

## Testimony 1: Sea Water Usage and Discharge

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

There are many reasons I am opposed to Port Ambrose, but in the interest of time, I want to talk specifically about my concern with the large amounts of seawater that will be used in this project and the water pollution that will be discharged during construction and operation – two things that will significantly damage the marine ecosystem.

During construction, hydrostatic testing at the port and pipeline will lead to the discharge of millions of gallons of chemically treated seawater into the ocean.

Once this facility is operating, the LNG tankers will be drawing in massive amounts of water for ballast as they offload LNG. This water will contain tiny plankton, eggs, and larvae, which support an ecosystem upon which many jobs rely. All of the water used in these processes will have chemicals in them that harm or kill marine life. We shouldn't let them put this into our ocean.

This is not far from the waters that [my children and] I rely on in the summer for recreation. We [fish/boat/sail/swim/surf] off these shores and rely on clean, healthy water for these activities.

For the health of our waters and the impacts Port Ambrose will have on our lives for years to come, I ask you to choose a **true** “no action” alternative. This project must not move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

## Testimony 2: Seafloor disturbance

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

Many concerns are being shared with you this evening and if I had more time, you'd hear me echo the sentiments of others in this room, because I am opposed to this project for many reasons. However, I have decided to use my time to highlight the significant concern of seafloor disturbance.

It is no secret that any form of ocean industrialization will negatively impact the seafloor. The Liberty Natural Gas proposal is no different. I was shocked to learn that the construction of the project will impact up to 250 acres of the seafloor. This action will kill shellfish such as lobsters, crabs, clams and scallops and disturb the seafloor habitats they rely upon. Some of these habitats require decades to form, and they will all be destroyed in a few months of dredging for pipeline laying and the installation of anchoring devices. I cannot even fathom that a company that has no real ties to New Jersey or New York would feel it has any right to disturb that much of our ocean and seabed.

Once damaged, it can take years to be restored to its original state. We should know; we've been trying for years to fix the damage done to the ocean in this region in the past and it has been long, hard work.

A wise motto to live by is to always leave things in a better condition than we found them. Apparently Liberty Natural Gas didn't get this message.

They're going to mar hundreds of acres of seafloor with this project, and I will not stand by and let this happen. You shouldn't either.

For this reason and many others provided in testimonies tonight, I support a **true** "no action" alternative – this project must not move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

*Prepared by Clean Ocean Action.org  
January 2015*

## Testimony 3: Price

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

There are a number of things I can't fathom about this project, but one in particular is that of price. Liberty has told us that the existence of their project will lower gas prices in my home. I don't think that will happen because that's simply not how the economics work.

The creation of this facility does not necessarily mean that additional supplies of LNG will be available to gas suppliers. Nor does it mean that I, in return, will see the benefits as a consumer. There has to be a favorable market for this product.

In the current market, domestic natural gas is cheaper than LNG. According to the Energy Information Agency, net imports of LNG to the US are currently near zero, and the US is projected to become a net exporter of natural gas this year and remain that way through at least 2040. Why? Well, in part because LNG is so much more expensive than domestic natural gas, and there are many countries that don't have sufficient domestic supplies that are willing to pay top dollar for US gas. Plain and simple, LNG import facilities around the country aren't being used – in mid-2013, an LNG import facility off of Massachusetts received federal approval to shut down operations for five years because of a lack of use. It only stands to reason that the Port Ambrose facility off our shores will see the same level of activity as the one off Massachusetts, and ultimately, I, the consumer, will see no impact on my natural gas prices.

The existence of the facility means nothing to me as a consumer and only hurts the resource that I benefit from daily: the ocean. Also, government data shows that regions of the Atlantic Ocean that have LNG import facilities frequently pay MORE for natural gas than we are here.

This project is not in the public interest, or in the interest of my family, or our wallets. We're being asked to give away a piece of something very valuable and see no benefits. I support a **true** "no action" alternative – this project must not move forward.

*Prepared by Clean Ocean Action.org  
January 2015*

## Testimony 4: Marine Life Impacts

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am from \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

I'd like to talk about a component of the Port Ambrose project application that gravely concerns me, specifically, the risks to marine mammals.

Marine mammals will succumb to various stressors as a direct result to the construction, operation and maintenance of Port Ambrose. Such impacts, include, but are not limited to: 1) disruption to their migration routes due to increased vessel traffic, 2) disruption to the food chain through the loss of plankton and other small invertebrates that make up the lower part of the food chain, and 3) increased noise production.

Liberty says that the project will have no likely adverse effects on endangered whales. I find this hard to believe, given that several endangered whale species occur regularly in the New York Bight, including the North American right whale, fin whales, humpback whales and even blue whales have been found to be seen at Fire Island in New York. Liberty says that additional tanker traffic is likely to result in only a small increase in the risk of vessel strikes to marine mammals and sea turtles. The facts say these endangered and threatened animals will be subjected to multiple stresses. There are only about 300-350 North Atlantic right whales left. So even a few strikes can have potentially catastrophic impacts on the population.

In addition to stresses associated with increase tanker traffic, marine mammals will also be exposed to various noise stressors. Marine mammals use sound in social interactions as well as forage, to orient, and to respond to predators. Any interference with their behavior and/or hearing could have drastic consequences at the individual and potentially species level.

For this reason and many others provided in testimonies tonight, I support a **true** “no action” alternative – this project must not move forward. .

Thank you for your time and consideration.

*Prepared by Clean Ocean Action.org  
January 2015*

## Testimony 5: Jobs

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

Undoubtedly, we will hear many comments this evening about jobs and our need to create them, both here and throughout the United States. I could not agree more. However, it is important to look at what Liberty's proposal is actually offering. When you look at the jobs balance sheet for this project, we actually see that Liberty is **taking** jobs from New York/New Jersey. That is counter-productive to everything we are fighting for. Liberty has promised to create 879 jobs in the Port Ambrose construction phase and they have spun this high and low in the media. What they have failed to tell you, though, is that:

- When they say “jobs” they actually mean “contracts”. It is not specifically stated whether multiple contracts cannot be awarded to one person. This could mean that one person would be awarded multiple contracts over the course of two years, which results in fewer people actually employed from the project than Liberty claims.
- The primary construction staging facility is going to be located in Quonset Point, Rhode Island or the Port of Coeymans, New York (located about 10 miles south of Albany) – neither of these locations can be considered “local” to the Long Island/Jersey Shore region by any stretch of the imagination. Several of these temporary jobs will be located there.
- Of the temporary contract jobs created, Liberty says that 35 percent of these jobs – over one third – will **not** be local hires.
- They only promise **5** permanent jobs.
- Life-long anglers and the tourism industry will be losing jobs if this project moves forward. Even assuming LNG explosions or disasters occur, construction itself will cause impediments to shipping into and out of the New York Harbor and will close prime fishing areas during the upcoming summer fishing seasons.

Yes, jobs are good. We need them in New York/New Jersey, but rather than supporting a project that will only create 5 permanent jobs at the detriment of hundreds of pre-existing, local jobs, we should be working together

*Prepared by Clean Ocean Action.org  
January 2015*

to find a way to maintain our current work force while growing positions for our union brothers and sisters. We should be collaborating to see that everyone goes to work, not fighting over a project that promises some temporary jobs, many of which Liberty itself admits will likely go to out-of-area workers, and only a handful of long-term jobs.

In short, we want clean energy jobs. I support a **true** “no action” alternative – this project must not move forward. Thank you for your time and consideration.

## Testimony 6: Shore Economy

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

For generations, the shore has been a prime destination for many of our families. I grew up going to the shore, and I cherish the memories I have made here.

Unfortunately, Superstorm Sandy impacted the shore economy. According to a resolution from the New Jersey Legislature calling for Congress to appropriate funding for fisheries disaster aid, “Hurricane Sandy left in its wake innumerable damaged and destroyed homes and businesses, thousands of displaced and homeless citizens, tens of billions of dollars in economic losses, and hundreds of miles of wrecked coastline, with the most severe impacts occurring in the states of New Jersey and New York, where the hurricane made landfall.”<sup>1</sup>

The Port Ambrose project will allow dangerous, gas-filled ships to anchor a few short miles off the Jersey Shore. These ships will be eyesores for shore-dwellers, swimmers, boaters and fishermen. There will be exclusion zones around the area where the ship sits, making it impossible for recreational use to continue. What’s more is the message that it sends to anyone along the waters: who wants to swim, fish, or play near something this large, polluting and dangerous?

Inevitably, people will move elsewhere to enjoy their summers and waters. Businesses will be impacted and tourism will see a decline. The environmental, aesthetic, and social impacts from this project will collectively negatively impact the economy that is still rebuilding after Sandy.

All of this because you’ve allowed foreign gas companies to use and abuse our shore against our loud, clear, and reasonable objections.

---

<sup>1</sup> COA Scoping Comments – Page 30

I'd like the shore to remain vibrant so my grandchildren can enjoy the same experiences I do. That's why I support a **true** "no action" alternative – this project must not move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

## Testimony 7: Terrorism

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

LNG and Port Ambrose are both dangerous and deadly.

I listen to the news and I have heard the hundreds of reports on natural gas pipelines exploding, leaving a devastating impact on the communities that they reside in.

I have lived in New York/New Jersey all my life, and as a resident of the greater New York area, the threat of terrorism remains in the back of my mind daily. I've seen the impacts that terrorism can have on a community.

One thing is clear: our coast is a target for terrorism, and our first responders and security personnel are already always on their toes, striving to ensure that we are safe at all times. The Government Accountability Office reported that "units of the Coast Guard...report insufficient resources to meet its own self imposed security standards, such as escorting ships carrying liquefied natural gas."<sup>2</sup>

That's going to be really challenging with a constant supply of explosive LNG sitting just miles from our shore. These ships have the same explosive power as 55 Hiroshima bombs.<sup>3</sup> That's surely enough to get some attention, and an almost certain terrorist target. In fact, Lieutenant Commander Cindy Hurst wrote that LNG "is more than just a potential weapon of mass destruction in the right locale. It also offers terrorists and awesome economic target wherever in the world it can be found."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Government Accountability Office, Report to Congressional Requesters, Maritime Security, *Federal Efforts Needed to Address Challenges in Preventing and Responding to Terrorist Attacks on Energy Commodity Tankers*, GAO-08-141, Dec. 2007, p. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Amory Lovins and L. Hunter Lovins, *Brittle Power* (Jack Howell Ed., Brick House Publishing Co. 1982) (1982), p. 88.

<sup>4</sup> Lieutenant Commander Cindy Hurst, *Is Liquefied Natural Gas an Economic Target?*, Spero News (adapted from a report for the Institute for the Analysis of Global Security and a contributor to The Cutting Edge News), June 30, 2008, at

<http://www.speroforum.com/site/article.asp?id=15596>.

With all that we do to protect our nation, why would you, the federal government, allow a foreign company to put an almost certain terrorist target right off the shore of one of the most densely populated metropolitan areas in our nation?

Given the testimony heard today, there is no real long-term economic or social benefit from this project, so why would we risk a terror attack, an explosion, or some other national security risk?

That's why I support a **true** "no action" alternative – this project must not move forward. Public safety depends on it.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

## Testimony 8: Need

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

LNG and Port Ambrose are not needed here, now, or in the future.

As an interested citizen, I only had to spend a few minutes on government websites/reading the news to figure out that we have much more capacity in the US than we need for LNG. According to the Energy Information Agency, net imports of LNG to the US are currently near zero, and are projected to dip into negative numbers (that is, exports) by this year, with a trend toward increasing and then stabilizing net exports through at least 2040. It's hard to imagine why another import facility, when the ones currently in operation are shutting down or switching to exports, is needed here.

I'm not an economist, but this is a clear example of excess and wastefulness. Natural gas in the US is cheaper than almost anywhere else in the world. To me, that means that any natural gas we manage to bring here would, by definition, be more expensive than the natural gas we already have domestically.

What's worse, LNG import facilities around the country aren't being used – in mid-2013, an LNG import facility off of Massachusetts received federal approval to shut down operations for five years because of a lack of use. It only stands to reason that the Port Ambrose facility off our shores will see the same level of activity as the one off Massachusetts.

We have a shoreline that we've worked hard to keep free of these types of projects. To have one come in when there is absolutely no need is an affront to our communities and our future.

Please do not add to government and economic waste. Stop this project before our waters become littered with decaying, unused, and empty facilities.

For this reason and many others provided in testimonies tonight, I urge you to choose a **true** “no action” alternative – this project must not move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

## Testimony 9: Noise Pollution

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

I'm here tonight to ask you to take a hard look at the noise pollution that will result at sea from this project.

The trenching, drilling, commissioning, testing, and operating activities for the port will have huge impacts on animals that rely on a relatively quiet underwater environment. This region is home to numerous migratory species, including many whales such as the critically endangered North Atlantic right whale. Whales are highly susceptible to impacts from human-caused sound in the ocean from activities such as shipping and construction.

Installing over 20 miles of pipes with underwater trenching dredges will surely be more of a disruption than a charter fishing boat!

Our marine ecosystem would be greatly harmed by the noise pollution this facility will generate, so please consider this issue in your review and put a stop to this project.

For this reason and many others provided in testimonies tonight, I urge you to choose a **true** “no action” alternative – this project must not move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

## Testimony 10: Air Pollution

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

Specifically, I am gravely concerned about the air pollution that will be generated during the construction and operation of this port.

According to Liberty's application, the carbon dioxide equivalents for port operation is very high with over 180,000 tons to be produced. Using EPA's conversion tool, the greenhouse gas emissions from operation are equivalent to annual emissions from 34,666 passenger vehicles or the electricity used by 24,910 homes per year! It also concerns me that this project is in direct competition with an offshore wind farm – it appears highly unlikely that both projects can move forward in the same space.

The air pollution that will be emitted when the pipeline is installed onshore will be concentrated in time and area to communities that are already facing poor air quality impacts on health. These communities are full of children, schools, and places of worship and should not be subjected to diesel fumes and machinery exhaust at scales larger than **some coal plants**.

Offshore, the air pollution emissions will be rained down into our ocean, harming our marine ecosystem and contributing to the problem of ocean acidification.

For this reason and many others provided in testimonies tonight, I urge you to choose a **true** “no action” alternative – this project must not move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

## Testimony 11: Exports

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

Tonight we've heard a great deal of testimony about the **need** for LNG in our community; however, one thing is clear: the United States is energy independent with natural gas. Our infrastructure **currently** has the capacity to not only meet the needs of the nation, but to also have natural gas reserves. If you add in the current LNG facilities we have around the nation that as of today, are going unused—we have more than enough capacity to serve the United States.

There is no need for you to authorize another LNG facility that will sit unused off our shores. Nearly every LNG import facility around the United States has applied for permits to switch to **exports**. In many of the applications, companies cite the lack of market demand for LNG in the US. In fact, just recently a company in Maryland was permitted to export gas from shale deposits located near us in New York and Pennsylvania.

This end-game is clear. There is no demand for LNG in the United States. But we do have a robust supply of natural gas, and once these facilities are installed in our communities, they can easily convert our domestic natural gas into LNG and export it to the highest bidder abroad.

This will lead to highly polluting hydrofracking activities, which will leave our land, air, and water contaminated and deplete our resources, ultimately leaving the United States to rely upon foreign natural gas. Furthermore, the evidence indicates that exports of domestically produced natural gas will **increase** our prices for natural gas, so this bait-and-switch import/export game puts our nation's energy and economic independence at risk.

These companies, and Liberty Natural Gas, are not being forthcoming with you or us. Their end-game will be to export domestic natural gas. For this reason and many others provided in testimonies tonight, I urge you to choose a **true** “no action” alternative – this project must not move forward.

*Prepared by Clean Ocean Action.org  
January 2015*

## Testimony 12: Exclusion Zones

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

There's a term that is used in Liberty Natural Gas's testimony: "exclusion zones". I found out that this zone—a perimeter of 1,000 feet around an LNG ship and equipment—would be off limits to fishermen, recreational use, and other activities. Also, when ships are coming into or leaving the port, all other uses will have to make way for them! This is an outrage. Furthermore, we rely on a clean environment and we make **actual** use of the region.

How can a company, with no real ties to New York or New Jersey, come into our communities, set up shop and tell us lifelong residents and ocean users, that we can't use this area because they're now using it?

This area is held in public trust by you, our government, for we, the people. It is not for sale. Livelihoods and marine life depend on this "open space."

This exclusion zone is diverse and full of marine life – fishermen use the Mud Hole and the Monster Ledge to catch several valuable fish species. This fishing area will be affected by mooring line scouring, ballast uptake, and cooling water discharges.

I can't imagine that for the entirety of this project, which may last decades, this company will have a lease on valuable space in our ocean that isn't rightfully theirs.

I believe this is the wrong choice for New York/New Jersey and the wrong message to send its residents. Our waters aren't for sale.

For this reason and many others provided in testimonies tonight, I urge you to choose a **true** "no action" alternative – this project must not move forward.

## Testimony 13: Storm Safety

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

This weather has been crazy, hasn't it? Something is in the air these days, because the entire world has seen storms, snow, and winds like never before.

All of this has made me wonder about the safety of the LNG facilities should our shores experience another hurricane or such extreme winds/storms as we did during Superstorm Sandy. I admit, I "Googled" similar instances and what I found was scary—these large ships full of potentially explosive gas could be at great risk should the right storm brew.

I can't imagine why anyone would want to put this on our shore. I can't imagine why you'd let them.

Superstorm Sandy broke all records of wave and surge heights. A storm surge of 13.88 feet occurred at Battery Park and a 32.5 foot wave was registered past a buoy 10 nautical miles southeast of Breezy Point, New York. We should plan for the worst and ensure that whatever we allow in our region will not be a threat should that happen.

Superstorm Sandy forever changed the way we plan, build, use and see the coastal zone and ocean, and this project, sitting in the middle of the Bight, must be considered in light of this new understanding.

For this reason and many others provided in testimonies tonight, I urge you to choose a **true** "no action" alternative – this project must not move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

## Testimony 14: Governor Christie vetoed this project back in 2011.

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am a resident of \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

You may recall that Governor Christie vetoed an offshore LNG facility proposed by Liberty Natural Gas under the name “Port Liberty” back in 2011. In his veto letter, the governor wrote that the project would, “present unacceptable and substantial risks to the State’s residents, natural resources, economy and security.” Liberty then amended their application so that the project was moved to a new location (the location currently proposed) and asked New Jersey if Governor Christie would maintain his veto, to which the state responded that yes, he would.

Liberty has now had the gall to withdraw their application to change the name and then reapply in the **same location**. Liberty has to be kidding itself if it really believes that by submitting a new application under a different name, Port Ambrose, that New Jersey’s government and residents are going to buy the same bad idea.

The real question here is why is the federal government proceeding with this timely process, spending taxpayer dollars, to review an application that was basically already shut down by the Governor of New Jersey?

For this reason and many others provided in testimonies tonight, I urge you to choose a **true** “no action” alternative – this project must not move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

## Testimony 15: Location on a fault line

---

Good evening. My name is \_\_\_\_\_ and I am from \_\_\_\_\_.

I am speaking to you tonight because I am opposed to the Liberty Natural Gas project and offshore liquefied natural gas facilities in general.

I'd like to talk about a component of the Port Ambrose project application that gravely concerns me. I have come to learn that the pipeline that Liberty would need to construct to connect the port to the existing natural gas pipeline would cross over a **seismic fault line** known as the New York Bight Fault Zone. Liberty has claimed that “the seismicity of the New York Bight area of the United States has been relatively stable over the past several hundred years,” but as anyone who lives near a fault line will tell you, tectonic plates shift erratically and unpredictably, sometimes unnoticeably, but other times with devastating consequences.

Seismic activity in the vicinity of the proposed pipeline could only serve to increase the risk of a pipeline rupture, which could lead to a massive release of natural gas into the marine environment. This gas will then travel through the water column and be released into the air as methane, a powerful greenhouse gas that is a major contributor to climate change impacts.

Building along a fault line is just a poor decision, regardless of Liberty's perception of the risk. Seismic activity could occur at any time, and we shouldn't risk the environmental consequences of a pipeline rupture.

For this reason and many others provided in testimonies tonight, I urge you to choose a **true** “no action” alternative – this project must not move forward.

Thank you for your time and consideration.