applicable regulatory
7 requirements.

8 In contrast, the Freshwater Wetlands
9 Protection Act at N.J.A.C. 7:7(a)-927.2, standard
10 requirements for all individual permits to find the
11 public interest very, very differently, and includes
12 the public interest in the preservation of natural
13 resources. The impacts associated with this
14 application do not safeguard natural resources.
15 FERC looks at the operational and financial aspects
16 of projects. This has little or no bearing on how
17 pipeline projects actually create cumulative impacts
18 in the real world beyond schematics and
19 spreadsheets.

20 Nature, as we all know, is complex,
21 increasingly unpredictable and interconnected.
22 Nature doesn't recognize artificial constructs that
23 FERC creates, and neither should the DEP.
24 Therefore, we request that the NJDEP withdraw the
25 dewatering permit and that the impacts of the

1 drawdown are included as part of the review of the
2 individual wetlands permit application. We also ask
3 that the DEP hold public hearings for the individual
4 wetland permit that allows robust public input.

5 This drawdown permit cannot be
6 adequately evaluated and should not be approved
7 until your department has completed a thorough and
8 inclusive review of the individual wetlands permit.

9 And I want to end by saying thank
10 you, New Jersey DEP. We have had over the years
11 very strong water laws and we know by simply fully
12 enacting existing New Jersey and federal water
13 regulations the DEP has the tools at its disposal to
14 stop projects like Penn East, the Southern
15 Reliability Link and to stop the Garden State
16 Expansion.

17 MS. PFLUGH: Carol Cann?

18 MS. CANN: Good evening. I hope that
19 on your way in, you were able to take a look at all
20 the beautiful photos on the wall over there behind
21 those gentlemen. If you haven't seen them on your
22 way in, please stop on your way out and take a look.

23 A group of residents have been taking
24 photos of this wildlife and wetlands at the
25 compressor station. They've been accessing the

1 property that Bordentown still owns, which is only a
2 very, very small piece of the full area. And even
3 though it's only a very small piece, abundant
4 wildlife and wildlife habitats have been documented
5 as seen in these photos.

6 We are concerned that the effect on
7 wildlife has not been sufficiently evaluated. For
8 example, the site currently has thriving vernal
9 pools. Many birds, nesting birds, and even a
10 pregnant or nursing fox. And this is only one very,
11 very small piece of the entire property. Our
12 concern is that the DEP is aware of what will be
13 destroyed if this project is approved, and we ask
14 that further wildlife studies be conducted. Thank
15 you. C-a-n-n.

16 MS. PFLUGH: Nicole?

17 MS. BENCIVENGO: Nicole Bencivengo,
18 B-e-n-c-i-v-e-n-g-o. This is my daughter Dorothy.
19 I'm at 5 Bordentown Chesterfield Road. I am one of
20 the wells less than a quarter mile away from the
21 project here. I moved to Chesterfield three years
22 ago. It's a farming town with beautiful landscapes
23 and abundance of wildlife and an amazing school
24 system and a lot of great people. Never had we
25 imagined we would be living a stone's throw away

1 from such a monstrosity. Dewatering may be a
2 temporary process with no adverse effects, but I'm
3 sure these adverse effects of this project will last
4 a lifetime. What do I do if my well and septic
5 can't handle the changes? What are the long-term
6 effects of the contaminants that are going to come
7 along with this project? What will happen to the
8 displaced wildlife? What will happen to the
9 farmers, their crops and their livelihood? What
10 will happen to the water quality? No one can give
11 us a truthful, educated answer. What goes up, must
12 come down, and our soil and water will be affected.
13 How will my neighbors, myself, my family, my friends
14 and my young daughter be affected?

15 Please make the decision to deny this
16 permit and preserve the integrity of Chesterfield
17 and Bordentown Township.

18 MS. PFLUGH: Next three speakers are
19 Thomas Galpion, Lena Smith, and I think this is Lily
20 or Lila Haller.

21 MR. GALPION: Thomas Galpion,
22 G-a-l-p-i-o-n. I reside at 606
23 Chesterfield-Arneytown Road, Chesterfield, New
24 Jersey. I resided my whole life in the State of New
25 Jersey. I stand before you gravely concerned about

1 the dewatering process associated with the
2 compressor station and the detrimental effects it
3 may impose on my only source of drinking water, my
4 private well. I wasn't sure how to address this
5 issue in this or any other forum. As far as the
6 water I'm drinking, I found myself reading things
7 such as the aquifer conditions and the presence of
8 any aquitards and aquicludes have a critical effect,
9 for example if the aquifer is highly transmissive,
10 then the distance of influence of pumping will be
11 large, and there is a potential for drawdown of
12 groundwater levels to occur at great distances from
13 the dewatering system, great distances, or if a
14 multiple aquifer system is be dewatered, presence of
15 aquicludes between the aquifers may restrict the
16 transmission of drawdown impacts of one aquifer to
17 another.

18 Where dewatering pumping is carried
19 out in an aquifer, water supply by third parties,
20 for example, for drinking water or for industrial
21 water use, there can be negative water resources
22 from the aquifer. These types of impacts are most
23 commonly concerned where the dewatering system is to
24 pump high flow rates for extended periods of time
25 several months or longer. In that case, the

1 sustained dewatering pumping may have a potential to
2 lower regional groundwater levels in the aquifer and
3 reduce the water resources available to the
4 third-party abstractors. This may be apparent in
5 the short-term in the form of lowered water levels
6 and water supply wells and corresponding the reduced
7 yields.

8 Well, the thing about it is, the more
9 I read, the more concerned I became not only because
10 what I read upset me, but I realized that I could
11 not present a logical argument due to my lack of
12 understanding of all of the technical and
13 engineering issues for which I profess ignorance,
14 and I am gravely concerned because the dewatering
15 project is adjacent to the New Jersey Turnpike, and
16 that happens to be one of the busiest highway
17 corridors in the nation, and when those cars go up
18 and down that highway, the spillage from the
19 benzene, from the gasoline, the collective come off
20 the Turnpike in that area and accumulate. So when
21 you start dewatering, what happens is you create a
22 vacuum. It pulls water from along others areas in
23 that vacuum, so now we are pulling more pollutants,
24 and the question's been raised, where is it all
25 going? I'm just, I'm concerned about the vehicle

1 pollution that's washed into that area and how that
2 water would be disturbed and redistributed.

3 Many of my neighbors and friends and
4 farmers depends on wells, and I have neither seen or
5 heard of mention to establish test wells from the
6 furthest supply point nor the mention of
7 establishing a baseline water test throughout the
8 project area. Subsurface cavitation, soil
9 displacement, contamination aquifers, I quickly
10 realize I am in over my head.

11 I ask myself am I'm going to trust
12 it? Who is best suited to represent me? Shouldn't
13 it be the New Jersey Department of Environmental
14 Protection? So I looked to your website and it
15 appears that the water monitoring and standards are
16 the primary responsibility of closely monitoring
17 this state's fresh, marine and ground waters -- and
18 I see the red light. I'm going to jump ahead.

19 I think this project needs to be
20 taken in its entirety, because if you just look at
21 the compressor station, I'm going to ask the
22 question. When you get down to 539 where the Bomark
23 site was, how are you going to go through that
24 plutonium-contaminated land? That land is full of
25 plutonium, and as a fact, as a law enforcement

1 officer for the Joint Base, I sat in many meetings
2 when the Bomark site was being depleted, and I
3 suggested that they dig a trench so you can't go in
4 there and steal and reclaim the metal, which they
5 were doing. The engineers opposed that, because
6 they said they don't want to disturb the groundwater
7 and plutonium flowing through that and there are
8 wells in there now.

9 How are we going to get to this
10 point, people? You need to stop it now. I'm going
11 give you this letter. I appreciate the time.

12 MS. SMITH: L-e-n-a S-m-i-t-h. It's
13 a hard one. New Jersey Natural Gas has not showed
14 need for the project, and since the compressor is
15 being built to supply gas to New Jersey Natural Gas,
16 the compressor station is unneeded. Water is a
17 public good and should remain in the public trust.

18 Oh, I should say I work for an
19 organization called Food and Water Watch, and we
20 work to protect our water and keep it publicly owned
21 and controlled. So water being a public good and
22 remaining in the public trust, it shouldn't be
23 allowed to be controlled and diverted by an
24 out-of-state corporation.

25 The compressor station and pipeline

1 are not in the public's interest, and the proposed
2 dewatering is not in the public's interest. The
3 Garden State Expansion Project, if constructed, will
4 inflict severe, irreparable harm on New Jersey fish,
5 wildlife, wetlands and hydrologic patterns. The
6 compressor station will require cutting down forests
7 and critical wetland habitat, robbing us of the many
8 benefits they provide. Groundwater flows will be
9 diminished and altered in ways that harm streams,
10 wetlands and potential drinking water supply.

11 The Garden State Expansion Project
12 will cause and contribute to violations of state
13 water quality standards and degradation of ground
14 and surface water. The compressor station will
15 damage property values, businesses of all kinds and
16 will subject this community to the risks of the air
17 pollution from blow downs. The dewatering for the
18 construction of the proposed Transco compressor
19 station will have significant effects on the
20 wetlands. The project may have adverse impacts on
21 ground water, agriculture, wells, residential wells,
22 surface water flows, wetlands and aquatic life. The
23 project may have adverse impacts on its users, and
24 it's not in the public interest.

25 The proposed project fails to address

1 the significant water resource impact that could
2 occur from this project. It has failed to provide
3 sufficient information to demonstrate compliance
4 with New Jersey State Water Quality Standards. The
5 dewatering for the compressor Transco station will
6 have significant effects on the wetlands.

7 The DEP should withdraw the
8 dewatering permit until the wetlands issues are
9 addressed and hold public hearing on wetlands
10 permits. The DEP should not consider issuing the
11 State Freshwater Wetlands Permit in lieu of the
12 requirement under the Clean Water Act for a 401
13 Water Quality Certificate and should deny the 401
14 Water Quality Certificate.

15 The project is not in the public's
16 interest and the threats that it poses to our water,
17 air, health, safety, environment and quality of life
18 must be taken into consideration. This project is
19 being proposed solely for corporate gain. We cannot
20 allow for our water, which is supposed to be held in
21 the public trust, to be managed by a private
22 out-of-state corporation. Thank you.

23 MS. PFLUGH: Lee Heller, and after
24 you it would be Jacqueline Halaw.

25 MR. HELLER: Lee Heller, and I am

1 from Germany. I have lived on 55 Bordentown
2 Chesterfield Road and I don't really, I don't think
3 it's safe. We should look at a new situation. Why
4 we don't look at a solar power or something like
5 that? That's more free, right? The sunshine from
6 Europe, we don't have much sunshine. Here in
7 America, we got a lot of sunshine. I got solar
8 lights outside my house. They work beautiful. They
9 are getting better every day. That's what I
10 suggest. Get rid of the pipeline, go with solar.
11 Thank you.

12 MS. PELUGH: Jacqueline Halaw, and
13 after Jacqueline it will be Jean Kovath, Linda Frese
14 and Fairfax Hatter.

15 MS. HALAW: My name is Jacqueline
16 Halaw, H-a-l-a-w. I'm a concerned resident from
17 Chesterfield. I'm also -- I was previously employed
18 as a geologist, and my comments are concerning New
19 Jersey Administrative Code 7:19 2-3 Sections D,
20 Section G2. The technical report submitted by the
21 applicant specifically Section 4.0 completely failed
22 to discuss the impacts of disturbing the
23 acid-producing Woodbury formation on the water
24 resource and other users of the water resource.
25 This is a severe lack of due diligence. Therefore,

1 I'm imploring that you deny this permit. Many of
2 the proposed dewatering locations, including the box
3 excavations at Sites 11, 12, 15 and several trench
4 excavations penetrate through the Pennsauken
5 formation referenced as Stratum 1 and into the
6 Woodbury formation referenced as Stratum 2.

7 The Woodbury formation is a
8 well-known acid-producing deposit in New Jersey. It
9 consists of gray clay with finely dispersed pyrite
10 or iron sulfide. In an undisturbed state, the
11 Woodbury formation is benign. However, if the soil
12 is drained and excavated and exposed to air, as this
13 dewatering and construction proposal intends, the
14 iron sulfides reacts with oxygen to form sulfuric
15 acid.

16 The release of this sulfuric acid
17 from the soil can, in turn, release iron, aluminum
18 and other heavy metals like arsenic within the soil.
19 Once mobilized, the acid and metals can create a
20 variety of negative impacts, including altering
21 natural communities, killing vegetation, impacting
22 water quality, compromising wetland ecology,
23 reducing agricultural productivity due to
24 metal-contaminated soils, thwarting the ability of
25 homeowners to establish lawns and other vegetation

1 and degrading concrete and steel structures that are
2 being built on the site.

3 The technical report submitted by the
4 applicant completely failed to address the impacts
5 of disturbing the Woodbury formation deposit nor did
6 it include any proposed dewatering mitigation plans
7 for the acid-forming soils found in the site. The
8 application did not address how they planned to
9 control surface or groundwater that will mix with
10 the acid-producing formation. The proposal for the
11 dewatering is neither just nor equitable to other
12 users of the water resource, specifically residents
13 farmers and wildlife, because there are adverse
14 impacts to the quality of surface water, groundwater
15 and the agricultural water supply. The surrounding
16 land and receding waters will be negatively impacted
17 by the acid leaching.

18 The lack of any mention in this
19 application is a severe lack of due diligence.
20 Therefore, again, imploring that you deny this
21 permit.

22 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you. Jean Kovath?

23 MS. KOVATH: My name is Jean Kovath,
24 K-o-v-a-t-h. My -- I live on the proposed route of
25 the SRL, and one of my main concerns after safety in

1 general is the impact this project will have on the
2 water supply of this entire, area. The Pinelands
3 and on my private well.

4 Under NJDEP Rule 7:19-2.3(d), which
5 we've heard much of, in order for this permit to be
6 approved, Transco must show that they have
7 considered the effects of the project on other,
8 quote, other users of the water source. That means
9 all of us, which includes all users of the aquifer
10 disturbed by the dewatering. How has Transco proved
11 to this body and to us that the dewatering
12 surrounding the compressor station will not affect
13 our aquifer?

14 Number one, has compelling scientific
15 evidence been provided to you that guarantees this
16 dewatering and relocation of millions of gallons of
17 water from the wetlands in Chesterfield will have no
18 adverse impact on the aquifer that provide the sole
19 water source for hundreds of homes?

20 Two, do you have absolute proof that
21 both the extraction and relocation of the water will
22 not change the ecosystem that helps to purify our
23 waters?

24 Number three, have the soils both
25 surrounding the compressor station and the soils of

1 the lands to be flooded been thoroughly tested for
2 all contaminants in order to guarantee dangerous
3 chemicals will not be released into our water
4 supply?

5 Have the wells within -- I have 35
6 wells. I mean that number's been 13. It changed
7 all night long from none to 20 to now 35 wells,
8 within the quarter mile radius of the dewatering
9 activity been pre-tested? Do you know whether, what
10 you are dealing with now to begin with?

11 Has Transco indicated where the water
12 will be moved to and how it will impact those lands?
13 And has Transco given sufficient study to the
14 potential effects of the wells and septic systems
15 within the quarter mile from the dewatering and
16 relocation activity?

17 And finally, how did Transco
18 determine where the water table will be on those
19 wetlands for the duration of the dewatering when our
20 soils are so affected by the weather? Did you
21 perform an annual analysis of water table conditions
22 for both the dewatering site and the receiving site?

23 In consideration this permit, New
24 Jersey DEP must consider the cumulative effects of
25 both the dewatering and the construction of the

1 Southern Reliability Link, which is only possible if
2 the compressor station is built. The SRL is a
3 30-mile high pressure transmission gas line that
4 will be constructed along sensitive wetlands across
5 many streams and creeks adjacent to preserved farms
6 that provide -- I see the yellow light is on. I'm
7 going to jump ahead.

8 What I want to know, I want to point
9 out is there's no easy fixes for ruining the water
10 supply in our area. There's no public water source
11 that we can get. There's no water available to us.
12 We could only use private wells. I believe the DEP
13 is responsible for the health and safety of our
14 environment. Right now our wetlands and streams and
15 private wells need your protection.

16 Has Transco and NJNG provided, proved
17 that there will be no negative impacts to the waters
18 of New Jersey? No negative impact to the existing
19 wildlife living in the wetlands surrounding the
20 compressor station? How are they protecting us?
21 What is the threshold of disruption?

22 I just have one more 10 cents. This
23 past several weeks, New York, New Hampshire,
24 Massachusetts and Kentucky have stopped major
25 natural gas infrastructure projects, including

1 compressor stations and transmission pipelines that
2 are being built in their states. All natural gas
3 infrastructure proposals have the same stated
4 purpose, reliability and resiliency. The four
5 states mentioned have determined the health and
6 safety risks of these projects are greater than the
7 need for reliability and resiliency. We ask that
8 New Jersey do the same.

9 MS. PFLUGH: Thank you, ma'am. Linda
10 Frese.

11 MS. FRESE: Hi, Linda Frese,
12 F-r-e-s-e. I'm -- I'm a Chesterfield Township
13 resident, and I wanted to say I do agree with all
14 the previous testimony. The New Jersey Turnpike
15 construction has already permanently lowered the
16 groundwater table during their six to nine widening
17 project. And there's already been acres of
18 woodlands adjacent to the project in this area that
19 has been clear cut due to the Trenton Woodbury
20 Expansion Project. So I hope you take that into
21 consideration as well.

22 The groundwater is already said to be
23 contaminated and we had to pay for the extra feet of
24 drilling to reach the deeper aquifer for our well.
25 When the second water table or aquifer, whatever

1 it's referred to, when that becomes polluted due to
2 the activities of the Turnpike, the compressor
3 station and the pipelines, who will provide the
4 residents of Chesterfield Township, Bordentown
5 Township and all the other residents that use this
6 aquifer an adequate supply of water for our children
7 and for our grandchildren and future New Jersey
8 residents?

9 And of the 21 or however many there
10 is wells within the quarter mile, did they include
11 11 Bordentown Chesterfield Road? Because we've
12 always been omitted from the -- as an existing
13 residence for both the Turnpike Widening Project and
14 the Transco Trenton Woodbury Expansion. Our
15 residence just didn't exist, so we were never
16 included as a residence, and so we are probably not
17 included as a well in that, in this plan.

18 Also the Turnpike Authority, this
19 project is directly adjacent to the New Jersey
20 Turnpike. The Turnpike Authority still has not
21 corrected the runoff and drainage issues from the
22 Route 528 road relocation for the widening project,
23 so how can we expect Transco and New Jersey Natural
24 Gas to comply with DEP requirements for restoring
25 the surrounding properties? Were all the wells that

1 were located at the dozen or so residences that were
2 acquired by the New Jersey Turnpike which were
3 subsequently sold to Transco, were all those wells
4 sealed properly? And one of these abandoned wells
5 is already on the existing property in this project.

6 Is the DEP taking into consideration
7 both projects combined? Because the Garden State
8 Expansion and the SRL are both one project. And
9 this entire project location, are they including the
10 substation, electrical substation? Because that is
11 all one and the same project.

12 MS. DELUGH: Thank you. Fairfax
13 Hutter?

14 MS. HUTTER: Hello, Fairfax Hutter of
15 Lawrenceville, New Jersey. I first of all want to
16 second the comments of Patty Cronheim and others
17 with respect to avoidance and following the
18 regulations of the like. There have been very many
19 good comments made.

20 I just wanted to say that I feel
21 strongly that the overall process needs to change.
22 This isn't necessarily DEP's process, but the whole
23 FERC process and pipeline process. These companies
24 pursue a divide and concur strategy, so it's
25 premature to look at each project in a vacuum before

1 all the data is in and is correct and to look at
2 projects out of order. It is time to look at these
3 projects as a whole.

4 We know the Garden State Expansion
5 links Southern Reliability Link and Penn East. We
6 know New Jersey Natural Gas has been at the Penn
7 East helm from the very beginning. You should not
8 be approving any projects and saddling citizens with
9 the costs until you know whether the source is
10 justified and viable.

11 The Penn East start is one of its
12 most problematic elements. It cannot go under the
13 Susquehanna River where it -- near where it starts,
14 because the Wyoming Valley is a honeycomb of
15 abandoned coal mines that are now flooded with acid
16 mine drainage. Penn East now proposes to open
17 trench and dam half the mighty Susquehanna.

18 FERC and all these other projects
19 should be looking about the ability to even get this
20 underway without committing people and communities
21 downstream to all the consequences. Penn East has
22 provided no geologic tests in 20 months showing that
23 they can do this safely without puncturing the roof
24 of the mines, and the Susquehanna did break in in
25 1959, drowning 12 minors, and also proving that they

1 will not be releasing acid mine drainage into the
2 Susquehanna, whose ultimate destination is the
3 Chesapeake Bay, or releasing PCBs, which we know are
4 in the Susquehanna from the upstream nearby
5 Lackawanna.

6 So, and people saw the consequences
7 in Colorado last summer when the Animus Mine
8 drainage got, when the gold mine, the mine polluted
9 the Animus River and turned it orange. We have
10 certain kind of consequences like that that really
11 need to be determined before any of the ensuing and
12 connected projects are considered, examined and
13 approved.

14 So please do not put the compressor
15 before the pipes. Thank you very much.

16 MS. PFLUGH: The next three people,
17 Sam Cansaro, I'm going to spell the next person's
18 name, S-r-i-n-i-v-a-s K-o-t-a-m-r-a-j-v. And Jerome
19 Barnoski. Those three speakers, please, starting
20 with Sam. Is Sam here? Is Sam Cansaro here? Is
21 S-r-i-n-i-v-a-s K-o-t-a-m-r-a-j-v here? Jerome
22 Barnoski? Is Jerome here? No? Denise Garner. Is
23 Denise Garner here? Is Virginia Monson here?

24 MR. MONSON: Her surrogate.

25 MS. PFLUGH: Followed by Rachel Leoni

1 and Andrea Monet.

2 MR. MONSON: Are you ready?

3 MS. PFLUGH: Your name?

4 MR. MONSON: I am Stephen Monson,
5 M-o-n-s-o-n, Steven with a P-H. I'm appearing for
6 my wife Virginia. We live in the Bordentown on
7 Winding Brook Road.

8 By way of background, we lived near
9 the Edison explosion site in the mid '80s.
10 Fortunately, nobody was killed that day, because
11 they were all at work. But had it happened at
12 night, the death toll would have been astronomical,
13 but you also have to take into consideration that
14 the blast zone, and that was just from the pipeline,
15 which is not a 30-inch pipeline, went out at least a
16 mile. People's windows were shattered, there was
17 substantial damage.

18 This compressor station has, well,
19 they call it a blast zone, but perhaps you ought to
20 realize it's a death zone, a kill zone, because of
21 the amount of gas and pressure that will be flowing
22 through it. And when it goes, not if, when it goes,
23 as it's been shown here tonight, the Turnpike will
24 be destroyed. Well over several thousand homes will
25 be destroyed along with the people in them, and

1 there will be a major disruption throughout the New
2 Jersey corridor.

3 Now, how is this relating to water?

4 Well, it's very nice that you all decided you would
5 have this public hearing on dewatering, segmenting.
6 Well, we all understand the sham that you are trying
7 to put over on us and Transco Williams is trying to
8 put over on us. And you have been very politely
9 sitting there stone faced. The impression we all
10 have is your mind's made up. Don't confuse us with
11 the facts.

12 Let's face it. This whole project
13 will destroy this area. Without water, water is the
14 basis of this planet. You want to mess with the
15 water, which is your responsibility, yours, and
16 yours alone, you want to mess with the water, you
17 are messing with everybody and everything. You
18 poison the water, people can't live. You poison the
19 water, no food. You poison the water, no wildlife,
20 no fish, no nothing. So you have to take cognizance
21 of that. If you are not, then you are doing
22 something seriously wrong.

23 Finally, don't forget, that there are
24 lands that have been purchased with money provided,
25 by the way, by your entity. Because our

1 constitution has been a -- excuse me, amended
2 several times to allow for wetlands to be set aside,
3 so now you are going to take the money that you set
4 aside to buy wetlands, what are you going to do?
5 You are just going to give it away? Not right.
6 That's probably unconstitutional. I hope
7 Mr. Harrison will bring that up in the lawsuit.

8 Thank you very much.

9 MS. PFLUGH: Rachel Leoni.

10 A VOICE: She left.

11 MS. PFLUGH: Andrea Boinett? And
12 after Andrea, it's Dawn Sheridan, Lorrie Thier and
13 Harris Bharsa. I apologize. Go ahead.

14 MS. BOINETT: Andrea Boinett,
15 A-n-d-r-e-a B-o-i-n-e-t-t. I would like to comment
16 that this project, this compressor station should
17 certainly not be built or approved based on the
18 misplaced confidence that the Penn East Pipeline is
19 a going entity. As sure as God made little green
20 apples, Penn East is not going to happen. It's
21 already been opposed by thousands. New Jersey
22 already has 43 percent more natural gas than it
23 needs, according to the studies I have seen.

24 Secondly, I would like to talk about
25 a credibility. We start with FERC which we have a

1 great deal of experience with in Hunterdon County.
2 They have never refused a pipeline, to the best of
3 my knowledge, and the group that they hired to do
4 their environmental impact statement, which I
5 realized is different from an environmental
6 assessment is called Tetra Tech. Tetra Tech is a
7 member of the Marcellus Shale Coalition, so they are
8 all gas people. What do you think they are going to
9 say? Of course there is no problem anywhere.

10 Then we have Transco's credibility.
11 I don't know if any of you were at the hearing at
12 Montgomery Township a couple of months ago. Transco
13 got permission to do a lot of stream drilling under
14 streams in the Princeton Ridge, and then they
15 discovered that after they started the project, the
16 Princeton Ridge has solid Diabase granite under it,
17 and their drills didn't work, so now they've already
18 started, made this horrendous mess, which I will be
19 happy to give anybody a tour of if you would like,
20 and now they come before DEP and saying oh, please,
21 please, let us cross the streams, just cross the
22 streams, you know. What difference does it make?
23 We already started.

24 And the other thing that Transco does
25 as it does Penn East is they have these weasel words

1 which George Orwell referred to as good speak, like
2 "not expected to." "Minimize" is one of their
3 favorites. "Mitigate" is another one and
4 "contingency plan." I would like to encourage
5 everyone in this room to be aware of how slimy every
6 one of these people are, and you cannot believe a
7 single thing.

8 MS. SHERIDAN: Good evening, Dawn
9 Sheridan, S-h-e-r-i-d-a-n. I'm a resident of
10 Chesterfield. As a mother I think I speak on behalf
11 of -- I'm a single mother, so I also speak as a
12 father. I think on behalf of mothers and fathers,
13 grandmothers and grandfathers, when we have
14 children, we do everything we can to protect them
15 and protect our family. At the end of the day I
16 look in the mirror and I ask myself, have I done
17 everything I can to protect my child and done what's
18 right? Will you be able to, after you rubber stamp
19 this, like every other government agency has done,
20 look in the mirror and say that?

21 The real, the reality of the fact is
22 you don't live here and neither does Transco. The
23 reality is they are not going to tell you -- they
24 are only going to tell you what they want to. They
25 have lied. They don't tell you about blow downs.

1 They sent children in Roseland, New Jersey, I spoke
2 to the mayor, to the hospital from the fumes.
3 That's something no parent wants to know. When a
4 person calls you and says your child's in the
5 hospital, panic sets in. We rush out of our jobs to
6 go make sure our child is okay.

7 At the end of the day I don't want to
8 go to work and wonder if my house is still standing.
9 We have been referred to as the armpit state of the
10 world. We are about to succumb to corporate greed
11 and be known as the pipeline state of the world, and
12 that's not a situation I want to be a part of.

13 Everyone said to me why are you
14 moving back to Chesterfield? There's nothing there.
15 That's exactly what I like. It's a close-knit
16 community, and we help each other out. When I
17 didn't live there, everyone looked out for my
18 grandmother, and they still do.

19 As a mother, I'm going to protect my
20 child at all costs, and one thing I've always told
21 my son is you are going to get in trouble if you lie
22 but you are in more trouble if you keep lying. Why
23 don't you make Transco be held accountable and
24 try -- about how deceptive they are? I mean, we
25 don't stand for this from our kids, and if you are

1 parents I'm sure your kids, you wouldn't stand for
2 them lying. Then why are you allowing them to
3 boldface lie to you, especially under oath?

4 MS. PFLUGH: Lorrie Thier?

5 MS. THIER: Lorrie Thier, 153
6 Chesterfield Crosswicks Road, L-o-r-r-i-e T-h-i-e-r.
7 My address should actually be very familiar to the
8 DEP, because about ten years ago, we were
9 experiencing a lot of growth in this town, and we
10 wanted to try to not spend as much for a big
11 beautiful school and be able to build on the lot
12 where the old school was, but the DEP came in and
13 protecting the environment and protecting our water,
14 did not allow for water or sewer to run down my
15 road. I have sewer. I have a well, and I am really
16 close to where this pipeline is going to be going.
17 I have three children. I have animals, I have, am
18 surrounded by wetlands. I can't do anything on my
19 property, because of the wetlands.

20 I don't understand how as a taxpayer,
21 I can't do anything with my property, but these
22 people come in here and are able to destroy our
23 lives, especially when it has been proven at every
24 meeting. Every time I come to a meeting, they have
25 different information. They don't even correct the

1 information. We spoon-feed them their deceptions
2 and they don't go back and correct it. They don't
3 go back and say wait a minute, there are this many
4 wells. They still don't get accurate information,
5 but we are allowing them to take over the lives of
6 so many people and, you know, I don't understand
7 why.

8 So I'm hoping that you guys will not
9 rubber stamp this, will not give this the green
10 light until they start providing accurate
11 information that you can analyze and make sure that
12 it is in the best interest of the environment, of
13 the water, and of the people that is going to affect
14 in these communities, but this is not needed for
15 anything other than making sure that their pockets
16 are lined. Thank you.

17 MS. PFLUGH: I'm going to spell the
18 last name. Harris, I think, B-h-a-r-r-s-a? Anyone?
19 Jeff Richter.

20 MR. RICHTER: Geoffrey Richter,
21 G-e-o-f-f-r-e-y R-i-c-h-t-e-r. I'm the outreach
22 manager of Pinelands Preservation Alliance. I just
23 wanted to make a couple quick points, not
24 necessarily about the compressor station. That's
25 not necessarily within our purview, but the company

1 that relies upon the compressor station, New Jersey
2 Natural Gas, they have violated the public trust.

3 Couple small points. We've recovered
4 documents and statements going back to 2013 of
5 financial analyst meetings, as well as financial
6 analyst reports, that show that actually written out
7 in the purpose and the need for the Southern
8 Reliability Link, the pipeline that you are
9 connecting to the compressor station, one of the
10 purposes for that was to support growth in Ocean
11 County over the long-term. They then testified to
12 the BPU that the only reason for the Southern
13 Reliability Link was to provide resiliency to the
14 system.

15 The volume of gas that is being
16 contracted to go through the Southern Reliability
17 Link through the Transco compressor station suggests
18 otherwise. Something smells off on that. Okay. So
19 that's one point.

20 The second point, it violates the
21 comprehensive management plan of the Pinelands. The
22 base -- so basically the reason that, you know, the
23 waiver that would allow for the pipeline to go
24 through the Pinelands in the areas that it does
25 would have to be based on some sort of need by the

1 Joint Base. A 2014 internal Air Force report showed
2 that the base had absolutely no need in the present
3 or in the foreseeable future of updating or
4 increasing its natural gas service. In fact, we did
5 OPRA on the FOIA requests that found that New Jersey
6 Natural Gas was actually fishing and going to
7 members of the base and asking them hey, do you
8 think some of your buildings might in the
9 foreseeable future need some natural gas, something
10 like that, so they were going around and trying to
11 create a narrative around which they could say that
12 the base needed gas.

13 Oh, and then, you know, in their
14 actual application, there's nothing in there showing
15 any kind of interconnect into the base. So where is
16 the need? What is the pipeline serving? So this is
17 the project, right? This is the project that is,
18 that is necessarily connected with the compressor
19 station, with this dewatering permit. So by
20 allowing for this process to go through, you are
21 essentially allowing an incredibly flawed and
22 devious company in process to go along with its
23 activities.

24 And then the third point, again, we
25 are coming back to the fossil fuel infrastructure.

1 We have to deal with climate change. So the energy,
2 the State's energy master plan is flawed. It
3 basically is trying to take away coal and allow for
4 new natural gas infrastructure and natural gas power
5 plants to be incorporated. That is based on
6 industry science and industry science that's
7 actually quite old.

8 Within the past few years, we've been
9 seeing that the scientific consensus is obvious that
10 climate change is real and man-made, and the impacts
11 are looking to be much, much sooner and much more
12 dire. Methane leakage is severely, and this is the
13 point, methane leakage from the system, from
14 production all the way to consumption, has been
15 wildly under reported for years going back to 2003.
16 The main piece of equipment --

17 MS. PFLUGH: Sir, your time is up.

18 MR. RICHTER: I realize that. The
19 main piece of equipment for actually measuring
20 methane leakage has shown only underestimate how
21 much leakage is there, with an average of 30
22 percent. So when we are talking about methane, we
23 are talking about something within a five-year time
24 period.

25 MS. PFLUGH: Your time is up.

1 MR. RICHTER: Right.

2 MS. PFLUGH: Sir, your time is up.

3 MR. RICHTER: Is one hundred times
4 more heat trapping than carbon dioxide. We talked a
5 lot of about carbon dioxide --

6 MS. PFLUGH: Sir, your time is up.

7 MR. RICHTER: It is 84 times more
8 powerful of a carbon dioxide. Within one hundred
9 years it goes down to only 34 times more heat
10 trapping that carbon dioxide.

11 Q. Thanks you.

12 MR. RICHTER: That is what we are
13 dealing with. Thank you.

14 MS. PFLUGH: There were a number of
15 people whose names I called before. Just to, in the
16 hope that they are still here, I'm going to call
17 their names. Sam Cansaro? Are you here? Jerome
18 Barnoski? No. Denise Garner? Rachel Leoni?
19 Harris B-h-a-r-s-a? Jamie Zaccaria? Garrett?
20 Steve Benowitz? Tim Serpico? S-r-i-n-i-v-i-s
21 K-o-t-a-m-r-a-j-v? No.

22 Was there anyone else that wanted to
23 speak? If so, if you could just sign in right now.
24 Otherwise, this is the end of our testimony.

25 MS. PFLUGH: Go ahead.

1 MR. GEIVELIS: Anastasios Geivelis,
2 A-n-a-s-t-a-s-i-o-s. Last name is G-e-i-v-e-l-i-s.
3 It's more of a question now, hearing -- being here
4 all evening, hearing all the concern and questions
5 and issues being raised, what is the next step or
6 the protocol that you guys as the DEP representing
7 the people and all the statements given tonight,
8 what happens next? What is the protocol that
9 happens next?

10 MS. PFLUGH: We'll have closing
11 statements, sir.

12 MR. GEIVELIS: Okay, that's it.
13 Thank you.

14 MS. PFLUGH: James Marsala?

15 MR. MARSALA: My names is James
16 Marsala, M-a-r-s-a-l-a. My sister Agnes has been
17 very vocal in this, and I have one thing I want to
18 say. That is more of a cautionary tale for the DEP,
19 all right? You have to take into consideration that
20 there's a presidential election coming right now,
21 and the DEP is on the chopping block for a whole
22 bunch of people for a whole bunch of reasons, so --
23 and I'm not trying to be ignorant to yous (sic), but
24 the truth of the matter is if you don't become of
25 use, you will be gotten rid of, and that's just the

1 way it's going to go. The Republican side is
2 basically looking to completely eliminate you
3 (sic). So there's a lot of Democratic people in
4 this community that care about things and care about
5 their homes, so maybe you should think about them
6 when you are making these decisions, because this is
7 our home just like your job is your job and your
8 home is your home. This is where we live, so just
9 remember that, that you guys all tie in with us the
10 same as we tie in with you.

11 MS. PFLUGH: Cindy Bennett.

12 MS. BENNETT: Hi. I'm Cindy Bennett,
13 B-e-n-n-e-t-t. I've grown up in Chesterfield since
14 1963. I'm not a farmer, but I've grown up around
15 farmers. I realize how important water is to them
16 and for them to have their livelihood. I see them
17 struggle every year and trying to work along with
18 the weather and what's going on and needing lakes
19 and streams to irrigate when we have drought times.

20 I just want to say that I appreciate
21 you guys listening to us, and I'm begging you to
22 please help us. I'm so frustrated with our
23 government and with what's going on. All these
24 agencies that I thought were out there to protect
25 our environment and to protect us, I just feel like

1 they failed and they don't care, and I'm just
2 praying that you guys care enough about our
3 community and all the communities that surround us.

4 This is already affected us in just,
5 you want to talk about money, I'm sure it's
6 affecting every township that's fighting it with
7 lawyers fees and everything that come down to taxes
8 from us. That's already affecting us, and I can't
9 imagine what it must -- will do, if it happens, to
10 the children of the future in this area, that I've
11 been able to enjoy this area fishing, checking out
12 frogs and whatever else I've done growing up. I
13 would hate to see the children of this area be
14 robbed of that, so anything you can do I would
15 greatly appreciate.

16 And I just want to say where the
17 compressor station is, every spring when I drive
18 over that overpass where the Turnpike is, I roll
19 down my windows and hear the first signs of spring.
20 There's so much sound coming from that particular
21 area, and I live out near streams and everything,
22 but the sound is just amazing there, so on your way
23 out, roll down your windows and listen to the sound,
24 because if this happens, it might not be there.

25 Thank you for anything you can do.

1 MS. PFLUGH: Craig DiGiovanna?

2 MR. DiGIOVANNA: My name is Craig
3 DiGiovanna, D-i-g-i-o-v-a-n-n-a. I live in
4 Bordentown in Clifton Mills, Winding Brook Road, and
5 the reason I came, I wanted to learn more about the
6 issues, you know. I've gotten information in the
7 mail, and I'm glad I came, because all these people
8 showing up tonight showed me this is a serious
9 issue, and I've been living in this neighborhood for
10 13 years, and I have young kid. I have an
11 eight-year-old, I have a three-and-a-half-year-old,
12 and I think about them playing soccer on the
13 weekends, I think about them doing things, I think
14 about how my life would change if everything came
15 about. My wife has told me, I don't want to live
16 here anymore if this is going to happen. I don't
17 want to be driven out of this area.

18 All I have to say I just want to be
19 on record that, you know, I don't know a lot about
20 deep into the issues that everybody was bringing up,
21 but I'm glad that I came here. Now I have a great
22 understanding of what's going on, and I think if so
23 many people show up like this, there's got to be a
24 reason why. You know what I mean? So, you know,
25 let's hope everybody hears what they need to hear

1 and everybody makes the right decision. Thank you.

2 MS. PFLUGH: Cindy Bloom-Cronin?

3 MS. BLOOM-CRONIN: My name is Cindy
4 Bloom-Cronin, B-l-o-o-m hyphen C-r-o-n-i-n. I live
5 at 31 Chesterfield Georgetown Road, but we also have
6 property right between where Nicole lives and where
7 Linda Frese lives, and I appreciate everybody else
8 bringing up their comments tonight. I'm sure that
9 Flint, Michigan also had a public hearing before all
10 their problems occurred, and I would just like to
11 state that if and when Nicole and Linda and I need
12 water brought in to cook with, brush our teeth, take
13 our showers, water our animals and water our fields,
14 that Flint or that somebody like Transco will bring
15 in our water so that we can have clear water to
16 drink with and do all of our necessities.

17 So thank you for seeing us tonight
18 and listening to our -- all our comments. But I
19 hope you do help us out. Thank you.

20 MS. PFLUGH: That concludes testimony
21 for tonight. I want to thank you all for being here
22 tonight, for sharing with us your thoughts, your
23 concerns and providing us with very good and helpful
24 information.

25 Based on the testimony we received

1 tonight and the public interest in this application,
2 it's been determined that the hearing records should
3 remain open until May 17, 2016. If you would like a
4 copy of the transcript of this hearing, we ask that
5 you please contact the stenographer or the reporting
6 company. A copy of the permit application and the
7 addendum, the draft permit and the staff report are
8 available on the DEP website. You can find it by
9 going to our DEP web page and then looking for the
10 Division of Water and Geoscience, and that
11 information, link is there with all of that
12 information.

13 Our hearing is now closed. Thank you
14 very much for coming tonight.

15 (Whereupon the proceedings were
16 concluded at 8:01 p.m.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25