



Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
 Office of Energy Projects
 Washington, DC 20426

Rio Grande LNG Project
Final Environmental Impact Statement
Volume III, Part 5



Rio Grande LNG, LLC and Rio Bravo Pipeline Company, LLC

April 2019
Docket Nos. CP16-454-000, CP16-455-000
FERC/EIS-0287F

Cooperating Agencies:



U.S. Environmental Protection Agency



U.S. Department of Transportation



U.S. Coast Guard



U.S. Department of Energy



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers



U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service



Federal Aviation Administration



National Park Service



National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration - National Marine Fisheries Service

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Kingsville, Texas

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATION COMMISSION
2
3 RIO GRANDE PROJECT
4 Docket Nos. CP16-454-000, CP16-455-0000
5 And
6 TEXAS LNG PROJECT
7 DOCKET NO. CP16-116-000
8
9
10
11 SCOPING MEETING
12
13
14 Texas A & M University, Kingsville
15 700 University Blvd.
16 Room 221 A & B
17 Kingsville, TX 78363
18
19
20 Tuesday, November 13, 2018
21 5:00 p.m.
22
23
24
25

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Kingsville, Texas

1 SPEAKER LIST

2

3 Ali Pilehvari

4 Rebekah Hinojosa

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Kingsville, Texas

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. PILEHVARI: Hi, my name is Ali Pilehvari. My
3 name is spelled A-l-i first name and last name
4 P-i-l-e-h-v-a-r-i. I am a full professor at the Department
5 of Chemical and Natural Gas Engineering. I teach natural
6 gas processing. I am very well familiar with the LNG
7 processes and I'm knowledgeable about the amount of natural
8 gas in this country and what a great clean fuel is.

9 And that U.S. can export LNG. It would benefit
10 the community as far as jobs, as far as income for the
11 region for development. It would provide a lot of jobs at
12 various levels for engineers, for technicians, for all kind
13 of support systems, so I highly support this project.

14 I hope this starts building soon and it starts
15 hiring permanent employees and bring great benefit to the
16 region.

17 MS. HINOJOSA: Rebekah Hinojosa, the first name
18 is spelled R-e-b-e-k-a-h and Hinojosa is H-i-n-o-j-o-s-a.
19 Okay, I'm a resident of Brownsville, Texas. I lived in the
20 -- I have lived in the Rio Grande Valley Region of south
21 Texas. I was born there, I've lived there most of my life.
22 My family is from there.

23 I go to South Padre Island more than several
24 times a month and I'm here to state my comment of
25 opposition. I'm opposed to Rio Grande LNG and the Rio Bravo

PM1-1

PM2-1

PM1-1 Comment noted.

PM2-1 Comment noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Kingsville, Texas

1 Pipeline and I request that the FERC deny the permits for
2 Rio Grande LNG and the Rio Bravo Pipeline and the other two
3 proposed LNG terminals in Nova LNG and Texas LNG.

PM2-1

4 This is a beautiful, pristine area. There's over
5 20,000 acres of wetlands and I'm opposed to these projects
6 because they will have -- they will impact these wetlands
7 which are part of an international wildlife corridor called
8 the Laguna Atascosa Wildlife Refuge and I also feel that the
9 LNG terminals will have adverse impacts to public health.

PM2-2

PM2-3

10 I also want to state that the city -- the
11 communities of Port Isabella, South Padre Island, Laguna
12 Vista and Long Island Village have all passed anti-LNG
13 resolutions. They are opposed to these big terminals and
14 hundreds of people have sent in comments opposing the LNG
15 terminals, so I agree with them and I am also opposed to
16 these projects.

PM2-4

17 (Whereupon at 7:30 p.m. the meeting was
18 concluded.)

19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PM2-2

Impacts on wetlands are addressed in section 4.4.2 of the EIS, and impacts on the Laguna Atascosa NWR are addressed in section 4.6.1.4.

PM2-3

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

PM2-4

The resolutions regarding opposition to the Project are noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)
Kingsville, Texas

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding

4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the

5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding: Ro Grande LNG Project

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 Docket No.: CP16-454-000

17 Place: Kingsville, TX

18 Date: Tuesday, November 13, 2018

19 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original

20 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy

21 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription

22 of the proceedings.

23

24 Larry Flowers

25 Official Reporter

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)
Raymondville, Texas

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

2

3 RIO GRANDE PROJECT

4

5 DOCKET NOS. CP16-454-000,

6 CP16-455-000

7 And

8 TEXAS LNG PROJECT

9 DOCKET NO. CP16-116-000

10

11

12 SCOPING MEETING

13

14 La Quinta Inn & Suites

15 128 North Expressway 77

16 Raymondville, TX 78580

17

18 Wednesday, November 14, 2018

19 5:00 p.m.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)
Raymondville, Texas

- 1 SPEAKER LIST
- 2 Dr. Sarah Bishop Merrill
- 3 Dale Rhodes
- 4 Sergio A. Salinas
- 5 Mark Mehaffey
- 6 Robert Christopher Balsadu, Ph.D
- 7 Jerry Ruiz
- 8 William Berg
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

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

2 DR. BISHOP MERRILL: Doctor Sarah, S-a-r-a-h
3 Bishop, B-i-s-h-o-p, Merrill, M-e-r-r-i-l-l. Okay this is
4 my comment on the FERC Draft Environmental Impact Statement
5 for the Rio Grande LNG Project and the Rio Bravo Pipeline
6 Project, CP16-454-000 and CP16-455 issued October 12th.

7 The staff of the Federal Regulatory Commission
8 has prepared the Draft Environmental Impact Statement which
9 responds to inadequate research by the corporate positions,
10 but it's unacceptable environmentally unsatisfactory and
11 unsafe -- the project because of two basic flaws in the
12 logic and methods of data assembly for the particular
13 questions.

14 A -- the methodology prejudices the LNG Project to
15 be followed by two more which are analyzed as subject to
16 appropriate mitigation when no such mitigation is shown to
17 be nearly adequate to the huge and irreversible scope of
18 damage expected.

PM3-1

19 And another slip of logic for the sake of public
20 prelations by the Rio Grande developers is that its
21 methodology and findings about security relative to its
22 proximity to the SpaceX launch sited at Boca Chica well
23 within a ten mile radius are so narrowly focused as to
24 constitute the flashlight fallacy using data only for the
25 possibility of an explosion or a leak in the SpaceX facility

PM3-2

PM3-1

The draft EIS provided sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand and consider the issues raised by the Project, and addresses a reasonable range of mitigation and alternatives. The final EIS provides substantive updates, where available. Further, the wetland mitigation plans for all three LNG projects would be finalized in coordination with the COE Section 404 permit process. None of the projects (if approved) would be permitted to proceed with construction until the mitigation plans have been finalized.

PM3-2

See responses to Comment Letters IND67 and CO9.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

1 and its flammables and not in the pooled area I've put a
2 hypothetical red cloud around.

3 Your response in Section 4.341 to the 2016 total
4 vision flashlight fallacy by the industry, by Rio Grande was
5 October 27th, 2016. It does look more into the events that
6 could occur at the LNG facility, but it really is focused on
7 fires from over here on the east that SpaceX is not focused
8 on the possibility of the ignition of a large methane pool
9 above the site which could easily migrate in shifting winds
10 even though the prevailing winds are from the southeast.

11 So this material could move here and then this on
12 the left -- it's not a question of individual components of
13 the LNG facility, but it's a question of the whole sky
14 overhead, and that's not dealt with at all.

15 I think we need the new research from the Chinese
16 Port explosion -- I'll talk about in a minute. So the
17 methodology pre-judges the LNG Project and commits the
18 fallacy of basically begging the question assuming what
19 needs to be indeed proven and then it also uses a complete
20 non-secretor mentioning hundreds of times the threatened
21 species and mitigation and habitat, but not actually
22 providing for mitigation adequate to the irreversible scope
23 of damage.

24 So you don't say, "Oh yes, there's all these --
25 this terrible risk," oh -- this is minimal 10% risk of this

PM3-2

PM3-3

PM3-3

The determination of the appropriate level and types of mitigation for the federally listed threatened and endangered species is under the jurisdiction of the FWS or NMFS (as applicable) and the regulatory authority under Section 7 of the ESA. As discussed in section 4.7.1, RG Developers must provide the FERC the required information for FERC to complete consultations with the FWS and NMFS, and complete any required mitigation, prior to construction of the Project.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

5

1 kind of explosion but that's not -- but therefore the
2 project should be built and you can't make that conclusion.
3 It's like saying let's see -- it's so and so far to the moon
4 and so far to the sun and therefore the moon is made of
5 green cheese, I mean it doesn't make any sense.

6 B -- the methodology and findings about security
7 relative to its proximity to SpaceX are so narrowly focused
8 as to constitute the flashlight fallacy using data only for
9 the possibility of an explosion at SpaceX, not of pooled
10 methane above the whole LNG site and the additional proposed
11 projects.

PM3-4

12 A drunk man searches in a parking lot under this
13 fallacy under a street light for his lost keys when a police
14 officer finally asks him, "Where did you lose them and
15 where's your car?" The drunk man replies, "I lost them way
16 over there by my gray Chevy but its dark over there so I'm
17 looking over here."

18 Now just because we can't know for sure and C --
19 literally see the pooling gas above. I know that methane is
20 not as flammable as the LNG's certainly not flammable. But
21 methane does burn and we're seeing methane which is lighter
22 than other components of air rising to the top and trapping
23 heat 33 times worse than CO2, but also providing fuel for if
24 there were fires in other operations.

PM3-5

25 So not just the live rocket fuel but the

PM3-4

See responses to Comment Letters IND67 and CO9.

PM3-5

An analysis of LNG Terminal safety, including LNG carrier safety, is included in section 4.12.1 of the EIS. The GWP factor for methane is addressed in section 4.11.1.2 of the EIS, and is used to quantify CO₂ equivalents in the EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

6

1 invisible pool of methane gas and flammable gases from
2 processing above the LNG site possibly drifting into the
3 path of the rocket, because this isn't even 10 miles away,
4 this is 5.4 miles and 7.4 miles, so we can have a combined
5 risk.

PM3-5

6 It's a false assertion under public safety
7 security and noise impacts that construction and operation
8 of the pipeline facilities would not contribute to
9 significant noise impact as well, now beyond the explosion
10 risk. It's clear to me that the analysis already submitted
11 by the industry and accepted by FERC must be re-submitted
12 for further environmental analysis using other LNG sites.

13 I simply don't believe the quantification of the
14 noise results and especially doesn't include large
15 explosions. But to say they're only temporary and the birds
16 will return in the section under the many threatened species
17 is also sheer speculation. It's not the way populations of
18 birds tend to be, they do remember.

PM3-6

19 The second category after public safety, security
20 and noise impacts is the unsatisfactory and irreversible
21 environmental harm to our listed species. FERC recommends
22 additional mitigation related to nest identification,
23 monitoring and implementation of best management practices
24 for the northern Aplomado falcon, but this recommendation is
25 unsatisfactory.

PM3-7

PM3-6

Section 4.11.2 assesses the noise impacts from routine construction and operation of the LNG Terminal. Section 4.6.1 addresses Project impacts, including noise, on wildlife, including birds, and acknowledges the loss of habitat at the LNG Terminal site.

By adhering to applicable safety standards identified in section 4.12.1 of the EIS, an explosion at the LNG Terminal site is not anticipated; the noise impacts associated with an explosion are therefore not a foreseeable impact of the Project and as such are not assessed in the EIS.

PM3-7

The BA provided in section 4.7 of the final EIS has been revised in accordance with FWS correspondence and concludes that the Project is not likely to adversely affect the northern aplomado falcon and piping plover and would not result in the adverse modification of critical habitat. Our determination of effect for the ocelot remains, and our current determination for the jaguarundi is "likely to adversely affect." The ESA requires that, if a Project is likely to adversely affect a threatened or endangered species, the federal action agency (in this case, FERC) must conduct formal consultations with the FWS. This process requires the FWS to prepare a Biological Opinion for the Project. The determination of the appropriate level of mitigation for the federally listed threatened and endangered species is under the jurisdiction of the FWS or NMFS (as applicable) and the regulatory authority under Section 7 of the ESA. As discussed in section 4.7.1, RG Developers must provide the FERC the required information for FERC to complete consultations with the FWS and NMFS, and complete any required mitigation, prior to construction of the Project.

Critical habitat is the term for habitat that is officially designated and protected by NMFS and/or FWS; important or significant habitats are still in the vicinity of the proposed Project, and impacts on these habitats are discussed where applicable.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

1 There is no way to protect the Aplomado falcon if
2 all of this habitat is destroyed or so noisy that it's not
3 attractive to them to fly over into the Rio Grande area.
4 The DEIS also has no adequate mitigation proposed and
5 regarding the endangered Kemp's Ridley sea turtles, is
6 simply false that "no critical habitat has been designated
7 for this species."

PM3-7

8 So in all the many mentions of threatened and
9 endangered species and all the listed federal and state
10 species it's false that "no critical habitat has been
11 designated for this species," as those of us who have
12 served on Turtle Patrol on South Padre Island beaches and
13 also on the Padre Island National Seashore know.

14 The LNG and pipeline -- the LNG and the pipeline
15 will adversely affect the northern Aplomado falcon, the
16 piping plover and the ocelot as the DEIS states, but no
17 mitigation plan yet emerges as adequate and no sign-off
18 letter from Fish and Wildlife is convincing given these
19 facts.

20 Three -- a third major heading of my objection,
21 the process is inadequate and outdated for assessing risks
22 on a cost benefit ratio. The obsolescence of fracked gas in
23 LNG production is a significant issue that is being ignored
24 here and the market force is now favoring renewables and
25 leaving oil in the ground are already well underway.

PM3-8

PM3-8

As described in section 3.1 of the EIS, the use of alternative sources of energy would not meet the stated objective of the Project, and evaluating alternative sources of energy is beyond the scope of this EIS. Economic need will be discussed in the Commission Order.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

8

1 Regarding the admitted increase in GHG's no
2 mitigation is possible if the project is approved but I
3 thank FERC for noting that fact. Public safety and security
4 -- as a professor at Purdue University and Kansas State and
5 the University of Texas, I taught engineering at Texas as
6 well as environmental ethics units and ethics across the
7 curriculum to professional engineers of the future for more
8 than 20 years -- longer in my whole career but 20 years of
9 that.

10 I know that engineers receive little training in
11 the ecological systems of those they impact, but they do
12 pledge first of all in all their codes of ethics to protect
13 the safety and health of the public in their work. Indeed
14 they were highly ethical, principled, continent thinkers who
15 solved the problems for the common good with their
16 professional skillset. They know they are governed by the
17 regulations which their professional societies -- for
18 instance the American Society of Civil Engineers, helped to
19 write and who aid in implementation and enforcement.

20 I thoroughly studied the INGAA Foundation's
21 construction safety consensus guidelines and in Section
22 3.3.1 they remind us that managing projects like LNG,
23 liquefaction requires management and any supervisory bodies
24 -- so as their managing engineers to, are responsible for
25 and empowering "All personnel with the authority to stop

PM3-9

PM3-9

Comment noted. RG Developers have committed to complying with the GHG BACT requirements included in their PSD permit for the LNG Terminal and Compressor Station (see section 4.11.1.3 of the EIS).

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

1 work whenever hazardous conditions or potentially hazardous
2 conditions are identified."

3 In a supervisory and evaluative role, FERC is
4 also responsible to avoid costly often fatal impacts of such
5 projects -- if not stop work orders, always likely to impact
6 contractor scheduling and must increase costs by delaying
7 construction deadlines. Then, if not just stop work then
8 with a duty to stop the project as a whole or to exercise
9 its power to deny a permit to the LNG projects.

10 In the May, 2013 version of the FERC Wetlands and
11 Water Body Construction and Mitigation Procedures, another
12 manual I studied at length, we find the following example of
13 a crucial preventive measure which seems impossible in our
14 specific site for this LNG liquefaction facility and
15 pipeline.

16 "Install sediment barriers and relocate
17 hydrostatic test manifolds outside wetlands to the maximum
18 extent practical." It follows that if the coastal wetlands
19 site is as extensive as this project requires, such
20 mitigation would be impossible. We need the citizen
21 scientists on our own nickel and not representing anybody
22 but that of scientific truth are concerned about a possible
23 problem not mentioned so far.

24 That CEII -- the Critical Energy Infrastructure
25 Information not be abused to hide actual risks under bogus

PM3-10

PM3-11

PM3-12

PM3-10

Under Section 3 of the NGA, oversight for LNG export is divided between the Commission and the DOE. FERC is responsible for the siting of LNG facilities, but does not determine the need for a project. It is the DOE, not the Commission, which retains the exclusive authority over the export of the natural gas as a commodity, including the responsibility to consider whether the exportation of that gas is in the public interest. As described in section 1.1 of the EIS, the DOE granted an authorization to RG LNG for export to countries having an FTA with the United States that includes national treatment for trade in natural gas. In accordance with the NGA and Energy Policy Act of 1992, export to a country with which there is an FTA requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas, is deemed consistent with the public interest. Further, RB Pipeline executed a precedent agreement for the total capacity of the RB Pipeline for the 20-year life of the Project. During construction, FERC exercises "stop work" authority in the event of a non-compliance with the conditions in the Certificate Order or approved construction procedures.

PM3-11

In accordance with section 7.3.4 of its Procedures, RG Developers would be required to locate hydrostatic test manifolds outside wetlands and riparian areas to the extent practicable along the Pipeline System. The northern extent of the Pipeline System is predominately uplands, and RB Pipeline would implement the measures in its Procedures and applicable state and federal permits to minimize the impacts of hydrostatic testing. At the LNG Terminal site, hydrostatic test water would be transferred to onsite stormwater ponds and tested for contamination prior to release to minimize water quality impacts on the BSC (see section 4.3.2.2)

PM3-12

Critical Energy Infrastructure information includes specific engineering, vulnerability, or detailed design information about proposed critical infrastructure that is not disclosed to the public since the information could be useful to a person planning an attack on critical infrastructure, or gives strategic information beyond the location of the critical infrastructure. The FERC has a responsibility to protect the confidentiality of all CEII information while balancing the need for public involvement in decision-making processes such as this EIS. To that end, the FERC has established a procedure whereby interested parties can request CEII information. This process involves signing a non-disclosure statement regarding the use of all CEII.

While some information is not publicly available, the lack of this final information does not deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental and safety effect of the projects or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such effect. The EIS includes sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand and consider the issues raised by the proposed projects and addresses a reasonable range of alternatives.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

10

1 security and trade secrets cover stories. There are such
2 serious risks to public service in the LNG Project that
3 failure to disclose and consider them would not be excused
4 when a disastrous explosion occurs by an industry-pressured
5 move to force FERC to approve an inherently unsafe and
6 polluting projects.

PM3-12

7 Accidents do happen. The Titanic effect which we
8 often study in engineering methods -- the Titanic effect of
9 allowing those selling the project to claim it is flawless
10 and cannot go down as with the sinking of the Titanic,
11 appears to be in effect here with regard to FERC
12 vulnerability to the people selling us the whole LNG
13 process, somehow without reason or logic, eliminating the
14 significant impacts and risks by saying it as if a magic
15 wand were waved.

16 So the reason they carefully list the risks and
17 the threats to endangered species and then they go right
18 ahead and seem to conclude that they're not significant and
19 that we can go ahead or that Fish and Wildlife will sign-off
20 at the state and federal levels or already have.

PM3-13

21 In fact, vapor cloud explosions -- VCE's which
22 are discussed in that document I just cited, as well as
23 destruction and undermining the facility by storm surges and
24 rising coastal water levels will occur. It is highly likely
25 that contrary to FERC's own requirements the storm surges

PM3-14

PM3-13

We disagree. FERC staff has listed the risks and assessed each to the extent where the impact of each risk factor can be determined, by which, a determination of effect under the ESA can be made. The determinations by FERC staff are then assessed by the FWS to determine adequacy. In its comments on the draft EIS/BA, the FWS identified additional information necessary prior to completion of the Biological Opinion.

PM3-14

DOT PHMSA's LOD issued on March 26, 2019 evaluated the overpressure or blast wave effects due to an explosion of flammable vapor. Specifically, section 9.5 of the LOD analysis showed the overpressure hazards would remain within the Project's property line and could extend into the BSC. In addition, Section 4.12.1.6 of the EIS discusses RG LNG's design to protect against storm surges and would be designed to withstand a Category 4 hurricane. Furthermore, section 4.12.1.6 discusses FERC staff's review of RG LNG's preliminary engineering design. This analysis contained various design reviews with a focus on the layers of protection or safeguards to reduce the risk of a potentially hazardous scenario from developing into an event that could impact the offsite public. If operational control of the facilities were lost and operational controls and ESD systems failed to maintain the Project within the design limits of the piping, containers, and safety relief valves, a release could potentially occur. To mitigate this scenario, RG LNG's design would include mitigation, such as spill containment and spacing, hazard detection, ESD and depressurization systems, hazard control, firewater coverage, structural protection, and emergency response. FERC staff has recommended further final design details be provided in section 4.12.1.7 to ensure adequate mitigation is in the final design of the proposed facility.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)
Raymondville, Texas

1 and rising Gulf water levels will disastrously damage
2 "cryogenic transfer piping, marine cargo unloading
3 platforms, binary and emergency electrical power," and
4 that's from the FERC Guidance Manual again, in my written
5 comments I'll show that quote in boldface.

6 So the storm surges and rising Gulf water levels
7 are undeniable now. No one who has survived a massive
8 hurricane making landing expects the power to remain on.
9 Locating this LNG facility here right on the Gulf shore near
10 Biaha Grande, Port Isabelle in Brownsville, Texas is sheer
11 folly and a direct contradiction of FERC's own policy sited
12 above.

13 So Item A under "Security Issues" is the serious
14 risk of catastrophic and widespread fire storms -- and I
15 site the Fire Safety Standards here, but I'll do so in my
16 written comments, please see those.

17 FERC's Guidance Manual requires applicant's under
18 18 CFR 380.12 and several other in the ASCE's 7 to
19 demonstrate, "That the potential hazard to the public from
20 failures to facility components resulting from natural
21 catastrophes is addressed and that there would not be a
22 significant impact on public safety from seismicity and
23 other natural hazards at LNG facilities." Now that quote is
24 from the background section introducing the Guidance Manual
25 -- FERC's own Guidance Manual.

PM3-14

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

1 The scope of natural catastrophes in coastal
2 areas given the new normal of extremes due to climate change
3 is so vast today that the LNG proposers can neither
4 demonstrate nor address such potential hazards now much more
5 likely to occur.

6 In the case of the Chinese port explosion in
7 August of 2015, cars were thrown more than a kilometer away
8 from their original location under three massive explosions
9 at a port location where some journalists reported LNG was
10 being imported and reprocessed for use near where stored
11 toxic chemicals which were directly blamed, were ignited in
12 a warehouse.

13 And the "whole sky" appeared to explode very high
14 above skyscrapers. In general it is well-known that LNG has
15 a relative high cost of production, needs to be stored in
16 expensive cryogenic tanks though it -- the LNG explodes only
17 when trapped into certain space, its by-products after
18 liquefaction with a source of ignition -- it's vapors in a
19 pool of the sky above the facility or blown down wind a bit
20 within that 5.4 miles may burn more readily when other fires
21 or say, live rocket fuel are present.

22 And this specific fact was not in the study
23 either the 2016 Falcon 96.1 Impact Probability Contours that
24 was filed with FERC October 27, 2016 on the rocket launch
25 failures citing. They didn't commit that flashlight

PM3-15

PM3-15

The incident at the Chinese port in August 2015 did not involve an LNG facility nor did it result in any known cascading consequence at the nearby LNG facility. Vapor cloud explosions are further discussed in response to comment IND154-5. Section 4.12.1.6 addresses launch failures from the SpaceX launch site.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

1 fallacy, they were focused on the SpaceX site, not on the
2 bigger LNG impact.

3 New storm data -- Section B -- new storm data
4 after Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Florence in Appendix 13
5 1.3. I see no persuasive clear commitment to or even a
6 reasonable possibility to meet FERC's own requirements cited
7 below given new storm surge facts from Hurricane's Harvey in
8 Texas, Florence in the Carolinas and rising coastal water
9 levels with climate change extremes -- especially more water
10 in each storm event due to evaporation from warming oceans.

11 So I cite a NOAA set of data. Harvey was a
12 thousand year storm that is thought less probable than .01%
13 and dozens of five hundred year storms have occurred within
14 the last decade alone. The U.S. has experienced at least 24
15 of what we thought were 500 year rain events since 2010
16 including Hurricane Matthew in 2016.

17 Previously rare events will become the norm as we
18 continue to warm the atmosphere since warmer air contains
19 more moisture. The LNG Project will release the
20 considerable heat generated by cooling the natural gas down
21 to minus 260 degrees according to specifications we have
22 seen into the air, not into the water, since releases into
23 the waters will kill many fragile organisms.

24 But even releases into the air above the LNG
25 facility proposed would eventually warm the Gulf waters and

PM3-15

PM3-16

PM3-17

PM3-16

The equivalent return period for a storm event is determined by comparing the attributes of a storm at a specific location against that location's historical records; that is, the return period is specific to the spot or area where the storm hit and should not be compared to the total number of 500-year events that occur across the country. Hurricane Harvey caused 1000-year precipitation and flooding in various areas of Texas; however, it made landfall 170 miles north of Brownsville. The other recent hurricanes mentioned, such as Hurricanes Florence, Irma, and Maria, impacted the eastern coast of the United States.

Furthermore, the 65 to 70 inches of rainfall from Hurricane Harvey which caused 1000-year floods in some places was the maximum observed rainfall in an isolated area where the eye of the storm had hit (with the most intense rainfall). The total rainfalls associated with Hurricane Harvey dropped significantly approximately 25 miles outside of where the eye made landfall and the vast majority of coastal Texas affected by Harvey experienced between 1 and 25 inches of rain.

PM3-17

Historically, LNG facilities have not been shown to emit heat at levels within or around the facility site substantially enough to affect the function of on-site equipment or affect personnel working on-site. Further, data within the air modeling analysis presented in section 4.11.1 demonstrates the dispersion of pollutants in the air surrounding the Rio Grande LNG Terminal, and weather/wind patterns in the Project area circulate air such that any heat emitted from the LNG Terminal would be dispersed from the site. Therefore, localized climate impacts due to any heat released by the LNG Terminal are not expected to occur.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

1 those of the fragile Bahia Grande within at least a month
2 given the fact that warmer air holds moisture which will
3 then fall back down as rain.

PM3-17

4 Okay now I make an extended quote from the
5 Guidance Manual about the necessity of describing the design
6 storm surge elevations of the project site and I remember
7 talking with some of the engineers about the elevation of
8 the site. At the time they told me they were only raising
9 it 6 feet above base level now, but your own policy requires
10 them to include all project elevations and I really have a
11 serious concern about that not being high enough, so they
12 need to include the historical and scientific basis but they
13 also need to include the new standards -- the new normal
14 after Harvey.

PM3-18

15 They're required to compare with 100, 500, 1,000
16 year and 10,000 year return period elevations and no storm
17 surge elevations. Now I've checked the latest NOAA
18 literature and I think that research is still in progress
19 but certainly we have had dozens of 500 year storms within
20 the last decade so we need to revise the probabilities on
21 which our predictions of "not to worry" are based.

22 And I think these vitiate really sadly the whole
23 project so this analysis has really been worth it, we know
24 what we need to do and it's sadly -- to say no. So this
25 environmental review should have at least included a

PM3-18

The equivalent return period for a storm event is determined by comparing the attributes of a storm at a specific location against that location's historical records; that is, the return period is specific to the spot or area where the storm hit and should not be compared to the total number of 500-year events that occur across the country. Hurricane Harvey caused 1000-year precipitation and flooding in various areas of Texas; however, it made landfall 170 miles north of Brownsville. The other recent hurricanes mentioned, such as Hurricanes Florence, Irma, and Maria, impacted the eastern coast of the United States.

Furthermore, the 65 to 70 inches of rainfall from Hurricane Harvey which caused 1000-year floods in some places was the maximum observed rainfall in an isolated area where the eye of the storm had hit (with the most intense rainfall). The total rainfalls associated with Hurricane Harvey dropped significantly approximately 25 miles outside of where the eye made landfall and the vast majority of coastal Texas affected by Harvey experienced between 1 and 25 inches of rain. Furthermore, the return period does not correspond to the number of storms across the U.S or a region, but to a focused and refined area.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

15

1 revisiting of the specific site elevations given the new
2 post-2017 surge data from NOAA and the Texas authorities.
3 There were data showing that it was -- it was
4 between 35 and 40 feet in some places and up to 60 inches of
5 rain. So unsatisfactory and irreversible environmental
6 harms to our listed species -- my point here is that the
7 mitigation would be either impossible or far too costly.
8 So I think I'll cover the other points. I'm
9 aware of the Walker's manioc which was not included but it
10 is on the NEPA site. Of course the ocelot, Aplomado falcon,
11 the Kemp's Ridley sea turtle was not given adequate coverage
12 -- just sort of some lip service but they do have a critical
13 habitat that has been established and the practice is off
14 the corrals for the eggs, keeping them safe from drivers on
15 the South Padre Island Beach was not mentioned, but we have
16 a major component of our Master Naturalist Chapter who
17 includes some of us in caring for these eggs until they can
18 be released.
19 So the Texas ayenia -- a-y-e-n-i-a -- Texas
20 ayenia is a plant familiar to us. My husband knows all its
21 Latin names and we have seen it in the drought years in that
22 area but it's denied in the report that this is an issue.
23 The fragile breeding grounds in the small
24 remaining areas of black mango swamps along Route 48 if
25 you've actually been to the construction site are

PM3-18

PM3-19

PM3-20

PM3-21

PM3-22

PM3-19

The commenter does not provide justification for the statement that mitigation would cost more than the Project is worth. As such, we cannot respond to this comment.

PM3-20

We disagree. FERC staff considered a variety of impacts on the noted species, which was supplemented as a result of agency correspondence and public review of the draft EIS. Section 7 consultation under the ESA is ongoing with the FWS and NMFS. We have confirmed through use of the FWS Information for Planning and Consultation that Walker's manioc is not identified as present in the Project area. In addition, the FWS was a cooperating agency on the development of this EIS and did not identify the Walker's manioc as a species of concern.

Critical habitat is the term for habitat that is officially designated and protected by the NMFS and FWS; important or significant habitats for sea turtles in the Project area are still in the vicinity of the proposed Project and impacts on these habitats are discussed where applicable. Direct impacts on nesting beaches would not occur as part of the Project.

PM3-21

The Texas ayenia is identified in section 4.7.1.6; however, based on consultations with the FWS, it is not expected in the Project area.

PM3-22

As described in section 4.4.2 of the EIS, RG LNG is consulting with the COE, EPA, and FWS regarding wetland mitigation plans as part of the permitting process associated with Section 404 of the CWA. RG LNG's final wetland mitigation plans would be developed and submitted to the COE, and would be implemented in addition to the construction mitigation measures outlined in RG LNG's Procedures and the measures described in the EIS. Compensatory or offsite mitigation is not required for general wildlife habitat; however, as discussed in sections 4.7.1.3 and 4.7.1.4, any mitigation for habitat loss for the ocelot or northern aplomado falcon would be determined through completion of the ESA consultation process. As stated in section 4.6.3.2, the black mangroves that would be impacted at the LNG Terminal site are likely isolated and experience limited tidal exchange, which indicates that they no longer act as breeding grounds for shrimp and do not function as EFH. Consultation regarding the EFH assessment for the Project is complete, and, given the temporary, minor impacts on EFH, NMFS does not have EFH conservation recommendations for the Project.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

16

1 endangering shrimp and the brown pelican which were saved
2 once already from near extinction by the public outcry
3 generated by Rachel Carson, Solid Spring, and widespread
4 scientific reporting in the past 50 years on the effects of
5 DDT on bird egg formation.

PM3-22

6 But we have another threat which prevents fixing
7 of calcium and that's the carbonic acid which is increasing
8 in the oceans and the carbonic acid also makes it impossible
9 for any animal that makes a shell to thrive and survive, so
10 these risks weren't named.

PM3-23

11 NEPA listing currently includes our species named
12 above that again the Texas ayenia is said not to be there
13 but we have seen it in drought years and we're going to be
14 alternating drought with floods. Preventing irreparable
15 harm is FERC's role among others.

PM3-24

16 My last point that I will detail in my written
17 comments is that a net negative cost benefit ratio in favor
18 of the costs is what we're looking at given the cost of
19 mitigation risks. Obsolete fossil fuel technologies within
20 a short period of time -- then we'll be left with this hulk
21 9 stories tall in a city block or acre-wide.

22 Renewables now dominant the market already and
23 Texas is a world leader in wind energy. And I would be the
24 first to fight any birders who think we couldn't have
25 windmills as we have up here in Raymondville and Willacy

PM3-25

PM3-23

Section 4.13.2.9 was revised to include an analysis of climate change impacts of the Project. We acknowledge the potential climate impacts on ocean acidity raised by the comment. Climate change is a global concern; however, for this analysis, we focus on the potential cumulative climate change impacts on the Project area.

PM3-24

The Texas ayenia is identified in section 4.7.1.6; however, based on consultations with the FWS, it is not expected in the Project area.

PM3-25

As described in section 3.1 of the EIS, the use of alternative energy sources would not meet the stated objective of the Project, and evaluating alternative sources of energy is beyond the scope of this EIS. Additionally, sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the EIS evaluated alternative locations along the Texas Gulf Coast that included more industrial development and less industrial development compared to the Port of Brownsville. None of the alternative sites were determined to provide an environmental advantage over the proposed Project. The GWP factor for methane is addressed in section 4.11.1.2 of the EIS, and is used to quantify CO₂ equivalents in the EIS; climate change is addressed in section 4.13.2.9 of the EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)
Raymondville, Texas

1 and its flammables and not in the pooled area I've put a
2 hypothetical red cloud around.

3 Your response in Section 4.341 to the 2016 total
4 vision flashlight fallacy by the industry, by Rio Grande was
5 October 27th, 2016. It does look more into the events that
6 could occur at the LNG facility, but it really is focused on
7 fires from over here on the east that SpaceX is not focused
8 on the possibility of the ignition of a large methane pool
9 above the site which could easily migrate in shifting winds
10 even though the prevailing winds are from the southeast.

PM3-2

11 So this material could move here and then this on
12 the left -- it's not a question of individual components of
13 the LNG facility, but it's a question of the whole sky
14 overhead, and that's not dealt with at all.

15 I think we need the new research from the Chinese
16 Port explosion -- I'll talk about in a minute. So the
17 methodology pre-judges the LNG Project and commits the
18 fallacy of basically begging the question assuming what
19 needs to be indeed proven and then it also uses a complete
20 non-secretor mentioning hundreds of times the threatened
21 species and mitigation and habitat, but not actually
22 providing for mitigation adequate to the irreversible scope
23 of damage.

PM3-3

24 So you don't say, "Oh yes, there's all these --
25 this terrible risk," oh -- this is minimal 10% risk of this

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

18

1 advises in temperatures we now understand that the extremes
2 of climate change are already upon us.

3 As our nation's trustees for energy policy and
4 public safety U.S. Commissioners, in order to be credible
5 and authentic as a body must sometimes cancel and refuse to
6 permit projects of great risk and such significant harms.
7 The net carbon footprint of the LNG Project in its whole
8 lifecycle is far larger than that of the alternatives --
9 energy conservation, wind, solar and other renewable energy
10 projects underway.

11 Since the expensive LNG will be sold abroad
12 rather than raising the prices of natural gas here in the
13 U.S. we hope, LNG producers tend to transport the LNG to
14 assume Chinese markets and super tankers. The dangers of
15 that are possible leaks underway and the simple scientific
16 fact that methane is lighter than other components of air.

17 But given the tariff war that has started, it's
18 not even certain that Chinese will find this attractive and
19 given the market forces so we may have LNG to give away and
20 no one to buy it.

21 FERC's very existence depends on its efficacy in
22 doing its duty to the common good. I strongly urge you
23 Commissioners to deny the permit for these LNG and pipeline
24 projects and to encourage the far less costly, less damaging
25 and better job producing safe alternatives in renewable

PM3-25

PM3-26

PM3-27

PM3-26

An analysis of LNG Terminal safety, including LNG carrier safety, is included in section 4.12.1 of the EIS. The GWP factor for methane is addressed in section 4.11.1.2 of the EIS, and is used to quantify CO2 equivalents in the EIS. As described in section 1.1 of the EIS, the DOE granted an authorization to RG LNG for export to countries having an FTA with the United States that includes national treatment for trade in natural gas. RB Pipeline executed a precedent agreement for the total capacity of the Rio Bravo Pipeline for the 20-year life of the Project. FERC considers the public interest of LNG projects under Section 3 of the NGA and the public convenience and necessity of pipeline projects under Section 7 of the NGA prior to making its decision on whether or not to approve it. Assessment of the proposed Project has included coordination with multiple federal and state agencies (including the DOE who authorizes the exportation of the commodity) and requires permits or authorizations from additional entities (see section 1.5).

PM3-27

See Comment Response PM3-25.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

19

1 energy here in Texas. Thank you for your time, that's
2 enough.

PM3-27

3 MR. RHOADES: Dale Rhoades. Where I live out
4 there I'm inundated with these projects. They have totally
5 trashed that country out there and I'm going to get to some
6 things here that you probably will not like. When you fight
7 something and you have other people that are for it, sooner
8 or later you end up with some people giving you information
9 that I probably shouldn't have.

PM4-1

10 On these pipelines the deal was made to sell off
11 40% of our gas to give an open perch with these wind farms.
12 This is why I don't know where this thing is going but when
13 you sit there and you do that, we do not have the position
14 in this country to sell off this much gas at 40% when you
15 walk outside and these wind turbines aren't turning.

16 We cannot depend on this energy. I realize it
17 was for just taxes alone, they want the revenue in some of
18 these areas and we have a two trillion dollar note with the
19 Saudi's and Chinese, probably two-thirds of your Congressmen
20 don't even know it. This stuff goes on.

21 I was telling it up front, every day when I walk
22 into my office I have this kind of stuff sitting on my desk,
23 every single day. Its either pipeline, power line, wind
24 farm, anything you can imagine and I want you to know where
25 I'm coming from. When the Bush administration was in the

PM4-2

PM4-1

Under Section 3 of the NGA, oversight for LNG export is divided between the Commission and the DOE. FERC is responsible for approving the safe and sound siting and operation of LNG facilities, given that DOE has approved the export of the commodity. It is the DOE, not the Commission, which retains the exclusive authority over the export of the natural gas as a commodity, including the responsibility to consider whether the exportation of that gas is consistent with the public interest. As described in section 1.1 of the EIS, the DOE granted an authorization to RG LNG for export to countries having a FTA with the United States that includes national treatment for trade in natural gas. In accordance with the NGA and Energy Policy Act of 1992, export to a country with which there is an FTA requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas, is deemed consistent with the public interest. Further, RB Pipeline executed a precedent agreement for the total capacity of the Rio Bravo Pipeline for the 20-year life of the Project, which establishes a basis for a finding by the Commission that the pipeline will be in the public convenience and necessity under Section 7.

PM4-2

Section 4.12.1 of the EIS identifies projects with the potential to contribute to cumulative impacts with the proposed Project, including wind farms, pipelines, and electric transmission projects.

1 White House fertilizer went up 400%. It is priced on nitro
2 gas.

3 Tires are the same way. American economy runs on
4 it. We do not need to be selling this gas. When you sit
5 there and you sell this stuff off and depend on these wind
6 turbines we have a several trillion dollar that we pay,
7 they're not dependable. The thing is with it -- and I'm
8 going to make a lot of people mad when I say this, it's like
9 Monsanto.

10 They sold out last year but the Bush family sat
11 on the Board, the Clinton family sat on the Board and Al
12 Gore's butt sat on the Board -- the price of planting seed
13 going up 1,000% when these people were sitting on the Board.
14 I have a map sitting in my office, it comes out of Chicago,
15 Illinois that has Barrack Obama's name and Congressional
16 District on it from 8 or 9 years ago.

17 If they're going to sit there and work these
18 things -- all of this goes together. This was in that
19 energy independence whatever propaganda they put up with.
20 All's it is is that they're stealing from the American
21 people -- every single one of them.

22 You're going to end up when this gas is pumped
23 out, you're going to end up sending boys back to the Middle
24 East and we're going to kill 'em, right and left again
25 because we're going to have to be fighting for oil again

PM4-1

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)
Raymondville, Texas

1 because you cannot depend on this other stuff.

2 And these people, when they go to do stuff they
3 at least need to keep their name off of it. I also farm
4 land and several years ago Al Gore came up with this scheme
5 and you've probably heard about it -- carbon credits. If
6 you heard about that it turned into the biggest scam in
7 Congress and they threw it out. That's what all of this
8 stuff here is -- they're trying to find ways to fill their
9 pocket with money and you have 300 million people in
10 America, they cannot afford this stuff.

11 That gas needs to stay in this country and be
12 used by Americans. All my neighbor kids were hauled off to
13 war, most of them come back and I don't want to see that
14 happen again. There's plenty of other options for energy --
15 you've got solar power, you have blue energy that's been
16 covered up for 25 years. When you sit here and you look at
17 this stuff they cover it up because there's no tax revenue
18 in these things.

19 All of these projects -- 135 miles here is
20 because your Congressman down there in Cameron County is
21 wanting jobs and tax revenue. That's fine, but that's why
22 it doesn't up here at the terminal, 135 miles north of here
23 that's why it's not turned loose there because it's just a
24 -- these deals are cut and they're hurting everyone.

25 If these Congress people don't believe what I'm

PM4-1

1 saying I will give them a tutor of what was some of the
2 prettiest country in America at one time and it is nothing
3 but an over industrialized slum and that's what it is.

4 300 million Americans are having to put up with
5 this stuff. We have got to find some way to sit there and
6 go to a type of energy that America doesn't look like a
7 junkyard and we have to stop.

8 And I did this same thing a couple of years ago.
9 I don't guess it had any effect on whatsoever because now
10 they're wanting to put that gas and light and sell it off
11 again. These things are all over America. When you have
12 the Native Americans, when they stopped one in Standing Rock
13 it's the best thing they ever did because those are the true
14 Americans -- they seen what was happening and when you stand
15 up to government the same thing happens every time. It
16 doesn't matter if you're one person in south Texas or the
17 Sioux Indians anywhere else. When they decide they're going
18 to take it, they're going to take it.

19 The American people need to know how corrupt this
20 energy industry is all the way from wind energy all the way
21 to selling this gas off. And all of these people are going
22 to have to pay for it if you don't stand up right now and
23 put a stop to it.

24 We have a several trillion dollar, like I said
25 before -- our kids are going to have to pay that thing off

23

1 and there is no way that them things make any money --
2 they're just built simply because this is what they decided
3 on building and they want the tax revenue in these areas.

4 We cannot afford it. Electricity is three to
5 four times as high. This gas -- when I started farming you
6 could buy fertilizer for \$80.00 a ton. It 30 years it went
7 to \$130 -- that was the inflation rate and overnight it
8 increased 400% and this is where this thing is going to end
9 up.

10 We're going to have energy shortages, we're going
11 to have brown-outs and we're going to have all those kinds
12 of problems and when this gas is all gone because I am not
13 the person in the coal industry, but until they find another
14 option, we have got to have something dependable and this
15 wind energy is not it -- there's too many people making too
16 much money off of it.

17 And the company that I've had the most trouble
18 with -- I have a map on my office table -- it's called E.ON
19 Climate and Renewables and they come right out of Chicago,
20 Illinois. I'm not the one that made the map, it's a great
21 big expensive map. A guy gave it to me and said, "You may
22 need this."

23 So I know I don't like talking about Congress and
24 American government like that but they need to quit lying to
25 the American people. We have to address this energy issue.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

24

1 This is half a century now that we've been sitting there and
2 having wars and everything else. It has to be done now.

3 When you talk about renewable energy I will bring
4 the tutor. Anybody who wants to look at it and the massive
5 slaughter of wildlife anywhere from hawks to anything else
6 that any kind of water fowl, there's nothing left in these
7 areas -- they're just dead sterile areas now. They killed
8 off all of the bats and when you sit there and you look at
9 nature and the damage that was done to it, humans -- we have
10 no idea, no environmental impact study was ever made on this
11 stuff.

12 It was an Executive Order, they did not do
13 anything about it, they built wind turbines over the top of
14 people's houses, they built them over schools, they built
15 them over churches, they built them over cemeteries and when
16 people fuss about it they laugh at them and they're going to
17 have to address that issue one day and that's about all I
18 have to say on it and thank you for giving us the
19 opportunity to do so, because most of the time they don't
20 give us opportunity to do anything.

21 MR. SALINAS: My name is S-e-r-g-i-o Sergio A.
22 Salinas. I am from the Rio Grande Valley and we would like
23 for this project to continue in process. The best thing is
24 that it will help us deliver more project for the
25 Raymondville community, wages, benefits and better life in

PM5-1

PM5-1

Comment noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

25

1 the Rio Grande Valley since we don't have no insurance or no
2 way, and our community should be growing and it wasn't
3 growing fast.

4 MR. MEHAFFEY: My name is Mark Mehaffey, M-a-r-k
5 M-e-h-a-f-f-e-y and I'd like to support it. I think it's
6 good for the valley and it's good for the economy. I happen
7 to be in the crane business and I think there will be some
8 benefit there. My wife is in the real estate business and I
9 think it will be beneficial there.

10 As far as the environmental stuff, I've done a
11 lot of work in the oil field and I know they're very strict
12 and have stringent rules and policies in the oil field
13 nowadays about, you know, not spilling any oil or
14 contaminating anything and I'm sure that these LNG perhaps
15 are the same. I've not been around an LNG plant but I've
16 been around natural gas pipelines and plants and compressors
17 and all that stuff.

18 They're just extremely conscious about the
19 environment so I'm not at all worried about them being in
20 our backyard and I just think it's going to be a big plus
21 for everybody's economy -- all the way through, that
22 trickle-down theory or the ripple effect I think is a big,
23 big plus for the valley so something I'm very much looking
24 forward to.

25 DR. BASALDU: Hello, my name is Robert

PM5-1

PM6-1

PM6-2

PM6-1

Comment noted.

PM6-2

Comment noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

26

1 Christopher Basaldu. First name R-o-b-e-r-t, middle name
2 Christopher, C-h-r-i-s-t-o-p-h-e-r, last name Basaldu,
3 B-a-s-a-l-d-u. I am a resident of Cameron County. I live
4 in Brownsville, Texas. My maternal great-grandparents lived
5 in Raymondville.

6 I grew up in Brownsville and in Corpus Christi,
7 Texas. My parents were born and raised in Corpus Christi,
8 Texas for the most part. My mother and my aunt spent some
9 of their childhood growing up in Lyford here in the Valley
10 and in Falfurrias. F-a-l-f-u-r-r-i-a-s, Texas.

11 And so all of these are places here in Cameron
12 and Williamson County except for Corpus Christi which is up
13 in Nueces County, so me and my family we've been here for a
14 very long time and we've been here for many, many
15 generations.

16 South Texas and the Rio Grande Valley are my home
17 and where I come from. I'm opposed to all of this LNG
18 development. I'm opposed to the Rio Bravo Projects for LNG.
19 I'm opposed to the refineries. I'm opposed to the pipelines
20 and I'm opposed to any further petrol chemical and fossil
21 fuel -- what is so-called development.

22 It is not going to provide a lot of good jobs for
23 people in this area and so I don't think that saying that
24 it's going to be good economic development is true. It's
25 not going to be good economic development for most of the

PM7-1

PM7-2

PM7-1

Comment noted. The scope of the proposed Project does not include refineries.

PM7-2

Impacts on socioeconomic conditions in the Project area are discussed in section 4.9. In addition to the temporary positive impacts associated with construction of the Project, 270 permanent jobs would be required for operation of the Project. RG Developers have been coordinating with local training organizations and school districts to provide seminars and career talks to discuss future career opportunities for the Project and anticipate hiring a number of unskilled or semi-skilled workers that would be trained on the job through the National Center for Construction Education and Research System.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

27

1 people here in south Texas or in the Rio Grande Valley.

PM7-2

2 These pipelines are going to cut through land and
3 they'll damage plants and animals. These projects are very
4 damaging and they will upset historic sites, they'll upset
5 archeological sites. They will -- these pipeline projects
6 and development projects will also destroy ancestral remains
7 and sacred sites of Native people -- of Native and
8 indigenous people that lived throughout south Texas and the
9 Rio Grande Valley. That will include Carrizo Comecrudo
10 people.

PM7-3

11 That will include also other Coahuiltecan people
12 and Tonkawa people, Karankawa people and it's -- we also
13 know historically that Comanche's, Kiowa's and various bands
14 of Apache peoples -- Lipah Apache's in particular made it
15 all the way down here through the Rio Grande Valley and all
16 of their ancestors that are buried here and whatever sacred
17 sites they had will potentially be disturbed by these
18 projects.

PM7-4

19 That is unacceptable and it's a continuation of
20 the genocide of Native and indigenous people. These
21 projects must be stopped. Aside from the environmental
22 damage it's also continued colonization and colonial damage
23 and like I said it will be further historic damage to
24 indigenous peoples.

25 These projects -- you know all pipelines leak.

PM7-3

Impacts on wildlife and vegetation are addressed in sections 4.6 and 4.5 of the EIS, respectively.

PM7-4

Section 4.10 of the EIS describes FERC's analysis of impacts on cultural resources. The Section 106 process to identify, evaluate, assess, and mitigate adverse effects to historic properties is ongoing, and would be complete prior to construction of the Project, if authorized. As described in section 4.10.3 of the EIS, RG Developers and FERC have consulted with federally recognized Native American tribes with interest in the Project area. In addition, section 1.3 describes FERC's public review and comment process to identify environmental issues.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

1 All pipelines break -- it's not a matter of how or if
2 they're going to break, it's that when will they break. And
3 these -- if these, when these pipelines break they will
4 damage -- if they're near people's houses or towns they will
5 potentially kill people. We don't want that and when these
6 pipelines break they will poison plants and animals and
7 that's also a terrible thing.

PM7-5

8 We don't need these pipelines coming through our
9 lands. We don't need these refineries at the Port of
10 Brownsville either. When an accident happens or when one of
11 these ships break, there's going to be a lot of pollution
12 into the channel, a lot of pollution into the inter-coastal
13 waterways, a lot of pollutions in the estuaries and these
14 chemicals are poisonous -- they're going to destroy, they're
15 going to kill plants, they're going to kill wildlife,
16 they're going to kill fish, they're going to kill oysters,
17 they're going to kill shrimp.

PM7-6

18 A lot of the coastal waterways rely upon fishing
19 and shrimping and oysters and other forms of seafood and
20 this type of petro chemical project has the potential to
21 poison wildlife, poison the oysters, poison shellfish and
22 fish and shrimp and you know, we in the Rio Grande Valley we
23 like to eat this seafood and we want it to be clean and we
24 don't want it to be poisons, so that's another bad thing
25 about these projects.

PM7-7

PM7-5

Section 4.12.2 of the EIS addresses pipeline safety.

PM7-6

Section 4.12.1.3 of the EIS lists some LNG carrier incidents, none of which resulted LNG cargo breaches. However, in the event an LNG carrier cargo tank were breached causing LNG to spill into the waterway, the immediate threat to aquatic life would be cold temperatures present at the spill. As the LNG spill warms up, the vapors would dissipate into the atmosphere. The primary hazard would be from radiant heat from a pool fire and if the spill does not ignite, an ignitable gas cloud could form until the LNG release dissipates completely.

PM7-7

As described in section 4.6.2 and 4.6.3 of the EIS, impacts on aquatic resources would be minor and, with implementation of required mitigation, impacts on EFH would be temporary and minor. Given the temporary, minor impacts on EFH, NMFS does not have EFH conservation recommendations for the Project.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

1 These projects are being backed in some cases by
2 international funders and the market for this liquid natural
3 gas is not going to benefit south Texas. It's not going to
4 benefit our gas prices at all -- liquid gas prices. All of
5 this liquid gas is being refined to be sold to overseas
6 markets.

7 And so it's not fair that we're going to have
8 projects that are going to destroy our lands or take away
9 lands from the private landowners, that are going to be
10 environmentally destructive, they're going to be destructive
11 to archeological and Native sacred sites. It is not fair
12 that these projects happen and then we don't even get our
13 natural gas prices lowered here as consumers.

14 Why -- because all of that refined gas is going
15 to go somewhere else. It's going to go to international
16 markets. So it is absolutely wrong. It's terrible to
17 destroy our lands and our environments just so other people
18 who live in other parts of the world can have access to
19 somebody's natural gas.

20 It is not fair that you have such high rates of
21 poverty in south Texas and in the Rio Grande Valley and
22 people have to pay retail prices for natural gas when gas --
23 natural gas is being refined and processed through here,
24 through the Rio Grande Valley just so other people can have
25 that gas and then we don't have our gas prices lowered.

PM7-8

PM7-9

PM7-10

PM7-8

Land acquisition and easements associated with the Project are addressed in section 4.8.1.4. As described, the LNG Terminal would be on undeveloped land owned by BND. Alternatively, portions of the Pipeline System would be on private lands and would be subject to landowner easements with RB Pipeline. The easement acquisition process is designed to provide fair compensation to landowners for the right of RB Pipeline to use the property during construction and operation of the pipelines. Easement agreements also would also specify the allowable uses and restrictions on the permanent right-of-way after construction. If an easement cannot be negotiated and the Project is certificated by FERC, then RB Pipeline may use eminent domain, as described in EIS section 4.8.1.4.

PM7-9

Under Section 3 of the NGA, oversight for LNG export is divided between the Commission and the DOE. FERC is responsible for approving the safe and sound siting and operation of LNG facilities, given that DOE has approved the export of the commodity. It is the DOE, not the Commission, which retains the exclusive authority over the export of the natural gas as a commodity, including the responsibility to consider whether the exportation of that gas is consistent with the public interest. As described in section 1.1 of the EIS, the DOE granted an authorization to RG LNG for export to countries having a FTA with the United States that includes national treatment for trade in natural gas. In accordance with the NGA and Energy Policy Act of 1992, export to a country with which there is an FTA requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas, is deemed consistent with the public interest. Further, RB Pipeline executed a precedent agreement for the total capacity of the Rio Bravo Pipeline for the 20-year life of the Project, which establishes a basis for a finding by the Commission that the pipeline will be in the public convenience and necessity under Section 7.

PM7-10

Comment noted. Environmental justice is addressed in section 4.9.10 of the EIS. See Comment Response PM7-9 regarding the purpose and need for the Project.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

1 These projects will enrich and benefit very few
2 people -- these company owners. And they get to live in
3 their houses away from the environmental destruction of
4 these pipelines and from these refineries but the people who
5 live here, we're going to have to be used as a sacrifice
6 zone. We're going to be poisoned by this petrol chemical
7 project. It's not fair that we get poisoned but we don't
8 get any of the benefits and that the profits go to other
9 people who don't even live here.

PM7-11

10 Please, by all means, do not approve any of this
11 liquid natural gas project. Please do not approve the
12 refineries, please do not approve the pipelines, please stop
13 these projects, thank you.

PM7-12

14 MR. RUIZ: Okay my name is Jerry, J-e-r-r-y
15 Ruiz, R-u-i-z. Okay I'm just here to state firmly that I'm
16 opposed to the LNG facilities they want to build in our area
17 and that goes for anywhere actually because they have proven
18 to be quite prone to accidents and to causing environmental
19 damage which we just don't need.

PM8-1

20 It's already come down from the UN that we have
21 like 12 more years left of trying to correct our
22 contaminating ways. This definitely doesn't help. And one
23 of the last places in Texas that has a green area, let's say
24 in our beaches and there's no reason for this. It's going
25 to cause more environmental and financial harm than people

PM7-11

Section 4.9.2 describes economic impacts of the Project. A portion of the construction and operational workforces would be hired locally. RG Developers have been coordinating with local training organizations and school districts to provide seminars and career talks to discuss future career opportunities for the Project and anticipate hiring a number of unskilled or semi-skilled workers that would be trained on the job through the National Center for Construction Education and Research System. As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

We address the potential for disproportionately high and adverse health or environmental effects of the Project on minority and low-income populations in section 4.9.10.

PM7-12

Comment noted. The scope of the proposed Project does not include refineries.

PM8-1

Comment noted. Section 4.12.1 of the EIS addresses LNG Terminal safety. Section 4.12.1.6 describes the operating history of the U.S. LNG industry.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

31

1 expect.

2 It's just making money for the few. The lack of
3 jobs won't be remedied by that, it's just going to actually
4 just make it worse, make people sick. Everybody knows -- at
5 least around the world know this, we're just trying to go
6 through with a green future and there's definitely money in
7 that.

8 So we're just shooting ourselves in the foot if
9 we let this happen. But besides that as well, all the
10 sickness from the contamination as well as contaminating the
11 land, the air, the water -- I already talked about the
12 contaminating ways they do -- we're worried about pipeline
13 explosions.

14 The blast areas can be pretty wide and cause
15 damage to neighboring communities and the local communities
16 are definitely against them. They voiced their concerns
17 they don't want them there and they are the ones that are
18 going to be in proximity to these facilities so they
19 definitely need to be listened to and adhered to I should
20 say and not to those who hold all the money.

21 So these people are going to be affected as well
22 as all of the rest of us down wind and even upstream so I'm
23 definitely opposed against these LNG sites being built in
24 any way, shape or form, thank you.

25 MR. BERG: My name is William Berg, W-i-l-l-i-a-m

PM8-2

PM8-3

PM8-4

PM8-5

PM8-2

Positive impacts on socioeconomic conditions in the Project area are discussed in section 4.9. In addition to the temporary positive impacts associated with construction of the Project, 270 permanent jobs would be required for operation of the Project. RG Developers have been coordinating with local training organizations and school districts to provide seminars and career talks to discuss future career opportunities for the Project and anticipate hiring a number of unskilled or semi-skilled workers that would be trained on the job through the National Center for Construction Education and Research System. Further, RG LNG has committed to donate \$10 million to aid in the funding of community projects.

PM8-3

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics. Further, RG LNG would implement the measures in its SPCC Plan during construction and operation, including spill prevention measures, mitigation measures, and reporting and cleanup methods to reduce potential impacts should a spill occur.

PM8-4

Section 4.12.2 of the EIS addresses pipeline safety, including the risk of pipeline explosion after a gas leak or rupture.

PM8-5

Comment noted. Air quality impacts are addressed in section 4.11.1 of the EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Raymondville, Texas

1 B-e-r-g and I'm here to talk about the big picture of LNG.
2 In early October the International Panel for Climate Change
3 IPCC, a UN organization of scientists who are monitoring
4 climate change and have been doing so for over 10 years
5 released a new report to be issued in December in Poland
6 that indicates if combustion of fossil fuels continues at
7 the current rate for another decade, humanity will
8 experience major disruptions as the planet goes through its
9 greenhouse gas-induced climate change.

10 The IPCC is suggesting rapid reductions in fossil
11 fuel use and rapid expansion of renewable energy
12 infrastructure are necessary to avoid serious disruptions to
13 humanity. The report suggests that the current target of a
14 maximum two degrees Celsius warming of the planning is
15 dangerously high and that 1.5 degrees is a new tipping
16 point.

17 Those are the IPCC's strong recommendations. The
18 preliminary warnings are coming to the United States in the
19 form of disastrous hurricanes, rainstorms and huge, fast
20 moving wildfires -- to Europe and Asia in the form of lethal
21 heat waves and to Africa and China as increasing
22 desertification.

23 With the foreseeable future bringing a required
24 curtailment of fossil fuel production and use or -- I'm
25 sorry let me say that again. With the foreseeable future

PM9-1

PM9-1

As described in section 3.1 of the EIS, the use of alternative energy sources would not meet the stated objective of the Project, and evaluating alternative sources of energy is beyond the scope of this EIS. Under Section 3 of the NGA, oversight for LNG export is divided between the Commission and the DOE. FERC is responsible for approving the safe and sound siting and operation of LNG facilities, given that DOE has approved the export of the commodity. It is the DOE, not the Commission, which retains the exclusive authority over the export of the natural gas as a commodity, including the responsibility to consider whether the exportation of that gas is consistent with ~~in~~ the public interest.

In section 4.12.1, we assess the structural design of the LNG Terminal in consideration of storms (including hurricanes), flooding, and sea level rise. In section 4.12.1.7, we have included a recommendation that RG LNG provide a plan for the perimeter levee to ensure protection of the facility with consideration for sea level rise.

1 bringing a required curtailment of fossil fuel production
2 and use or increasingly catastrophic weather-driven
3 disasters, it does not seem wise for a government agency
4 named Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to be issuing new
5 permits to build fossil fuel pipelines, compressor stations
6 and production plants with anticipated lifetimes of over 3
7 decades.

PM9-1

8 At one time natural gas and its liquid form, LNG,
9 were seen to be a bridge fuel between dirtier fossil fuels
10 including petroleum, coal and peat and the renewable energy
11 future. It turns out that natural gas and fossil fuels are
12 not so clean and natural gas methane is a greenhouse gas
13 over 80 times the disastrous effect of carbon dioxide.

PM9-2

14 With the leaks in pipelines and compressor
15 stations added to the production of LNG, the total impact of
16 LNG is much greater total impact to the greenhouse gas
17 situation in the atmosphere is much greater than simply
18 burning coal.

19 It seems now that either the bridge will have a
20 very short lifetime or else decades of numerous deadly
21 weather events caused by human created climate change will
22 increase. The good news is that FERC can be -- have a
23 positive role.

24 We have the recent example of the thinning of the
25 ozone layer in the upper atmosphere that protects the

PM9-2

As described in section 3.1 of the EIS, the use of alternative energy sources would not meet the stated objective of the Project, and evaluating alternative sources of energy is beyond the scope of this EIS. Economic need will be discussed in the Commission Order. Section 4.13.2.9 of the final EIS was revised to address regional climate change impacts, and section 4.11.1 of the EIS quantifies Project-related GHG emissions, including fugitive emissions from the Pipeline System and compressor station emissions.

1 surface of the planet from deadly solar ultraviolet
2 radiation. The discovery of the problem and its cause came
3 in the mid-1970's.

4 It was release of chloral-floral carbon
5 refrigerants into the atmosphere. In the early 1980's it
6 was discovered that there was an actual hole in the ozone
7 layer in the southern hemisphere -- refrigerants that were
8 once thought to be inert gases turned out to be destroying
9 the ozone layer in the upper atmosphere where the gases
10 inert on the earth's surface became chemically active.

11 Laws were made in the 1980's curtailing the use
12 of the suspect refrigerants and new refrigerants replaced
13 them in the early 1990's. The rate of ozone layer
14 destruction began to slow. In a decade the hole began to
15 shrink and in 2018 it was reported that the hole in the
16 ozone layer is gone and the ozone layer is growing.

17 The lesson is that human intervention to
18 eliminate the sources of human created problems can have a
19 happy outcome, thank you very much.

20 (Whereupon at 7:33 p.m. the meeting was
21 concluded.)

22
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2
3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding
4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the
5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding: Ro Grande LNG Project

7
8
9

10
11
12

13
14
15

16 Docket No.: CP16-454-000

17 Place: Kingsville, TX

18 Date: Wednesday, November 14, 2018

19 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original
20 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy
21 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription
22 of the proceedings.

23
24 Larry Flowers
25 Official Reporter

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

2

3 Rio Grande LNG Project

4

5 Docket Nos. CP16-454-000, CP16-455-000

6

7 and

8

9 Texas LNG Project

10

11 Docket No. CP16-116-000

12

13 Port Isabel Convention Center

14 309 E. Railroad Avenue

15 Port Isabel, TX 78578

16 Thursday, November 15, 2018

17 5:00 p.m.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

- 1 SPEAKER LIST
- 2 Thomas Jaudzemis
- 3 Lela Burnell Korab
- 4 Theresa Rudolph
- 5 Andrea Hance
- 6 Nytah Burnell
- 7 Jennie McBride
- 8 Ed McBride
- 9 Gail Tschirhart
- 10 Rene Valdez
- 11 Mary Branch
- 12 James Bathurst
- 13 Marianne Poythress
- 14 Glenn Boward
- 15 Dr. Shelly Sembler
- 16 Joanna Ward
- 17 Marta Elena Pena
- 18 Rafael Salazar
- 19 Anita Ramirez
- 20 Patricia Rubio
- 21 William E. Kenon
- 22 Joseph Cantu
- 23 Ivy Hinson
- 24 Doug Faircloth
- 25 Madeleine Sandefur

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

- 1 SPEAKER LIST (Continued)
- 2 Ralph Cowen
- 3 Rick Cruz
- 4 Wanda Reyes
- 5 Maile Worrell
- 6 Josette Cruz
- 7 William Berg
- 8 Dr. Robert Christopher Basaldu
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. JAUDZEMIS: My name is Thomas, T-h-o-m-a-s
3 Jaudzemis, it's J-a-u-d-z-e-m-i-s. I live on South Padre
4 Island, Texas. My address is 708 Padre Boulevard, number
5 1005 South Padre Island 78597.

6 I'm here because I'm very concerned about the
7 effects of this proposed development on the residents and
8 the economy of South Padre Island. South Padre Island's
9 economy is 100% based on tourism. The only reason people go
10 to South Padre Island is to enjoy the beach, to go fishing,
11 to go swimming, to look at the birds, to look at the
12 dolphins, to take eco-trips and there is no heavy industry
13 or anything like that in the immediate vicinity.

14 Our island's southern border is the ship channel
15 that goes up to the Port of Brownsville and from my condo or
16 from the Port Isabel causeway I can see the Port of
17 Brownsville and so I know that we would be directly impacted
18 by any kind of major event that happened in the Port of
19 Brownsville and I'm very concerned that one of the last
20 areas in Texas that still has clean air, clean water, clean
21 sand could be permanently ruined by any kind of incident
22 that would happen in the Port of Brownsville.

23 We're just a short distance from the Port. We're
24 connected by water with the Port. Any ships carrying these
25 products would be passing right by the island and Texas

PM10-1

PM10-2

PM10-1

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction.

PM10-2

Comment noted. As described in section 4.12.1.3 of the EIS, major LNG marine vessel accidents have not resulted in injury to the public and have resulted in minimal loss of LNG for incidents involving loading or unloading operations and no loss of LNG after a grounding or collision event. Section 4.12.1.3 also discusses Coast Guard's requirements for LNG marine vessel operations and the potential hazards within the Zones of Concern in the event of a LNG marine vessel breach.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

5

1 already has hundreds of miles of carcinogenic coasts and
2 simply doesn't need any more.

3 We have by far the best beaches in Texas and
4 literally hundreds of thousands of people come to that area
5 to enjoy the -- what's still a nice, pristine area and
6 that's a sustainable form of economy, it's a sustainable
7 form of tourism, but it's something which could be destroyed
8 in a heartbeat if there's anything bad that happens as a
9 result of a project as the one which is proposed here.

10 The same is largely true for the surrounding
11 areas. Port Isabel still has a streams, fishing is a big
12 activity out of the Port Isabel there's still a shrimp fleet
13 in, comes out of the Port of Brownsville. And when I look
14 at some of the incidents which have happened in the Gulf of
15 Mexico in recent years, we know that they have long-lasting
16 consequences could devastate a fishery and I just don't know
17 how the economy of this area would ever recover from that
18 kind of an incident.

19 There's no -- really no backup plan that I know
20 of for places like South Padre Island and Port Isabel. If
21 our clean air, clean water are ruined by some kind of tanker
22 that goes down off the coast here.

23 I'm also very concerned that we're trying to
24 sacrifice the environment of this area and of the country
25 for a product which is going to largely be exported -- it's

PM10-2

PM10-3

PM10-3

Under Section 3 of the NGA, oversight for LNG export is divided between the Commission and the DOE. FERC is responsible for approving the safe and sound siting and operation of LNG facilities, given that DOE has approved the export of the commodity. It is the DOE, not the Commission, which retains the exclusive authority over the export of the natural gas as a commodity, including the responsibility to consider whether the exportation of that gas is consistent with the public interest. As described in section 1.1 of the EIS, the DOE granted an authorization to RG LNG for export to countries having a FTA with the United States that includes national treatment for trade in natural gas. In accordance with the NGA and Energy Policy Act of 1992, export to a country with which there is an FTA requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas, is deemed consistent with the public interest. Further, RB Pipeline executed a precedent agreement for the total capacity of the Rio Bravo Pipeline for the 20-year life of the Project, which establishes a basis for a finding by the Commission that the pipeline will be in the public convenience and necessity under Section 7.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

6

1 going to be sold to other countries. I don't know why we
2 would have to pay that environmental cost for something
3 which isn't even going to benefit people in this country.

4 This is a fuel which is going to be used for a
5 short period of time. The way the climate is changing, with
6 global warming, if we don't stop relying on fossil fuels and
7 all their costs such as the extraction costs to the
8 environment, refinement costs and the costs of burning these
9 fuels, we're going to be seeing great catastrophic effects
10 on life in this planet.

11 We already see the State of California burning up
12 because it's been so dry. We see storms hitting, you know
13 500 years, 1,000 year storms hitting every year. We see
14 changes in rainfall, we see areas which are normally wet,
15 drying up. Northern Europe last summer had so little rain
16 they couldn't ship boat traffic on the Rhine River and on
17 the Danube River, something which has never happened before.

18 They have forest fires in the Baltic States and
19 in Finland and I think if we simply continue to sacrifice
20 the future for so few bucks at the present time, it's very
21 far-sighted and it's going to be harmful for generations to
22 come and at some point it's going to be irreversible damage.

23 I just think if you do a legitimate cost benefit
24 analysis of this project, especially figuring out the cost
25 and benefits over time, this is a project which should not

PM10-3

PM10-4

PM10-5

PM10-4

We have updated section 4.13.2.9 to include a discussion regarding climate change.

PM10-5

Comment noted. The EIS is not a decision document; rather, it is a tool to ensure that the potential environmental impacts that would occur as a result of a federal action are fully analyzed and presented, in compliance with NEPA. Under NEPA, the determination that an impact is significant necessitates the preparation of an EIS (as opposed to an EA). In accordance with NEPA, we have prepared this EIS to present the environmental impacts that would occur as a result of the Project. The decision of whether to authorize the Project is determined by the FERC Commissioners.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

7

1 be allowed to proceed. I don't see any kind of widespread
2 support for this kind of project in the local population.
3 Almost all the people that I talk to are appalled by this
4 project, they're scared of it and I hope the project is not
5 green-lighted to go forward.

6 I would be willing to testify and make my
7 feelings known at any further hearings and I'm glad to go on
8 record in opposition to this project, thank you.

9 MS. KORAB: My name is Lela Burnell Korab.

10 L-e-l-a B-u-r-n-e-l-l Korab, K-o-r-a-b is my last name.

11 And I am with Shrimpers and Fisherman of the RGB. And I --
12 we are third generation shrimping -- from a shrimping family
13 of third generation and we have been in this area since the
14 1800's and right now we have shrimp boats still and we have
15 a store it's called Shrimp Outlet, and we cater to tens of
16 thousands of tourists every year.

17 And I had one customer -- one customer came in
18 and say that she has travelled the coast from one point of
19 the United States, she left from Oregon area and they
20 travelled along all the west coast and came all along the
21 south and then all along the east coast and our area was the
22 most beautiful area that they had seen and they chose to
23 settle here of all the United States.

24 And the reason they liked it because the lack of
25 industry and the lack of pollution and they were very

PM10-5

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

8

1 impressed and I feel like our area attracts tourism just for
2 that reason and I feel like the construction of all these
3 plants and the danger of pollution would have a huge effect
4 on our local fisherman that fish for pleasure and also that
5 fish commercially and our shrimping, because the shrimping
6 depends largely on the estuaries and our eco-system and I
7 feel like a spill like I read today is inevitable.

PM11-1

8 Like I read -- this is a quote from the Coast
9 Guard in the Monitor Magazine, it says, "Accidents while LNG
10 is being transferred to the ship at the site of LNG storage
11 tanks and liquefaction process is where Hightower has seen
12 some of the biggest spills that still happen in small
13 amounts. Hightower said maybe 4 to 5 gallons. It takes
14 about 15 hours to fill up the LNG ship and transfer the
15 liquid very fast and use multiple hoses he said so if you
16 don't get something that causes the hose break or the ship
17 moves, there is an emergency shutdown device, but you can
18 have gallons spill out.

PM11-2

19 Those small gallons would affect the shipping
20 channel where it's going to be. That's where a lot of the
21 estuary is in place for our shrimping and our local fishing
22 and that is my concern. Also, the lack of the use of the
23 waterways and the lack of for sports fishermen and
24 commercial fishermen as well. I think that's it.

25 MS. RUDOLPH: My name is Theresa Rudolph,

PM11-1

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. Overall, we anticipate that visitation patterns may change but the number of visits to the Project area would likely not. We further conclude that employment in the tourism industry is not likely to be adversely affected.

PM11-2

The LNG loading arms would be not hoses, but specialized equipment that consists of hard piping. In addition, each LNG loading arm would be equipped with a powered emergency release coupling that allows the loading arms to safely break away in the event that the LNG marine vessel moves. The coupling is designed to disconnect the LNG loading arms and prevent large releases into the waterway. If any LNG were released, it would quickly flash to gas and not affect water quality or aquatic resources.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 T-h-e-r-e-s-a Rudolph is R-u-d-o-l-p-h. I've lived on
2 South Padre Island since 2001 full time. I've been visiting
3 here since 1987 and I've owned property both in Port Isabel
4 and on South Padre Island since 1994.

5 My background is I'm a businesswoman and I fully
6 understand the need for jobs. However, I am totally against
7 LNG and fracking, especially in our area because I believe
8 it will have a negative effect on jobs.

9 Yes, people at the Port will make money but our
10 main industry is tourism, including fishing and eco-tourism.
11 Increased pollution in air and water will reduce tourism and
12 hurt our local economy and ultimately reduce the number of
13 jobs. We draw tourists from Houston, from Dallas, from
14 Austin, San Antonio and all around Texas. A lot of these
15 tourists drive here.

16 In driving here in many cases they drive right
17 past exits for Galveston and Corpus Christi and other towns
18 along the beach area. They come here and they come here
19 because we don't have the industry and the pollution that
20 those other places do. They pass right by Corpus Christi,
21 three hours they're drive could be done three hours earlier,
22 instead they come here.

23 They come here because our water is relatively
24 clean and our air is relatively clean and we don't have a
25 huge industry and the tall buildings they feel like they

PM12-1

PM12-2

PM12-1

Impacts on tourism, and jobs associated with the tourism industry, are discussed in section 4.9.3.1.

PM12-2

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. Overall, we anticipate that visitation patterns may change but the number of visits to the Project area would likely not. We further conclude that employment in the tourism industry is not likely to be adversely affected.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

10

1 really have a getaway. Our water here is already a problem.
2 LNG will make it worse.

3 Some may think it is acceptable levels of
4 pollutants. I would urge you to be the person who's
5 drinking the water or in our case not drinking the water. I
6 have rental units, I need to provide bottled water for them.
7 We have filtered water in our restaurants, it's already a
8 problem.

9 There is no question there will be air and water
10 pollution. The question is what are the levels and what is
11 acceptable and what is acceptable to whom. It's not
12 acceptable to me, it's not acceptable to the residents in
13 this area.

14 In addition to we will have an effect from that
15 pollution both in the first year and every year thereafter.
16 Safety is another issue. I realize that they're doing what
17 they can to keep it safe, however, there is only one way for
18 me to get off that island in case there's a problem. I'm
19 within several miles, I have to cross the Queen Isabella
20 causeway, it is the only way across and off the island and
21 unfortunately it's over the causeway towards the problem.

22 We would be driving directly towards any blast or
23 any problem that occurs or any leakage or spillage or
24 anything else. We're on the other side, but we're right
25 there. I have a friend with asthma, he's a singer. If the

PM12-2

PM12-3

PM12-4

PM12-5

PM12-3

Surface water impacts associated with the Project are discussed in section 4.3.2.2 of the final EIS. Impacts on air quality are discussed in section 4.11.1.

PM12-4

Section 4.12.1.6 of the EIS contains more information on the development of RG LNG's ERP. RG LNG would continue these collaborative efforts during the development, design, and construction of the Project. Section 4.12.1.7 of the EIS also contains a recommendation that RG LNG provide periodic updates on the development of these plans and ensure they are in place prior to commencement of construction. This recommendation would also require RG LNG to provide evacuation plans. In addition, section 4.12.1.7 recommends that Project facilities be subject to regular inspections throughout the life of the facility and would continue to require RG LNG to provide updates to the ERP.

PM12-5

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

11

1 air quality is any worse he will have to leave. We'll lose
2 residents, there are studies -- in fact we've had people
3 before discuss the problems this has on children's health
4 and on anyone who is not fully developed yet, those problems
5 are even stronger and worse and harder than they are on
6 adults.

PM12-5

7 Getting to the natural area and habitat -- I
8 moved here because it was a beautiful, relatively pristine
9 area where there was tourism, yes, there was fishing, there
10 were people out playing on the water in all kinds of
11 different ways. That's going to be reduced.

PM12-6

12 The traffic of the tankers will be an eyesore and
13 it will be a problem for boaters who go out both early in
14 the mornings for fishing and coming back. It will be a
15 problem for tourism boats. We have a lot of boats who go
16 out on dolphin watches, we have a lot of fishing boats just
17 by the day. We have a lot of people who just go out joy
18 riding in the boats and now all of a sudden we are going to
19 have tankers going back and forth every single day in the
20 channel that we've enjoyed. I think that will reduce the
21 tourism.

PM12-7

22 I think a lot fewer people will come here because
23 of that which means ultimately fewer jobs. We have a lot of
24 issues in this area because they would affect the ocelot,
25 the natural beauty in a lot of the areas. In reading the

PM12-8

PM12-6

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to- ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction.

PM12-7

See Comment Response PM12-6.

PM12-8

In section 4.4.2 of the EIS, we recognize that the LNG Terminal would result in the permanent loss of wetlands. If approved, the Project would be subject to the requirements for compensatory mitigation for wetland losses under Section 404 of the CWA, in addition to the construction mitigation measures outlined in RG LNG's Procedures and the measures described in the EIS. Further, compensatory or offsite mitigation is not required for general wildlife habitat; however, as discussed in sections 4.7.1.3 and 4.7.1.4, any mitigation for habitat loss for the ocelot or northern aplomado falcon would be determined through completion of the ESA consultation process with the FWS. .

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

12

1 materials it looks like they are not going to provide equal
2 areas to fix what they're ruining.

PM12-8

3 I know that they are going to provide some jobs
4 but it's not nearly the amount of jobs that we are going to
5 lose ultimately from this. I believe our current
6 administration is in there because of increased jobs and the
7 promises of increased jobs. So I am appealing to you on
8 that current that I truly believe we will have a net loss of
9 jobs if this is allowed to come here.

PM12-9

10 We are also one of the worst areas as far as
11 getting good premium healthcare, so if you add all these
12 detriments to our health in the air, in the water and then
13 the potential problems of explosions, leaks, other things --
14 we do not have the kind of healthcare a major city would
15 have. We are one of the poorest areas of the country and I
16 feel like this is being pushed on us because we are one of
17 the poorest areas in the country.

PM12-10

18 They can easily build this somewhere else. There
19 is land where it's already not pristine. There are many
20 dirty sites that this could be built on including some in
21 Corpus Christi, so I really think that those are the places
22 that this should be. If it is built here, our health will
23 decline. It will be years before we see the cumulative
24 effects of what will happen to our health and to our
25 children's health.

PM12-11

PM12-12

PM12-9

As identified in section 1.0, FERC considers the public interest and/or the public convenience and necessity of a project prior to making its decision on whether or not to approve it. The EIS is developed as part of the proposed Project's consideration to identify the environmental impacts that would occur if the Project were to be approved, and to identify mitigation measures that would minimize those impacts on the environment. Assessment of the proposed Project has included coordination with multiple federal and state agencies and requires permits or authorizations from additional entities (see section 1.5). Positive impacts on socioeconomic conditions in the Project area are discussed in section 4.9. In addition to the temporary positive impacts associated with construction of the Project, 270 permanent jobs would be required for operation of the Project. RG Developers have been coordinating with local training organizations and school districts to provide seminars and career talks to discuss future career opportunities for the Project and anticipate hiring a number of unskilled or semi-skilled workers that would be trained on the job through the National Center for Construction Education and Research System. Further, RG LNG has committed to donate \$10 million to aid in the funding of community projects.

PM12-10

As discussed in 4.9.10 of the EIS, although the demographics indicate that potential environmental justice communities are present within the census blocks near the Project site, there is no evidence that these communities would be disproportionately affected by the Project or that impacts on these communities would appreciably exceed impacts on the general population. Further, as described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. Potential pollution emissions from the proposed new compressor stations and LNG Terminal, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

PM12-11

As discussed in section 3.3, alternative sites for the Project in Corpus Christi, Texas were evaluated; however, all of these sites failed to meet the established criteria for a suitable Project site.

PM12-12

Cumulative impacts on air quality are addressed in section 4.13.2.9 of the EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 There are already many other sites this thing
2 could go. I urge that you please say no to LNG and no to
3 the pipelines coming here. Thank you for your time.

4 MS. HANCE: My name is Andrea Hance, it's
5 A-n-d-r-e-a H-a-n-c-e. My title if you need it, I'm the
6 Executive Director of the Texas Shrimp Association.

7 So we have a few concerns that I'd like to bring
8 up. First of all we obviously are concerned about any
9 environmental impacts and I do realize that there are some
10 studies that either are currently being conducted or they
11 will in the near future but obviously that's our number 1
12 concern is any effects on the estuaries, the water
13 temperatures, and probably things that I'm not even aware of
14 because I'm not a marine biologist, so that's our first
15 concern.

16 Our second concern would be the use of the
17 channel. So the vessel traffic -- are we going to be
18 easily, are we going to be allowed to basically come and go
19 as need be or are we going to be limited to certain hours?
20 We obviously need to make sure that our ships can flow in
21 freely, you know, obviously if there's any negative -- if
22 we're effected negatively on that we'd like to have some
23 form of compensation and then the other area we want to make
24 sure that with these facilities will it increase the level
25 of security in terms or in relations to our fishing vessels?

PM12-13

PM13-1

PM13-2

PM12-13

Comment noted. Section 3.3 evaluates other potential locations for the LNG Terminal.

PM13-1

Impacts on water quality are described in section 4.3.2 of the EIS.

PM13-2

Impacts on marine transportation are addressed in section 4.9.8.2. LNG carriers would be required to follow mandates such as providing notification to LNG Terminal managers and relevant authorities of the expected arrival of an LNG carrier 4 days in advance. The estimated delay for vessels during inbound LNG carrier transits would be about 3 hours. Further, we recognize in section 4.9.3, impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass, if they arrive during LNG carrier transit.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 So in other words, we get boarded every now and then from
2 the Coast Guard or any law enforcement agency, they can
3 board our boats.

4 And we just want to make sure that this is not
5 going to increase our working together -- I guess the number
6 of boardings so to speak. We want to make sure
7 security-wise they're not out there boarding our boats every
8 single time the boat comes in or out.

9 I guess the fourth concern is obviously tourism,
10 so we've really vamped up the tourism down at the Port of
11 Brownsville by the winter Texan tourists and actually the
12 Texas Shrimp Association is actually working with a grant to
13 assist with increasing the tourism and we run anywhere from
14 5 to 7,000 people through in a month and a half and
15 obviously timing-wise that's going to revert back to you
16 know, the ships need to be there at a certain time.

17 I know one of my fellow shrimpers they work in
18 the tourism industry and they have to make sure the ships
19 are there at a certain time in order to feed the consumer --
20 feed the tourist. And those are just touching upon I guess
21 the four or five issues that we're having a problem with.

22 I guess the other thing I'd like to bring up is
23 kind of the fear of the unknown. What happens if and/or
24 when we are financially impacted? I'd like to know what
25 kind of compensation plan that's in place and other than

PM13-3

PM13-4

PM13-5

PM13-3

Section 4.12.1.4 of the EIS contains more information on the Coast Guard's Letter of Recommendation (LOR). As stated in the LOR, the Coast Guard would assess each transit on a case by case basis to identify what safety and security measures would be necessary to safeguard the public health and welfare, critical infrastructure and key resources, the port, the marine environment, and the LNG marine vessel. If this Project is approved and if appropriate resources are not in place prior to LNG marine vessel movement along the waterway, then the COTP would consider at that time what, if any, vessel traffic and/or facility control measures would be appropriate to adequately address navigational safety and maritime security considerations.

PM13-4

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction. Finally, sections 4.9.4 and 4.9.8.2 have been revised to more explicitly address impacts on the bait shrimping industry.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

PM13-5

Negative and positive impacts on socioeconomic characteristics in the Project area are addressed in section 4.9. Specifically, we find that the increase need for emergency services such as police, fire, and medical to be minor given the nominal change in the local population during construction and operation. Further, need for these services would be offset by RG LNG’s commitment to train a portion of the construction and operation workforces as emergency responders and to hire onsite security. Also, as described in section 4.12.1.6 of the EIS and as required by 49 CFR 193.2509 Subpart F, RG LNG would need to prepare emergency procedures manuals that include provisions for evacuation of the public, including plans for coordinating with appropriate local officials in preparation of an emergency evacuation plan.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 that I think that's all that I'd like to bring up.

2 MS. BURNELL: Nytah, N-y-t-a-h Burnell. I quote
3 from an article in the Monitor, "The U.S. Coast Guard
4 assesses these hazards and determines critical areas and
5 waterway suitability Hightower said.

6 The speed limit is one way to minimize the
7 severity of an accident, there are a lot of things the Coast
8 Guard can draw on to reduce the likelihood of a breach and
9 thus the hazard to the public, Hightower said.

10 It changes depending on the waterway what
11 industries, community center and residential areas, but it's
12 still best to be as far away from populated areas as
13 possible like the Cheniere Testa Levine and Sabine Pass,
14 Louisiana."

15 If the Federal Energy Regulation Commission
16 provided these provisions for the Cheniere Facility, what is
17 the difference for our area? I am currently living less
18 than 100 yards from the waterway in question. I would
19 appreciate the same considerations.

20 Bullet points for comments to FERC on Rio-Grande
21 LNG Draft Environmental Impact Statement -- the Draft
22 Environmental Impact Statement is incomplete. There is a
23 long list of important information that FERC is requesting
24 from Rio Grande.

25 Before the end of the comment period, how is the

PM14-1

PM14-2

PM14-1

Section 4.12.1.3 of the final EIS contains information of the Coast Guard regulatory requirements. This includes LNG marine vessel security plans, risk management strategies, and characterization of the LNG marine vessel route. As described in section 4.12.1.3 of the EIS, major LNG marine vessel accidents have not resulted in injury to the public and have resulted in minimal loss of LNG for incidents involving loading or unloading operations and no loss of LNG after a grounding or collision event. Figures 4.12.3-1 and -2 in the draft EIS showed the potential extent of hazards due to accidental and intentional disruptive incidents to a loaded (outbound) LNG marine vessel along the LNG marine vessel route. The outer perimeter of Zone 3 (NVIC 01- 2011, "Zones of Concern") equates to the vapor cloud dispersion distance to the lower flammability limit from a worst case un-ignited release. However, for the largest intentional zone, page 53 of the Sandia National Laboratories Report SAND2004-6258 states, "the potential for a large vapor dispersion from an intentional breach is highly unlikely." The Sandia Report reaches this determination because any intentional act that would have enough energy to breach the cargo tank would also be expected to quickly ignite the LNG vapor, which would then burn near the pool source and not disperse. Section 4.12.1.6 of the final EIS also discusses the ERP that would be developed and coordinated with appropriate federal, state, and local officials. These plans would include an emergency evacuation plan of the surrounding public in the event of an emergency, including the unlikely catastrophic failure of an LNG storage tank and emergency response needs along the entire ship route.

PM14-2

The EIS was prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ guidelines, and the Commission's regulations and policy. The EIS is consistent with FERC style, formatting, and policy regarding NEPA evaluation of alternatives and different impact types. The EIS is comprehensive and thorough in its identification and evaluation of feasible mitigation measures to reduce those effects whenever possible. While some information was still pending at the time of issuance of the draft EIS, the lack of this final information does not deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such effect. The draft EIS included sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand and consider the issues raised by the proposed Project and addresses a reasonable range of alternatives. The final EIS includes additional information provided by RG Developers, cooperating agencies, and new or revised information based on substantive comments on the draft EIS.

The draft EIS comment period was consistent with the FERC's typical comment period of 45 days. The FERC continued to accept comments on the draft EIS and other related materials placed into the record well past the end date of the comment period up, to the extent possible, the point of publication of the final EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

16

1 public supposed to comment on information that isn't there?
2 The comment deadline should be extended for at least 2 weeks
3 after all the required information is submitted and made
4 public. The mitigation plan is grossly inadequate.

PM14-2

5 There is no mitigation plan for the Upland, Loma
6 and brush habitat that will be destroyed. For the wetlands
7 that will be built in -- excuse me, they proposed preserving
8 an area that is already under Fish and Wildlife Service
9 Protection and Management -- that does not mean in full
10 mitigation.

PM14-3

11 The Wetlands Mitigation Plan as proposed will
12 violate the No Net Loss Federal Policy. The need for this
13 project has not been demonstrated. There are no buyers for
14 the LNG, no binding contracts for a project with so many
15 negative impacts, unequivocal need for the product of each
16 town.

PM14-4

17 There is no analysis of the impacts to both the
18 bait shrimping industry which relies on the BSC nor on the
19 off-shore shrimping industry which relies ready access to
20 the BSC to get to and from the Gulf.

PM14-5

21 The DEIS says that of the 36 -- 3,655 acres that
22 would be disturbed during construction, 1,507 acres would
23 return to pre-construction conditions and use including
24 wetlands. After literally years of construction and
25 activity that is highly unlikely, particularly in the

PM14-6

PM14-7

PM14-3

Upland habitats, including lomas, in the Project area are not protected; therefore, mitigation of these habitat is not required. However, we acknowledge that lomas are important habitat for ocelots. Any mitigation for habitat loss for the ocelot would be determined through completion of the ESA consultation process. As described in section 4.4.2 of the EIS, wetland mitigation plans are part of the permitting process associated with Section 404 of the CWA. RG LNG's final wetland mitigation plans would be developed and submitted to the COE, and would be implemented in addition to the construction mitigation measures outlined in RG LNG's Procedures and the measures described in the EIS. Construction of the LNG Terminal would not be authorized to commence prior to finalization of the wetland mitigation plans and issuance of the COE's CWA Section 404/Section 10 permit.

PM14-4

See Comment Response PM14-3. Under Section 3 of the NGA, oversight for LNG export is divided between the Commission and the DOE. FERC is responsible for approving the safe and sound siting and operation of LNG facilities, given that DOE has approved the export of the commodity. It is the DOE, not the Commission, which retains the exclusive authority over the export of the natural gas as a commodity, including the responsibility to consider whether the exportation of that gas is consistent with the public interest. As described in section 1.1 of the EIS, the DOE granted an authorization to RG LNG for export to countries having a FTA with the United States that includes national treatment for trade in natural gas. In accordance with the NGA and Energy Policy Act of 1992, export to a country with which there is an FTA requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas, is deemed consistent with the public interest. Further, RB Pipeline executed a precedent agreement for the total capacity of the Rio Bravo Pipeline for the 20-year life of the Project, which establishes a basis for a finding by the Commission that the pipeline will be in the public convenience and necessity under Section 7.

PM14-5

Impacts on commercial fishing are addressed in section 4.9.4. While minor, temporary and permanent impacts on commercial fishing in the BSC would occur from construction and operation of the LNG Project, the majority of the commercial fishing industry is based on offshore shrimping and fishing. As such the Project is unlikely to result in a measurable effect on commercial landings in the Project area. Sections 4.9.4 and 4.9.8.2 have been revised to more explicitly address impacts on the bait shrimping industry.

PM14-6

Sections 4.4, 4.5, and 4.8 provide detail acres of impacts by wetland, vegetation, and land use type, respectively.

PM14-7

Section 4.4.2.2 of the EIS acknowledges that, due to the longer disturbance of wetlands within the same corridor due to proposed sequential installation of Pipelines 1 and 2, and the potential for conversion of wetland cover types within the permanent right-of-way, compensatory mitigation could be required as part of the CWA Section 404 permit for the Pipeline System. Issuance of the CWA Section 404 permit is not under FERC's jurisdiction. Regarding the restoration of wetlands disturbed during construction, section 6.3 of RG Developers' Procedures describes wetland restoration requirements, which includes, but is not limited to, consultation with appropriate federal or state agencies to develop a Project-specific wetland restoration plan, and ensuring that all disturbed areas successfully revegetate with wetland herbaceous and/or woody plant species and that the company control the invasion and spread of invasive species and noxious weeds. Section 6.4.5 of RG Developers' Procedures describes the criteria for determining successful wetland restorations. The COE may require additional monitoring parameters during its permitting process.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 terminal area.
2 FERC should require Uplands mitigation for this
3 loss. Dredging impacts on the Bahia Grande and South Bay
4 need to be examined. Sea grasses and oyster beds can be
5 affected by even mild dredged soil deposition.
6 Using wetlands for work space and roads is
7 unacceptable. The likelihood of their returning to their
8 original state after several years of heavy construction is
9 almost non-existent. The DEIS says that 74 acres of
10 wildlife habitat will be permanently destroyed at the
11 terminal site.
12 There is no mention of how this loss will be
13 replaced or mitigated. A moderate permanent impact on local
14 wildlife is not acceptable. The DEIS states that wetlands
15 that channel and mud flaps at the terminal site are
16 essential fish habitat, yet it appears no study has been
17 done on the fish and vented resources in the channel at the
18 project site.
19 Without that data, how can you assess the impacts
20 of the extensive dredging, pile driving and operation of the
21 project. The DEIS states that this project has the
22 potential to result in significant impacts on ocelot and
23 ocelot recovery for an area that has so few ocelot and so
24 little ocelot habitat, this is reason to deny the permit.
25 The DEIS states that there would be moderate

PM14-7

PM14-8

PM14-9

PM14-10

PM14-11

PM14-12

PM14-8

As described in section 4.6.2, South Bay connects to the BSC more than 2.5 miles from the LNG Terminal site; therefore, impacts of dredging and dredged materials on seagrass beds and oyster beds in South Bay are not anticipated. Dredging is not proposed in the Bahia Grande or South Bay; dredging would occur within the BSC and the LNG Terminal site (see section 4.3.2.2).

PM14-9

Section 6.3 of RG Developers' Procedures describes wetland restoration requirements, which includes, but is not limited to, consultation with appropriate federal or state agencies to develop a Project-specific wetland restoration plan, and ensuring that all disturbed areas successfully revegetate with wetland herbaceous and/or woody plant species and control the invasion and spread of invasive species and noxious weeds. Section 6.4.5 of RG Developers' Procedures describes the criteria for determining successful wetland restoration, including that vegetation is at least 80 percent of either the cover documented for the wetland prior to construction, or at least 80 percent of the cover in adjacent wetland areas that were not disturbed by construction. If natural rather than active revegetation was used, the plant species composition must be consistent with early successional wetland plant communities in the affected ecoregion. The COE may require additional monitoring parameters during its permitting process.

PM14-10

Comment noted; wildlife impacts are addressed in section 4.6.1 of the EIS. Appendix M includes a revised EFH assessment for the Project, which includes an assessment of habitats and managed fish and shellfish species with the potential to occur at the Project site based on available data and field survey results for habitats in the Project area. Consultation regarding the EFH assessment is complete, and, given the temporary, minor impacts on EFH, NMFS does not have EFH conservation recommendations for the Project.

PM14-11

As identified in section 4.7.1.4, our determination of effect for the ocelot is "likely to adversely affect." A "likely to adversely affect" determination is not a reason to deny a permit under Section 7 of the ESA. Rather, the ESA requires that, if a project would be likely to adversely affect a threatened or endangered species, the federal action agency (in this case, FERC) must conduct formal consultations with the FWS. This process requires the FWS to prepare a Biological Opinion for the Project.

PM14-12

Impacts on the Zapata boat launch and associated facilities are addressed in section 4.8.1.5; and impacts on recreation fishing, including fishing trips that launch from the Zapata boat launch, are addressed in section 4.9.3. As discussed further in section 4.9.7, the influx of temporary and permanent workers to the Project are would result in nominal increases in the total population requiring public services such as school, police, fire, and medical. Under the worst-case scenario, the Project would increase school enrollment by less than 5 percent and the student-to-teacher ratio would increase by less than one. Increase need for emergency services such as police, fire, and medical were also found to be minor and would be offset by RG LNG's commitment to train a portion of the construction and operation workforces as emergency responders and to hire onsite security.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 impacts of this upon the boat launch area. There would be
2 even greater impacts onto fish in the restoration channel
3 which nearly abuts the Rio Grande LNG site. This needs to
4 be addressed and included.

5 The DEIS states there will be 92.9 million in
6 property taxes paid over 22 years which will result in a
7 moderate, permanent and positive economic impact. This
8 averages 4.2 million per year which has to cover increased
9 school costs, construction, repair of roads,
10 infrastructure, fire, police, EMS and other services.

11 Taxpayers will likely be paying more than 2
12 million per year and is FERC considering that with every
13 year of operation the taxable value of the project will be
14 depreciating.

15 MS. MCBRIDGE: My name is Jennie McBride and it's
16 J-e-n-n-i-e M-c-B-r-i-d-e, McBride. Well I don't know if
17 they know anything about the fact that there's an island
18 very near here, it's called Long Island Village and it has a
19 community of about 2,500 sometimes more, sometimes less
20 residents and its located just 1.7 miles southeast of the
21 proposed LNG plant, especially Texas LNG.

22 Our community was created with a resort-like
23 atmosphere with many outdoor activities like golfing and
24 fishing, swimming and most of the owners there including
25 myself are older, retired residents. Many have compromised

PM14-12

PM14-13

PM14-13

As discussed further in section 4.9.5, the estimated tax benefits presented within assume the Project would receive tax abatements comparable to those recently granted for other LNG and major refining and petrochemical facilities along the Texas Gulf Coast. Further, RG LNG has committed to annual payments of \$2.7 million during the first 10 years of operation to offset a portion of the forgone taxes associated with the abatement.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 respiratory systems, compromised immune systems and
2 cardiopulmonary problems.

3 The proposed LNG project would negatively impact
4 -- I'm a little nervous, impact my community's health, the
5 health that everybody that lives in Long Island Village and
6 Port Isabel because of the harmful emissions and I've
7 already read some of the things that have come out that
8 there are harmful emissions and we're directly south,
9 southeast from these plants so it will come right down the
10 ship channel and right into our village.

11 Many of us would have to sell and move. The LNG
12 tanker ships used to transport the gas represent another
13 hazard. We are just one-half mile from where these tanker
14 ships will pass through on the Brownsville Ship Channel well
15 within the extreme danger zone.

16 I really wish somebody from FERC would come out
17 and just look at what I'm talking about and see Long Island
18 Village and our proximity to what you're proposing doing out
19 there or the companies are proposing doing.

20 Should there be an incident at the LNG plant or
21 on a tanker ship our ability to evacuate is compromised by
22 the fact that there's only one escape route and that is an
23 old swing bridge that was built in the 1950's. This bridge
24 is frequently closed to vehicular traffic so when it opens
25 up to boat traffic, barges, commercial and tourist boats,

PM15-1

PM15-2

PM15-3

PM15-1

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

PM15-2

Section 4.12.1.3 of the EIS indicates that major LNG marine vessel accidents have not resulted in injury to the public and have resulted in minimal loss of LNG for incidents involving loading or unloading operations and no loss of LNG after a grounding or collision event. Section 4.12.1.3 also discusses Coast Guard's requirements for LNG carrier operations and the potential hazards within the Zones of Concern in the event of a LNG carrier breach.

PM15-3

As described in section 4.12.1.6 of the EIS, RG LNG would need to prepare an emergency response plan that would include provisions for evacuation of the public, including cost sharing plans and coordination with appropriate state and local agencies. If authorized, the emergency response plan and cost sharing plan would need to be submitted for review and approval prior to any construction at the site.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 fishing boats, shrimping boats, all of that and then we
2 can't get off the island when it's opened up for the boat
3 traffic.

PM15-3

4 If there was an incident we could be trapped on
5 the island with no place to get off, no way to get off,
6 that's our only escape. So these proposed LNG plants are
7 miles away from Brownsville Ship Channel or Brownsville, the
8 city, but they're sitting right on top of our beautiful
9 coastal communities.

10 The residents of Long Island Village came here to
11 get away from pollutants, of big cities and factories.
12 Please consider saying no to the Rio Grande LNG Plant, the
13 Texas LNG Plant and Nova. Don't make another -- doom
14 another coastal community. It also, I know it will kill the
15 shrimping industry down here, it will kill the fishing
16 industry.

PM15-4

17 I mean everybody fishes in South Bay and they
18 won't be able to get there because with three LNG plants
19 there's going to be all these tankers coming down the
20 waterway, nobody will be able to get out there and fish.
21 It's a very bad situation for the people that live in this
22 area, and that's about it.

23 MR. MCBRIDE: My name is Ed McBride, the last
24 name is spelled M-c-B-r-i-d-e. I'm a resident of Long
25 Island Village, it's a small island between the Brownsville

PM15-4

Impacts on recreation and tourism are addressed in section 4.9.3, and impacts on commercial fishing are addressed in section 4.9.4. Further, sections 4.9.4 and 4.9.8.2 have been revised to more explicitly address impacts on the bait shrimping industry.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 Ship Channel and the Intracoastal Waterway and we're about a
2 mile -- 1.7 miles southeast of the proposed LNG export
3 terminal and which puts us in their blast zone.

PM16-1

4 Also the prevailing winds are from that direction
5 and so it also puts us in their pollutant zone and we feel
6 like we were never considered when the LNG plants were being
7 built. All the things we saw were this far from Brownsville
8 or this far from downtown Brownsville and they're so much
9 closer to our island than to Brownsville Island and I'm a
10 retired Captain with the -- from the Colorado Fire
11 Department and a veteran from Vietnam and I'm a taxpaying
12 citizen of Texas.

PM16-2

13 And I feel like those people that make the
14 decisions whether or not to build these plants should take
15 into consideration our proximity and the dangers that we
16 face on a day-to-day basis if they put the plant in or if
17 those large shipping barges go past our island every day,
18 okay.

PM16-3

19 MS. TSCHIRHART: My name is Gail Tschirhart and
20 my last name is T (as in Tom), s (as in Sam) c-h-i-r-h-a-r-t
21 and G-a-i-l for my first name.

22 Okay my main concern is that I live on Long
23 Island Village and there are several concerns with that.
24 Number one we're within the blast zone and number two -- we
25 moved here to get away from the pollution and we're

PM17-1

PM16-1

See responses to PM14-1 and PM15-2. We also note that the Zones of Concerns do not correspond to a blast zone. The basis for the three zones is based on worst case accidental and intentional evented as explained in section 4.12.1.3 of the EIS and the Coast Guard regulatory framework and LOR process considers the impacts within the Zones of Concern, including marine vessel security plans and risk management strategies, as explained in sections 4.12.1.3 and 4.12.1.5 of the EIS.

PM16-2

See responses to PM14-1, PM15-2, and PM16-1. We also note that the Commission considers the potential reliability and safety impacts in its decision.

PM16-3

See responses to PM14-1 and PM15-2.

PM17-1

See response to PM16-1.

**Public Meeting Transcript (PM)
Port Isabel, Texas**

1 concerned about the pollution that's going to be coming our
2 way due to the main direction of the wind from that plant.

3 I'm also concerned about the wildlife. We have a
4 refugee refuse out there, wildlife refuge and they will be
5 taking part of that away from us and what the impact will be
6 on the animals is a concern.

7 The other one is that with the people on Long
8 Island Village most of us are older, retired people with
9 health issues and the pollutants coming our way I'm worried
10 that it will affect them. And the last one is that we do
11 live on an island that has an old swing bridge -- that's our
12 only way on and off that island and the swing bridge was
13 built in the '50's.

14 If something happened and the bridge was open, we
15 would be trapped on the island if there was an explosion or
16 anything else that happened. That's it.

17 MR. VALDEZ: My name is Rene Valdez, R-e-n-e last
18 name Valdez, V-a-l-d-e-z. So again my name is Rene Valdez,
19 I am a resident of Laguna Vista and I work on South Padre
20 Island and I wanted to make my comments known that I am for
21 the project or all the projects with the natural gas coming
22 to the area. Being a former Point Isabel independent school
23 district Board member and Board President -- as a Board
24 member I would have been in full support of the project and
25 also I would hope that all the other Board members would be

PM17-2

PM17-3

PM17-4

PM17-5

PM18-1

PM17-2 Air quality impacts associated with the Project are discussed in section 4.11.1 of the final EIS.

PM17-3 Impacts on wildlife and national wildlife refuges are described in section 4.6.1.

PM17-4 As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

PM17-5 See response to PM15-3.

PM18-1 Comment noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 in support of the project as well.

2 One of the things that I'm looking forward to is
3 the types of jobs that this would bring to our area. I am
4 the father of three children and one of those children has
5 his heart set on being a mechanical engineer and so those
6 types of jobs around this area are non-existent and so these
7 types of projects would bring those jobs to our area -- good
8 paying jobs that he could get here locally as opposed to
9 having to go to another city, away or around the country or
10 anywhere else.

11 So I just wanted to be known and go on record as
12 saying that I am for the project and I hope that they get
13 the qualifications that they need to start construction and
14 open up very, very soon.

15 MS. BRANCH: Mary Branch, B-r-a-n-c-h. I wanted
16 to address the Environmental Impact as my primary reason for
17 being against these projects and hope that FERC considers my
18 comments which the Bahia Grande unit will be affected which
19 now part of the Laguna Atascosa National Wildlife Refuge.

20 Historically the wetlands of the Bahia Grande
21 Unit served as a very important nursery for a wide variety
22 of fish and shellfish and wintering winter fowl and
23 waterfowl that had natural tidal flow between the Bahia
24 Grande and the Laguna Madre and that was cut-off by
25 construction projects in the 1930's and the 1950's.

PM18-1

PM19-1

PM19-1

Impacts on the Laguna Atascosa NWR are discussed in section 4.6.1.4.

1 For 70 years this degraded wetland was a source
2 of blowing dust, a site of massive fish kills and a
3 complicated natural resource problem. Today Bahia Grande is
4 considered one of the largest and most successful coastal
5 wetland restoration projects in the United States.

6 The Laguna Atascosa National Wildlife Refuge
7 acquired this Bahia Grande unit, 21,700 acres, located
8 between the towns of Laguna Vista and Brownsville, Texas.
9 Almost half of the unit is wetlands including the 6,500 acre
10 Bahia Grande Basin for which the tract of land was named.

11 This is now with the -- in 2007 everything has
12 been restored. They cut in new channels and waters to make
13 the tidal flows exchange throughout the whole system so now
14 we have the Laguna Margate and the Little Laguna Madre.

15 While more work still remains, we have these
16 10,000 acres of wetland that is vitally rehabilitated for
17 habitat, wildlife and fisheries. We've improved
18 environmental positions in surrounding communities that were
19 previously affected by blowing dust and have provided
20 opportunities for recreation and environmental education
21 and contribute to the local economy through increased nature
22 and eco-tourism.

23 The partnership of more than 65 groups has made
24 all of this happen and have won awards in the National
25 Wetlands Conservation and Coastal American Partnership

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 awards. The hydrology is now restored. This highly
2 affected lagoon system is once again an important nursery
3 for fin fish such as redro, shellfish, shrimp, blue crab.
4 The interior islands are attracting breeding
5 water birds, gull billed terns, skimmers and most recently
6 the first nesting pair of pelicans -- brown pelicans in
7 South Texas since the 1920's. The next phase needs to
8 happen and we do not need it degraded by the 7 year
9 construction plan of these plants and terminals to export an
10 industry that is struggling for advocacy and there is no
11 reason for that to be placed here or for these contracts to
12 be approved.
13 The Laguna Atascosa National Wildlife Refuge is
14 the largest protected area of natural habitat left in the
15 lower Rio Grande Valley. Its 98,000 acres located almost
16 entirely in Cameron County. The Peregrine Fund began
17 introducing captive bred northern aplomado falcons to the
18 refuge in 1985, they had been nearly extinct in the
19 Southwestern United States.
20 Now we're home to 40 pairs. 9 other endangered
21 or threatened species inhabit this refuge -- the Texas
22 ocelot, the Gulf Coast Jaguarundi and other rare wild cats
23 and biologists just now tracked one female ocelot and found
24 her den and a baby kitten weighing less than one pound is
25 now in our refuge.

PM19-2

PM19-2

Impacts on the Bahia Grande and the Bahia Grande Channel are discussed in section 4.3.

1 The birds -- oh my gosh, the Laguna Atascosa
2 National Wildlife Refuge is a designated Western Hemisphere
3 shore bird reserve network. There's very few of those --
4 it's for the whole western hemisphere.

5 These two sites along with the Rancho Rincon de
6 Anachuitas in Mexico -- these two sites make up the first
7 bi-national sites within the western hemisphere that
8 together host 100,000 shore birds annually.

9 Their mission is to conserve shore birds, their
10 habitats through -- and their habitats through a network of
11 key sites across the Americas protecting birds as they
12 migrate across international borders is a conservation
13 priority that requires coordinated efforts among countries.

14 This refuge is host or home to an incredible
15 diversity of migrating birds that funnel through the tip of
16 Texas in an effort to avoid flying too far east over the
17 Gulf Coast or too far west over the desert. In addition,
18 many southern species of wildlife reach their northernmost
19 range when they hit the Rio Grande.

20 Butterflies -- this is home to 130 documented
21 species. In closing, the unique convergence of the
22 temperate climate, sub-tropical coastal and Chihuahuan
23 Desert habitats in this region supports habitat diversity
24 which today includes 450 plant species and the list is
25 growing.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 I have seen nothing in the 700-page DEIS that
2 FERC has put out that addresses any of this. I have not
3 seen comments from U.S. Fish and Wildlife, the Corps of
4 Engineers, any of the environmental or conservation groups.
5 I am very much opposed to it and I think besides the safety
6 portion of it -- that it is going to be a travesty to our
7 community and our environment.

8 MR. BATHURST: My name is James Bathurst, it's
9 J-a-m-e-s B-a-t-h-u-r-s-t. I'm a 20-year resident here in
10 Port Isabel. I'm very much opposed to the LNG projects.
11 I'm also a licensed master boat captain, I don't do any
12 commercial work down here but I have done in many other
13 places.

14 I understand what happens when these ships come
15 and go. And we bought in this area and moved here because
16 of the spectacular environment and the boating
17 opportunities. And nobody seems to be able to give an
18 accurate representation of how many ships will be coming and
19 going. I've heard that if all three of these entities are
20 -- come to fruition that there may be 10 ships a week having
21 dealt with and worked with the U.S. Coast Guard on many
22 occasions.

23 In other places its 500 yards laterally, 1,000
24 yards fore and aft for a no-go zone around the ships. The
25 Brownsville Ship Channel is 1,200 feet wide which

PM19-3

PM19-4

PM20-1

PM19-3

We disagree. Impacts on wildlife, including migratory birds, and on pollinator species are addressed in section 4.6.1 of the EIS.

PM19-4

Comment noted.

PM20-1

The cumulative impacts on vessel traffic as a result of the three LNG projects are discussed in section 4.13.2.7 (estimated to be about 517 LNG carriers per year, combined). Section 4.9.8.2 of the EIS discusses the impacts on marine traffic from the Project.

1 effectively cuts off the Ship Channel to any traffic being
2 able to access either Port of Brownsville or from that
3 direction heading east into the Gulf of Mexico.

4 When we first came to this area the number 1
5 industry here was shrimping -- it's now been moved down a
6 notch with tourism but we have one of the most beautiful
7 pristine beaches along the Gulf Coast. I saw what happened
8 with the oil spill further north along the Gulf Coast with
9 10 ships per week coming and going.

10 There will at some point, be some sort of an
11 incident. It'd be great to think that it's not going to
12 happen but it would decimate our local economy way worse
13 than the collapse of the Queen Isabella Causeway did.

14 Anyway, it's my home is approximately 1.8 miles
15 from where one of these plants is destined and the thought
16 of something that can pollute the waters will absolutely no
17 question about it, be light pollution at night, there will
18 be noise involved, there will be heavy traffic coming and
19 going.

20 I'm not just some old fart who is saying, "Not in
21 my backyard," this area is too spectacular to sell it away
22 for essentially an under-utilized concept at this point.

23 When they talk about the jobs that this will bring that is
24 just insane to think that those jobs could replace all of
25 the shrimping, fishing and tourist jobs when some kind of an

PM20-2

PM20-3

PM20-4

PM20-2

Section 4.12.1.6 of the final EIS details the engineering and technical review of RG LNG's preliminary engineering design. This analysis contained various design reviews with a focus on the layers of protection or safeguards to reduce the risk of a potentially hazardous scenario from developing into an event that could impact the offsite public. If operational control of the facilities were lost and operational controls and emergency shutdown (ESD) systems failed to maintain the Project within the design limits of the piping, containers, and safety relief valves, a release could potentially occur. To mitigate this scenario, RG LNG's design would include mitigation, such as spill containment and spacing, hazard detection, ESD and depressurization systems, hazard control, firewater coverage, structural protection, and emergency response. FERC staff recommends further final design details be provided in section 4.12.1.7 to ensure adequate mitigation is in the final design of the proposed facility. In addition, section 4.12.1.2, discusses DOT's siting regulations and LOD process.

PM20-3

As described throughout the EIS, the LNG Terminal would be on undeveloped land owned by BND, outside of city boundaries and closest residences are over 2.2 miles from the site. Furthermore, the Project site is characterized, in part, as industrial with the movement of domestic and foreign products within the BSC and associated with the Port of Brownsville. Potential impacts on visual resources are addressed in section 4.8.1.5. Potential noise impacts are discussed in section 4.11.2.3. As described further within this section, visual impacts from the LNG terminal would be mitigated by RG LNG's use of ground flares and installation of the perimeter storm surge levee. In addition, the reliability and safety impacts are discussed in section 4.12.1 of the EIS.

PM20-4

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to- ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction. Finally, sections 4.9.4 and 4.9.8.2 have been revised to more explicitly address impacts on the bait shrimping industry.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 incident happens here and that all goes away.

2 I'm -- I guess I can't be more emphatic about
3 what a blight this is. From a personal point of view I'm
4 sure it will clean my property values. Well I'm an old guy,
5 probably not going to happen while I'm still around so but I
6 think about my heirs and I think about people who would be
7 coming to make use of this area or to move here and the area
8 is showing nice growth and to bring in this kind of
9 industrial so close to where people are living is -- I
10 just, I am stunned that it's even a consideration.

11 30 seconds -- I think I've probably said enough.
12 I'm just angry about it and I'm sorry that you have to
13 listen to this repeatedly, you seem like a very nice man.

14 MS. POYTHRESS: My name is Marianne Poythress.
15 Marianne is spelled M-a-r-i-a-n-n-e and Poythress is
16 P-o-y-t-h-r-e-s-s. Alright so I'm going to do two. So let
17 me start with Rio Grande.

18 So first the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
19 is incomplete, it's a long list of information that FERC is
20 requesting from Rio Grande before the end of the comment
21 period. So my question is obviously somebody is doing a
22 shoddy job here, how's the public supposed to respond to
23 information that isn't present yet?

24 Second, the mitigation plan is inadequate.
25 There's no mitigation plan for Upland Loma and brush habitat

PM20-4

PM20-5

PM21-1

PM21-2

PM20-5

Impacts on property values are discussed in section 4.9.9. As described throughout the EIS, the LNG Terminal would be on undeveloped land owned by BND, outside of city boundaries, and the closest residences are over 2.2 miles from the site. Further, the LNG Terminal site is in an area that is characterized, in part, as industrial with the movement of domestic and foreign products within the BSC and associated with the Port of Brownsville.

PM21-1

See Comment Response PM14-2.

PM21-2

See Comment Response PM14-3.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 -- that will be destroyed. The wetlands -- that will be
2 filled in, they propose preserving an area that's already
3 under the Fish and Wildlife Service Protection and
4 Management.

5 This is not a meaningful mitigation. The next
6 point is I have health issues and if Rio Grande is built it
7 will be the largest single stationary source of nitrogen
8 oxide, carbon monoxide, VOC's, sulfur dioxide, particulate
9 matter, greenhouse gases in the Rio Grande Valley.

10 All these things will be blowing directly on me.
11 I live on the -- from the prevailing winds, from their
12 facility and I will be breathing that. The DEIS states that
13 project emissions are below applicable screening levels and
14 therefore adverse health effects are not expected.

15 I disagree, the higher air pollutants level
16 affect -- have more adverse health effects, especially a
17 vulnerable population like me. I'm going to feel every one
18 of those particulates and stuff blowing in the air. In
19 April and May there are days when the RGB has some of the
20 highest particular levels in the state and this project
21 would worsen those levels and there's no safe level for
22 VOC's.

23 The cumulative emissions of greenhouse gases
24 would be massive. 10.7 trillion tons per year with the Rio
25 Grande being by far the largest contributor and this would

PM21-2

PM21-3

PM21-4

PM21-5

PM21-3

Comment noted. As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The final EIS was revised to identify the pollutants assessed, which include benzene (a VOC). The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which include standards for PM, and, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

PM21-4

See Comment Response PM21-3.

PM21-5

We have updated section 4.13.2.9 to include a discussion regarding climate change.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 continue for 20 to 30 years or longer. During a time when
2 we need to be reducing carbon emissions drastically, this
3 project if built and approved would move us in the opposite
4 direction and that's the Rio Grande's contribution to the
5 cumulative impact on climate change and cannot be precisely
6 measured and there's no reason for FERC to wash its hands of
7 it. FERC should require a carbon capture and deny the
8 permit.

9 The Valley Crossing Pipeline already goes under
10 the Rio Grande terminal site. We do not think it's safe to
11 build an LNG liquefaction terminal over a large buried
12 high-pressure natural gas pipeline, even if the risk of
13 rupture is low.

14 The SpaceX launch site at Boca Chica is 5 miles
15 from their terminal site, where is the launch failure
16 analysis? Did this analysis include SpaceX BFR which will
17 be larger than any existing rocket and is what SpaceX says
18 they intend to use at the Boca Chica site.

19 The DEIS says the greatest cumulative impacts
20 would be on soil, surface water quality, vegetation,
21 wildlife, aquatic resources, threatened and endangered
22 species, visual resources, land and water based
23 transportation, air quality and noise. These are more than
24 sufficient for what -- these are more than sufficient
25 reasons to deny this permit.

PM21-5

PM21-6

PM21-7

PM21-8

PM21-9

PM21-6

We have updated section 4.13.2.9 to include a discussion regarding climate change.

PM21-7

Section 4.12.1.6 of the EIS addresses the potential impact on the Project from external events, including the Valley Crossing Pipeline (VCP). As noted in the EIS, the VCP would be routed through a 75-foot wide utility easement and would not be located directly under critical onsite facilities. Also as noted in the EIS, there could be risk to construction personnel and operators during the class/re-rate process of the VCP, but the risk would not impact the public.

PM21-8

Section 4.12.1.6 of the EIS addresses the potential impact on the Project from external events, including the nearby SpaceX rocket launch facility. Specifically, RG LNG contracted ACTA, Inc. (ACTA) to conduct a space launch analysis. Public portions of the ACTA analysis were submitted to the Project docket on March 21, 2017, and supplemental data was submitted on August 22, 2017. The public information provided in these filings shows the debris impact probability contours for varying debris from both the Falcon 9 and Falcon Heavy rocket launch vehicles. The EIS provides the FERC staff's conclusions based on this analysis. Section 4.12.1.6 of the EIS has been updated to indicate that the analysis is specific to both Falcon 9 and Falcon Heavy launch vehicles and not for conceptual launch vehicles such as the Big Falcon Rocket. In addition, FERC staff has updated recommendations in section 4.12.1.7 so that RG LNG must file procedures to conduct risk based assessments that would incorporate FAA's public guidance prior to a rocket launch. Since the risk assessments would incorporate the FAA's public guidance, the risk assessments would be based on the most up to date information about areas likely to be impacted by falling debris and would allow RG LNG to take any action such as reducing or stopping certain plant operations prior to a rocket launch.

PM21-9

Comment noted. The EIS is not a decision document; rather, it is a tool to ensure that the potential environmental impacts that would occur as a result of a federal action are fully analyzed and presented, in compliance with NEPA. Under NEPA, the determination that an impact is significant necessitates the preparation of an EIS (as opposed to an Environmental Assessment [EA]). In accordance with NEPA, we have prepared this EIS to present the environmental impacts that would occur as a result of the Project. The decision of whether to authorize the Project is determined by the FERC Commissioners.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 Okay now onto Texas. Alright for the Texas LNG
2 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is incomplete,
3 there's a long list of information that FERC is requesting
4 from Texas LNG before the end of the comment period.

5 How is the public supposed to comment on
6 information that isn't there? The mitigation plan is
7 inadequate, there's no mitigation plan for destroyed Loma --
8 Loma del Mosquite in Loma del Draga in the brush habitat for
9 the wetlands.

10 Texas LNG proposes mitigation of the Loma
11 Ecological Preserve, an area that is already under the Fish
12 and Wildlife Surface Protection and Management. This is not
13 a meaningful mitigation.

14 Texas LNG would be a large single stationary
15 source of nitrogen oxide, carbon monoxide, VOC's, sulfur
16 dioxide, particulate matter and greenhouse gases in the Rio
17 Grande Valley. The higher air pollutant's levels, the more
18 diverse health affects there are, especially to vulnerable
19 populations.

20 I am one of those populations. I suffer from
21 respiratory problems that cause all sorts of complications
22 for me and so I'm very concerned about this. In April and
23 May there are days when the RGB has some high particular
24 levels, some of the highest particulate levels in the state.

25 This project would worsen those levels and

PM21-10

PM21-10

Comments pertain to the Texas LNG Project, and are therefore outside the scope of this EIS.

1 there's no safe level for VOC's. The leading climate change
2 scientists believe that these elevated levels of greenhouse
3 gases are the primary cause of warming from the global
4 climate system. These existing and future global emissions
5 of greenhouse gases unless significantly curtailed have the
6 potential to cause further warming and changes to the local,
7 regional and global climate systems.

8 The impacts of SpaceX on LNG operations and LNG
9 operations on SpaceX must be fully analyzed before
10 permitting LNG. Analysis of the impacts after construction
11 is not in the public interest. It is also not clear if the
12 SpaceX study included the BFR which is now the rocket
13 proposed to be launched at the SpaceX Boca Chica facility.

14 Texas LNG proposed to acquire gas from
15 non-jurisdictional Texas LNG lateral which will connect to
16 the Valley Crossing Pipeline. Texas LNG has not identified
17 the company who would construct the pipeline.

18 Valley Crossing multiple times has communicated
19 to FERC that it will not be associated with providing gas to
20 LNG terminals, nor has Valley Crossing communicated any
21 changes to their design with connections to LNG projects.
22 Before issuance of a permit their plan to acquire gas in
23 agreements with Valley Crossing should be verified and
24 detailed and project planned in the DEIS and available for
25 public viewing and comment.

PM21-10

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 The Texas LNG DEIS indicates the greatest
2 cumulative impact beyond surface water resources, ocelot
3 habitat, visual resources and operational noise. These are
4 more than sufficient reasons to deny a permit.

PM21-10

5 Once again I am a resident directly in line of
6 receiving all of the junk that they put out and I don't want
7 it and it doesn't do the community any good. Thank you.

8 MR. BOWARD: My name is Glenn Boward, spelled
9 G-e-l, I'm sorry let's try it again, G-l-e-n-n B-o-w-a-r-d.

10 I ask FERC to deny Rio Grande LNG's request for
11 authorization to construct and operated liquefied natural
12 gas facilities in Cameron County, Texas and Rio Bravo
13 Pipeline's request to construct, operate and maintain a new
14 pipeline system in Jim Wells, Kelberg, Kenedy, Willacy and
15 Cameron County Texas.

PM22-1

16 FERC's opening letter of the Draft EIS to Rio
17 Grande LNG clearly justifies reasons to deny Rio Grande
18 LNG's request for authorization. I quote, "The FERC staff
19 concludes that construction and operation of the Rio Grande
20 LNG Project would result in some adverse environmental
21 impacts."

22 And combined with other projects within the
23 geographic scope, Rio Grande LNG Project, "Would result in
24 certain, significant, cumulate impacts." From the Draft
25 EIS's opening letter it appears that FERC has enough

PM22-2

PM22-1

Comment noted. The EIS is not a decision document; rather, it is a tool to ensure that the potential environmental impacts that would occur as a result of a federal action are fully analyzed and presented, in compliance with NEPA. Under NEPA, the determination that an impact is significant necessitates the preparation of an EIS (as opposed to an EA). In accordance with NEPA, we have prepared this EIS to present the environmental impacts that would occur as a result of the Project. The decision of whether to authorize the Project is determined by the FERC Commissioners.

PM22-2

See Comment Response PM22-1.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 information to outright deny Rio Grande LNG's request for
2 authorization but I offer the following additional reasons:

3 The Draft EIS is simply incomplete. FERC
4 reviewed and found unacceptable Rio Grande LNG's request for
5 additional alternative measures from FERC procedures, FERC
6 recommended Rio Grande LNG file an updated project
7 justification for their proposed use of certain wetlands as
8 "work spaces," prior to the end of the Draft EIS comment
9 period.

10 FERC should deny the permit if Rio Grande LNG
11 does not comply with their request. How can FERC justify a
12 deadline for public comments when important information is
13 excluded? Until Rio Grande LNG complies with FERC's request
14 and such important information is made public, I recommend
15 that the deadline for public comments be extended a minimum
16 of 2 weeks after Rio Grande LNG compliance to FERC's request
17 is made public.

18 Rio Grande LNG has proposed a flagrantly
19 insufficient mitigation plan. Rio Grande LNG proposed to
20 preserve an area that is already under U.S. Fish and
21 Wildlife Service Protection and Management.

22 As proposed by Rio Grande LNG, the mitigation
23 plan violates the No Net Loss Federal Policy. The Draft EIS
24 states that 74 acres of wildlife habitat will be permanently
25 destroyed at the terminal site. There is no stated plan on

PM22-2

PM22-3

PM22-4

PM22-3

See Comment Response PM14-2.

PM22-4

See Comment Response PM14-4.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 how this loss will be replaced or mitigated.

PM22-4

2 A "moderate, permanent impact," on local wildlife
3 is unacceptable. How can FERC ignore such flagrantly
4 insufficient mitigation plan? The Draft EIS notes that
5 3,655 acres would be disturbed during the construction and
6 1,507 acres would return to pre-construction conditions and
7 uses including wetlands.

PM22-5

8 This seems highly improbable, especially in the
9 proposed terminal area. To compensate for this loss FERC
10 should require Upland mitigation. Using wetlands for work
11 space and roads is unacceptable. Returning work space
12 wetlands to preconstruction conditions and uses after
13 several years of heavy construction is highly unlikely.

14 There needs to be a study on the impact that the
15 proposed dredging would have on existing sea grass and
16 oyster beds in the Bahia Grande and South Bay, such areas
17 are highly vulnerable to a small degree of dredged soil
18 deposition. FERC should request such a study.

PM22-6

19 The Draft EIS states that the Rio Grande LNG
20 Project "has the potential to result in significant impacts
21 on ocelot and ocelot recovery." Given the ocelot population
22 and habitat has greatly been reduced in this area, this is
23 another reason for FERC to deny the project.

PM22-7

24 If Rio Grande LNG is built, it would be the
25 largest single stationary source of nitrogen oxides, carbon

PM22-8

PM22-5 See Comment Response PM14-3.

PM22-6 See Comment Response PM14-8.

PM22-7 See Comment Response PM14-11.

PM22-8 Comment noted. As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The final EIS was revised to identify the pollutants assessed, which include benzene (a VOC). The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which include standards for PM, and, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 monoxides, volatile organic compounds, sulfur dioxide,
2 particulate matter and greenhouse gases in the Rio Grande
3 Valley.

4 The Draft EIS states project emissions are below
5 applicable screening levels and therefore adverse health
6 effects are not expected -- I disagree.

7 DR. SEMBLER: Okay my name is Doctor Shelly
8 Sembler, and I live in Laguna Heights which is --
9 S-e-m-b-l-e-r. I live in Port Isabel which lies between
10 Laguna Vista and Port Isabel and this is the second time
11 reporting to you know, verbal statement because we -- in our
12 area, in South Padre Island, Port Isabel, Laguna Vista, we
13 don't want this facility coming because it will be a loss of
14 value of our property which is already decreasing.

15 It was on its way up and then LNG announced that
16 it was coming and the property values plateaued and now
17 they're heading downward and its -- we're -- that's very
18 important to our area. Also, we're a tourist area, we
19 depend on the cleanliness of our beaches and our water and
20 that will change radically with this facility coming.

21 And that's beside all the impact of the people
22 who come to look at the birds and the ocelots and the
23 unusual sea life that's here, the turtles. We are a tourist
24 area and we attract people who come from all over the world
25 specifically to look at us and then a lot of them decide

PM22-8

PM23-1

PM23-2

PM23-1

Impacts on property values are discussed in section 4.9.9.

PM23-2

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 that they're going to not just vacation but come and live
2 here and so the South Padre Island, the values of the
3 properties there -- they're not selling anymore.
4 People are sort of upset and worried because the
5 value has plateaued and then it's beginning to slide
6 downward, so that's a lot of it. And then there's also the
7 fact that business-wise because we are a tourist company,
8 tourist area, our tourists will disappear because people
9 won't want to come to do the touristy things, the beaches
10 and the water and taking the tours there, they won't want to
11 because the gas and oil is going to change the air quality
12 here and also the water quality.
13 Right now we only have to deal with I think three
14 airports and four dumps, that's what impacts our air quality
15 right now. And this is going to change us so that instead
16 of dealing with three airports, we'll now have to deal with
17 the same environmental loss of sorry, the poor air quality
18 as though we had 10 airports and 25 dumps.
19 And that's ridiculous that people come here to
20 have longer life and all of that is going to change and it
21 will decrease the quality of our life. Let me think, the
22 other thing is when the ships are coming in and out of the
23 channel, the channel has to close down because it's a danger
24 and so -- and that ship channel goes right past our
25 Schlitterbaun, it goes past our beaches, our county parks,

PM23-2

PM23-3

PM23-4

PM23-3

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

PM23-4

Impacts on marine transportation are addressed in section 4.9.8.2 of the EIS. In addition, Coast Guard requirements pertaining to safety and security measures, including consideration of the Zones of Concern are described in sections 4.12.1.3 and 4.12.1.5 of the EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 so all of that affects our lives and the loss of business is
2 just -- I'm very concerned about that and I think that's
3 something I understand it's not an environmental impact
4 exactly except as we lose our environment, our excellent
5 quality of environment, the reason that people come here
6 will be lost.

PM23-4

7 And so people who come and have worked here for
8 years, generations they won't be able to continue to live
9 here because their jobs will be gone. It seems to me that
10 it would be much smarter if the port and the environment did
11 something to help boost the tourist -- thank you, that would
12 help boost the tourist business instead of a loss of it and
13 that's what I would hope that you all would pay a lot of
14 attention to that and thank you very much for listening to
15 my comments, I appreciate it.

PM23-5

16 MS. WARD: Joanna, J-o-a-n-n-a Ward, W-a-r-d. I
17 live in Laguna Vista and I came here because of the pristine
18 area to retire. I've met a lot of people here and
19 discovered the multi-million dollar eco-tourism industry
20 that we have here that is growing. My community tripled
21 since I moved here 10 years ago and the winter it triples
22 even more every year now.

PM23-6

23 We have millions that just came for eco-tourism
24 building in Laguna Vista and with plans to have bike trails
25 to the Bahia Grande which is the largest restoration project

PM24-1

PM23-5

The proposed pipelines are not likely to result in destruction of the community values, rural quality of life, or sense of place. Once construction is completed, the right-of-way would be restored, and visual effects would be confined to areas where vegetation has been removed within the Project route. The buried pipeline would not otherwise visibly intrude on communities. As described throughout the EIS, the LNG Terminal would be on undeveloped land owned by BND, outside of city boundaries, and closest residences are over 2.2 miles from the site. Further, the LNG Terminal site is in an area that is characterized, in part, as industrial with the movement of domestic and foreign products within the BSC and associated with the Port of Brownsville. We conclude that the Project, as modified by our recommendations in section 4 of the EIS, would not destroy community values, rural quality of life, or sense of place.

PM23-6

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction. Finally, sections 4.9.4 and 4.9.8.2 have been revised to more explicitly address impacts on the bait shrimping industry.

PM24-1

The EIS recognizes the Project’s impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to- ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

40

1 in North America right across from -- right across the area
2 where Rio Grande LNG is planning to build and the toxins
3 that they will put into that air and the money that this
4 project will take away from people that have been here for
5 generations with their businesses is criminal really, I
6 think it's just unethical.

PM24-1

7 And another concern is people aren't going to
8 want to come here because of the safety with these
9 industrial polluters. We need to see standards that are
10 developed for having a LNG export facility so near to a
11 community, 2.2 miles from the Rio Grande.

PM24-2

12 They don't even have the newest standards
13 developed yet for the larger ships exporting ships and for
14 the larger storage tanks. And we know leaks happen all the
15 time, you can't smell them, you can't see them and they can
16 get ignited, so there's the safety of the community's -- how
17 close can a community live and be safe?

18 And then there's the shrimping industry and
19 what's that going to do to that business? The shrimping
20 industry sends -- it's known, this is Gulf shrimp it's
21 shipped all over, it's a big industry, so I'm very concerned
22 about the shipping industry. I love wild shrimp. So many
23 people I know up north get it from down here.

PM24-3

24 So I'm concerned about the businesses that are
25 already in existence here and you're going to bring in toxic

PM24-4

PM24-2

Section 4.12.1.2 of the EIS describes DOT's LOD process. The DOT issued its LOD after reviewing RG LNG's hazard analysis and modeling results. Section 4.12.1.3 of the EIS discusses Coast Guard's WSA review as well as the zones of concern for LNG shipping operations. The Coast Guard has issued its LOR after reviewing RG LNG's WSA. Each review (as appropriate) considered the size of the LNG storage tanks and the LNG marine vessels. In addition, FERC staff reviewed RG LNG's preliminary engineering design. This analysis contained various design reviews with a focus on the layers of protection or safeguards to reduce the risk of a potentially hazardous scenario from developing into an event that could impact the offsite public. If operational control of the facilities were lost and operational controls and emergency shutdown (ESD) systems failed to maintain the Project within the design limits of the piping, containers, and safety relief valves, a release could potentially occur. To mitigate this scenario, RG LNG's design would include mitigation, such as spill containment and spacing, hazard detection, ESD and depressurization systems, hazard control, firewater coverage, structural protection, and emergency response. FERC staff recommends further final design details be provided in section 4.12.1.7 to ensure adequate mitigation is in the final design of the proposed facility.

PM24-3

Impacts on commercial fishing are addressed in section 4.9.4. While minor, temporary, and permanent impacts on commercial fishing in the BSC would occur from construction and operation of the LNG Project, the majority of the commercial fishing industry is based on offshore shrimping and fishing. As such the Project is unlikely to result in a measurable effect on commercial landings in the Project area.

PM24-4

Potential impacts on tourism, including eco-tourism and recreational fishing, are addressed in section 4.9.3. Potential impacts on threatened and endangered species are discussed in section 4.7.

1 pollutants and you're going to affect what attracts the
2 eco-tourism, the ocelots, the endangered birds and the
3 aplomado falcon -- all these other things.

4 So and I don't know how we can probably get all
5 of our facts in to make our comments without having all of
6 the data. How are they going to mitigate? We don't even
7 have the details of the mitigation? I mean how -- wetlands,
8 you can't build on wetlands, we can't build houses on
9 wetlands, now they're going to build over these wetlands and
10 we don't even know.

11 I mean we have endangered turtles. Once the
12 turtles go, then there goes the sea grass. I mean you're
13 not thinking about now and the future and of course our
14 President has money in the fossil fuel industry and Perry
15 and Abbott were bought by the fossil fuel industry, so the
16 Texas Commission on Environmental Quality is just to get
17 their permits, not to worry about the communities around
18 them -- we're collateral damage because we're poor, not me,
19 but I'm getting out of here as soon as the permit is granted
20 I'm gone, I'm selling my house.

21 This is my childhood dream to come to a clean,
22 beautiful beach, an area where I can afford to live and
23 enjoy clean air and clean water and that's going to be gone
24 if you grant even one of these LNG export facilities. Where
25 those people will not bring their families down here, you're

PM24-4

PM24-5

PM24-5

Impacts on wetlands as a result of the Project are discussed in section 4.4 of the final EIS. It is standard industry practice to construct pipelines through wetlands, following proper BMPs. The EIS discloses the potential impacts on environmental resources resulting from construction and operation of the Project, including impacts on wetlands and sea turtles. The EIS was prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ guidelines, and other applicable requirements. The draft EIS included sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand and consider the issues raised by the Project and addresses a range of alternatives. The final EIS provides substantive updates, where available. This EIS is consistent with FERC style, formatting, and policy regarding NEPA evaluation of alternatives and different impact types, including cumulative impacts. The EIS is comprehensive and thorough in its identification and evaluation of feasible mitigation measures to reduce those effects whenever possible.

As described in section 4.4.2 of the EIS, wetland mitigation plans are part of the permitting process associated with Section 404 of the CWA. RG LNG's final wetland mitigation plans would be developed and submitted to the COE, and would be implemented in addition to the construction mitigation measures outlined in RG LNG's Procedures and the measures described in the EIS. Construction of the LNG Terminal would not commence prior to finalization of the wetland mitigation plans and issuance of the COE's CWA Section 404/Section 10 permit.

1 darn sure of that, they're going to leave them up in the
2 woodlands.

3 MS. PENA: It's Marta, M-a-r-t-a Elena, E-l-e-n-a
4 Pena. So underneath the proposed action for Texas LNG they
5 state, "Texas LNG plans to initiate construction of Phase 1
6 upon receipt of all required authorizations and Phase 2 --
7 once a customer for the production enters into a long-term
8 tolling agreement that is sufficient to support the
9 financing of the Phase 2 construction cost."

10 My comment to that is this statement confirms
11 that a long-term agreement and/or business partner has not
12 been secured by Texas LNG to purchase their product. Over
13 650 acres of environmentally sensitive land would be
14 irreversibly destroyed to make way for an LNG project
15 without a buyer.

16 Wildlife and aquatic resources -- the proposed
17 project site is across State Highway 48 but approximately
18 200 feet from the Laguna Atascosa National Wildlife Refuge
19 this is stated in the Texas LNG DEIS. My statement to that
20 is the DEIS concludes that the construction and operating of
21 Texas LNG would not have a significant impact on wildlife
22 resources based on noise and light only -- based on noise
23 and light only.

24 The DEIS fails to mention the potential negative
25 impacts on native flora and fauna, if an accident or blast

PM25-1

PM25-1

Comments pertain to the Texas LNG Project, and are therefore outside the scope of this EIS.

1 were to occur, reports of accidents at operating LNG
2 facilities have been reported with a vehicle radius
3 measuring .75 miles. The DEIS does not mention closer
4 communities such as the -- it does mention Port Isabel but
5 it doesn't mention other communities that are within that
6 very close radius of the proposed site.

7 Threatened and endangered species -- the Texas
8 LNG DEIS states, "We conclude that the project is not likely
9 to adversely affect federally listed species including the
10 ocelot," -- my response to that is the ocelot has been
11 protected since 1982 under the Endangered Species Act or
12 ESA. There are an estimated 50 remaining ocelots in the
13 United States and they're all right here in South Texas.

14 Loss of habitat is the number 1 reason for their
15 decline. Ocelots are nocturnal and like under the cover of
16 darkness meaning noise and light would negatively impact
17 their ability to fly. ESA Section 9 makes it unlawful for
18 anyone to take a listed animal and this includes
19 significantly modifying its habitat, that's ESA Section 9.

20 The Texas part -- the DEIS also states that the
21 Texas Park and Wildlife Department is particularly concerned
22 with Texas tortoises and has recommended that Texas LNG
23 develop a plan for the capture and relocation of Tortoises
24 prior to construction.

25 My response to that is a plan has not been

PM25-1

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 developed that outlines the safety of the Texas tortoise
2 population which is a state protected animal. A plan has
3 not been developed that identifies a suitable relocation
4 habit and my main response is that it is irresponsibility
5 presumptive to conclude that impacts on state listed species
6 would not be significant without a proposed plan for public
7 review and comment.

8 Under land use recreation and visual resources,
9 the DEIS states, "South Padre Island in particular, has
10 numerous high-rise condominiums that would have views of the
11 project facilities, especially from the higher floors." My
12 comment to that is the DEIS does not unwind or give
13 estimates on the negative impact to property values in Port
14 Isabel, South Padre Island and Long Island Village
15 communities.

16 This factor in addition to the visual resources
17 important for communities to consider before making public
18 comments, that's it.

19 MR. SALAZAR: My name is Rafael Salazar, spelled
20 R-a-f-a-e-l last name Salazar, S-a-l-a-z-a-r. I'd like to
21 begin with my question for FERC is one -- when we find these
22 facilities or transport units that are taking the liquid
23 form or holding the liquid form, once they are found to be
24 either obsolete or not meeting FERC standards due to either
25 that they pose a serious danger or a serious concern that

PM25-1

PM26-1

PM26-1

Section 5.2 of the EIS contains information regarding FERC staff's recommended mitigation for the proposed Rio Grande LNG Project. This includes providing FERC with the authority to address any requests for approvals or authorizations necessary to carry out the conditions of the Order, and take whatever steps are necessary to ensure the protection of life, health, property, and the environment during construction and operation of the Project. This authority would allow: (1) the modification of conditions of the Order; (2) stop-work authority and authority to cease operation; and (3) the imposition of any additional measures deemed necessary to ensure continued compliance with the intent of the conditions of the Order as well as the avoidance or mitigation of unforeseen adverse environmental impact resulting from Project construction and operation. In the event of an incident, FERC has delegated authority to take whatever steps are necessary to ensure operational reliability and to protect human life, health, property, or the environment, including authority to direct the LNG facility to cease operations. In addition, FERC staff recommends on incident reporting requirements that would require RG LNG to report incidents immediately (not to exceed 24 hours).

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 could lead to making them unable to operate or use, what is
2 the timeline that these liquid natural gas companies or
3 transporters are required to shut down these units?

4 So to be very clear, what is the time between
5 they have to one -- report to these liquid natural gas
6 transporters or liquid natural gas companies to give them a
7 complete cease of operations? I feel that that is a very
8 good question. And my other question is if FERC is truly
9 practicing impartiality, why do we have Neal Chatterjee
10 which is actually a Board member of FERC which was once a
11 lobbyist for very dirty energy so we have to ask ourselves
12 that question as well if we're looking to practice
13 partiality why is he on the Board?

14 And lastly is the concern for how are we going to
15 assess a serious issue for example if there is a fracture
16 that occurs either from airborne debris or if for some
17 reason the holding tanks do have a fracture on them, what
18 kind of training is provided by the local police department?
19 How are the fire departments trained in order to assess a
20 serious issue like that?

21 Because as far as I know in Washington state
22 these holding tanks were burning for three days straight and
23 neither the fire department locally or other fire
24 departments surrounding the area were able to stop this fire
25 from burning, alright, thank you so much.

PM26-1

PM26-2

PM26-3

PM26-2

This comment is outside of the scope of the EIS.

PM26-3

Section 4.12.1.6 of the EIS discusses the emergency response and cost sharing plans. If the Project is authorized, both plans would need to be submitted for review and approval prior to construction of the Project. The cost sharing plan would specify direct cost reimbursements to any state and local agencies and would include capital costs for equipment and for any required specialized training.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 MS. RAMIREZ: My name is Anita Ramirez, A-n-i-t-a
2 R-a-m-i-r-e-z. I am born and raised here in Port Isabel and
3 I am not for the LNG. I think they're lying to us but
4 they're mostly saying that it's not going to affect our
5 health. I do hair and I have customers that come out of
6 state and they say that where they come from they have, you
7 know, LNG and it is not good for our health.

8 So you know, why do they lie to the people of
9 Port Isabel? You know, like I mean it's not right. And if
10 you have a kid that has health problems it's going to affect
11 them but they're just thinking about the money they're
12 making, they're not thinking about the health or the people
13 from Port Isabel that are not for it.

14 So that's my comment, you know, it's not right
15 what they're doing.

16 MS. RUBIO: Patricia Rubio, P-a-t-r-i-c-i-a and
17 then Rubio R-u-b-i-o. I am an interpretative naturalist
18 that means I help people understand nature in the best way
19 that helps them. I am also a citizen scientist which means
20 I volunteer at various nature centers and wildlife refuges
21 to help monitor the health and well-being of our native
22 habitat and wildlife.

23 And ultimately -- well I'm also a nursery
24 technician, meaning I grow native plants but most of all I'm
25 an environmental educator and I work with children. I work

PM27-1

PM27-1

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

1 with K through 12 and for two years I worked on wetland
2 education and it was a contract with the school district and
3 it was all related to state testing as well as wetland
4 education.

5 And we teach the children alongside what they
6 need for school, anything in regards to math, science, even
7 art -- we teach them about the importance of nature and how
8 important it is to not disturb it.

9 So as part of what I am teaching children is to
10 teach them that keep things wild and so we share it side by
11 side and that means that this side is for them and this side
12 is for us because we live differently but we need each
13 other.

14 And I can't take children outside if it is going
15 to be full of toxins. I can't take children outside for
16 fear that a mix of smoke or eruption of something that could
17 happen, I can't put children's lives in danger because I am
18 responsible for them and I don't want to tell the children,
19 "I'm sorry we can't do anything because everything is
20 polluted and destroyed."

21 One of their favorite things is to get their
22 hands dirty and look for all the bugs in the ponds. They
23 love water chemistry because they get to take control and
24 mix all the chemicals up and they get to decide together as
25 a group whether the wetland is healthy or unhealthy and if

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 this happens, everything I'm doing is almost going to be
2 worthless because if this happens, you're showing them that
3 everything I taught them is a lie, and I'm not a liar.

4 I take great pride in environmental education and
5 what I'm teaching them is all in relation to state testing.
6 So it's also showing them that their state testing doesn't
7 matter. So what happens is we're bringing up a generation
8 that is going to be completely apathetic to everything so
9 they will not see the value in themselves and I think that
10 is a great danger to bring up generations thinking that they
11 don't matter.

12 And we also teach them about diversity,
13 biodiversity so the difference in life in nature and that
14 also helps them understand that we're different and it's
15 important to give each other respect and space and also to
16 acknowledge and respect each other's way of learning.

17 So I'm also teaching them how to work together
18 and if this happens I potentially lose my job. My friends
19 lose their job. We also take people on birding tours and we
20 have friends from all over the world that they can't wait to
21 see us every year for our bird -- our annual birding
22 festival, our annual butterfly festival.

23 I have friends that will fly or drive down for
24 hours, days just to see a butterfly and I really just don't
25 want to lose my friends either but ultimately my concern is

PM28-1

PM28-1

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction. Impacts on birds and pollinators are discussed in section 4.6.1.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 the children. I don't want them to think that they don't
2 matter and if this happens and these scars happen across the
3 land, they're going to think that I lied to them.

PM28-1

4 And when they leave all I get are nothing but
5 hugs, thank you Miss Patty, you rule, algae rocks, can I be
6 your best friend, can I be your helper forever and
7 everything that I just stated are actual responses from
8 children.

9 Teachers tell me thank you my students have
10 learned something, they're so happy, you're so good at what
11 you do, I've never seen my kids so excited. And thank you,
12 that's the one with autism and I can't believe you got them
13 to do it and I've gotten nothing but praises from teachers
14 in the public school system.

15 Our wetlands need to not be disturbed and also
16 our wildlife. Thank you.

PM28-2

17 MR. KENON: My name is William E. Kenon,
18 K-e-n-o-n. I'm a resident here of Port Isabel. I'm an
19 independent businessman that does business here,
20 Brownsville, Port Isabel and the Island. I own and operate
21 shrimp vessels. I do marine construction and salvage work.
22 Where I'm concerned about the LNG plants is the operations
23 that I do with my boats and barges and shrimp boats up and
24 down the Brownsville Ship Channel.

PM29-1

25 A while back at a meeting of the Brownsville

PM28-2

Comment noted.

PM29-1

The cumulative impacts on vessel traffic as a result of the three LNG projects are discussed in section 4.13.2.7 (estimated to be about 517 LNG carriers per year, combined). Section 4.9.8.2 of the EIS discusses the impacts on marine traffic from the Project. Impacts on commercial fishing are addressed in section 4.9.4. While minor, temporary, and permanent impacts on commercial fishing in the BSC would occur from construction and operation of the LNG Project, the majority of the commercial fishing industry is based on offshore shrimping and fishing. As such the Project is unlikely to result in a measurable effect on commercial landings in the Project area.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 Shrimp Producers negotiation we had two gentlemen that
2 represented LNG -- three gentlemen, excuse me, James
3 Markham, M-a-r-k-h-a-m, there was a Mr. Steve Breese,
4 B-r-e-e-s-e and there was a Mr. Trey Lewis, L-e-w-i-s.

5 There was a Mr. Tom Rodino, Rodino is
6 R-o-d-i-n-o. Tom Rodino is a retired Coast Guard Captain.
7 Tom Rodino is a retired Coast Guard Captain that does
8 independent evaluations for different people. The LNG
9 people had asked him to do an evaluation and to present to
10 the Port Isabel Shrimp Producer's Association.

11 So there was a group of us there, this meeting
12 was called on September the 30th, 2015 in the afternoon. At
13 that meeting basically they told us that our operations
14 would have to change because we were not going to be able to
15 run up and down the ship channel like we had been before
16 because our ships were going to be too big, it was going to
17 be too dangerous for us to pass while they were discharging
18 or just loading onto the vessel.

19 And they asked us if we could change our
20 operation to operate at night. For my construction business
21 running back and forth with my barges, that doesn't work
22 very well and the shrimp boats have been operating in the
23 daytime, they come and go day and night but just to operate
24 just at night is going to place an extra burden on the
25 Shrimp Association on the shrimp boats for operating.

PM29-1

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

51

1 I've tried to get back to see if this is still
2 the way that it is -- if we're still going to have to make
3 these drastic changes and nobody will give me a straight
4 answer. So I'm not sure about that, a lot of people don't
5 believe that that will happen but that's what they told us
6 at the meeting.

7 The -- I understand now that they may also load
8 LNG trucks out of the terminal and that they will be
9 traveling up and down on Highway 48 and they plan to put as
10 many as they could put 60 trucks a day on the road out
11 there.

12 I don't think we're really set up for that kind
13 of traffic. We're also in the blast zone and I think it's
14 too close and too dangerous here in Port Isabel. They could
15 move this to Corpus where it's compatible with other plants.

16 MR. CANTU: Joseph Cantu, it's J-o-s-e-p-h last
17 name C-a-n-t-u. I'm here in opposition to LNG plants
18 opening here in my community. I'm a veteran and ex-refinery
19 worker and I've seen it -- I've seen the refinery and
20 chemical plant open from the ground up and I have witnessed
21 countless thousands of volatile organic compound possible
22 fugitive emission points along flanges, equipment, pumps,
23 exchangers, drilling equipment, everything from expiration
24 this process from expiration to process to finished product
25 will leak. These things run 365, 24/7 other than

PM29-1

PM29-2

PM29-3

PM30-1

PM29-2

Impacts on land-based transportation are addressed in section 4.9.8.1.

PM29-3

See responses to PM14-1, PM15-2, and PM23-4.

PM30-1

Outside of emissions emitted during the operation of fired heaters, flaring activity, and venting required prior to maintenance activity, the proposed process would be a closed system (i.e., the process would be isolated from the environment). Further, section 4.11.1 of the EIS quantifies Project-related emissions, including fugitive emissions and emissions associated with maintenance, startup, and shutdown of the LNG Terminal.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

52

1 shut-downs and when you have something laying that long with
2 that much time on equipment it's just natural for things to
3 break down so these refineries leak and it's a self-reported
4 industry, self-regulated.

5 In other words, TCEQ here in Texas and then FERC
6 specifically are organizations that are supported by the
7 very same industry that they are expected to watch over and
8 I feel as a father of three children and a leader in my
9 community, it's only right to be here and I oppose this.

10 The jobs that are touted, I've seen those from construction
11 and start-up and there is 3, 4, 500 I've seen laborers out
12 there who were first starting the process and then as the
13 plant comes online those people are asked to basically stop
14 working and then just the pretty much process operations and
15 maintenance stays around so.

16 For a few dozen jobs we're destroying the
17 environment, proliferating fracking which not only is going
18 to be proven here shortly, which has actually already been
19 proven to effect the water table and also release all kinds
20 of respiratory related I guess, dangerous particles in
21 carcinogens so I'm here to oppose this vehemently and I'm
22 asking the leaders from my President all the way down to my
23 Congressman here to put an end to this, to ask FERC to be
24 more involved and basically I just want to say I'm totally
25 opposed to it, that's all I have to say.

PM30-1

PM30-2

PM30-3

PM30-2

The positive economic effects of the Project are an estimate based on reasonable assumptions. We recognize that construction of the Project would result in increased local employment related to the Project that would not be sustained during operation.

PM30-3

The Project would not involve gas extraction activities. Section 1.3.1 of the final EIS addresses comments that we received recommending that environmental impacts associated with natural gas production, including the practice of hydraulic fracturing ("fracking"), be evaluated in our review.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 MS. HINSON: My name is Ivy Hinson, I-v-y
 2 H-i-n-s-o-n. So I would like to oppose the LNG Pipeline
 3 mostly because it doesn't make sense in a world where we are
 4 continually switching to green energy to invest in another
 5 fossil fuel industry even if we did switch from coal to
 6 natural gas completely, we're not going to see any dramatic
 7 declines in greenhouse gas emissions.

8 So I think that South Texas has an opportunity to
 9 lead the way in green technology and you could see we've
 10 already done that a bit with the windmills and what not, so
 11 it doesn't make sense to take us back to a more archaic form
 12 of energy generation.

13 Also, I wanted to comment on the fact that Port
 14 Isabel's economy depends on tourism and fisheries and we
 15 don't really know what this habitat destruction and
 16 pollution is going to do to these industries and is it worth
 17 the risk?

18 And lastly, the only positive to having this LNG
 19 pipeline plant come to Port Isabel is the job generation and
 20 it's only going to generate, you know, a handful of
 21 permanent jobs which are generally specialist jobs that
 22 probably won't even be filled by residents. That's all I
 23 have to say.

24 MR. FAIRCLOTH: My name is Doug Faircloth,
 25 D-o-u-g F-a-i-r-c-l-o-t-h. I live here in Port Isabel just

PM31-1

PM31-2

PM31-3

PM31-1

We have updated section 4.13.2.9 to include a discussion regarding climate change.

PM31-2

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction.

PM31-3

Comment noted. The effects of the non-local workforce anticipated for the Project are discussed in section 4.9.

1 a few blocks from here and so this plant would -- the
2 building of this plant would directly affect myself and a
3 whole bunch of other people that surround here to express
4 their concerns and really the main overall reason why I'm
5 here, not just because it affects me, but it affects the
6 whole planet, the IPCC continues to issue dire warnings
7 about the severity of climate change and natural gas
8 production releases more methane than any other type of
9 fossil fuel production.

10 It has a head capacity barrier 25 times greater
11 than carbon dioxide so construction of plants like this are
12 only going to continue to add to the severity of climate
13 change which we need to drastically work towards reversing
14 or at least slowing down if not within 50 years, we're going
15 to have a whole lot more problems than whether or not we
16 just want to purchase a plan or not and yeah, a few jobs is
17 nice but jobs can't cure cancer or can't stop environmental
18 degradation that plants like this will entail.

19 We need to work towards a green new deal for our
20 renewable energy that's going to provide clean energy, clean
21 jobs and want to ensure that this planet continues to be
22 habitable. So I personally oppose these projects and a lot
23 of the people that live here do too, that's all I got.

24 MS. SANDEFUR: I'm Madeleine Sandefur,
25 M-a-d-e-l-e-i-n-e last name is Sandefur, S-a-n-d-e-f-u-r. I

PM32-1

PM32-1

We have updated section 4.13.2.9 to include a discussion regarding climate change.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 live in Laguna Vista. I've been a resident there for 13
2 years. I'm very, very concerned because Laguna Vista is
3 downwind basically. We have prevailing southeast winds and
4 so I'm very, very concerned about the air quality.

5 I've also taken a quick look at the EIS although
6 it's a very long document. There's a long list of
7 information that FERC has requested through Rio Grande LNG
8 before the end of the comment period and how is the public
9 supposed to know what they could comment on if there's
10 information that's missing?

11 So we are proposing that the comment deadline
12 should be extended for at least two weeks after all the
13 required information has been submitted and then the public.

14 The mitigation for a wetlands -- there's not
15 really a plan for mitigation for the Upland Loma and brush
16 habitat that will be destroyed. The wetlands that are going
17 to be destroyed they're proposing that they be filled in,
18 that they mitigate with areas that are already under Fish
19 and Wildlife Service Protection and Management so that is
20 not a mitigation and it also violates the Federal Policy of
21 No Net Loss.

22 There has not been a need demonstrated in my
23 opinion, for this project. There are no buyers for the LNG,
24 no binding contracts. I also believe that they have not
25 adequately demonstrated community support.

PM33-1

PM33-2

PM33-3

PM33-4

PM33-1 Air quality impacts associated with the Project are discussed in section 4.11.1 of the final EIS.

PM33-2 See Comment Response PM14-2.

PM33-3 See Comment Response PM14-3.

PM33-4 See Comment Response PM14-4.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 Another area that's of great concern to me is
2 ocelot because I've been involved with ocelots and I've been
3 a member of the Board of Friends of Laguna Atascosa where we
4 have one of the only remaining populations of ocelots.

5 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement states
6 that the project has the potential to result in significant
7 impact on ocelot and ocelot recovery. I'm aware that there
8 is a -- that there are negotiations with the Mexican
9 government for a translocation project for ocelots. The
10 population that we have right now is so small that there is
11 concern about interbreeding and if there were ever -- if
12 there was ever a disease that would hit the ocelots it
13 would basically wipe out the populations so a lot of money
14 has been spent on this translocation project and the
15 building of these facilities would jeopardize that project.

16 I think that's about it. I'm basically just
17 making a short verbal comment and I will submit the written
18 comments with more detailed information.

19 MR. COWEN: My name is Ralph, R-a-l-p-h Cowen,
20 C-o-w-e-n. I wanted to speak in favor of both projects.
21 I've been familiar with them and have been following them
22 since the beginning. I'm an elected Commissioner at the
23 Port of Brownsville. I saw them when they were first
24 presented to them.

25 In fact I was Chairman of the Board at the time

PM33-5

PM33-5

FERC has determined that the Project is likely to adversely affect the ocelot; therefore, the FWS will further assess impacts on the species to determine if the Project would result in jeopardy of the species. Further, as discussed in section 4.7.1.4, the FWS and RG Developers are coordinating regarding mitigation for the loss of potential ocelot habitat. Final mitigation plans would be determined through completion of the ESA consultation process.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

57

1 and I believe the projects have great merit, they could be
2 operated in a safe manner. I've gone to see other projects
3 -- similar projects and they're operating very well. The
4 safety record is good. It's far enough away from town to
5 where it's not going to populated areas, it's not going to
6 be a detriment.

7 The tax base will be very, very advantageous to
8 the area and the jobs that will be created to build it, to
9 maintain it and to run it and then the direct and indirect
10 -- the direct jobs that will be there and then the indirect
11 jobs that come up and down. It will mean -- it will change
12 the face of the Port and yes things will change here, but
13 they will change for the better.

14 I can't understand why anybody would be against
15 it but you know, everybody has their own opinion and they're
16 very welcome to it. As a friend of mine used to say, every
17 head is another world and really that's -- you know, all the
18 scientific reasons why the Coast Guard has approved it and
19 FERC has given it -- you know, done all of these studies and
20 everything has come out to be positive and I don't see any
21 reason why it should be denied, thank you.

22 MR. CRUZ: Alright my name is Rick Cruz, that's
23 R-i-c-k C-r-u-z. I'm sorry I just came to leave a comment
24 as far as why I oppose LNG, why I oppose the Texas and the
25 Rio Grande Projects, why I oppose both projects either way.

PM34-1

PM35-1

PM34-1

Comment noted.

PM35-1

Comment noted. As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The final EIS was revised to identify the pollutants assessed, which include benzene (a VOC). The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which include standards for particulate matter, and, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

58

1 And I oppose them because I don't believe that my
2 hometown should be subjected to such environmental you know,
3 something that isn't going to last, it's been proven that
4 it's going to destroy -- it's destroyed communities, it's
5 destroyed other you know, livable areas and you know, I
6 don't want to -- I don't want my kids to grow up in such a
7 -- you know, such a messed up environment really.

8 I mean I want them to be able to breathe clean
9 air and this is our paradise. I don't understand why these
10 people want to come in and destroy that.

11 Anyways it's going to destroy a lot of habitats
12 and plant life and I don't know, I don't see it as
13 acceptable at all anyway and that's all I've really got to
14 say.

15 MS. REYES: Wanda, W-a-n-d-a R-e-y-e-s is the
16 last name. I would like to say I'm here on behalf and
17 supporting the Rio Grande LNG and Rio Bravo Pipeline and
18 that I support the project because it's been clarified as
19 being economically safe and we need the economic impact and
20 the great jobs in this community so badly that has one of
21 the highest unemployment rates in the entire state and
22 country.

23 So for that I applaud Rio Grande LNG for being
24 here and what it's going to do to our community and I think
25 it's an awesome, awesome, project, thank you.

PM35-1

PM35-2

PM36-1

PM35-2

Comment noted. Impacts on wildlife, including habitat loss associated with the Project are discussed in section 4.6.1.

PM36-1

Comment noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

59

1 MS. WORRELL: Maile Worrell, and you spell it
2 M-a-i-l-e and then W-o-r-r-e-l-l. These terminals would be
3 the largest air polluter in the Rio Grande Valley. Schools
4 are just a few miles downwind from the pollutants, the town
5 of Laguna Vista just 5 miles downwind, the coastal towns,
6 the government opposes LNG.

PM37-1

7 The impacts of all the diverse wildlife that this
8 area are known for, some that are federally protected to be
9 considered in impacts, eco-tourism, the information that
10 you've gathered, the insight to know what's truly best for
11 the people not what's best for big business.

PM37-2

12 And I believe that to begin now to monitor the
13 air quality with a plan in place so that if this does occur
14 what's going to happen when the pollutants exceed a "safe"
15 level? And that's all I've got for today. We'll do more
16 later.

PM37-3

17 MS. CRUZ: Okay so my name is Josette Cruz,
18 J-o-s-e-t-t-e last name is C-r-u-z. I am here today to
19 oppose both the Texas and Rio Grande LNG Projects. The
20 Draft DEIS Statement is lacking information that should be
21 given to the public in regards for the public -- I'm
22 speaking for some other people in Brownsville, myself and my
23 family included.

PM38-1

24 I have a daughter who is special needs and the
25 last thing that she needs and any of her other friends need

PM37-1

Comment noted. As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The final EIS was revised to identify the pollutants assessed, which include benzene (a VOC). The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which include standards for particulate matter, and, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

PM37-2

Comment noted. The EIS is not a decision document; rather, it is a tool to ensure that the potential environmental impacts that would occur as a result of a federal action are fully analyzed and presented, in compliance with NEPA. Under NEPA, the determination that an impact is significant necessitates the preparation of an EIS (as opposed to an EA). In accordance with NEPA, we have prepared this EIS to present the environmental impacts that would occur as a result of the Project. The decision of whether to authorize the Project is determined by the FERC Commissioners.

PM37-3

The comment pertains to the TCEQ's review and enforcement of air quality permits for the Project, which is not under FERC's jurisdiction. As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, ambient air quality monitors used to identify background concentrations are based on those monitors that were nearest or most representative of the proposed Project facilities. Ambient air quality monitor locations were identified by RG Developers in coordination with the TCEQ.

PM38-1

We disagree. The EIS discloses the potential impacts on environmental resources resulting from construction and operation of the Project. The EIS was prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ guidelines, and other applicable requirements. The draft EIS included sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand and consider the issues raised by the Project and addresses a range of alternatives. The final EIS provides substantive updates, where available. This EIS is consistent with FERC style, formatting, and policy regarding NEPA evaluation of alternatives and different impact types, including cumulative impacts. The EIS is comprehensive and thorough in its identification and evaluation of feasible mitigation measures to reduce those effects whenever possible.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

60

1 is this cancer factory coming in polluting the air that they
2 breathe. That is something that would be devastating to
3 many of those within the special needs community. Many of
4 those people are not here because they are busy taking care
5 of their children.

PM38-2

6 I am here before you today to speak out and speak
7 up for them and speak for my community in regards to that,
8 as well as the fact that this project itself is being
9 located in a place that is predominantly brown and in my
10 opinion, this is environmental racism, this is something
11 that cannot and should not happen here because of the fact
12 that many of the local politicians as well have allowed tax
13 abatements which is not something that many of us agreed to.

PM38-3

14 But there is also the fact that the Draft EIS
15 Statements says that people who are living here will be
16 paying property taxes and their property taxes will
17 increase. So that does not seem fair to the people in the
18 public here, especially if most of this information is not
19 readily available in their native language which is Spanish
20 so it does not seem fair to have this information out --
21 that's lacking a lot of information and many people are
22 unaware that their property taxes will be going up as well.

PM38-4

PM38-5

23 So I'm here as a woman -- an indigenous woman to
24 just say that these two projects are not welcome here on our
25 lands. Thank you.

PM38-6

PM38-2

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

PM38-3

As discussed in 4.9.10 of the EIS, although the demographics indicate that potential environmental justice communities are present within the census blocks near the Project site, there is no evidence that these communities would be disproportionately affected by the Project or that impacts on these communities would appreciably exceed impacts on the general population.

PM38-4

As discussed further in section 4.9.5, the estimated tax benefits presented within assume the Project would receive tax abatements comparable to those recently granted for other LNG and major refining and petrochemical facilities along the Texas Gulf Coast. Further, RG LNG has committed to annual payments of \$2.7 million during the first 10 years of operation to offset a portion of the forgone taxes associated with the abatement.

PM38-5

This statement is incorrect. Section 4.9.2 of the EIS states that RG LNG would pay property taxes (ad valorem taxes), but does not state that individual property taxes would increase.

PM38-6

We received two comments during the scoping period requesting that Project materials be translated into Spanish. Executive Order No. 12898, which informs the federal government's approach to issues of environmental justice, provides that "Each Federal agency may, whenever practicable and appropriate, translate crucial public documents, notices, and hearings relating to human health or the environment for limited English-speaking populations." However, Executive Order No. 12898 applies to the agencies specified in section 1-102 of that Order, and the Commission is not one of the specified agencies. Consequently, even if translation were required under Executive Order No. 12898, the provisions of the Order are not binding on the Commission. However, it is current Commission practice to address environmental justice in its NEPA document when raised. Therefore, we have included this discussion in the final EIS in section 4.9.10. Further, in an effort to include Spanish language speakers in the NEPA process, Spanish language Project materials were made available to the public during the scoping meeting and public comment meeting held in Port Isabel and described in section 1.3.1 of the final EIS. In addition, a translator was available to assist Spanish language speakers. During the public scoping meeting, very few of the Spanish language materials that were made available were utilized by attendees. As such, we determined that translation of the draft EIS into Spanish was not necessary. As discussed further in section 4.9.2 of the EIS states that RG LNG would pay property taxes (ad valorem taxes), however the EIS makes no determination about changes in individual property taxes.

1 MR. BERG: My name is William Berg, William
2 W-i-l-l-i-a-m Berg B-e-r-g and I want to make a comment to
3 address Rio Grande LNG. It's not to address Rio Grande LNG
4 it's to address FERC and this is a message to FERC about
5 LNG.

6 Recently in early October the International Panel
7 for Climate Change, the IPCC which is a UN Board of
8 scientists monitoring climate change and they've been at it
9 for at least 25 years that I know of, they released a new
10 report to the press which is reporting on it and they're
11 going to give their official issuance in December at an
12 International Conference on Climate in Poland.

13 They're indicating that the combustion of fossil
14 fuels cannot continue for 10 years or the planet will pass
15 its tipping point into a terrible place for humanity. They
16 are suggesting that the new target for climate change is no
17 longer 2 degrees Celsius but is now 1 and degrees Celsius,
18 by 2 degrees Celsius there will be disasters -- human scale
19 disasters, threatening populations all over the world.

20 The IPCC is suggesting rapid reductions in fossil
21 fuel use and rapid expansion of renewable energy
22 infrastructure. The report suggests that this needs to be
23 done to avoid serious disruptions to humanity.

24 Those are the IPCC's strong recommendations. We
25 are already getting warnings. The preliminary warnings are

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

62

1 coming to the United States in the form of disastrous
2 hurricanes, rainstorms, and huge fast moving lethal
3 wildfires.

4 The warnings are coming to Europe in the form of
5 large massive heat waves which are killing hundreds of
6 people in every city. And the warnings are coming to Africa
7 and China in terms of increasing desertification -- the
8 deserts are growing in those countries in Africa and China.

9 The IPCC suggests that fossil fueled projects
10 with a lifespan of more than a decade should be
11 reconsidered. The LNG companies, excuse me, and we're
12 considering right now Rio Grande LNG but also applies to the
13 other two applicants in Brownsville and in fact all future
14 applicants.

15 They cannot possibly succeed in the timeframe of
16 10 years. If permitted today, they will be forced to close
17 and it will take 5 years to build and then another 5 years
18 before the world closes down on them. It's just not
19 feasible to build these things, we therefore recommend to
20 the FERC to no longer offer permits to fossil fueled
21 producers and fossil fueled power plants, thank you very
22 much.

23 DR. BASALDU: Good evening my name is Robert
24 Cristopher Basaldu. I am a resident of Brownsville, Texas,
25 a resident of Cameron County and this is -- today is

PM39-1

PM39-1

We have updated section 4.13.2.9 to include a discussion regarding climate change.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

63

1 November 15th, 2018 and I'd like to go on the record again
2 and make another comment that I am completely opposed to all
3 liquid natural gas and the liquid natural gas development,
4 the terminal stations, the pipelines, all of it.

PM40-1

5 And I grew up in Brownsville, Texas. I grew up
6 in Corpus Christi, Texas. I grew up coming to South Padre
7 Island and coming to visit South Padre Island and coming to
8 visit Port Isabel and these are some of my favorite places
9 in the world and they're very -- you know the natural beauty
10 here is very unique and very special.

11 The eco-systems here with the plants, the
12 animals, the sea life, the estuaries, the rivering areas,
13 they're -- it's all really wonderful and really special and
14 we should be doing everything we can to protect these areas,
15 not destroy them.

PM40-2

16 And these LNG Projects will destroy these natural
17 habitats. They're -- the regular running of these
18 businesses and these projects will poison the land and
19 poison the water. It'll poison the estuaries, it'll poison
20 the plants and animals and we need to not allow this to
21 happen.

PM40-3

22 There are people that make their livings, of
23 course, fisherman and shrimpers and people that lead
24 wildlife tours and eco-tourism tours and dolphin watches.
25 There are a lot of people in this area who actually make

PM40-4

PM40-1

Comment noted.

PM40-2

Comment noted. Impacts on wildlife and aquatic resources are discussed in section 4.6.

PM40-3

Impacts on water quality, wildlife, and aquatic resources are addressed in sections 4.3.2, 4.6.1, and 4.6.2 of the EIS, respectively.

PM40-4

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 their living from doing the kinds of businesses that
2 highlight water -- highlight wildlife and the beauty of the
3 natural world.

4 And this project will negatively impact all of
5 these people's businesses and livelihoods and that's another
6 reason to not allow this project. Again, this project is
7 about the development of carbon -- they're putting too much
8 carbon into the atmosphere and right now this planet needs
9 to be taking greenhouse gases, carbon dioxide, carbon
10 monoxide, methane, we need to be taking it out of our
11 atmosphere, not adding more greenhouse gases into the
12 atmosphere.

13 And we will -- if this project goes through it'll
14 negatively impact the planet as well as the local area
15 because it's going to just put more methane, more carbon
16 into the atmosphere which will lead to you know, more global
17 disruption -- global climate disruption.

18 So we need to not -- we need not have this
19 project. The Environmental Impact Statement does not do
20 enough to review environmental, you know, environmental
21 impacts even as large as the document is, it does not do a
22 good enough job of actually describing how negative the
23 impacts -- the environmental impacts are going to be.

24 There's not enough consultation of indigenous
25 people so the part of the Draft EIS talks about cultural

PM40-4

PM40-5

PM40-6

PM40-7

PM40-5

We have updated section 4.13.2.9 to include a discussion regarding climate change.

PM40-6

We disagree. The EIS discloses the potential impacts on environmental resources resulting from construction and operation of the Project. The EIS was prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ guidelines, and other applicable requirements. The draft EIS included sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand and consider the issues raised by the Project and addresses a range of alternatives. The final EIS provides substantive updates, where available. This EIS is consistent with FERC style, formatting, and policy regarding NEPA evaluation of alternatives and different impact types, including cumulative impacts. The EIS is comprehensive and thorough in its identification and evaluation of feasible mitigation measures to reduce those effects whenever possible.

PM40-7

As described in section 4.10.3 of the EIS, RG Developers and FERC have consulted with federally recognized Native American tribes with interest in the Project area. In addition, section 1.3 describes FERC's public review and comment process to identify environmental issues. The Section 106 process to identify, evaluate, assess, and mitigate adverse effects on historic properties is ongoing, and would be completed prior to construction of the Project, if authorized.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

65

1 impacts is woefully ignorant, it's woefully lacking, it has
2 not done its due diligence. The Draft EIS hasn't done its
3 due diligence in many places that -- not on cultural
4 impacts, not on historical impacts, and it hasn't gone far
5 enough on environmental impacts and as far as like
6 mitigation, the mitigations that the LNG companies are
7 prescribing or saying that they'll use for environmental or
8 natural resource mitigation, they are laughable, they're
9 woefully inadequate.

10 They don't go -- they don't actually do anything
11 to -- they don't do anything to support the wildlife or
12 protect the wildlife and they're not enough. And like the
13 endangered Texas tortoise, they're saying that they're just
14 going to have people pick up the tortoise and remove it or
15 move it to a different habitat, that is inadequate, that is
16 an inadequate mitigation.

17 There is so much wrong with this project and of
18 course with the source of this natural gas is fracked
19 natural gas. Fracking has been fracturing is leading to
20 poisoning aquifers, it takes fresh water and it fills it
21 with carcinogenic chemicals that get injected back into the
22 land.

23 That pollution will seep into water tables and it
24 will poison water. So you know, having all this fracked gas
25 coming from other parts of Texas you know, this pipeline is

PM40-7

PM40-8

PM40-9

PM40-10

PM40-8

As described in section 4.4.2 of the EIS, wetland mitigation plans are part of the permitting process associated with Section 404 of the CWA. RG LNG's final wetland mitigation plans would be developed and submitted to the COE, and would be implemented in addition to the construction mitigation measures outlined in RG LNG's Procedures and the measures described in the EIS. Construction of the LNG Terminal would not commence prior to finalization of the wetland mitigation plans and issuance of the COE's CWA Section 404/Section 10 permit.

PM40-9

Section 4.8.1.1 has been revised to include additional correspondence from the TPWD. We note that RG Developers may need to consult with the TPWD regarding impacts on individual Texas tortoises to adhere to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Code, Chapter 67 and Sections 65.171 through 65.176 of the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) and, in response to TPWD's comments on the draft EIS, RG Developers clarified that they will continue to work with the agency to develop a plan to minimize potential impacts on the species at the LNG Terminal site.

PM40-10

The Project would not involve gas extraction activities. Section 1.3.1 of the final EIS addresses comments that we received recommending that environmental impacts associated with natural gas production, including the practice of hydraulic fracturing ("fracking"), be evaluated in our review.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

66

1 going to bring all of that stuff down, it's going to
2 encourage more fracking and we can't have that. It's not
3 good for the planet, it's not good for the environment.
4 It's not just this pipeline project or the LNG
5 terminals or the refineries, it's the whole system is
6 damaging our environment, the land, water, our drinking
7 water, it's going to be poisoning us and this is
8 unacceptable -- this entire project is unacceptable. We
9 should be investing in renewable resources like solar and
10 wind power not continuing carbon-based fossil fuels and
11 developing fossil fuels.
12 We need to stop that. Aside from the
13 environmental destruction it's poisonous, it'll lead to
14 cancer clusters and the pipelines always leak and they
15 always break and in the case of natural gas pipeline,
16 they're going to continue to -- they could even blow up and
17 if they blow up they'll destroy -- they could destroy
18 neighborhoods if they're near there too.
19 This entire project is unacceptable and there was
20 not enough community input in the early approval stages of
21 the whole project. That must be mitigated too and we need
22 to really think, really think about this whole project.
23 It's not acceptable and you know, the other thing that these
24 pipelines are going to do is they're going to destroy Native
25 American remains and burials that are along the paths of the

PM40-10

PM40-11

PM40-12

PM40-13

PM40-14

PM40-15

PM40-11

Comment noted. The purpose of the final EIS is to evaluate and disclose the potential impacts of the proposed Project. Therefore, the discussion of alternative energy forms is outside the scope of the EIS.

PM40-12

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

PM40-13

Pipeline safety standards are discussed in section 4.12.2.1 of the EIS.

PM40-14

We disagree. The Project has not been approved, and section 1.3.1 of the EIS describes the public review and comment process for the EIS.

PM40-15

RG Developers provided a plan addressing the unanticipated discovery of cultural resources or human remains during construction (see section 4.10.2).

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 pipeline. That is the continuing genocide of Native and
 2 indigenous people.
 3 It's unacceptable and it needs to stop. Just
 4 because these are our ancestors who have died and they have
 5 been laid to rest, it doesn't mean that they can be thrown
 6 away as trash. It doesn't mean that they can be destroyed
 7 again. To have these pipelines go through, especially
 8 Native burial grounds, all that does is it tries to kill
 9 Native and indigenous people all over again. This is
 10 completely unacceptable. I don't see any -- there's not
 11 enough in the Draft EIS that deals with NAGPRA, Native
 12 American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act.
 13 There has not been -- there has just not been
 14 sufficient work in this Draft EIS, not in environmental
 15 impacts, not in species impacts, not in cultural impacts,
 16 nothing. The Draft EIS is incomplete and it's obvious that
 17 the work -- not enough work went into it. It's clear that
 18 due diligence has not been performed.
 19 So I ask FERC to deny whatever permits and deny
 20 this project. The project itself is unacceptable. We
 21 shouldn't even be having this conversation but I encourage
 22 FERC to deny any continuance on this project, thank you.
 23 (Whereupon at 9:00 p.m., the meeting was
 24 adjourned.)
 25

PM40-15

PM40-16

PM40-17

PM40-16

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act only applies to actions on federal lands. As the Project would be constructed on private lands, the Act does not apply.

PM40-17

We disagree. The EIS discloses the potential impacts on environmental resources resulting from construction and operation of the Project. The EIS was prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ guidelines, and other applicable requirements. The draft EIS included sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand and consider the issues raised by the Project and addresses a range of alternatives. The final EIS provides substantive updates, where available. This EIS is consistent with FERC style, formatting, and policy regarding NEPA evaluation of alternatives and different impact types, including cumulative impacts. The EIS is comprehensive and thorough in its identification and evaluation of feasible mitigation measures to

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)
Port Isabel, Texas

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding

4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the

5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding: Rio Grande LNG Project

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 Docket No.: CP16-116-000

17 Place: Port Isabel, TX

18 Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018

19 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original

20 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy

21 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription

22 of the proceedings.

23

24 Larry Flowers

25 Official Reporter

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

2

3 Rio Grande LNG Project

4 Docket Nos. CP16-454-000 and CP16-455-000

5

6 and

7

8 Texas LNG Project

9 Docket No. CP16-116-000

10

11 SCOPING MEETING

12

13 Port Isabel Convention Center

14 309 E. Railroad Avenue

15 Port Isabel, TX 78578

16

17 Thursday, November 15, 2018

18 5:00 p.m.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

- 1 SPEAKER LIST
- 2 Kathleen Jaudzemis
- 3 William C. Best, Jr.
- 4 Desi Martinez
- 5 Steven Knott
- 6 Odilon Amador
- 7 Victor Montemayor (interpreter)
- 8 Darreld Nick Woolsey
- 9 Rolando Gonzalez
- 10 Maria Galasso
- 11 James Chapman
- 12 Victor Wonnell
- 13 Ternie Nunez
- 14 Robert Radnik
- 15 Patrick Anderson
- 16 Kathleen Sheldon
- 17 Doris Meinerding
- 18 William Beaty
- 19 Susan Lippman
- 20 Lydia Caballero
- 21 William Jason Fry
- 22 Laurel Steinberg
- 23 Marta Elena Pena
- 24 Diane Lucas Joe
- 25 Davin Joe

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MS. JAUDZEMIS: My name is Kathleen,
3 K-a-t-h-l-e-e-n Jaudzemis, J-a-u-d-z-e-m-i-s. For three
4 years I have been a resident of South Padre Island but
5 prior to that I was a resident of Laguna Vista so I have
6 been a Texas resident and a Texas voter since 2008.

7 The reason that many of us have chosen to
8 relocate to the beautiful area of the lower Rio Grande
9 Valley is because of its unique eco-system. We are aware
10 that it is fragile and that we need to protect it. There is
11 a significant diversity of birds and butterflies and plant
12 species which are found candidly nowhere else in Texas
13 because of our unique coastal location and because of our
14 deep southern location in this state.

15 We are also aware of how environmental damage can
16 seriously impact all of these species as well as the water
17 and the land itself and also how difficult it is to come
18 back from those kinds of disasters. We all know about Exxon
19 Valdez, we all know about Deep Water Horizon, we all know
20 about the leaks in every pipeline they've had through Canada
21 and through Northern America.

22 And the reality is that the LNG provides exactly
23 all of those dangers in a much more fragile area. We also
24 feel that it would discourage the kind of eco-friendly
25 development that we are concerned about and that we would

PM41-1

PM41-1

Project safety is discussed in section 4.12. The purpose of the final EIS is to evaluate and disclose the potential impacts of the proposed Project. Therefore, the discussion of other types of development is outside the scope of the EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

72

1 like to see the area promote for tourism as well as for the
2 vital environmental health of the area and for all of those
3 reasons we oppose the LNG proposal.

PM41-1

4 MR. BEST: Good evening, my name is Bill Best,
5 I'm officially on the records as William C. Best, Jr. I'm a
6 resident of South Padre Island for 35 years and I would like
7 to lodge my objection to the LNG facilities as they are
8 proposed and I will break down my objections and try to keep
9 this organized.

PM42-1

10 First I would like to address the issue of toxic
11 emissions. Now, I'm addressing toxic emissions based upon
12 data that was provided by Rio Grande LNG and Rio Bravo
13 Pipeline. It was in their own brochure and I will start off
14 first of all addressing that and I will attach that sheet as
15 an Exhibit A but first let me begin.

16 With regard to toxic emissions, these entities
17 have admitted that they will be producing and emitting toxic
18 pollutants into the air -- the very air that we breathe.
19 First there is particulate matter. There are two kinds.
20 There are PM 10 and PM 2.5. These are small particles we
21 breathe in and which are emitted into the air by the LNG
22 facilities.

PM42-2

23 They admit this. These PM's -- particulate
24 matter get into your lungs when you breathe, when you
25 inhale. They cause cardiac and respiratory diseases. PM

PM42-1

Comment noted.

PM42-2

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The final EIS was revised to identify the pollutants assessed, which include benzene (a VOC). The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which include standards for PM, and, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

1 10's -- the larger of the particular matters that are
2 produced get lodged into the mucus membranes of the lungs.
3 They cause infections to the lungs and asthma attacks.

4 PM 2.5 particles are smaller and get into your
5 blood and cause inflammation and this inflammation is linked
6 with heart attacks, obesities and diabetes -- studies have
7 shown this. According to the Rio Grande LNG company itself,
8 their facility alone will produce almost 800 tons of this
9 particulate matter every year -- 800 tons produced as poison
10 into the air that we breathe.

11 LNG plants also produce and emit volatile organic
12 compounds -- these are carcinogens, quite simply they cause
13 cancer and birth defects and according to doctor's studies
14 they cause permanent cognitive impairment which is a fancy
15 way of simply saying permanent brain damage.

16 From what I read, Rio Grande LNG will emit over,
17 excuse me, 570 tons of volatile organic compounds per year
18 over its 570 tons of this cancer-causing poison. Now I'm
19 going to attach to this section as Exhibit A, a brochure
20 production table 9.2.1 produced by Rio Grande LNG and Rio
21 Bravo Pipeline.

22 In other words, they're admitting to this. They
23 are saying this is what they will do and this is what they
24 will do at the very least if everything goes right and
25 nothing goes wrong -- almost 800 tons per year of

PM42-2

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

74

1 particulate matter. That's over 1,600,000 pounds a year
2 that they will be producing and emitting into the very air
3 we breathe.

4 With the volatile organic compounds, they're
5 saying 573.7 tons per year. This is a cancer-causing agent.
6 This is what -- this comes out to over 1,147,000 pounds of
7 volatile organic compounds per year. These guys are
8 emitting this.

9 Thirdly, they also, according to their own table
10 of estimated emissions, will be producing hazardous air
11 pollutants in the amount of 53.7 tons per year. That equals
12 107,400 pounds of hydrocarbon air pollutants. Sir, I'd like
13 to hand you what's been marked as Exhibit A.

14 There has been a report -- oh I'm sorry, that has
15 been produced by three well-known pediatricians -- Dolly
16 Savier, Carmen D'Rocco and Marsha Griffin, and I'm going to
17 give you that report as an Exhibit B.

18 For the sake of brevity I will not read this
19 entire report but I will submit it as Exhibit B. With
20 regard to two other items, please bear in mind that we have
21 prevailing southeasterly winds that will be pushing and
22 blowing this poison -- these toxins, into populated areas.

23 In fact from the Texas proposed Texas LNG site,
24 Laguna Heights is only 3 miles downwind, Walmart here in
25 Port Isabel is about 1.85 miles downwind. Port Isabel is

PM42-2

PM42-3

PM42-3

See response to PM15-3 on cost sharing plans between RG LNG and local responders. Also see section 4.12.1.2 for DOT siting requirements and section 4.12.1.3 for Zones of Concern distances. To mitigate fire (or other hazard) scenarios, RG LNG's design would include mitigation, such as spill containment and spacing, hazard detection, ESD and depressurization systems, hazard control, firewater coverage, structural protection, and emergency response. FERC staff recommends further final design details be provided in section 4.12.1.7 to ensure adequate mitigation is in the final design of the proposed facility.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

75

1 about 2.5 miles downwind and South Padre Island is 5 miles
2 away. Now, this also brings up another point I'd like to
3 mention is that these facilities have no means by which to
4 control any fires that may occur and accidents are known to
5 happen.

6 Fires are known to occur and these fires burn so
7 hot that the local fire department does not have the ability
8 or means to extinguish these fires. And these LNG companies
9 are not provided their own means to extinguish these fires.
10 I would like to attach this map as Exhibit C and also
11 mention that it is recommended there be a 3 mile safety
12 zone. We're well within that.

13 And also, sir, I would like to point out that
14 there are -- there's only two ways to get away from these
15 LNG sites and that's on Highway 48 and Highway 100. All of
16 them are within that 3 mile safety zone and there's no way
17 to prevent or actually it would prevent people from
18 evacuating. Here you go sir.

19 The next issue I would like to address is
20 profitability. First of all let it be known that all this
21 proposed LNG product is not for use here in the United
22 States, it's for sale overseas and there are no current
23 contracts that have for sure the sales and yet they still
24 want to go ahead with constructing these facilities and
25 poisoning the environment.

PM42-3

PM42-4

PM42-5

PM42-4

See response to PM15-3.

PM42-5

This is outside the scope of the EIS. Under Section 3 of the NGA, oversight for LNG export is divided between the Commission and the DOE. FERC is responsible for approving the safe and sound siting and operation of LNG facilities, given that DOE has approved the export of the commodity. It is the DOE, not the Commission, which retains the exclusive authority over the export of the natural gas as a commodity, including the responsibility to consider whether the exportation of that gas is consistent with the public interest. As described in section 1.1 of the EIS, the DOE granted an authorization to RG LNG for export to countries having a FTA with the United States that includes national treatment for trade in natural gas. In accordance with the NGA and Energy Policy Act of 1992, export to a country with which there is an FTA requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas, is deemed consistent with the public interest. Further, RB Pipeline executed a precedent agreement for the total capacity of the Rio Bravo Pipeline for the 20-year life of the Project, which establishes a basis for a finding by the Commission that the pipeline will be in the public convenience and necessity under Section 7.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

76

1 Now the environment is the very basis of the
2 largest industry we have in the area and that is tourism.
3 In fact an A&M study showed that eco-tourism here in South
4 Texas brings in 450 million dollars annually and the economy
5 is growing. And the tourism is brought about by the
6 pristine environment, the beaches, the clean air, fishing,
7 both in bay and offshore, birding centers, sea turtle ink
8 and dolphin watching but to name a few.

9 Just about all the businesses here in this area
10 are related to accommodating tourists -- for example hotels,
11 rentals of houses and condominiums et cetera, restaurants,
12 bars, charter fishing, site seeing tours, sales, clothing,
13 t-shirts, surf boards, paddle boards, kayaks, fishing
14 equipment, rentals of equipment.

15 And in spite of all the panacea that these
16 companies are offering in the way of many, many billions of
17 dollars in profit to the area, I'm sorry that's not true,
18 that's a lie. I will provide as the next exhibit an
19 application for appraisal value filed by Inova, signed by
20 David Chung and he -- and this was signed and sworn to under
21 penalty of perjury if he is lying and has a tendency to
22 straighten people up.

23 And according to this, he says that the number of
24 jobs that is going to be created annually after these
25 facilities are created, these monstrosities are built,

PM42-6

PM42-7

PM42-6

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction.

PM42-7

This comment references documentation of a separate project. Potential impacts on the economy and employment in the Project area from the proposed Project are addressed in section 4.9.2. This analysis is based on Project details provided by RG Developers and a report prepared by the Perryman Group, which characterizes the net economic impacts of the Project, including direct and indirect employment. The positive economic effects of the Project are an estimate based on reasonable assumptions. We recognize that construction of the Project would result in increased local employment related to the Project that would not be sustained during operation.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

77

1 there's only going to be 90 people employed full-time and
2 their average salary will be but \$36,197 per year. This is
3 a far cry from what they're trying to represent to the
4 public.

5 I would like to attach the application and the
6 affidavit signed by the President, David Chung as the next
7 exhibit. I would like to attach the next exhibit as the
8 number of entities that have already voted in opposition to
9 any LNG facilities in the area as the next exhibit.

10 And next is an exhibit -- a bullet point that
11 you're probably going to hear sir from other people that I
12 would like to attach as the next exhibit. Again, I would
13 like to submit my opposition to these LNG facilities, they
14 are bad, they are not good, they're not going to help and
15 here is a letter that I prepared for FERC that I'd like to
16 attach as the next exhibit.

17 Thank you ma'am, thank you sir.

18 MR. MARTINEZ: My name is Desi, D-e-s-I Martinez,
19 M-a-r-t-i-n-e-z. I live at 1806 Haverford Boulevard,
20 Harlingen, Texas 78552 in Harlingen. I'm an economist with
21 a Master's in economics and I am a consultant in this
22 coastal south Texas area.

23 Presently I have to do some work for the city of
24 Los Fresnos, Economic Development Corporation, also known as
25 the Los Fresnos Community Development Corporation. My

PM42-7

PM42-8

PM42-8

Comment noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

78

1 purpose here today is to provide input and to the
2 socio-economic impact of the EIS that presently FERC is
3 looking into of these LNG companies developing their
4 projects in south Texas.

5 The economic situation in south Texas is one of
6 much poverty -- probably the highest in the nation, lack of
7 skill, labor and the need for jobs and skills training. We
8 have been working and talking to the LNG's representatives
9 of developing opportunities for people to work and to
10 improve their quality of life.

11 Texas is known for its natural resources and this
12 is one of the major natural resources that will export
13 products throughout the nation and the world out of its
14 locations that they have at the Brownsville Ship Channel and
15 Port of Brownsville.

16 People are hungry for these jobs and
17 opportunities so they can improve their quality of life and
18 get a better opportunity to get in a better place in
19 America. We believe that -- and I say we, because I'm a
20 liaison for the Community Development Corporation, EDC,
21 Economic Development Corporation that jobs are very much
22 needed from these companies and they have reached out to
23 work with us in the communities all over from the coast from
24 Kleberg County south, et cetera so that these opportunities
25 we can develop our skilled labor and be able to have

PM43-1

PM43-1

Comment noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 permanent jobs as well as construction jobs for our
2 community down here.

3 South Texas being the southernmost part of the
4 nation is in dire need of these industries. Manufacturing
5 done here in south Texas is very minimal. We manufacture
6 very much, we're a big consumption area. Our biggest
7 industry I guess in part is a pass-through economy for the
8 billions of dollars being produced just across the border.

9 We supply a lot of materials to the port, to
10 Monterey and others and they create some jobs but they're
11 minimal. This would create solid, strong jobs for our
12 community all over south Texas from Kleberg County to
13 Cameron County along the coast.

14 We need them. I believe that these companies
15 will be eco -- rather eco-friendly to protect the
16 surrounding communities and we will -- like I said, be
17 working with them diligently so they could be good corporate
18 citizens and bring in these export opportunities and jobs
19 that we need down here.

20 My name is Desi Martinez, I hope that the FERC
21 positively provides the EIS approval for these two companies
22 that are going through this process, thank you.

23 MR. KNOTT: My name is Steven Knott, S-t-e-v-e-n
24 K-n-o-t-t. Good evening everyone and thank you for your
25 consideration during this public comment process. My name

PM43-1

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

80

1 is Steve Knott and I'm a senior commercial director for
2 McDermott, International, a Houston-based engineering
3 procurement construction and installation company.
4 McDermott, along with many other organizations,
5 supports the Rio Grande LNG Project. In fact we have
6 already invested a great deal of time and resources into
7 this project and will continue to do so if we are chosen to
8 help execute this work.
9 We look forward to partnering with the company
10 and Next Decade to deliver a world-class LNG facility in a
11 manner that is safe and environmentally responsible.
12 McDermott places quality, health, safety, environment and
13 security at the core of everything it does. We call it
14 simply QHSES, it's just good business.
15 We do not cut corners to the detriment of any of
16 these areas and this is one of the reasons why we support
17 Next Decades effort to develop the Rio Grande LNG Project.
18 We both share a similar vision when it comes to QHSES.
19 Achieving QHSES excellence is contingent upon
20 continuously investing in excellent people and offering
21 these same individuals ample opportunity for professional
22 growth, so I cannot emphasize this enough, we will need
23 people, we will need a lot of people.
24 To achieve the high-quality standards we demand
25 we will need people who are trained and capable, that's why

PM44-1

PM44-1

Comment noted.

1 we've been proactive in ongoing outreach activities with
2 training and educational institutions as well as civil and
3 economic organizations in the valley.

4 As we have done in other areas, investing in
5 workforce training is a necessary part of our operational
6 success -- such investments not only help us deliver the
7 quality solutions our clients expect of us, but also result
8 in high-paying jobs with good benefits.

9 And it's worth noting our commitment to the
10 valley goes beyond this project. For instance we have a
11 skilled workforce that we employ in the United States.
12 Currently we employ about 700 individuals from Hidalgo,
13 Cameron and Willacy counties and over the past 5 years we've
14 employed well over 5,000 individuals from the valley.

15 We would love to see our employees have a chance
16 to return home to work for this project and continue to work
17 to advance their careers with McDermott International. We
18 also believe in promoting supply chain opportunities for
19 local and diverse businesses -- this project will provide
20 direct subcontracting and procurement work as well as
21 indirect and induced opportunities for local businesses.

22 So I'll conclude as I started, we at McDermott
23 International support the Rio Grande LNG Project. It will
24 be a good investment that will benefit the region, it will
25 create good-paying direct and indirect jobs, grow the local

PM44-1

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 economy, increase the local tax base and improve the quality
2 of life for the people of this community, thank you.

PM44-1

3 MR. AMADOR: My name is Odilon Amador, my name is
4 Victor Montemayor, I'm the interpreter. Odilon is O-d (as
5 in delta) - i-l-o-n, last name is Amador, A-m (as in
6 Mary)-a-d-o-r. My name is Victor Montemayor, that's V (as
7 in Valet)-i-c-t-o-r Montemayor, M-o-n-t-e-m-a-y-o-r.

8 I don't have any problem with the pipes that are
9 supposedly going to be built to go through my property. I
10 mean I have no problem with it. It's probably rules and
11 regulations by the government so I have no problem with it.
12 At any point when you're going to go through my property
13 just leave there a note, or you can send me a notice in
14 Spanish to my home address.

PM45-1

15 I mean you can cut the lock on my fence open and
16 just go in and just leave a note saying that you did, that
17 you are inside working in my home address box. I mean I'm
18 not at home during office hours. I get to work at 7, I come
19 back at 4 during Saturdays I normally use it to do my
20 chores, wash my clothes go out and do some exercise and I'm
21 pretty sure no one works on Sunday so.

22 So then that will be all, 29548 Hamaca Lane,
23 that's h-a-m-a-c-a, Los Fresnos, Texas 78566.

24 MR. WOOLSEY: Darreld, D-a-r-r-e-l-d Nick,
25 N-i-c-k Woolsey, W-o-o-l-s-e-y. Okay I'm 75 years old, I'm

PM45-1

Comment noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

83

1 retired. I moved here because of the weather and the fun
2 things to do and I think LNG is going to enhance that and I
3 think it's good for the economy. I think everything about
4 it is good.

5 I have not seen one negative thing that would
6 change my opinion or some people have tried to but that
7 isn't going to work. I think that what it's going to do is
8 it's going to give jobs that are not where people just have
9 to work with their hands, they can work with their brain and
10 their back.

11 I talked to some people from the various
12 companies that said they were looking into schooling for the
13 young people so that they could learn a trade and earn a
14 good income for their family. Everything that I've seen on
15 the proposal so far is fine, the only thing that I have any
16 doubts about is the federal government sticking their nose
17 into things and holding things up.

18 But I know it's for the best interest of
19 everybody that they do this and that's what they have been
20 telling me for my 75 years of life but I don't exactly agree
21 with that. I like it -- the companies that are here in the
22 area right now are doing some of the work that's going to
23 progress into the usage of this product that we're talking
24 about.

25 We've got so much gas we don't know what to do

PM46-1

PM46-1

Comment noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

84

1 with it all and my wife would kind of like me to find out
2 what to do with my gas, but natural gas is a wonderful thing
3 I think. It's a great product, it doesn't bother anybody
4 and it has so many uses for different things and if we can
5 help Europe be better, it's what the end goal here is going
6 to be. Those companies are going to make a lot of money,
7 but we're going to help a lot of people in Europe and other
8 countries that are lacking in a product that we have more
9 than what we need to do with it.

10 Sometimes it takes me a while to get my point
11 across but I don't know anything other than I think it's a
12 great idea and I'm looking forward to seeing that it gets
13 better and gets done in the correct manner.

14 MR. GONZALEZ: Hi my name is Rolando Gonzalez,
15 resident of Luna Vista here representing myself. I am a
16 city councilman for the town. R-o-l-a-n-d-o
17 G-o-n-z-a-l-e-z, the main concern which I had focused on --
18 well actually two areas concerning the -- once the
19 processing starts, how will there be a change in air
20 quality?

21 We have prevailing winds here in the area that
22 are mostly out of south/southeast which would mean the areas
23 that get affected. We have dust that blows when we get dry
24 periods and that's fairly often, maybe ever three or four
25 years, dust blows and any of these contaminants from the

PM46-1

PM47-1

PM47-1

Air quality impacts associated with the Project are discussed in section 4.11.1 of the final EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

85

1 exhaust be caught up with that dust and if they are very
2 harmful what impact would they maybe have on the residents
3 of these communities that are south or downwind from the
4 exhaust of the LNG processing will be done.

5 I've also -- the other concern is the impact on
6 all our bodies of water, the marine and the estuaries and so
7 forth. Whether or not you know, I've heard again both sides
8 of the story. One thing that I would believe would help the
9 LNG folk is to increase trust.

10 One measure for example, with air quality, maybe
11 they could provide or find a way to fund so that cities
12 would get air quality gauges so that if there's indeed an
13 issue of air quality to have these gauges working prior to
14 the processing or the beginning of the processing for the
15 LNG plant, both the state and the LNG one so that it could
16 be understood very clearly by folk that prior to and after
17 there may be a difference or there may not be a difference.

18 If there isn't that definitely leaves a higher
19 level of potential increase in trust which I would think is
20 at the root of the issue here. Today's world with all the
21 network -- all the different types of media it isn't hard to
22 project horrid images of explosions and so forth concerning
23 chemical plants whether they're gasoline or petroleum or
24 whether they're chemical production plants.

25 So again it would be to increase trust to do

PM47-1

PM47-2

PM47-3

PM47-2

Surface water impacts associated with the Project are discussed in section 4.3.2.2 of the final EIS.

PM47-3

The TCEQ conducts air quality monitoring in the state of Texas; the comment is outside the scope of this EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

86

1 things for the area with the money from the companies so
2 that there's an increase again of trust. There will be an
3 increase of traffic in the Ship Channel it's to be expected
4 because there's going to be more, but those are basically my
5 two areas of concern and waste products in terms of going in
6 through the water cycle whether it's estuaries, the Ship
7 Channel and it's connected -- it's all connected to currents
8 move throughout this whole area so yeah, that would be my
9 main concern in terms of contaminants and pollutants in our
10 water and the air quality.

11 This is an assumption being that we will never
12 have any sort of major malfunction or any major catastrophe
13 due to some sort of an explosion because if that does happen
14 again we're down wind and that's always scary and I think a
15 lot of people see those images and that's what they're
16 scared of. Those are the answers -- I mean those are the
17 questions that I would have and maybe subtle
18 recommendations to offer ways to show as proof prior to and
19 after in terms of air quality and water.

20 MS. GALASSO: My name is Maria Galasso, its
21 M-a-r-i-a G-a-l-a-s-s-o thank you. So note in addition to
22 the comments I'm submitting today I will provide final
23 comment for the FERC deadlines of December 3, 2018 for Rio
24 Grande LNG and December 17th, 2018 for Texas LNG.

25 These are my comments. Number one -- FERC issued

PM47-2 ctd

PM47-4

PM47-4

See responses to PM14-1 and PM15-2.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on October 12th,
2 2018 and set a comment deadline of December 3rd, 2018 for
3 Rio Grande LNG along with a public meeting scheduled for
4 November 15th, 2018 which is today.

5 The DEIS is comprised of two volumes of the total
6 of 1,120 pages. Similarly the Texas LNG DEIS issued on
7 October 26th, 2018 with a comment deadline of December 17th,
8 2018. The FERC determined that the public meeting would be
9 held along with the one scheduled for Rio Grande LNG.

10 The Texas LNG DEIS is comprised of two volumes
11 with a total of 789 pages because both proposed LNG projects
12 will be located within a few miles of each other on the
13 Brownsville Ship Channel, both projects seek comments from
14 the same group of residents expecting that the public review
15 the volumes of information that has been gathered for each
16 project and provide meaningful comments by the established
17 date for the public meeting is unrealistic, creates undue
18 hardship and casts doubt about the Agency's goal for the
19 public meeting.

20 The date for the combined public meeting for the
21 projects should have been extended once the Texas LNG DEIS
22 was added to the agenda. Alternatively, the Texas LNG
23 public meeting should have been scheduled on its own at a
24 later date.

25 Number two -- the Rio Grande LNG Appendix A is a

PM48-1

PM48-1

The FERC continued to accept comments on the draft EIS and other related materials placed into the record well past the end date of the comment period up, to the extent possible, until the point of publication of the final EIS. The intent of the combined public meeting was to provide interested parties the opportunity to discuss, and provide comments for, both projects in one venue. FERC staff was available at the public meeting to answer questions about our environmental review process and the content of the EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

88

1 list titled, "Distribution for Notice and Availability," it
2 includes a list of more than 2,500 contact names. The Texas
3 LNG Appendix A is titled "Distribution List," and only
4 includes 106 individuals. My name is included in the Texas
5 LNG list but it is not included in the Rio Grande LNG list
6 although I have been actively involved and have commented
7 often with all three projects proposed for the Brownsville
8 Ship Channel.

9 It was our understanding that because of the
10 siting proximity of the project, the comments on any of the
11 three dockets would be filed with the other two. The
12 differing distribution lists suggests that this did not
13 happen.

14 Number three -- the wetlands mitigation plan as
15 proposed for both projects will violate the No Net Loss
16 Federal Policy.

17 Number four -- the need for these projects has
18 not been demonstrated, there are no buyers for the LNG in
19 the form of binding contracts and for projects with so many
20 negative impacts an unequivocal need for the product must be
21 shown, especially in light of the unequivocal and official
22 opposition to the projects demonstrated by resolutions
23 passed by all the governing bodies of the nearby communities
24 who will most directly experience the in particular negative
25 impacts.

PM48-2

PM48-3

PM48-4

PM48-5

PM48-2

The intent of the combined public meeting was to provide interested parties the opportunity to discuss, and provide comments for, both projects in one venue. We note that multiple comments were received and considered from the commentor on the Rio Grande LNG Project; however, no address was provided to include in the Project distribution list.

PM48-3

See Comment Response PM14-3.

PM48-4

See Comment Response PM14-4.

PM48-5

The resolutions regarding opposition to the Project are noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 Further, South Padre Island, Port Isabel, Long
2 Island Village and Laguno Vista are not within the
3 Brownsville Navigation District and therefore had no voice
4 or representation in the decision made by the Port of
5 Brownsville to lease Navigation District property on the
6 Brownsville Ship Channel to the LNG companies. Our
7 representative voices concerning these projects lay with the
8 elected town council and city council officials.

PM48-6

9 Number five -- there is no analysis of the
10 impacts to both the bait shrimping industry which rely on
11 the BSC nor on the offshore shrimping industry which relies
12 on ready access to the BSC to get to and from the Gulf, even
13 less than significant impact could cause these industries to
14 fail locally.

PM48-7

15 Number six -- the DEIS states that the project
16 has the potential to result in significant impacts on the
17 "ocelot and ocelot recovery," from an area that has so few
18 ocelots and so little ocelot habitat. This is reason to
19 deny the permit.

PM48-8

20 Number seven -- oh I still have five more things
21 -- okay number ten -- the SpaceX launch site in Boca Chica
22 Beach is 5 miles from the Rio Grande LNG terminal site and
23 even closer to the Inova site. Where is the FERC completed
24 SpaceX launch failure analysis? Did that analysis include
25 the SpaceX BFR which will be larger than the Falcon or the

PM48-9

PM48-6

This is outside the scope of the EIS.

PM48-7

Sections 4.9.4 and 4.9.8.2 have been revised to more explicitly address impacts on the bait shrimping industry.

PM48-8

See Comment Response PM14-11.

PM48-9

See Comment Response PM21-8.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

90

1 Falcon head rockets and which SpaceX now says it intends to
2 launch from their Boca Chica site because a larger rocket
3 brings with it a larger debris radius.

4 A launch failure analysis for the SpaceX BFR is
5 required before FERC approval and it should be made very
6 clear in the analysis the insurance
7 requirements/responsibilities for all public/private
8 involved entities.

9 MR. CHAPMAN: My name is Jim Chapman, I live in
10 Weslaco, Texas and I am going to make a few comments on the
11 Texas LNG Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

12 C-h-a-p-m-a-n, Chapman, and I am opposed to the granting of
13 the permit to Texas LNG overall, more specifically the
14 comment period for the Draft Environmental Impact
15 Statement, because it is superimposed on Rio Grande LNG's
16 comment period.

17 There's really too much information to go through
18 thoroughly and comment on so the first request is that the
19 comment period for Texas LNG be extended. Secondly, the
20 permit for Texas LNG's should be denied because they have
21 not demonstrated a need for the project. They have no
22 confirmed buyers, no binding contracts to buy the LNG,
23 therefore there's not a demonstrated need for the project,
24 the project should not go forward.

25 The mitigation plan is unacceptable. There's a

PM48-9

PM49-1

PM49-1

These comments pertain to the Texas LNG Project, and are therefore outside the scope of this EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

91

1 No Net Loss Policy which is being violated. They propose to
2 mitigate their wetland losses by preserving an area that's
3 already an existing wetland that's being managed and
4 protected by Fish and Wildlife Service so there would be a
5 net loss of wetlands if that would proceed, so I think FERC
6 should not accept that as wetlands mitigation.

7 There's also significant Uplands loss including
8 the Loma which they will be building on and that there's no
9 mitigation for that loss in the Environmental Impact
10 Statement and there should be.

11 And I'll switch to Rio Grande LNG and the first
12 point is the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is
13 incomplete because there's a long, long list of important
14 information that FERC is requesting before the end of the
15 comment period. How are we going to comment on things that
16 are not in the environmental impact statement?

17 That information -- and it's a long list of
18 information, will come in right at the end of the comment
19 period. How will the public see that information, how will
20 they comment on that information, so that is -- really seems
21 to violate the whole spirit of a public comment period.

22 My suggested solution is when that information
23 does come in that there be an additional two weeks for the
24 public -- first of all that should go out to the public and
25 there should be a two-week comment period on that additional

PM49-1

PM49-2

PM49-2

See Comment Response PM14-2.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 information.

2 The mitigation plan is very inadequate. It is
3 very -- it is -- they propose to mitigate by preserving land
4 that is already an existing wetland and it is already under
5 management and protection by Fish and Wildlife Service.

6 If they were proposing to restore a degraded
7 wetland that would be mitigation, to perverse and existing
8 wetlands is not mitigation so that is not acceptable in the
9 wetland laws for Rio Grande LNG is quite substantial.

10 There is nothing in the Environmental Impact
11 Statement about impacts to shrimping, bay shrimpers use the
12 Ship Channel to fish and the offshore shrimpers have to
13 traverse the Channel back and forth which will become
14 increasingly difficult to do if the project is built and the
15 tankers are daily going up and down with their security
16 escorts.

17 The dredging impacts to South Bay which is the
18 first Texas State Coastal Preserve is not even mentioned.
19 Dredging soil is extremely damaging to sea grasses. South
20 Bay has sea grasses, a unique species of oyster and is
21 immensely valuable -- that should be evaluated and it's not.
22 And there's also no mention of the possible dredging impacts
23 to the Behia Grande so that's missing from the EIS.

24 Using wetlands for roads and work space is not
25 acceptable and it is extremely unlikely that after several

PM49-2

PM49-3

PM49-4

PM49-5

PM49-6

PM49-3

As described in section 4.4.2 of the EIS, wetland mitigation plans are part of the permitting process associated with Section 404 of the CWA. RG LNG's final wetland mitigation plans would be developed and submitted to the COE, and would be implemented in addition to the construction mitigation measures outlined in RG LNG's Procedures and the measures described in the EIS. Construction of the LNG Terminal would not be authorized to commence prior to finalization of the wetland mitigation plans and issuance of the COE's CWA Section 404/Section 10 permit.

PM49-4

Impacts on marine transportation are addressed in section 4.9.8.2. LNG carriers would be required to follow mandates such as providing notification to LNG Terminal managers and relevant authorities of the expected arrival of an LNG carrier four days in advance. The estimated delay for vessels during inbound LNG carrier transits would be about 3 hours. Further, we recognize in section 4.9.3, impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass, if they arrive during LNG carrier transit.

Impacts on commercial fishing are addressed in section 4.9.4. While minor, temporary and permanent impacts on commercial fishing in the BSC would occur from construction and operation of the LNG Project, the majority of the commercial fishing industry is based on offshore shrimping and fishing. As such the Project is unlikely to result in a measurable effect on commercial landings in the Project area.

PM49-5

See Comment Response PM14-8.

PM49-6

See Comment Response PM14-9.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 years of heavy construction those wetlands could ever be
2 restored so that would be an unnecessary loss of wetlands if
3 that were to happen.

PM49-6

4 There is no -- when we're talking about the
5 impacts of dredging there has been no study and there should
6 be of the benthic fish and resources in the Ship Channel in
7 the vicinity of the project. If you don't know what's there
8 how can you assess the impacts of dredging?

PM49-7

9 The DEIS says that there will be no impacts -- no
10 economic negative impacts, in fact while there would be
11 short term, there would be a positive impact in terms of
12 construction jobs, long-term the economic impact is likely
13 to be negative because these plants employ relatively few
14 people, most of those people will not be local and
15 industrializing the area is going to impact nature and beach
16 tourism which is the number one industry here and will cause
17 a negative economic impact.

PM49-8

18 The endangered species consultation that is going
19 on with Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine
20 Fisheries should be completed as part of the Environmental
21 Impact Statement, not completed prior to construction,
22 that's the only way that the public would have a chance to
23 look at it so requiring that after the permit is issued is
24 wrong and should not be done. More comments will follow in
25 writing, thank you.

PM49-9

PM49-7

Section 4.3.2.2 of the EIS describes dredging impacts on water quality, including the potential for sediment to reach the Bahia Grande. Impacts on aquatic resources are discussed in section 4.6.2.

PM49-8

Negative and positive impacts on socioeconomic characteristics in the Project area are addressed in section 4.9. Impacts on recreation and tourism are addressed in section 4.9.3.

PM49-9

The EIS was prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ guidelines and other applicable requirements. In addition to conducting its own independent analysis of the Project, FERC also relies on the expertise of federal, state, and local agencies who have regulatory authority and oversight of the laws, rules, and regulations described in the EIS. The outreach and agency engagement conducted for the Project is described in section 1 of the EIS. An applicant must also demonstrate that it has conducted surveys in accordance with a regulatory agency's protocols and/or the law, and consulted with the appropriate agency personnel and applied for applicable permits. If the Project is authorized, the FERC Order will include conditions that must be met in advance of any construction. If the applicable conditions cannot be met, construction could not move forward, even if the Project was authorized. One such condition includes finalization of ESA consultation with the FWS and NMFS, which will identify any additional mitigation that must be met. If either agency issues a jeopardy determination, FERC could adopt a reasonable or prudent alternative, refuse to authorize the commencement of construction, or request an exemption from the Endangered Species Committee. Given these regulatory mechanisms, FERC finds that recommending these consultations to be finalized prior to construction is adequate.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 MR. WORRELL: My name is Victor Worrell,
2 W-o-r-r-e-l-l. If built these terminals will be the largest
3 source of hazardous air pollution in the Rio Grande Valley
4 and the health of our children is at stake.

5 TCEQ has two reasonably thorough air quality
6 monitoring stations in the area, one in Brownsville upwind
7 of the proposed facilities and one in Mission, almost 70
8 miles west which is not directly downwind. Our high school
9 and our junior high school are three miles directly downwind
10 from the proposed facility.

11 On September 1st, 2015 the Laguna Vista Town
12 Council passed a Resolution officially opposing the
13 construction of any LNG facility in the vicinity. A copy of
14 the Resolution was sent to the Federal Energy Regulation
15 Commission. Laguna Vista is 5 miles directly downwind of
16 the proposed facility.

17 The lower Rio Grande Valley is habitat for many
18 threatened and endangered species. The Environmental Impact
19 Statement states that these facilities are likely to
20 adversely affect ocelots, aplomado falcons and piping
21 plovers. These animals are endangered and irreplaceable.

22 The actual local job creation is minimal,
23 especially considering tourism-based jobs that will be lost
24 due to these facilities intrusion into the area. The
25 permits to build these facilities should be denied. That's

PM50-1

PM50-2

PM50-3

PM50-4

PM50-1

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, ambient air quality monitors used to identify background concentrations are based on those monitors that were nearest or most representative of the proposed Project facilities. Ambient air quality monitor locations were identified by RG Developers in coordination with the TCEQ, and impacts on air quality are assessed in section 4.11.1 of the EIS.

PM50-2

The resolutions regarding opposition to the Project are noted.

PM50-3

The BA provided in section 4.7 of the final EIS has been revised in accordance with FWS correspondence and concludes that the Project is not likely to adversely affect the northern aplomado falcon and piping plover and would not result in the adverse modification of critical habitat. Our determination of effect for the ocelot remains, and our current determination for the jaguarundi is, "likely to adversely affect." Nevertheless, a "likely to adversely affect" determination is not reason to deny a permit under Section 7 of the ESA. Rather, the ESA requires that, if a project is likely to adversely affect a threatened or endangered species, the federal action agency (in this case, FERC) must conduct formal consultations with the FWS. This process requires the FWS to prepare a Biological Opinion for the Project.

PM50-4

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction. Finally, sections 4.9.4 and 4.9.8.2 have been revised to more explicitly address impacts on the bait shrimping industry.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 what I got.

2 MS. NUNEZ: Terrie Nunez, T-e-r-r-i-e N-u-n-e-z.

3 I'm a Port Isabel resident born and raised. Fracking has
4 been known to spew hazardous levels of pollution, increased
5 earthquakes and contaminate ground water and I strongly
6 believe that fracked gas pipelines and LNG export terminals
7 pose a major threat to the safety and well-being of my
8 fellow residents and most importantly our environment.

9 My home community and livelihood are in danger if
10 Rio Grande LNG builds its massive liquefied natural gas
11 export terminal and flammable pipelines here. This massive
12 fossil fuel industrial complex would pollute the paradise
13 we've lived in and destroy our local economy with it.

14 Many local businesses including my families
15 depend on tourism. Most of our customers are from out of
16 town who return year after year because of the beauty we're
17 surrounded by. It's saddening to even think about losing
18 customers we've grown to call family. What's even more
19 disturbing is a massive company wanting to step all over us
20 for their own cash flow gain.

21 South Padre Island is the last untouched clean
22 beach in Texas. Our area is well-known for fishing life,
23 real estate opportunities, wildlife and marine life. LNG
24 would be a blow to the Laguna Atascosa Wildlife Refuge, an
25 international wildlife corridor with pristine wetlands and

PM51-1

PM51-2

PM51-3

PM51-4

PM51-1

The Project would not involve gas extraction activities. Section 1.3.1 of the final EIS addresses comments that we received recommending that environmental impacts associated with natural gas production, including the practice of hydraulic fracturing (“fracking”), be evaluated in our review.

PM51-2

Air quality impacts associated with the Project are discussed in section 4.11.1 of the final EIS.

PM51-3

Impacts on tourism are discussed in section 4.9.3.1.

PM51-4

The EIS recognizes the Project’s impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to- ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 home to the endangered ocelot and aplomado falcon.
2 As a community that loves and supports any and
3 all animals, why should we risk the health of our eco-system
4 and our cities for money. The communities of Port Isabel,
5 South Padre Island, Laguna Vista and Long Island Village
6 have all passed anti-LNG Resolutions.
7 Fellow residents and I are the ones who are
8 affected here and we don't want LNG here. FERC needs to
9 strongly hear our communities that will be forced to live
10 within three miles of the terminals and deny the company
11 permits.
12 MR. RADNIK: My name is Robert Radnik,
13 R-o-b-e-r-t R-a-d-n-i-k. I live in San Benito, Texas and
14 I'm here to tell the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
15 that I feel that these LNG Projects are the wrong way for
16 this country to be moving. I think that we're running out
17 of time as far as things that are happening in climate
18 change and that we should be moving as fast away from the
19 fossil fuel industry as we possibly can.
20 Wind and solar should be things that we are
21 focused on -- renewable energy and finding better ways of
22 utilizing our resources. Investors should be aware that
23 this is a no win situation for them if we continue to upset
24 the carbon cycle which our planet depends on -- we're
25 already losing the planet's air conditioner which is the

PM51-4

PM51-5

PM52-1

PM52-2

PM51-5

The resolutions regarding opposition to the Project are noted.

PM52-1

We have updated section 4.13.2.9 to include a discussion regarding climate change.

PM52-2

Comment noted. The purpose of the final EIS is to evaluate and disclose the potential impacts of the proposed Project. Therefore, the discussion of alternative forms of energy is outside the scope of the EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

97

1 arctic, it's melting.

2 This last year they posted the arctic ice extent
3 tide the 6th lowest but even worse the thickest parts are
4 getting thinner so that means as time goes by we'll be
5 reaching tipping points that we will not be able to -- the
6 plant won't recover from for thousands of years.

7 This equilibrium that we've lived in for the last
8 11-12,000 years since the end of the last Ice Age has
9 provided the growth for civilization and everything that we
10 have right now and we're about to screw it up big time and I
11 think that bringing these LNG plants only continues to
12 exacerbate the problem and that we should be moving in other
13 directions and that if our children and grandchildren are
14 going to have a quality of life like we've had, this is the
15 direction we should be taking, both economically,
16 politically and socially, thank you.

17 MR. ANDERSON: My name is Patrick Anderson and
18 that is spelled P-a-t-r-i-c-k A-n-d-e-r-s-o-n. And my
19 comments apply to both Texas LNG and Rio Grande LNG and Rio
20 Bravo dockets. My comments are regarding specifically right
21 now the conclusionary statements at the end of the executive
22 summary. It says that FERC reached the conclusion that both
23 projects would have adverse environmental impacts. We agree
24 and thus these permits should be denied.

25 Factors that guided the conclusion also support

PM52-2

PM53-1

PM53-1

Comment noted. The EIS is not a decision document; rather, it is a tool to ensure that the potential environmental impacts that would occur as a result of a federal action are fully analyzed and presented, in compliance with NEPA. Under NEPA, the determination that an impact is significant necessitates the preparation of an EIS (as opposed to an EA). In accordance with NEPA, we have prepared this EIS to present the environmental impacts that would occur as a result of the Project. The decision of whether to authorize the Project is determined by the FERC Commissioners.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 the denial of permits. The LNG Terminal would be
2 constructed in an area currently zoned for commercial and
3 industrial use along an existing, man-made Ship Channel.
4 First point is that both Rio Grande and Texas LNG Terminal
5 designs have operational footprint outside of the project's
6 boundaries and outside of the Port of Brownsville boundary.

7 Light and sound impacts are physical footprints
8 of operation that extended beyond the Ship Cannel and into
9 the wildlife corridor managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife
10 Service and the Laguna Atascosa Wildlife Refuge.

11 Secondly, according to Section 7 of the
12 Endangered Species Act as referred to in the Texas LNG DEIS,
13 Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act states that amended
14 that, "Any project authorized, funded or conducted by any
15 federal agencies should not jeopardize the continued
16 existence of any endangered species or threatened species or
17 result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat
18 of such species which is determined to be critical."

19 The permit should be denied according to Section
20 7 of the DEIS as listed species of habitat will be affected
21 within the outside of the project boundaries as indicated in
22 the DEIS. Secondly, not all consultations and plans have
23 been finalized as indicated in the DEIS. Some have not been
24 started by Texas LNG and Rio Grande LNG, thus the statement
25 in both DEIS's that FERC concludes that impacts on the

PM53-2

PM53-3

PM53-4

PM53-2

Comment noted. Light and sound impacts inherently extend beyond the direct footprint of a facility. As such, the EIS fully analyses and considers these impacts on all areas potentially affected by light and sound. These impacts are presented throughout the EIS including in sections 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, and 4.11.2.

PM53-3

The BA provided in section 4.7 of the final EIS has been revised in accordance with FWS correspondence and concludes that the Project is not likely to adversely affect the northern aplomado falcon and piping plover and would not result in the adverse modification of critical habitat. Our determination of effect for the ocelot remains, and our current determination for the jaguarundi is, "likely to adversely affect." Nevertheless, a "likely to adversely affect" determination is not a reason to deny a permit under Section 7 of the ESA. Rather, the ESA requires that, if a project would be likely to adversely affect a threatened or endangered species, the federal action agency (in this case, FERC) must conduct formal consultations with the FWS. This process requires the FWS to prepare a Biological Opinion for the Project.

PM53-4

We disagree. The EIS discloses the potential impacts on environmental resources resulting from construction and operation of the Project. The EIS was prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ guidelines, and other applicable requirements. In addition to conducting its own independent analysis of the Project, FERC also relies on the expertise of federal, state, and local agencies who have regulatory authority and oversight of the laws, rules, and regulations described in the EIS. The outreach and agency engagement conducted for the Project is described in section 1 of the EIS. Both the ESA and the MSFCMA encourage inclusion of the BA and EFH Assessment in the NEPA document (EIS). An applicant must also demonstrate that it has conducted surveys in accordance with a regulatory agency's protocols and/or the law, and consulted with the appropriate agency personnel and applied for applicable permits. The draft EIS included sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand and consider the issues raised by the Project, and addresses a reasonable range of alternatives. The final EIS includes additional information provided by RG Developers, cooperating agencies, and new or revised information based on substantive comments on the draft EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

99

1 environment from the proposed project would be reduced to
2 less than significant levels are nothing more than
3 speculative.

4 Furthermore there is no indication that Texas LNG
5 or Rio Grande LNG will adopt FERC recommendations found
6 throughout the DEIS.

7 Third, Rio Grande developers would follow an
8 environmental inspection program including environmental
9 inspectors to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures
10 that become conditions of the FERC authorizations.

11 FERC staff would conduct inspections throughout
12 construction, commissioning and operation of the project.
13 There is no such inspection program found in the DEIS.
14 Details regarding this plan should be included in the DEIS
15 with an extended comment period for the public to review and
16 comment.

17 The U.S. Coast Guard issued a letter of
18 recommendation indicating that the Brownsville Ship Channel
19 would be considered suitable for the LNG marine traffic
20 associated with projects. However, the Coast Guard did not
21 take into consideration recommendations by the Society of
22 International Gas Tanker and Terminal Operators, as
23 published in site selection and design for LNG ports and
24 jetty's.

25 The site selection indicates several parameters.

PM53-4

PM53-5

PM53-6

PM53-7

PM53-5

The recommendations included in the final EIS are the recommendations of the FERC staff to the Commission. FERC staff recommends these measures be included as conditions to any authorization issued by the Commission. If the Commission adopts our recommendations and approves the Project, the recommendations then become mandatory conditions which would be binding on RG Developers.

PM53-6

Section 2.4 of the EIS describes RG Developers' environmental inspection program as well as the FERC oversight and inspection protocols. The responsibilities of RG Developers' EIs are described in the Project-specific Plan and Procedures (see appendix D and E of the EIS), and were available for review in the draft EIS. Further, the FERC continued to accept comments on the draft EIS and other related materials placed into the record well past the end date of the comment period up, to the extent possible, until the point of publication of the final EIS.

PM53-7

The design, construction, and operating requirements for the Project are contained in 33 CFR 103 through 105, 33 CFR 127, and 49 CFR 193. In addition, RG LNG must meet the DOT's siting regulations in 49 CFR 193. These regulations do not require the use of SIGTTO publications. However, certain design criteria described as recommendations in SIGTTO Information Paper No. 14, Site Selection and Design for LNG Ports and Jetties, (i.e., strength/positions of mooring systems and breasting dolphins; interlinking of ship and shore ESD systems; installing quick acting valves at the PERC connections; using sensors to monitor the positions of the LNG loading arms; limiting ignition sources on the jetty; use of tugs and pilots to safely maneuver the LNG marine vessel to the jetty, etc.) are considered during the Coast Guard and FERC's evaluation of the Project. In addition, as indicated in section 4.12.1.6, FERC conducted an engineering review on the use of various layers of protection or safeguards to reduce risks of potential hazards to offsite public. FERC also reviewed potential impacts from natural hazards and external impacts from the surrounding areas.

1 The first parameter, there is no acceptable probability for
2 a catastrophic LNG release. Three LNG facilities proposed
3 at the Port of Brownsville in close proximity to each other
4 increases the probability of catastrophic LNG release and
5 thereby not in accordance to the guidelines and standards.

6 Secondly, liquefied natural gas ports must be
7 located where LNG vapors from spill or release cannot affect
8 civilians. Tankers will be exiting the Port of Brownsville
9 Ship Channel thereby passing only a matter of feet by Isla
10 Blanca Park and the jetty's heavily populated by civilians.

11 Recommendations from the National Laboratories of
12 a distance of 2.2 miles and Doctor Jerry Havens, a former
13 Coast Guard LNG vapor hazard researcher of three miles,
14 populated areas including Long Island Village, Port Isabel
15 and Isla Blanca Park are within these recommendations.

16 Third recommendation -- LNG shippers must be far
17 from the ship transit fairway to prevent collision or all
18 other vessels to prevent surging and ringing along the LNG
19 pier and jetty's that may cause the ship to break its
20 moorings and LNG connections since all the vessels must be
21 considered an ignition source.

22 The Brownsville Ship Channel is a narrow one-way
23 channel that will be in close proximity to all Port
24 Brownsville ship transit fairway and thereby present
25 collision and emission sources to LNG tankers. The location

PM53-7

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

101

1 of all proposed LNG facilities are on the end of the ship
2 channel near the entrance and exit and this results in all
3 Port of Brownsville ship traffic passing by all three LNG
4 sites.

5 MS. SHELDON: This is Kathleen Sheldon,
6 K-a-t-h-l-e-e-n S-h-e-l-d-o-n. I grew up in Harlingen, I
7 was born in the valley, grew up in Harlingen, have gone to
8 the beach before they even had a ferry -- I mean before they
9 had a causeway but most importantly this is a very narrow --
10 I'm very opposed to both the Rio Grande LNG Project and the
11 Texas LNG Project.

12 The reason is a very narrow corridor with a very
13 narrow channel, a very narrow entryway from the Gulf right
14 next to this area is you know, a resort area with condos and
15 whatnot and then along the highway that will pass by these
16 facilities are little areas for people to fish, also the
17 Bahia Grande was recently restored as a wetland -- just
18 these precious rare delicate areas, that's number one.

19 Number two, which isn't -- just the worst thing,
20 but the visual impact -- can you imagine the people the
21 people in the condos who are facing more west or the bay
22 side look out and there they are for their honeymoon and
23 they've rented a condo up on the 20th floor and they look
24 out and what they see are flares similar to what you see at
25 Orange, Texas, Beaumont area up by Corpus -- places that

PM53-7

PM54-1

PM54-2

PM54-1

Comment noted. Impacts on the Bahia Grande and the Bahia Grande Channel are discussed in section 4.3.

PM54-2

Impacts on the viewshed, including visual simulations of the Project facilities from various observation points, are discussed in section 4.8.2 of the final EIS.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

102

1 have these things and we don't.

2 And now we're going to be having them, it's just
3 visually its' just a travesty then to speak of the pollution
4 -- the air pollution, you know, you'll hear people say oh,
5 the kids are going to get cancer, we're all going to get
6 cancer and that can be true and but if that -- if you don't
7 sort of want to pay attention to that, there are things that
8 come out of these places, these facilities that do get in
9 the air and it can't be good.

10 If there ever is an accident or a major hurricane
11 that disturbs the infrastructure, leakage, whatnot, it just
12 isn't the place for it. Put it in somewhere else on the
13 coast, further up the coast that's on the land -- not on a
14 delicate barrier island area.

15 You know I just lose sleep thinking about the
16 horribleness of this whole thing and its big money, its big
17 people with big money who absolutely don't care one bit.
18 But you ask them would you like to live -- would you like to
19 have your condo looking out on that? I could tell you right
20 now none of the owners of these companies, none of the
21 people that are profiting from all of this would even dream
22 of having their condos right nearby.

23 They're not up in Orange, Texas, they're not up
24 at Beaumont and all those places in Louisiana where the
25 orange flares are going off and turn the night into

PM54-2

PM54-3

PM54-4

PM54-5

PM54-3

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

PM54-4

Section 4.12.1.6 of the EIS discusses FERC staff's review of how the Project would withstand impacts from hurricanes and other natural disasters. The design wind speeds for the proposed Project would be in accordance with 49 CFR 193 and American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) 7-05. In addition, DOT's LOD addresses design wind speeds for LNG facilities as defined in 49 CFR 193.

PM54-5

Comment noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

103

1 semi-sunset, you know, constantly. I just -- oh I just
2 can't stand it. You don't know the depth of my anger about
3 it, and this is wrong and Texas Environmental Commission --
4 whatever the group is, TEQ, is not paying attention to what
5 the people are saying.

6 They think we're just a couple of little people
7 whining and that's not true. It's the wrong kind of project
8 in the wrong place and the future of the world is not in
9 fossil fuels, it just isn't, you know, we're just going to
10 get away from that and we will have this monstrosity so I'm
11 just really furious and very angry.

12 So thank you for having to listen or for you to
13 type this up or to create this, you're the person that's
14 listening to this and they did not give us donuts, they gave
15 us a number but they didn't give us donuts to be here, but
16 anyway thank you.

17 MS. MEINERDING: Hi, Doris, D-o-r-i-s Meinerding,
18 M-e-i-n-e-r-d-i-n-g and I spell that like all the time. I
19 do not have my glasses so I do not have a prepared statement
20 because I can't read what I have prepared but I will submit
21 that online. One of the things that I find really
22 disturbing is I read in the DEIS for Rio Grande LNG that
23 they were looking at 3,655 acres being destroyed even though
24 about 40% of this they said would come back to life at some
25 point but during the construction period 3,655 acres.

PM54-5

PM55-1

PM55-1

The reported 3,633.2 acres that would be temporarily impacted by the Project would occur throughout the Project area, which includes Cameron, Willacy, Kenedy, Kleberg, and Jim Wells Counties. The referenced communities are in Cameron County, where a total of 35.4 miles of the 135.5-mile-long pipeline and the LNG Terminal would be constructed. RB Pipeline has selected a route for the Pipeline System that would result in 66.0 percent of the route being within, or adjacent to, existing disturbance, while RG LNG selected a site for the LNG Terminal that is 4 or more miles from these communities.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

104

1 Out of curiosity I looked -- I converted that to
2 square miles, it comes to about 5 and square miles and
3 then I looked at the size of South Padre Island, the size of
4 Laguna Vista -- add those two cities together and then you
5 can take about 11% of Port Isabel and that would comprise
6 3,655 acres and I started crying.

PM55-1

7 I had no idea. I have looked at architectural
8 drawings, I have been on the boat, I have been to the Port
9 of Brownsville, I have looked at everything but until I
10 actually did the math and saw how big just one facility was
11 going to be and the crazy thing is its going to destroy so
12 much wetlands. It's going to destroy so much of our
13 eco-system which is so important.

PM55-2

14 I won't even go there right now and they don't
15 even have a binding contract. You're going to allow all of
16 this destruction when there's no proof that they will ever,
17 ever, export one iota of liquid natural gas?

PM55-3

18 And the other thing is if they do get a binding
19 contract there is evidence that shows between fracking and
20 everything that goes in to creating LNG and exporting it to
21 Europe, you would have as much damage done to the climate --
22 I'm sorry I'm losing my words here and as I said I don't
23 have this prepared.

PM55-4

24 As if you were using coal and if you export it to
25 China, they're showing that it would be even more so, more

PM55-2

Comment noted. Wetland impacts are addressed in section 4.4.2 of the EIS. The COE has a goal of "no net loss" of wetlands; therefore, wetland impacts at the LNG Terminal would be offset by wetland mitigation.

PM55-3

See Comment Response PM14-4.

PM55-4

The Project would not involve gas extraction activities. Section 1.3.1 of the final EIS addresses comments that we received recommending that environmental impacts associated with natural gas production, including the practice of hydraulic fracturing ("fracking"), be evaluated in our review.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

105

1 harmful to the environment than coal. So this is crazy and
2 please for the sake of my grandchildren no permits please,
3 thank you.

PM55-4

4 MR. BEATY: Okay my name is William Beaty, that's
5 W-i-l-l-i-a-m last name B-e-a-t-y. I live in Luna Vista,
6 Texas just a few miles from where we are right now. I'm a
7 homeowner, I'm retired. I'm concerned about the health
8 concerns specifically for our school children. I think
9 that's been made clear and for the safety concerns of having
10 an LNG terminal in an area where schools quite nearby and
11 residences.

PM56-1

12 Apart from that what really baffles me is with
13 all of the previously impacted coastline on Texas and other
14 parts of the Gulf, why on earth do we need to come to a
15 pristine area which is the hub of Texas's recreation
16 industry?

PM56-2

17 We have -- the fact that the tourism --
18 eco-tourism specifically which means fishing, birding, all
19 that's associated with the outdoors is a half a billion
20 dollar business in the lower Rio Grande Valley, why are we
21 putting those jobs -- thousands of jobs, in jeopardy for a
22 handful of jobs that this complex will bring?

PM56-3

23 That is one thing that baffles me. I don't see
24 any sense to it. There's a lot to be preserved here.
25 There's much to be lost. I certainly wouldn't want to be a

PM56-1

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

PM56-2

As discussed in section 3.3, alternative sites for the Project along the Texas coast were evaluated; however, all of these sites failed to meet the established criteria for a suitable Project site.

PM56-3

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

106

1 part of making that come about so I'm here to make my
2 statement in opposition to this industry moving into the
3 area. It's an area that should be preserved.

4 Other parts of the coast have been lost, they are
5 available and I think these people should be looking to
6 those places to set up their plants. That is my statement,
7 thank you.

8 MS. LIPPMAN: My name is Susan Lippman, S-u-s-a-n
9 L-i-p-p-m-a-n. And I'm a Texan, I was born in Austin but I
10 was brought here to the Rio Grande Valley when I was still
11 in a cradle and so this is my early first home and we lived
12 here until I went to -- until I was 7 and this is a place
13 that's very special to me because we came out to Padre
14 Island all the time, every weekend and I learned to swim in
15 the waves of the Gulf of Mexico. So it was a beautiful
16 place then and it still is and I have to note that it's the
17 tourist attraction for the whole state of Texas and beyond
18 and that it is the eco-tourism economy here that is
19 dependent on its beauty and its purity and its healthiness.

20 It also attracts the retirement community and
21 with the baby boomers starting to get that age, as I am, I
22 know that many of them will be looking for a beautiful place
23 like this to live. There's too much that would be
24 sacrificed if this area were industrialized and polluted and
25 the air were not to be healthy.

PM57-1

PM57-1

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

1 Besides just the tourism there's the fishing,
2 dolphin tours and an incredible diversity of wildlife.
3 There are wildlife preserves that are being threatened at
4 the same time by the wall -- the border wall and these
5 projects. There's endangered populations of ocelots and
6 probably even jaguars that need to cross freely from one
7 side of the border to the other and to have sufficient
8 habitat to continue.
9 These areas are also situated where there are
10 wetlands and where they will be subject to sea level rise
11 that will probably be greater than anyone's predicting.
12 They will be subject to hurricanes -- much more fierce than
13 we have established records of in the past.
14 The amount of engineering that it would take to
15 keep these facilities safe I think is probably beyond what
16 most people are anticipating. And I understand that the
17 natural gas terminals which means they are liquid because
18 they're under so much pressure that gas becomes liquid. If
19 these were to be breached, a cloud of natural gas could go
20 up in the air un-combusted but mixed with oxygen and be
21 extremely volatile and it could drift over a populated area,
22 even the high school on Highway 100 and could explode
23 somewhere at some distance from the terminal itself.
24 And I have a concern -- even though I am not a
25 tribal member myself, I think that it is just morally

PM57-2

PM57-3

PM57-4

PM57-5

PM57-2

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction.

PM57-3

In section 4.12.1.6 of the EIS, we assess the structural design of the LNG Terminal in consideration of storms (including hurricanes), flooding, and sea level rise. RG LNG would install a storm levee around the entire site, and we recommend in section 4.12.1.7 that RG LNG maintain the elevation of the levee throughout the life of the facility to ensure it is protected from flooding and sea level rise.

PM57-4

Section 4.12.1.6 of the final EIS details the engineering and technical review of RG LNG's preliminary engineering design. This analysis contained various design reviews with a focus on the layers of protection or safeguards to reduce the risk of a potentially hazardous scenario from developing into an event that could impact the offsite public. As described in our process design review, the facilities would not liquefy natural gas into LNG under pressure, rather the natural gas is cooled to cryogenic temperatures and stored just above atmospheric pressure.

PM57-5

Based on the results of RG LNG's cultural resources survey of the LNG Terminal site described in section 4.10.1 of the EIS, no intact deposits of the Garcia Pasture site were encountered. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred with the survey results.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 unconscionable to desecrate the gravesites and the sacred
2 sites of the tribes who have lived here since long before my
3 ancestors even came to this country even though that was a
4 couple of hundred years ago. Those ancestors have been here
5 for thousands of years.

6 Even though this is not my backyard now, there
7 are effects that affect me and the whole of Texas and they
8 affect the whole of the planet. I understand that the
9 purpose of a liquid natural gas terminal is for exporting
10 the gas and we have leaks of methane. Natural gas is mostly
11 methane and the leaks will be along the whole structure of
12 the pipeline wherever there are nodes and stations and
13 methane is so much more powerful than carbon dioxide that
14 it's a significant climate influencer by itself.

15 But if you look at the big picture, the liquid
16 natural gas terminals facilitate the export of natural gas
17 which will of course, help the oil and gas companies with
18 their profits but doesn't do that much for the State of
19 Texas and therefore it will increase the rate and amount of
20 fracking all over the State of Texas which is a danger to
21 the water supplies and as the future predicts more draughts
22 as well as more fierce storms and downbursts of rain, that
23 water that's in the ground will be especially important to
24 the future generations and that also is being threatened by
25 the fracking.

PM57-5

PM57-6

PM57-7

PM57-6

We have updated section 4.13.2.9 to include a discussion regarding climate change.

PM57-7

The Project would not involve gas extraction activities. Section 1.3.1 of the final EIS addresses comments that we received recommending that environmental impacts associated with natural gas production, including the practice of hydraulic fracturing ("fracking"), be evaluated in our review.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

109

1 All in all we do not need these terminals and
2 they should not be approved.

PM57-8

3 MS. CABALLERO: My name is Lydia Caballero,
4 L-y-d-i-a C-a-b-a-l-l-e-r-o. I came to speak opposing the
5 LNG Project for this area of the Rio Grande Valley of South
6 Texas and I have many reasons for opposing this.

7 First of all I am a retired surgical nurse and as
8 a surgical nurse I traveled across this great country,
9 Canada, Central and South America. I am bi-lingual. I
10 experienced working in the areas of Canada where the
11 fracking industry was big for natural gas.

12 I started seeing an upsurge in unusual cancers in
13 that area and after research was done they found that yes
14 indeed, there were some cancers that were going up in the
15 rates in that area, also, while I was there and prior to I
16 had heard of and experienced several earthquakes which were
17 proven later to be extremely caused by the fracking.

18 The other reason I'm here is because I am a 5th
19 generation shrimper. My father, my great-grandfather and
20 his father were all shrimpers, my brothers -- four of my 11
21 brothers are shrimpers and this will affect the pollution in
22 the air and also in the sea with the hurricanes and the
23 different tides in this part of the country.

PM58-1

24 I'm scared of having experiencing the upsurge in
25 the cancers, earthquakes that I experienced in Canada and

PM58-2

PM57-8

Comment noted.

PM58-1

Impacts on water quality and air quality are assessed in sections 4.3.2 and 4.11.1, respectively.

PM58-2

The Project would not involve gas extraction activities. Section 1.3.1 of the final EIS addresses comments that we received recommending that environmental impacts associated with natural gas production, including the practice of hydraulic fracturing ("fracking"), be evaluated in our review.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

110

1 also I worked in north central as a travelling nurse in
2 North Central Texas. My bloodline is American Indian. I am
3 57% Native American. I think my great-grandfathers and all
4 of my ancestors would be rolling in their grave on that side
5 of the family. They had been here for many, many hundreds
6 of years.

7 On the other side of the family my bloodline goes
8 all the way back to the people that came from Spain and had
9 -- the queen had given them the deeds here and those
10 ranchers that came from Spain and set up in this part of
11 Texas, took care of the lands and I don't think is taking
12 care of the lands.

13 I think that we can do well enough with solar
14 energy and other forms of looking for energy and I would
15 like for this to be considered on behalf of not just my
16 ancestors but also my grandchildren that I hold dear to my
17 heart and the future generations in my community and in my
18 family, thank you.

19 MR. FRY: Hello, yes my name is William Jason
20 Fry, Fry F-r-y and I'm a resident of South Padre Island and
21 Brownsville. I have houses in both places. Our house here
22 is a rental, specifically condo. That is what I'm really
23 worried about. My mother -- she lives off of the income of
24 that property and we're located directly at the base of the
25 bridge and if these LNG plants go in, our biggest fear is

PM58-2

PM58-3

PM58-3

Comment noted. The purpose of the final EIS is to evaluate and disclose the potential impacts of the proposed Project. Therefore, the discussion of alternative forms of energy is outside the scope of the EIS

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

111

1 that our tourism -- the tourism will drop off and then that
2 will affect us monetarily and basically my mother will lose
3 her livelihood.

4 I can move away, I can go back to Dallas where
5 I'm from, where I've lived, she cannot -- she's elderly. So
6 I'm concerned about her livelihood. I'm also concerned
7 about the livelihood of the people here -- the fisherman,
8 the shrimpers, the people that derive their income from
9 tourism and that's really my concerns.

10 So South Padre Island is a tourist -- it drives
11 almost I would say 98% of its income from tourism and if
12 people fail or quit coming down here, that will dry up and
13 this area will go downhill rather quickly. You can see that
14 in other areas north of here -- Corpus Christi, things like
15 that.

16 What we really like down here and the reason that
17 people live down here is because we have a good quality of
18 life. We don't have the income level that you would in a
19 large metropolitan area, however our quality of life is its
20 nice and peaceful and it's not polluted.

21 You know, when you live in a big city so often if
22 you want to do anything you have to spend money. Down here
23 if you want to do something you can just walk outside and
24 you can see the nature, you know, the butterflies are
25 migrating right now, we have all sorts of different birds

PM59-1

PM59-1

The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to-ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit. As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

112

1 and things like that. So that's really the jewel of this
2 area and just because certain people at this time are not
3 appreciating it and they seem to think that petrol chemical
4 plants will -- that our environment can co-exist with petrol
5 chemical plants -- I see that as completely 100% false.

6 People come here because it is not polluted and
7 it's not industrialized. I think that in the future that
8 you will be able to put a monetary value on this and that
9 people will come from all over the country to experience our
10 wildlife and our birds and our wonderful weather.

11 If these petrol chemical plants come in they're
12 going to ruin the view, specifically between Brownsville and
13 South Padre Island. If we have structures -- petrol
14 chemical structures that are interfering with the skyline,
15 basically what it's going to look like is you're going to
16 have 20 miles of petrol chemical industrialization -- you're
17 in a 4 mile tourist area. I don't think anybody is going to
18 want to drive through 20 miles of industrialization to reach
19 4 miles of beach.

20 I don't think that that beach is going to be
21 clean and going to be -- I don't think people are going to
22 want to go, so we have that. We have our air quality -- a
23 lot of people down here are elderly and a lot of people live
24 below the poverty line, they can't afford to go to your
25 really good doctors so they get stuck with the pollution

PM59-2

PM59-3

PM59-2

Impacts on the viewshed, including visual simulations of the Project facilities from various observation points, are discussed in section 4.8.2 of the final EIS. The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to- ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit.

As further described in section 4.9.3.1, most current nature tourism facilities at the Laguna Atascosa NWR, including Boca Chica Beach, are far enough away from the LNG Terminal site that they would not be impacted by construction.

PM59-3

As described in section 4.11.1 of the EIS, the State of Texas requires a State Health Effects air quality analysis. The results of RG LNG's State Health Effects modeling evaluation indicate that the Project emissions are below applicable effects screening levels, and therefore adverse health effects are not expected. The TCEQ is the agency responsible for the review of the State Health Effects analysis, and on December 17, 2018, the TCEQ issued an order granting air quality permits to RG LNG. Further, potential pollution emissions from the LNG Terminal site, when considered with background concentrations, would be below the NAAQS, which are designated to protect public health including sensitive populations such as children, the elderly, and asthmatics.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

113

1 that gets handed to them.

2 Another thing is the fishing -- for instance we
3 think they just spent 4 billion dollars or something
4 ridiculous like that on cleaning up and opening up our
5 largest new estuary and fish breeding ground -- the Bahia
6 Grande.

7 Now if you put directly across the street a
8 chemical plant that its emissions are volatile chemicals and
9 things such as that, if you kill the environment of the
10 fishing. If you pollute the water and the fish eggs die
11 then there's not going to be any fish. If there's not going
12 to be any fish then there will not be any fishermen to pay
13 for people like myself who's a bartender and I derive my
14 income from our tourists, so I really strongly and 100%
15 oppose the LNG plants.

16 MS. STEINBERG: It's Laurel Steinberg,
17 L-a-u-r-e-l S-t-e-i-n-b-e-r-g. Okay I want to make some
18 comments about Rio Grande LNG first -- just a couple of
19 things. Regarding the mitigation for filling wetlands,
20 right now there's no satisfactory plan for mitigating the
21 loss of wetlands.

22 Preserving the Loma's which they're proposing
23 does not replace the wetlands that they are filling.

24 Regarding the visual impacts -- the EIS claims minimal
25 visual impact, that they will have one mile frontage on

PM59-3

PM59-4

PM60-1

PM60-2

PM59-4

Impacts on recreation and tourism are addressed in section 4.9.3 and impacts on commercial fishing are addressed in section 4.9.4. Impacts on water quality and aquatic resources are addressed in sections 4.3.2 and 4.6.2 of the EIS, respectively.

PM60-1

Upland habitats, including lomas, in the Project area are not protected; therefore, mitigation of these habitat is not required. However, we acknowledge that lomas are important habitat for ocelots. Any mitigation for habitat loss for the ocelot would be determined through completion of the ESA consultation process. As described in section 4.4.2 of the EIS, wetland mitigation plans are part of the permitting process associated with Section 404 of the CWA. RG LNG's final wetland mitigation plans would be developed and submitted to the COE, and would be implemented in addition to the construction mitigation measures outlined in RG LNG's Procedures and the measures described in the EIS. Construction of the LNG Terminal would not be authorized to commence prior to finalization of the wetland mitigation plans and issuance of the COE's CWA Section 404/Section 10 permit.

PM60-2

Impacts on the viewshed, including visual simulations of the Project facilities from various observation points are discussed in section 4.8.2 of the final EIS. The EIS recognizes the Project's impacts on eco-tourism in section 4.9.3, including an increase in noise, changes in the visual landscape, and heavier traffic along SH-48. Recreation and special use areas, including birding trails, that are in proximity to the Project are also addressed in section 4.8.1.5, while impacts on visual receptors at recreation and special use areas are addressed in section 4.8.2. We find that impacts on tourism, including nature-based and eco-tourism, would generally be greatest during construction of the Project. Following construction, the LNG Terminal would be the primary source of permanent impacts on tourism, as the pipelines would be buried and the associated aboveground facilities would be in remote areas, offering limited visibility and mitigating noise impacts. To mitigate impacts on visual receptors and operational noise from the LNG Terminal, RG LNG would use ground flares, grey tank coloring, horticultural plantings, and the construction of a levee that would obstruct most construction activities and low-to- ground operational facilities from view. We find that no visual or noise impacts on South Padre Island beaches and associated tourism would occur, given that the beaches face the ocean and are 5 miles away. However, we do recognize impacts on recreational fishing boats for trips that begin from Port Isabel or South Padre Island, in the form of delays at Brazos Santiago Pass if they arrive during LNG carrier transit.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

114

1 Route 48 with refrigeration trains and storage tanks right
 2 across from the Bahia Grande which will be open soon for
 3 public recreation, so how will this not be a major visual
 4 impact -- and that's all I want to say about Rio Grande LNG.

PM60-2

5 And for Texas LNG also regarding mitigation they
 6 propose to preserve 45 acres of wetlands which are already
 7 protected by Fish and Wildlife Service. That is not
 8 mitigation -- they need to create or restore wetlands.

PM60-3

9 Regarding impacts on wildlife -- there was no
 10 explanation of why they claim the impacts on wildlife are
 11 not significant. Regarding the Endangered Species Act, all
 12 consultations should be completed before the record of
 13 decision, not before the project construction.

PM60-4

PM60-5

14 Regarding the Garcia Pasture, there needs to be a
 15 plan from the Texas Historical Commission -- the site cannot
 16 just be removed. Regarding the SpaceX launch failure
 17 analysis -- it does not seem to be in the EIS.

PM60-6

PM60-7

18 Also there are many other missing items which are
 19 being required prior to construction or prior to the initial
 20 site preparation. So when can the public review these items
 21 and who will make sure that these items will be properly
 22 completed? And that's all I want to say right now.

PM60-8

23 MS. PENA: It's Marta Elena Pena, first name
 24 M-a-r-t-a, middle name E-l-e-n-a, last name P (as in Paul) -
 25 e-n-a. Alright my first comment is that the FERC DEIS is

PM61-1

PM60-3

These comments pertain to the Texas LNG Project, and are therefore outside the scope of this EIS.

PM60-4

Impacts on wildlife, including habitat loss associated with the Project are discussed in section 4.6.1.

PM60-5

The EIS was prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ guidelines and other applicable requirements. In addition to conducting its own independent analysis of the Project, FERC also relies on the expertise of federal, state, and local agencies who have regulatory authority and oversight of the laws, rules, and regulations described in the EIS. The outreach and agency engagement conducted for the Project is described in section 1 of the EIS. Both the ESA and the MSFCMA encourage inclusion of the BA and EFH Assessment in the NEPA document (EIS). An applicant must also demonstrate that it has conducted surveys in accordance with a regulatory agency's protocols and/or the law, and consulted with the appropriate agency personnel and applied for applicable permits.

PM60-6

Based on the results of RG LNG's cultural resources survey of the LNG Terminal site described in section 4.10.1 of the EIS, no intact deposits of the Garcia Pasture site were encountered. The SHPO concurred with the survey results.

PM60-7

See response to PM21-8.

PM60-8

We disagree. The EIS discloses the potential impacts on environmental resources resulting from construction and operation of the Project. The EIS was prepared in accordance with NEPA, CEQ guidelines, and other applicable requirements. The draft EIS included sufficient detail to enable the reader to understand and consider the issues raised by the Project and addresses a range of alternatives. The final EIS provides substantive updates, where available. This EIS is consistent with FERC style, formatting, and policy regarding NEPA evaluation of alternatives and different impact types, including cumulative impacts. The EIS is comprehensive and thorough in its identification and evaluation of feasible mitigation measures to reduce those effects whenever possible.

PM61-1

We received two comments during the scoping period requesting that Project materials be translated into Spanish. Executive Order No. 12898, which informs the federal government's approach to issues of environmental justice, provides that "Each Federal agency may, whenever practicable and appropriate, translate crucial public documents, notices, and hearings relating to human health or the environment for limited English-speaking populations." However, Executive Order No. 12898 applies to the agencies specified in section 1-102 of that Order, and the Commission is not one of the specified agencies. Consequently, even if translation were required under Executive Order No. 12898, the provisions of the Order are not binding on the Commission. However, it is current Commission practice to address environmental justice in its NEPA document when raised. Therefore, we have included this discussion in the final EIS in section 4.9.10. Further, in an effort to include Spanish language speakers in the NEPA process, Spanish language Project materials were made available to the public during the scoping meeting and public comment meeting held in Port Isabel and described in section 1.3.1 of the final EIS. In addition, a translator was available to assist Spanish language speakers. During the public scoping meeting, very few of the Spanish language materials that were made available were utilized by attendees. As such, we determined that translation of the draft EIS into Spanish was not necessary.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

115

1 not available in Spanish which is the predominant language
2 here in the Rio Grande Valley.

PM61-1

3 The DEIS statement -- the DEIS is incomplete.
4 There is a long list of important information that FERC is
5 requesting from Rio Grande before the end of the comment
6 period. How are we supposed to comment on information that
7 isn't there? All endangered species consultations with FWS
8 and MMFS should be completed before the FERC decision, not
9 before construction.

PM61-2

10 This is especially true in regards to the ocelot
11 and jaguarundi -- the ocelot there are only 50 known left in
12 the United States. They all are here in the Rio Grande
13 Valley just very close by and they are protected under the
14 Endangered Species Act. They are a federally protected
15 animal.

PM61-3

16 And this -- especially in Section 7 and 9 of the
17 Endangered Species Act it specifically says that not only
18 are they protected, but also the environment that they live
19 in -- it cannot be altered.

20 Next, the comment deadline should be extended for
21 at least two weeks after all the required information is
22 submitted and made public. And I'm going to say this again
23 just because I'm so passionate about it and it hurts my
24 heart that the FERC DEIS is not available in Spanish. This
25 is so important, it is absolutely irresponsible that if it

PM61-4

PM61-2

See Comment Response PM14-2.

PM61-3

As identified in section 4.7.1.4, our determination of effect for the ocelot and jaguarundi is "likely to adversely affect." A "likely to adversely affect" determination is not a reason to deny a permit under Section 7 of the ESA. Rather, the ESA requires that, if a project would be likely to adversely affect a threatened or endangered species, the federal action agency (in this case, FERC) must conduct formal consultations with the FWS. This process requires the FWS to prepare a Biological Opinion for the Project.

PM61-4

See Comment Responses PM14-2 and PM61-1.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

116

1 is not available in the predominant language of the Rio
2 Grande Valley and its residents.

3 The mitigation plan is grossly inadequate. There
4 is no mitigation plan for the Upland Loma and brush habitat
5 that will be destroyed. For the wetlands that will be
6 filled in, in the preserving an area that is already under
7 official wildlife service protection and management -- so
8 that is not mitigation, not in the least is that mitigation.

9 The Wetlands Mitigation Plan as proposed will
10 violate the No Net Loss Federal Policy. I want to repeat
11 that -- the wetlands mitigation plan as proposed will
12 violate the No Net Loss Federal Policy. I also want to
13 comment on the Texas tortoise which is a state-protected
14 animal.

15 The Texas LNG DEIS states that their plan is to
16 gather the tortoises and put them on another piece of land
17 nearby and it says that that's a fine plan. That is not --
18 it's grossly inadequate as well. There are no details on
19 how they plan to herd these little critters up, where
20 they're going to go, how they're going to do that.

21 This is just not -- I mean it's just a ridiculous
22 plan. I would not call that a plan at all to gather up a
23 state protected animal without further details and that
24 needs to be presented for the public for them to comment and
25 review, that's it.

PM61-4

PM61-5

PM61-6

PM61-7

PM61-5

See Comment Response PM14-3.

PM61-6

See Comment Response PM14-3.

PM61-7

Section 4.8.1.1 of the Rio Grande LNG final EIS has been revised to include additional correspondence from the TPWD. We note that RG Developers may need to consult with the TPWD regarding impacts on individual Texas tortoises to adhere to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Code, Chapter 67 and Sections 65.171 through 65.176 of the TAC and, in response to TPWD's comments on the draft EIS, RG Developers clarified that they will continue to work with the agency to develop a plan to minimize potential impacts on the species at the LNG Terminal site.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 I'd also like to comment on the retail value of
 2 properties in Port Isabel in South Padre Island and the
 3 other beautiful communities around this area. As you might
 4 know there are some very valuable pieces of property that
 5 people invest very highly in. As stated in the DEIS for
 6 Texas LNG they do recognize that properties that are at a
 7 very high proximity so I guess the higher up you get in real
 8 estate, the more expensive this real estate is.

9 You can imagine we have multi-million dollar
 10 properties that are going to have a beautiful view of these
 11 plants should they be -- if they do come to fruition,
 12 they're property values will definitely go down and this is
 13 not exactly addressed.

14 The communities need to know that their
 15 properties are at risk of being devalued and they should be
 16 able to have a report and be able to comment.

17 MS. JOE: My name is Diana Lucas Joe, I am a
 18 grandmother age -- oh my name, you spell it D-i-a-n-a
 19 L-u-c-a-s J-o-e. I am a grandmother, my age is 58. I am
 20 here to just let the people know that as a grandmother I
 21 don't think it's a good idea for any kind of intrusion to
 22 come through the lands that I grew up in because it
 23 terrifies me to know that in the future maybe my
 24 grandchildren will not be able to have the enjoyment of the
 25 beautiful land areas and the beauty that comes with the

PM61-8

PM62-1

PM61-8

Impacts on property values are discussed in section 4.9.9. As described throughout the EIS, the LNG Terminal would be on undeveloped land owned by BND, outside of city boundaries, and the closest residences are over 2.2 miles from the site. Further, the LNG Terminal site is in an area that is characterized, in part, as industrial with the movement of domestic and foreign products within the BSC and associated with the Port of Brownsville. As discussed further in section 4.8.2, while it would be possible to see the LNG Terminal from some vantage points in Port Isabel, in particular elevated sites, the distance to the LNG Terminal site limits its visibility and as such it would not be a prominent feature in the viewshed.

PM62-1

Potential impacts on visual resources are addressed in section 4.8.1.5. As described further within this section, visual impacts from the LNG terminal would be mitigated by RG LNG's use of ground flares and installation of a 67-foot-high vertical wall. Impacts on vegetation, wildlife, and land use are discussed in sections 4.5, 4.6.1, and 4.8, respectively.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

118

1 territory here to enjoy themselves as I did as a child, you
2 know.

PM62-1

3 And so basically that is why I am wanting to
4 speak here with Native American roots in this area. We
5 have a lot of ceremonies that go on here and so I want my
6 grandchildren to understand that this is where these
7 ceremonies are buried, especially like my bilicus (ph)
8 ceremony when I was born here in Brownsville, Texas.

9 It's the belly button and the placenta is giving
10 back to the earth and if anything goes through the land they
11 will desecrate that sacredness and these are my stories and
12 basically that's just what I want to say. I am pleading.
13 They told us never to beg but I am pleading with the
14 corporations that have intentions to come through and never
15 mind us and I speak on behalf of my parents who taught me
16 the stories of the land here.

17 My grandmother who is of Yaqui descent so from
18 the Yaqui Tribe and so it pains me very much -- I am, I have
19 trouble sitting here talking because I don't have the
20 educated words to say more other than please don't bring
21 your pipes, don't bring your things that will further hurt
22 the earth because we already have like this fence that went
23 up too and that was without ceremony and that hurts.

PM62-2

24 And so that's all I have. I thank you in advance
25 and be good.

PM62-2

Comment noted. The EIS is not a decision document; rather, it is a tool to ensure that the potential environmental impacts that would occur as a result of a federal action are fully analyzed and presented, in compliance with NEPA. Under NEPA, the determination that an impact is significant necessitates the preparation of an EIS (as opposed to an EA). In accordance with NEPA, we have prepared this EIS to present the environmental impacts that would occur as a result of the Project. The decision of whether to authorize the Project is determined by the FERC Commissioners.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

119

1 MR. JOE: (Native American words). They call me
2 Davin Joe, D-a-v-i-n J-o-e. Thank you for allowing me this
3 opportunity to speak a few words. I want to share from a
4 perspective of my indigenous people of the Dinen Nation who
5 are labeled as Navajo people.

6 In my land there have been many companies that
7 came through our reservation to extract resources through
8 our land -- coal, uranium, lumber and such and these
9 companies through time through my years that I have been
10 around since the early '60's all the way up to this point,
11 you know, companies that have come through these.

12 My reservation had like always extracted
13 resources like I've said. You know, let's say for example
14 the timber has been extracted and in return there's no
15 replanting. Coal has been extracted -- very little of the
16 royalties have come to the Nation. Uranium have been
17 extracted, uranium tailings have been exposed even though to
18 this day and these companies have come through let's say the
19 devastation of uranium. The tailings have never been
20 cleaned up.

21 EPA have also been involved yet as far as
22 clean-up wise. These things are still troublesome on the
23 Navajo Reservation and I'm sure all these other reservations
24 might have experienced some sort of desecration of some sort
25 in this regard.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

120

1 Well, these are just an experience of what I've
2 seen, what corporations can do or companies and so from my
3 perspective, I'm married to this area. My wife is from
4 Brownsville, Texas. When I was about 8 years old my father
5 taught me that, you know, because I was going to visit
6 Missouri -- Independent, Missouri with a teacher that asked
7 me to go back with her to her home town.

8 My father told me that you make sure you go look
9 to the east and wherever the air touches the earth, wherever
10 the earth compliments the air you walk and you make your
11 circumference. Go all the way around the radius and look to
12 the four cardinal directions and I want you to take care of
13 that land, because that's the land that you will be in. You
14 take care of that land as if you were on the Deni Res. where
15 you were raised at.

16 And that same piece of honor, give it that honor
17 where you're going to be visiting that and from that day on
18 the valuable father/son yes and that's always been there
19 with me. So now that I'm married here, I did the same
20 thing. This is the land that I take care of and this is the
21 land that I'm in. I now understand that there will be a
22 company that will be coming through putting maybe -- putting
23 pipeline through here.

24 I would say that maybe this company is not a new
25 company, maybe this company might be -- have had other

PM63-1

PM63-1

Comment noted.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

121

1 experiences in other parts of the land. This country --
2 maybe out of this country too and I'm just going to say that
3 if you were to look at this, the track record of this
4 company I'm going to make sure that probably it's not going
5 to 100% a pure company as far as respecting Mother Earth,
6 respecting the land because past history, like I said this
7 company is from my land, coal, uranium, forestry.

8 These companies that came through took what they
9 needed, took what they wanted, but left and washed their
10 hands of the clean-up or took it without replenishing what
11 was there before. Therefore I'm going to say this much --
12 that this new company that's coming through probably has the
13 same thing.

14 So I speak as a relative to the Plant Nation --
15 the animal, the human beings, the ones that crawl, all these
16 are my relatives and for those that can't speak in that
17 regard I speak to against the devastation of the elements of
18 Creator's creation so that the future of the non-born
19 children are to come, they can reap something that's
20 beautiful. This is a beautiful part of this land. I came
21 to be married here and I'd liked to see it stay that way.

22 So I appreciate this time that was given to me,
23 thank you very much and I appreciate you too to take my
24 words.

25 (Whereupon at 9:00 p.m., the meeting was

PM63-1

PM63-2

PM63-2

Comment noted. The EIS is not a decision document; rather, it is a tool to ensure that the potential environmental impacts that would occur as a result of a federal action are fully analyzed and presented, in compliance with NEPA. Under NEPA, the determination that an impact is significant necessitates the preparation of an EIS (as opposed to an EA). In accordance with NEPA, we have prepared this EIS to present the environmental impacts that would occur as a result of the Project. The decision of whether to authorize the Project is determined by the FERC Commissioners.

Public Meeting Transcript (PM)

Port Isabel, Texas

1 concluded.)

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 Meeting Transcript (PM)
Port Isabel, Texas

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding

4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the

5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding: Rio Grande LNG Project

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 Docket No.: CP16-116-000

17 Place: Port Isabel, TX

18 Date: Thursday, November 15, 2018

19 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original

20 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy

21 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription

22 of the proceedings.

23

24 Mike Williams

25 Official Reporter