

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND1 – Barbara Weckesser

IND1-1

cont'd



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4
 515 East Amite Street
 Jackson, MS 39201
 ATTN: Mr. B.J. Hailey
 PHONE: (601) 961-5783 FAX: (919) 541-0516

FILE #: 0344.00
 REPORTED: 12/15/16 10:23
 SUBMITTED: 10/07/16 to 11/04/16
 AQS SITE CODE:
 SITE CODE: CCPG-MS

Analyte	Result	Units	Source Result	RPD	RPD Limit	Notes
---------	--------	-------	---------------	-----	-----------	-------

Air Toxics by EPA Compendium Method TO-15 - Quality Control

Batch B6K0906 - Summa Canister Prep

Duplicate (B6K0906-DUP1) Continued Source: 6110404-01 Prepared: 11/02/16 Analyzed: 11/09/16

1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Toluene	1.85	ppbv	2.06	11.0	25	
Dibromochloromethane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
1,2-Dibromoethane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
n-Octane	0.071	ppbv	0.09	21.5	25	
Tetrachloroethylene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Chlorobenzene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Ethylbenzene	0.348	ppbv	0.40	13.2	25	
m,p-Xylene	1.38	ppbv	1.55	11.4	25	
Bromoform	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Styrene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
o-Xylene	0.462	ppbv	0.51	10.5	25	
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	0.388	ppbv	0.44	12.6	25	
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	0.833	ppbv	0.93	11.1	25	
m-Dichlorobenzene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
p-Dichlorobenzene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
o-Dichlorobenzene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Hexachloro-1,3-butadiene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U

Duplicate (B6K0906-DUP2) Source: 6110404-02 Prepared: 11/02/16 Analyzed: 11/09/16

Acetylene	0.157	ppbv	0.18	13.2	25	
Propylene	2.28	ppbv	2.60	13.5	25	
Dichlorodifluoromethane	0.394	ppbv	0.45	13.7	25	
Chloromethane	0.430	ppbv	0.50	14.3	25	
Dichlorotetrafluoroethane	ND	ppbv	0.04		25	U
Vinyl chloride	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
1,3-Butadiene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Bromomethane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Chloroethane	0.039	ppbv	0.04	5.22	25	
Acetonitrile	0.088	ppbv	0.10	14.8	25	
Acrolein	0.446	ppbv	0.52	15.1	25	
Trichlorofluoromethane	0.216	ppbv	0.25	14.6	25	
Acrylonitrile	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
1,1-Dichloroethene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Dichloromethane	0.051	ppbv	0.08	27.3	25	
Carbon Disulfide	ND	ppbv	0.02		25	U

Eastern Research Group

The results in this report apply only to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND1 – Barbara Weckesser

IND1-1

cont'd



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4
 515 East Amite Street
 Jackson, MS 39201
 ATTN: Mr. B.J. Hailey
 PHONE: (601) 961-5783 FAX: (919) 541-0516

FILE #: 0344.00
 REPORTED: 12/15/16 10:23
 SUBMITTED: 10/07/16 to 11/04/16
 AQS SITE CODE:
 SITE CODE: CCPG-MS

Analyte	Result	Units	Source Result	RPD	RPD Limit	Notes
---------	--------	-------	---------------	-----	-----------	-------

Air Toxics by EPA Compendium Method TO-15 - Quality Control

Batch B6K0906 - Summa Canister Prep

Duplicate (B6K0906-DUP2) Continued Source: 6110404-02 Prepared: 11/02/16 Analyzed: 11/09/16

Trichlorotrifluoroethane	0.062	ppbv	0.07	15.8	25	
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
1,1-Dichloroethane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Methyl tert-Butyl Ether	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Chloroprene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Bromochloromethane	0.036	ppbv	0.04	17.0	25	
Chloroform	0.019	ppbv	0.03	46.3	25	
Ethyl tert-Butyl Ether	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
1,2-Dichloroethane	0.014	ppbv	0.02	45.3	25	
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Benzene	0.533	ppbv	0.65	19.8	25	
Carbon Tetrachloride	0.087	ppbv	0.11	21.7	25	
tert-Amyl Methyl Ether	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
1,2-Dichloropropane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Ethyl Acrylate	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Bromodichloromethane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Trichloroethylene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Methyl Methacrylate	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Methyl Isobutyl Ketone	0.033	ppbv	0.04	27.1	25	
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Toluene	1.85	ppbv	2.02	8.64	25	
Dibromochloromethane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
1,2-Dibromoethane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
n-Octane	0.077	ppbv	0.09	13.1	25	
Tetrachloroethylene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Chlorobenzene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Ethylbenzene	0.376	ppbv	0.41	8.55	25	
m,p-Xylene	1.48	ppbv	1.59	7.24	25	
Bromoform	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Styrene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
1,1,1,2-Tetrachloroethane	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
o-Xylene	0.490	ppbv	0.53	8.19	25	
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	0.406	ppbv	0.44	8.31	25	
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	0.884	ppbv	0.95	7.11	25	

Eastern Research Group

The results in this report apply only to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND1 – Barbara Weckesser

IND1-1
cont'd



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4
515 East Amite Street
Jackson, MS 39201
ATTN: Mr. B.J. Hailey
PHONE: (601) 961-5783 FAX: (919) 541-0516

FILE #: 0344.00
REPORTED: 12/15/16 10:23
SUBMITTED: 10/07/16 to 11/04/16
AQS SITE CODE:
SITE CODE: CCPG-MS

Analyte	Result	Units	Source Result	RPD	RPD Limit	Notes
Air Toxics by EPA Compendium Method TO-15 - Quality Control						
<i>Batch B6K0906 - Summa Canister Prep</i>						
Duplicate (B6K0906-DUP2) Continued Source: 6110404-02 Prepared: 11/02/16 Analyzed: 11/09/16						
m-Dichlorobenzene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
p-Dichlorobenzene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
o-Dichlorobenzene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U
Hexachloro-1,3-butadiene	ND	ppbv	ND		25	U

Eastern Research Group

The results in this report apply only to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Page 24 of 31

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND1 – Barbara Weckesser

IND1-1

cont'd



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4
 515 East Amite Street
 Jackson, MS 39201
 ATTN: Mr. B.J. Hailey
 PHONE: (601) 961-5783 FAX: (919) 541-0516

FILE #: 0344.00
 REPORTED: 12/15/16 10:23
 SUBMITTED: 10/07/16 to 11/04/16
 AQS SITE CODE:
 SITE CODE: CCPG-MS

Analyte	Result	Units	% Difference	Limit (%)	Notes
---------	--------	-------	--------------	-----------	-------

Air Toxics by EPA Compendium Method TO-15 - Quality Control
 Sequence 1610025

Calibration Check (1610025-CCV1)

Prepared & Analyzed: 10/12/16

Analyte	Result	Units	% Difference	Limit (%)
Acetylene	1.83	ppbv	-26.2	30.00
Propylene	2.00	ppbv	-18.2	30.00
Dichlorodifluoromethane	2.00	ppbv	-20.1	30.00
Chloromethane	1.86	ppbv	-26.0	30.00
Dichlorotetrafluoroethane	2.11	ppbv	-13.4	30.00
Vinyl chloride	1.95	ppbv	-22.8	30.00
1,3-Butadiene	2.06	ppbv	-17.5	30.00
Bromomethane	1.99	ppbv	-20.9	30.00
Chloroethane	1.96	ppbv	-23.2	30.00
Acetonitrile	1.90	ppbv	-23.2	30.00
Acrolein	2.29	ppbv	-4.5	30.00
Trichlorofluoromethane	2.01	ppbv	-19.3	30.00
Acrylonitrile	2.30	ppbv	-9.3	30.00
1,1-Dichloroethane	2.12	ppbv	-14.5	30.00
Dichloromethane	2.25	ppbv	-10.6	30.00
Carbon Disulfide	1.95	ppbv	-22.0	30.00
Trichlorotrifluoroethane	2.09	ppbv	-15.5	30.00
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	2.40	ppbv	-2.3	30.00
1,1-Dichloroethane	2.19	ppbv	-12.6	30.00
Methyl tert-Butyl Ether	2.00	ppbv	-20.7	30.00
Chloroprene	2.43	ppbv	-2.9	30.00
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	2.33	ppbv	-7.6	30.00
Bromochloromethane	2.24	ppbv	-10.2	30.00
Chloroform	2.38	ppbv	-7.1	30.00
Ethyl tert-Butyl Ether	2.31	ppbv	-12.4	30.00
1,2-Dichloroethane	2.41	ppbv	-4.5	30.00
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	1.90	ppbv	-25.3	30.00
Benzene	2.31	ppbv	-8.3	30.00
Carbon Tetrachloride	2.15	ppbv	-13.3	30.00
tert-Amyl Methyl Ether	2.36	ppbv	-11.3	30.00
1,2-Dichloropropane	2.32	ppbv	-9.3	30.00
Ethyl Acrylate	2.08	ppbv	-18.4	30.00
Bromodichloromethane	2.13	ppbv	-16.8	30.00
Trichloroethylene	2.16	ppbv	-15.6	30.00

Eastern Research Group

The results in this report apply only to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND1 – Barbara Weckesser

IND1-1

cont'd



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4
 515 East Amite Street
 Jackson, MS 39201
 ATTN: Mr. B.J. Hailey
 PHONE: (601) 961-5783 FAX: (919) 541-0516

FILE #: 0344.00
 REPORTED: 12/15/16 10:23
 SUBMITTED: 10/07/16 to 11/04/16
 AQS SITE CODE:
 SITE CODE: CCPG-MS

Analyte	Result	Units	% Difference	Limit (%)	Notes
---------	--------	-------	--------------	-----------	-------

Air Toxics by EPA Compendium Method TO-15 - Quality Control

Sequence 1610025

Calibration Check (1610025-CCV1) Continued

Prepared & Analyzed: 10/12/16

Methyl Methacrylate	2.08	ppbv	-19.5	30.00	
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	2.73	ppbv	5.7	30.00	
Methyl Isobutyl Ketone	2.15	ppbv	-15.9	30.00	
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	2.61	ppbv	4.2	30.00	
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	2.47	ppbv	-2.8	30.00	
Toluene	2.48	ppbv	-0.6	30.00	
Dibromochloromethane	2.34	ppbv	-8.0	30.00	
1,2-Dibromoethane	2.58	ppbv	2.0	30.00	
n-Octane	2.30	ppbv	-8.7	30.00	
Tetrachloroethylene	2.32	ppbv	-7.9	30.00	
Chlorobenzene	2.49	ppbv	-0.3	30.00	
Ethylbenzene	2.60	ppbv	2.5	30.00	
m,p-Xylene	5.13	ppbv	1.6	30.00	
Bromoform	2.11	ppbv	-16.8	30.00	
Styrene	2.64	ppbv	4.8	30.00	
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	2.78	ppbv	9.4	30.00	
o-Xylene	2.58	ppbv	4.3	30.00	
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	2.46	ppbv	-2.3	30.00	
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	2.35	ppbv	-1.2	30.00	
m-Dichlorobenzene	2.31	ppbv	-3.4	30.00	
p-Dichlorobenzene	2.63	ppbv	1.2	30.00	
o-Dichlorobenzene	2.29	ppbv	-8.5	30.00	
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	2.97	ppbv	19.8	30.00	
Hexachloro-1,3-butadiene	2.42	ppbv	-3.1	30.00	

Sequence 1611007

Calibration Check (1611007-CCV1)

Prepared & Analyzed: 11/03/16

Acetylene	2.41	ppbv	-2.9	30.00	
Propylene	2.46	ppbv	0.4	30.00	
Dichlorodifluoromethane	2.45	ppbv	-1.8	30.00	
Chloromethane	2.45	ppbv	-2.3	30.00	
Dichlorotetrafluoroethane	2.50	ppbv	2.6	30.00	
Vinyl chloride	2.41	ppbv	-4.5	30.00	
1,3-Butadiene	2.48	ppbv	-0.9	30.00	
Bromomethane	2.34	ppbv	-7.1	30.00	

Eastern Research Group

The results in this report apply only to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND1 – Barbara Weckesser

IND1-1

cont'd



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4
 515 East Amite Street
 Jackson, MS 39201
 ATTN: Mr. B.J. Hailey
 PHONE: (601) 961-5783 FAX: (919) 541-0516

FILE #: 0344.00
 REPORTED: 12/15/16 10:23
 SUBMITTED: 10/07/16 to 11/04/16
 AQS SITE CODE:
 SITE CODE: CCPG-MS

Analyte	Result	Units	% Difference	Limit (%)	Notes
---------	--------	-------	--------------	-----------	-------

Air Toxics by EPA Compendium Method TO-15 - Quality Control
 Sequence 1611007

Calibration Check (1611007-CCV1) Continued

Prepared & Analyzed: 11/03/16

Chloroethane	2.40	ppbv	-5.7	30.00	
Acetonitrile	2.56	ppbv	3.8	30.00	
Acrolein	2.34	ppbv	-2.5	30.00	
Trichlorofluoromethane	2.28	ppbv	-8.3	30.00	
Acrylonitrile	2.62	ppbv	3.0	30.00	
1,1-Dichloroethene	2.72	ppbv	9.6	30.00	
Dichloromethane	2.93	ppbv	16.2	30.00	
Carbon Disulfide	2.39	ppbv	-4.4	30.00	
Trichlorotrifluoroethane	2.48	ppbv	0.6	30.00	
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	2.43	ppbv	-1.3	30.00	
1,1-Dichloroethane	2.47	ppbv	-1.5	30.00	
Methyl tert-Butyl Ether	2.24	ppbv	-11.1	30.00	
Chloroprene	2.69	ppbv	7.6	30.00	
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	2.52	ppbv	-0.06	30.00	
Bromochloromethane	2.19	ppbv	-12.4	30.00	
Chloroform	2.63	ppbv	2.5	30.00	
Ethyl tert-Butyl Ether	2.40	ppbv	-9.1	30.00	
1,2-Dichloroethane	2.61	ppbv	3.7	30.00	
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	2.71	ppbv	6.6	30.00	
Benzene	2.56	ppbv	1.5	30.00	
Carbon Tetrachloride	3.06	ppbv	23.4	30.00	
tert-Amyl Methyl Ether	2.50	ppbv	-5.9	30.00	
1,2-Dichloropropane	2.75	ppbv	7.3	30.00	
Ethyl Acrylate	2.80	ppbv	9.8	30.00	
Bromodichloromethane	2.56	ppbv	-0.2	30.00	
Trichloroethylene	2.37	ppbv	-7.4	30.00	
Methyl Methacrylate	2.79	ppbv	8.2	30.00	
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	2.83	ppbv	9.8	30.00	
Methyl Isobutyl Ketone	2.74	ppbv	7.2	30.00	
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	2.67	ppbv	6.8	30.00	
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	2.51	ppbv	-1.2	30.00	
Toluene	2.33	ppbv	-6.5	30.00	
Dibromochloromethane	2.53	ppbv	-0.7	30.00	
1,2-Dibromoethane	2.36	ppbv	-6.6	30.00	

Eastern Research Group

The results in this report apply only to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND1 – Barbara Weckesser

IND1-1

cont'd



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4
 515 East Amite Street
 Jackson, MS 39201
 ATTN: Mr. B. J. Hailey
 PHONE: (601) 961-5783 FAX: (919) 541-0516

FILE #: 0344.00
 REPORTED: 12/15/16 10:23
 SUBMITTED: 10/07/16 to 11/04/16
 AQS SITE CODE:
 SITE CODE: CCPG-MS

Analyte	Result	Units	% Difference	Limit (%)	Notes
---------	--------	-------	--------------	-----------	-------

Air Toxics by EPA Compendium Method TO-15 - Quality Control

Sequence 1611007

Calibration Check (1611007-CCV1) Continued

Prepared & Analyzed: 11/03/16

n-Octane	2.56	ppbv	1.7	30.00	
Tetrachloroethylene	2.40	ppbv	-4.8	30.00	
Chlorobenzene	2.36	ppbv	-5.6	30.00	
Ethylbenzene	2.30	ppbv	-9.6	30.00	
m,p-Xylene	4.75	ppbv	-6.0	30.00	
Bromoform	2.37	ppbv	-6.2	30.00	
Styrene	2.22	ppbv	-11.8	30.00	
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	2.81	ppbv	10.6	30.00	
o-Xylene	2.53	ppbv	2.3	30.00	
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	2.04	ppbv	-19.0	30.00	
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	2.00	ppbv	-15.9	30.00	
m-Dichlorobenzene	2.06	ppbv	-13.9	30.00	
p-Dichlorobenzene	2.25	ppbv	-13.3	30.00	
o-Dichlorobenzene	2.15	ppbv	-13.9	30.00	
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	2.20	ppbv	-11.4	30.00	
Hexachloro-1,3-butadiene	2.31	ppbv	-7.4	30.00	

Sequence 1611019

Calibration Check (1611019-CCV1)

Prepared & Analyzed: 11/09/16

Acetylene	1.88	ppbv	-24.4	30.00	
Propylene	1.98	ppbv	-19.1	30.00	
Dichlorodifluoromethane	2.25	ppbv	-9.9	30.00	
Chloromethane	1.95	ppbv	-22.5	30.00	
Dichlorotetrafluoroethane	2.37	ppbv	-2.9	30.00	
Vinyl chloride	2.06	ppbv	-18.1	30.00	
1,3-Butadiene	2.09	ppbv	-16.5	30.00	
Bromomethane	2.20	ppbv	-12.9	30.00	
Chloroethane	2.12	ppbv	-17.0	30.00	
Acetonitrile	2.06	ppbv	-16.5	30.00	
Acrolein	1.94	ppbv	-19.2	30.00	
Trichlorofluoromethane	2.26	ppbv	-9.2	30.00	
Acrylonitrile	2.29	ppbv	-9.9	30.00	
1,1-Dichloroethene	2.18	ppbv	-12.2	30.00	
Dichloromethane	2.29	ppbv	-9.1	30.00	
Carbon Disulfide	2.29	ppbv	-8.6	30.00	

Eastern Research Group

The results in this report apply only to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND1 – Barbara Weckesser

IND1-1

cont'd



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4
 515 East Amite Street
 Jackson, MS 39201
 ATTN: Mr. B.J. Hailey
 PHONE: (601) 961-5783 FAX: (919) 541-0516

FILE #: 0344.00
 REPORTED: 12/15/16 10:23
 SUBMITTED: 10/07/16 to 11/04/16
 AQS SITE CODE:
 SITE CODE: CCPG-MS

Analyte	Result	Units	% Difference	Limit (%)	Notes
---------	--------	-------	--------------	-----------	-------

Air Toxics by EPA Compendium Method TO-15 - Quality Control

Sequence 1611019

Calibration Check (1611019-CCV1) Continued

Prepared & Analyzed: 11/09/16

Trichlorotrifluoroethane	2.46	ppbv	-0.2	30.00	
trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	2.45	ppbv	-0.5	30.00	
1,1-Dichloroethane	2.39	ppbv	-4.6	30.00	
Methyl tert-Butyl Ether	2.42	ppbv	-4.0	30.00	
Chloroprene	2.48	ppbv	-0.9	30.00	
cis-1,2-Dichloroethylene	2.40	ppbv	-4.6	30.00	
Bromochloromethane	2.48	ppbv	-0.7	30.00	
Chloroform	2.61	ppbv	2.1	30.00	
Ethyl tert-Butyl Ether	2.51	ppbv	-4.8	30.00	
1,2-Dichloroethane	2.43	ppbv	-3.6	30.00	
1,1,1-Trichloroethane	2.39	ppbv	-5.8	30.00	
Benzene	2.40	ppbv	-5.0	30.00	
Carbon Tetrachloride	2.79	ppbv	12.5	30.00	
tert-Amyl Methyl Ether	2.50	ppbv	-6.1	30.00	
1,2-Dichloropropane	2.33	ppbv	-9.0	30.00	
Ethyl Acrylate	2.32	ppbv	-8.9	30.00	
Bromodichloromethane	2.39	ppbv	-6.6	30.00	
Trichloroethylene	2.62	ppbv	2.3	30.00	
Methyl Methacrylate	2.18	ppbv	-15.3	30.00	
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	2.66	ppbv	3.3	30.00	
Methyl Isobutyl Ketone	2.14	ppbv	-16.3	30.00	
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	2.46	ppbv	-1.5	30.00	
1,1,2-Trichloroethane	2.39	ppbv	-5.8	30.00	
Toluene	2.42	ppbv	-2.8	30.00	
Dibromochloromethane	2.84	ppbv	11.3	30.00	
1,2-Dibromoethane	2.52	ppbv	-0.5	30.00	
n-Octane	2.19	ppbv	-13.3	30.00	
Tetrachloroethylene	2.48	ppbv	-1.5	30.00	
Chlorobenzene	2.41	ppbv	-3.7	30.00	
Ethylbenzene	2.37	ppbv	-6.8	30.00	
m,p-Xylene	4.78	ppbv	-5.3	30.00	
Bromoform	2.71	ppbv	7.1	30.00	
Styrene	2.42	ppbv	-4.1	30.00	
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	2.18	ppbv	-14.3	30.00	

Eastern Research Group

The results in this report apply only to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Page 29 of 31

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND1 – Barbara Weckesser

IND1-1

cont'd



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4
515 East Amite Street
Jackson, MS 39201
ATTN: Mr. B.J. Hailey
PHONE: (601) 961-5783 FAX: (919) 541-0516

FILE #: 0344.00
REPORTED: 12/15/16 10:23
SUBMITTED: 10/07/16 to 11/04/16
AQS SITE CODE:
SITE CODE: CCPG-MS

Analyte	Result	Units	% Difference	Limit (%)	Notes
---------	--------	-------	--------------	-----------	-------

Air Toxics by EPA Compendium Method TO-15 - Quality Control

Sequence 1611019

Calibration Check (1611019-CCV1) Continued

Prepared & Analyzed: 11/09/16

o-Xylene	2.45	ppbv	-0.7	30.00	
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene	2.23	ppbv	-11.6	30.00	
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene	2.07	ppbv	-13.0	30.00	
m-Dichlorobenzene	2.13	ppbv	-10.8	30.00	
p-Dichlorobenzene	2.35	ppbv	-9.6	30.00	
o-Dichlorobenzene	2.19	ppbv	-12.4	30.00	
1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	2.49	ppbv	0.2	30.00	
Hexachloro-1,3-butadiene	2.48	ppbv	-0.7	30.00	

Eastern Research Group

The results in this report apply only to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Page 30 of 31

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND1 – Barbara Weckesser

IND1-1

cont'd



CERTIFICATE OF ANALYSIS

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4

515 East Amite Street

Jackson, MS 39201

ATTN: Mr. B.J. Hailey

PHONE: (601) 961-5783 FAX: (919) 541-0516

FILE #: 0344.00

REPORTED: 12/15/16 10:23

SUBMITTED: 10/07/16 to 11/04/16

AQS SITE CODE:

SITE CODE: CCPG-MS

Notes and Definitions

U Under Detection Limit
INT Not reportable due to interference.
D-F Duplicate exceeds DQO criteria.
ND Analyte NOT DETECTED
NR Not Reported
MDL Method Detection Limit
RPD Relative Percent Difference

Note: The test results meet all requirements of NELAC; however the following analytes are not accredited: 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene, 1,2-dibromoethane, 1,2-dichloropropane, 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene, 1,3-butadiene, acetylene, acrolein, bromochloromethane, bromodichloromethane, bromoform, carbon disulfide, dibromochloromethane, dichlorodifluoromethane, dichlorotetrafluoroethane, ethyl acrylate, ethyl tert butyl ether, hexachloro-1,3-butadiene, octane, propylene, tert amyl methyl ether, tetrachloroethylene, tran-1,2-dichloroethylene, trichlorofluoromethane, and trichlorotrifluoroethane.

Eastern Research Group

The results in this report apply only to the samples analyzed in accordance with the chain of custody document. This analytical report must be reproduced in its entirety.

Page 31 of 31

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND2 – Barbara Weckesser

20190225-5155 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 2/25/2019 4:35:20 PM

Barbara Weckesser, Pascagoula, MS.

I would like to enter the following comments concerning FERC Docket No.: CP15-521 the DEIS for the Gulf LNG project being considered in Pascagoula Mississippi. I live at 1502 Cherokee Street in Pascagoula. I am submitting these comments for myself and my family. I am also the president of the Cherokee Concerned Citizens, a C3 non-profit organization.

IND2-1

I have numerous concerns with the DEIS for the Gulf LNG project. Most importantly it does not recognize the terrible air quality conditions citizens who live near the existing industries experience on a daily basis. I complain constantly to local industry contacts, MDEQ, EPA, and the press. It is easy to find documentation of our suffering. There is already terrible air quality for people who live near Bayou Casotte. Myself, my family and many of my neighbors have health issues we believe are caused by the existing poor air quality. We do not need a new source of air pollution, flares and traffic.

IND2-2

Wetlands help control stormwater and storm surge. We live in a low-lying coastal area. We can not afford to lose 38+ acres of wetlands and the protection they provide. Mitigation will not replace the protection we lose.

IND2-3

We have terrible, existing violations of noise quality. This will further add to that.

IND2-4

I participated in the investigation of a nearby pipeline explosion. The investigators were the CSE. Our community was not properly notified of the danger until days later. This new activity will add to the risk of explosions near my house.

IND2-5

The DEIS on 4-216 claims no harm to environmental justice. I completely disagree. We have numerous low-income and minority residents. Clearly, we will get the harm of this project and you will not hear our concerns. The safety issues, additional air pollution, loss of wetlands, increased noise, and increased traffic will definitely cause harm.

The impacts on my family which includes elderly and children do not need more problems. We are already suffering. This will cause significant additional harm to our quality of life.

IND2-6

The DEIS says that "prior to the end of the DEIS comment period Gulf LNG can file an updated traffic analysis". I did not see the update so I can't comment.

IND2-7

The fact that the comment period for this was over the holidays was not considerate of including all comments.

IND2-8

To conclude, the purpose and need to export to foreign lands is not adequate to harm our community. We will have additional health problems, die earlier, lose wetland protection, have more safety issues, only to

IND2-1

The commenter's statements regarding the existing air quality are acknowledged. As stated in section 4.11.1.2 of the EIS, areas where ambient air pollutant concentrations are below the NAAQS (established by the EPA) are designated as attainment, while areas where ambient air concentrations are above the NAAQS are designated as nonattainment. The proposed Project would be constructed in Jackson County, which is in the Southern Mississippi Interstate AQCR. Jackson County is in attainment or unclassifiable for all criteria pollutants.

IND2-2

As stated in section 4.4 of the EIS, the Project would impact 31.1 acres because CSA-5 would be required to be restored following construction. In addition, as discussed in section 4.4 and in figure 4.4-3, the proposed 50-acre on-site, in-kind compensatory wetland mitigation site would create more wetlands than would be impacted and would be directly south of the Project area.

IND2-3

The commenter's statements regarding the existing noise quality are acknowledged. As discussed in sections 4.11.2.4 and 4.11.2.5 of the EIS, noise from construction and operations is not expected to result in impacts on NSAs, the closest of which would be 9,400 feet away.

IND2-4

As stated in section 5.1.12 of the EIS, an evaluation and review of the safety of the proposed Terminal Expansion by the FERC staff, including a review of the cryogenic design of the facilities proposed for liquefaction, related facilities, and safety systems, concluded that the Terminal Expansion would not pose a significant risk or significant increase in risk to public safety with the incorporation of our recommendations. In addition, Gulf LNG would design, construct, operate, and maintain its Pipeline Modifications to meet or exceed the DOT Minimum Federal Safety Standards in 49 CFR 192 and other applicable federal and state regulations.

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND2 – Barbara Weckesser

20190225-5155 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 2/25/2019 4:35:20 PM

Barbara Weckesser, Pascagoula, MS.

I would like to enter the following comments concerning FERC Docket No.: CP15-521 the DEIS for the Gulf LNG project being considered in Pascagoula Mississippi. I live at 1502 Cherokee Street in Pascagoula. I am submitting these comments for myself and my family. I am also the president of the Cherokee Concerned Citizens, a C3 non-profit organization.

IND2-1 I have numerous concerns with the DEIS for the Gulf LNG project. Most importantly it does not recognize the terrible air quality conditions citizens who live near the existing industries experience on a daily basis. I complain constantly to local industry contacts, MDEQ, EPA, and the press. It is easy to find documentation of our suffering. There is already terrible air quality for people who live near Bayou Casotte. Myself, my family and many of my neighbors have health issues we believe are caused by the existing poor air quality. We do not need a new source of air pollution, flares and traffic.

IND2-2 Wetlands help control stormwater and storm surge. We live in a low-lying coastal area. We can not afford to lose 38+ acres of wetlands and the protection they provide. Mitigation will not replace the protection we lose.

IND2-3 We have terrible, existing violations of noise quality. This will further add to that.

IND2-4 I participated in the investigation of a nearby pipeline explosion. The investigators were the CSB. Our community was not properly notified of the danger until days later. This new activity will add to the risk of explosions near my house.

IND2-5 The DEIS on 4-216 claims no harm to environmental justice. I completely disagree. We have numerous low-income and minority residents. Clearly, we will get the harm of this project and you will not hear our concerns. The safety issues, additional air pollution, loss of wetlands, increased noise, and increased traffic will definitely cause harm.

The impacts on my family which includes elderly and children do not need more problems. We are already suffering. This will cause significant additional harm to our quality of life.

IND2-6 The DEIS says that "prior to the end of the DEIS comment period Gulf LNG can file an updated traffic analysis". I did not see the update so I can't comment.

IND2-7 The fact that the comment period for this was over the holidays was not considerate of including all comments.

IND2-8 To conclude, the purpose and need to export to foreign lands is not adequate to harm our community. We will have additional health problems, die earlier, lose wetland protection, have more safety issues, only to

IND2-5 See the responses to comments IND2-1, IND2-2, IND2-3, IND2-4, and IND2-6 regarding impacts on air quality, wetlands, noise, and traffic. As stated in section 4.9.7 of the EIS, although there are environmental justice communities within the study area, given the minor impacts from the Project overall and the distance from the Terminal Expansion (the main Project construction) to nearby residences, we conclude the Project would not have a disproportionately high and adverse health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations.

IND2-6 See the response to comment FA2-6.

IND2-7 The commenter's statement regarding the comment period is acknowledged. On February 7, 2019, because of a funding lapse at certain federal agencies between December 22, 2018 and January 25, 2019, the Commission reopened the comment period until February 25, 2019.

IND2-8 The commenter's statement regarding purpose and need is acknowledged. According to 40 CFR 1502.13, an EIS should only "briefly" discuss the purpose and need explained by the Applicants in their proposals to which the FERC is responding. This brief summary can be found in section 1.1 of the EIS. The EIS is not a decision document. We anticipate that the Commission Order will include further consideration of Project need.

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS

IND2 – Barbara Weckesser

20190225-5155 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 2/25/2019 4:35:20 PM

IND2-8 | accommodate the profits of exporters. We should not die and suffer to
cont'd | provide other's exports.

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

1

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
3 Office of Energy Projects

4 - - - - -X
5 Gulf LNG Liquefaction Company, LLC Dkt. No. CP15-521-000
6 Gulf LNG Energy, LLC
7 Gulf Listening Pipeline, LLC

8 - - - - -X

9

10 GULF LNG LIQUEFACTION PROJECT

11

12 Pelican Landing Convention Center
13 6217 Mississippi Highway 613
14 Moss Point, Mississippi 39563
15 Tuesday, December 18, 2018

16

17 The public comment meeting, pursuant to notice, convened
18 at 3:40 p.m.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

2

1 VERBAL COMMENTS

2 MS. WECKESSER: Barbara, B a r b a r a W e c k e
3 s s e r, 1502 Cherokee Street, Pascagula, Mississippi,
4 39581.

PS1-1

5 My comments are, the neighborhood I live in can
6 take no more emissions from anywhere. It was my
7 understanding this LNG would not be processing, but
8 shipping and receiving. The letter I received made mention
9 to fliers. Chevron, your adjoining title 5 company, already
10 puts out over the limit for us to breathe. I am submitting
11 two pages from two different reports of what we are having
12 to breathe. I ask before any permit is done, look at
13 removing residents from all these chemicals. By the way,
14 this subdivision was here before industry. Does Clean Air
15 water Act speak for residents? Must not, or something would
16 have already been done for these residents.

17 And then here is the two pages of chemicals.

18 MR. WECKESSER: You think you should read them so
19 they could be in the record?

20 THE REPORTER: We'll help put them in the record.

21

22 MS. WECKESSER: Well, it's, I mean, I just copied
23 two pages out of here versus trying to give you the whole
24 thing.

25 FERC: Whatever you want.

PS1-1 See the response to comment IND1-1 regarding air quality.

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

3

PS1-2

1 MS. WECKESSER: Well, I can get another copy of
2 the whole thing. So, I'm just going to use the whole thing
3 because this subdivision, I'm telling you, is having to
4 breathe everything in the world in and in the letter you
5 sent, the flier caught my eye.

6 My husband was in the hospital up on the fourth
7 floor at Singing River Hospital on Highway 90, and out of
8 five nights Chevron put off flares for four. All those
9 emissions are going into our lungs, and if we have LNG out
10 here processing this well, which it looks like that's what
11 the goal is now, then we're going to have more emissions.
12 We already have Chevron putting out three to four times more
13 what they're supposed to do. Then we're going to have LNG.
14 We have no EPA or MDEQ that controls what you put out,
15 because that's just a given that you're just going to do it
16 and they don't care. Otherwise, they would have already
17 done something about it.

PS1-3

18 And when I have, in my neighborhood alone, and I
19 look at 11 houses and in two years out of those 11 houses,
20 five people have died with cancer. That's 11 houses at the
21 bottom end of my subdivision. And that's what's going on.
22 That's not counting the rest of the 120 households out
23 there. That's those five down there that are gone out of
24 those 11 houses. And all with cancer.

25 So, if I look and I read this report that I paid

PS1-2 The FERC cannot comment on Chevron's permit requirements. Gulf LNG would be required to obtain the necessary air permits in coordination with the EPA and the MDEQ. Gulf LNG would be required to adhere to all permit requirements.

PS1-3 See the response to comments IND1-1 regarding air quality.

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

4

PS1-3
cont'd

1 \$670-some to get done, and I see that I'm breathing in
2 gypsum, Anurite (ph), clays, feldspars, rust, iron oxide,
3 titanium dioxide, paint, processed cellulose, natural
4 cellulose, and wood, zinc oxide, fiberglass, starch, even
5 maybe skin fragments. The sample contained pollen corks,
6 calcumite, dolomite, (ph) all of this in my area, that I
7 paid for. This one MDEQ did, out of one that they did for
8 us, and out of this one we're breathing Acetone, prolene --
9 some of these words I can't even pronounce, so that's why I
10 say I breath in 'doolene, moolene, and doolene.' And that's
11 the way it goes.

12 And it's not, it's not a little bit. And when
13 they give us our reports and they say, 'Oh, well, this is
14 figured on an eight hour work day.' I don't live in my
15 house eight hours a day. I live in my house 24/7. And
16 then, on top of that, if we end up with this LNG out there,
17 adding to this, then what are we supposed to do? Evidently
18 they want us all to die off. And if it keeps going the way
19 it is, we soon will be. And that will be the end of my
20 comment.

21 MS. CROSSLIN: Jennifer Crosslin, J E N N I F E
22 R, and then Crosslin, C R O S S L I N. I'm a resident of
23 Jackson County. Do I need to give my address? No? And I
24 am a member of the Cherokee Concerned Citizens. It's a
25 neighborhood group mostly made up of residents that live

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

5

1 there. I've been an advocate and organizer working with the
2 community for the last four years.

PS1-4

3 So, I come today to speak as a member of the
4 Cherokee Concerned Citizens and also as a concerned parent
5 and human being who lives in Jackson County and really on
6 this planet. First, I think with the, in the last four-and-
7 a-half years, four years working with Cherokee Concerned
8 Citizens and hearing firsthand some of the things they've
9 been experiencing, ranges from respiratory problems to memory
10 and mental problems, fertility problems to cancer, to body
11 rashes and so forth; so, of this neighborhood of about 150
12 households less, so now over the years people haven't come
13 back after Katrina -- but they are being impacted heavily by
14 the six, maybe seven, off the top of my head, title 5
15 industries that pollute, reported to the EPA, over 2.4
16 million pounds of hazardous pollutants and certainly
17 additional criteria pollutants, climate change pollutants.

PS1-5

18 I think that even though the EIS concludes that
19 there are no measurable environmental impacts to be
20 concerned with, I think that even another pound of pollution
21 is of concern, particularly when it comes to this community
22 and what they've been impacting. One of these things that I
23 find really interesting, I'm sort of, can still call myself
24 a novice because I'm not a scientist in terms of an
25 environmental scientist; I have a political science degree.

PS1-4

It is expected that the applicable federal and state air quality standards and regulations would be addressed accordingly in the individual air quality permits obtained by the companies in the Project area. Gulf LNG would be required to obtain the necessary permits and adhere to any permit requirements. As a result, we conclude that air quality impacts during operation of the proposed Project would be minor.

As detailed in section 4.11, Gulf LNG conducted air dispersion modeling for compliance with the NAAQS and PSD increments as required before issuance of the air quality permit. The preliminary modeling analysis must show that emissions from the Terminal Expansion are less than the respective SIL to be considered de minimis with insignificant air quality impacts. In the event that emissions exceed the SILs, then all on-property sources and off-site sources within 50 km of the project site must be modeled in a full impact analyses. This process ensures that an adequate level of modeling is conducted to ensure that the cumulative air impacts of all nearby sources do not affect air quality.

PS1-5

CAA permitting requirements and emission limits are set in order to be protective of the environment and human health. These requirements and limits are discussed in section 4.11.1 of the EIS.

See also the response to comment IND1-1.

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

6

PS1-5
cont'd

1 But one of the things I that continually perplexes me about
2 the environmental impact studies that I come across is that
3 what gets left out is public health and the health of
4 people. And somehow there's this arbitrary separation
5 from environment that excludes people, as if the very reason
6 for why we're wanting the clean air, water and land is not
7 to sustain our species. And so, what we see is this
8 disconnect and in working with this community this is not
9 something that is just with FERC, this is something that is
10 just structural with every agency that deals with the oil
11 and gas and chemical industries and the regulation of
12 environmental protection. They basically do not see, you
13 know, do not investigate the correlation in a really
14 meaningful way between the environmental impacts and the
15 health impacts and this community has been repeatedly, sort
16 of, pushed aside their concerns and their, in that the
17 health impacts that they're seeing have been ignored and
18 public processes like this really don't give them the
19 opportunity to meaningfully share those concerns because, as
20 stated in your EIS, just even in the notice of publication
21 it basically tells you that really what they want you to
22 comment on is the environmental impact study in itself.
23 And so the decision's going to be based on,
24 really, your critique of their, sort of, analysis of the
25 Environmental Impact, but if the language around public

PS1-6 See also the response to comment IND1-1.

PS1-7 The EIS is not a decision document. The Commission would issue its decision in an Order. See also the response to comment IND1-1.

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

7

PS1-5
cont'd

1 health is not even included in the document, then what types
2 of comments when it comes to the concerns of public health
3 and the impact that these communities are experiencing, how
4 does those even get weighed in? And basically, what I've
5 been told by other agencies, not particularly FERC, but is
6 that they just don't, which is disheartening and frustrating
7 and really points to the fact that this public process, in
8 and of itself, is sort of an environmental injustice because
9 it does not allow for people to meaningfully engage just
10 because you send out a public notice or you contact the
11 leaders of certain organizations; but if you're not fully
12 investigating their public health concerns you haven't made
13 an effort, for example, to do a health study to investigate,
14 you know, we say, we've got six people died of cancer that
15 live on two streets in the last year. That seems a little
16 odd to us.

17 But it's outside the purview of this agency, it's
18 outside the purview of any agency that regulates these
19 industries and so it just doesn't get done and it gets left
20 out and so, yes, it's an insult to community, impacted
21 communities, this one and communities all around the United
22 States that have to, sort of, meaningfully participate when
23 really their comments about public health and their real
24 concerns are meaningfully left out of the document, of the
25 decision making process, of the structure in and of itself.

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

8

PS1-5
cont'd

1 And it's just not fair and it's unjust.

2 Yes. This community, it says here, just even at
3 a glance at the environmental impact study, you know,
4 looking at it just as I noted, it doesn't say anything
5 about, there's no, you know, there's no conversion, it says:
6 so there's a health impact, or, there's an impact at this
7 many emissions or we anticipate this type of releases, but
8 there's no conversion factor that says this environmental
9 amount of emissions turns into this increased rate of, you
10 know, asthma or, you know, particular health impacts.

11 Now we know, I've seen reports. We can draw
12 conclusions between air quality and asthma rates but they're
13 not done in these reports, they're not done in any of the
14 title 5 permit processes and so as citizens when we read
15 this, we read, 'this many emissions.' well, what does that
16 tell us? I don't know what that means. Does that mean
17 it's going to be harder to breathe? Does it mean that 10
18 years from now because you pollute, you pollute, you
19 pollute, you pollute that I'm going to have cancer or that
20 someone living near me, does it explain the reason why my
21 daughter has mental health issues and is having difficulty
22 concentrating in school? Does it explain why my son has
23 asthma? I don't really know and these are the types of
24 questions that the community has and go unanswered
25 repeatedly over and over again.

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

9

1 And I think that it's intentional, not
2 necessarily intentional by you guys, and you know as
3 employees of FERC, but it's intentional in the political
4 process and it's designed to benefit the expansion of the
5 oil and gas and chemical industries and it really does not
6 protect the interests of people. And what we're seeing now
7 as the climate change report, and this is my, sort of, last
8 formal -- or actually, before I move on there was one thing
9 I did want to mention. I remember taking a picture of it.

10 And I'm going to comment, I'm going to take more
11 time to go through it and have written comments to sort of
12 go through each section that you wrote out; but it
13 basically says the environmental justice that, the
14 environmental justice communities, they're studying, so the
15 analysis of the environmental justice impact, which is
16 obviously legally required, is that though there's been
17 environmental justice -- communities in the area is a minor
18 impact, due to the distance and the main project
19 construction. But as far as I understand this EIS study is
20 supposed to be construction and operation.

PS1-6

21 And so operation is not explicitly -- maybe as
22 implied in the report somewhere -- but it certainly implied
23 it should be explicit in this concluding paragraph. It
24 makes me feel like just in reading this, and reading, you
25 know, through, as I said, I just skimmed through the

PS1-8 See the response to IND2-5.

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

10

PS1-6
cont'd

1 outline, they really haven't done their due diligence in
2 terms of determining the health impacts or the environmental
3 justice impacts of this community that has been, you know,
4 identified. So, yes, last thing is I don't
5 live in the community. I care very deeply about the people
6 in the community and Barbara, and I've watched people lose
7 their loved ones and I -- it pisses me off that this is
8 happening to them. And for many of them it's not as simple
9 as just getting up and moving, that's what some of the
10 people have told them, to get up and move. And that is not,
11 that is not a real solution and it is not one that you
12 should, it's not the burden of the people. It should be the

PS1-7

13 burden of the industry. And then, and also, I'm a parent
14 and a human being and I have two children and climate
15 change. It's not even in the report. It says regional
16 climate. There is no climate change. We just got a U,
17 United, U.N. World report that said, basically, we need to
18 do some radical changes and we need some swift, radical
19 action, now. Even Trump came on board, a conservative party
20 that has been known to deny climate change as being a human
21 impact, has come out and said, 'This is true, and we need
22 swift action.'

PS1-8

23 I don't see why we're continuing to expand the
24 oil and gas industry. And we're expanding in such a way to
25 export gas and not even to be using what we have and there

PS1-9 Climate change is discussed in section 4.13 of the EIS.

PS1-10 The development of natural gas is not the subject of this EIS nor is the issue directly related to the proposed Project. Production and gathering activities, and the pipelines and facilities used for these activities, are not regulated by FERC, but are overseen by the affected region's state and local agencies with jurisdiction over the management and extraction of the resource.

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

11

1 is several reports which I will probably look for and cite
2 in my comments, but there are several reports that say that
3 we burn up all of the, we use all of the gas and coal that
4 we have we will basically bring on this extinction. And
5 frankly, just the very fact that we continue to expand the
6 oil and gas industry when it's absolutely not necessary is
7 just, just infuriating. And when I think about what's going
8 to happen for future generations.

9 Also, I know that essentially exporting is not
10 exclusively an expansion but it certainly puts in, builds
11 infrastructure for an expansion. Building infrastructure is
12 part of the expansion. And so, and that's what we're doing
13 here. We are building infrastructure that continues to
14 support an industry that needs to be obsolete yesterday for
15 the future of all of us.

PSI-9

16 Lastly, what I did notice just briefly going over
17 it, the climate change, in addition to not even climate
18 change impacts, the environmental impact study does not
19 include just the impact as it connects to all parts, right?
20 The gas industry is a cradle-to-grave situation where its
21 extraction, it's carried, it's transported, it's processed,
22 and then it's transported again, then it's used and burned.

23

24 And so, the impact from the very beginning to not
25 just this community, it's just one community that's going to

PSI-11

The environmental analysis of induced natural gas production, LNG transport, and end use are not only beyond the scope of NEPA, but too speculative to permit meaningful consideration as part of our analysis. See section 4.13.1.15 of the EIS.

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

12

PS1-9
cont'd

1 be impacted on the whole process, but communities all
2 throughout the nation are going to be impacted and globally
3 we're going to be impacted; that is not included in the EIS
4 study and that certainly is an environmental process and
5 it's something that I've noticed that FERC and a lot of
6 other agencies do, they separate out, and of course, that
7 again, supports the expansion of the oil and gas because
8 industry gets away with, sort of, not looking at the whole
9 impact. They get to section it off and say, 'Oh, well, it's
10 not, it doesn't seem so bad when you look at it from this
11 perspective.' And that's, all right.

PS1-10

12 So, also, one final point. Promise. Cumulative
13 impact, sort of the same thing. I notice that you have a
14 list, I need to do a better job, but you have a list of all
15 the industries listed there. It doesn't seem clear to me
16 that the cumulative impact has been looked at in any real
17 way to measure, just as I said before, that converts, you
18 know, sort of the collective emissions and its real health
19 impacts on the community. And so, certainly this is a
20 cumulative impact, a question of cumulative impact for this
21 community. And it's not just, you know, this one facility,
22 but several others that are releasing emissions.

23 I think that's it. Thank you.

24 MR. FREELAND: My name is George Freeland.

25 That's F R E E L A N D. Suffix Junior. I'm the Executive

PS1-12 Cumulative impacts are discussed in section 4.13 of the EIS.

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

13

1 Director for the Jackson County Economic Development

2 Foundation.

PSI-11

3 So, on behalf of the Foundation's members, those
4 being the Jackson County Board of Supervisors, the Jackson
5 County Port Authority, the municipalities of Pascagoula,
6 Moss Point, Gautier, and Ocean Springs, as well as all other
7 significant industrial tenants in the community, I express
8 our support of Kinder Morgan's proposed liquefaction
9 terminal in Bayou Casotte. The Foundation has concluded the
10 significant economic development value and benefits of a
11 liquefaction terminal, and as such commit our support in any
12 way that might be required by Kinder Morgan and/or its
13 agents.

14 [Jokingly:] That has nothing to do with the
15 Environmental Impact Statement itself but there you have it.
16 Don't put that in the record.

17 FERC: That's absolutely fine. You can leave any
18 comment that you want.

19 MR. FREELAND: Very good. Good enough?

20 FERC: All right. Thank you.

PSI-12

21 MR. CUMBEST: I simply would like to voice my
22 support for the Kinder Morgan project. I'm sure you all are
23 aware we already have part of the facility located there.
24 Originally, Gulf LNG was going to import liquefied natural
25 gas; and so it's exciting now to see that facility is going

PSI-13 The commenter's statements are acknowledged.

PSI-14 The commenter's statements are acknowledged.

PUBLIC SESSION COMMENTS

PS1 – Pelican Landing Convention Center – December 18, 2018

20190123-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 01/23/2019

14

PS1-12
cont'd

1 to be used, and as a local banker, I'm very much excited
2 about the jobs and the ongoing employment that it will
3 provide. And it's good to have a top tier company like
4 Kinder Morgan involved in the process. I'm a little
5 familiar with them. I have a very good opinion of the way
6 they conduct their business. That's it.

7 [Pause 5:00 - 7:30]

8 [Whereupon at 7:30 p.m., the verbal comment
9 session concluded.]

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

APPENDIX M

Keyword Index

KEYWORD INDEX

- access road, ES-4, 2-9, 2-13, 2-15, 2-17, 2-18, 2-22, 4-6, 4-8, 4-10, 4-11, 4-34, 4-45, 4-82, 4-83, 4-84, 4-85, 4-98, 4-164, 4-166, 4-180, 4-221, 5-12, 5-16
- air emissions, 4-109, 4-121, 4-227, 4-228
- Air Quality Control Region (AQCR), 4-109, 4-111
- Alabama red-bellied turtle, 5, 5-6
- alternatives, ES-1, 4, 9, 1-4, 1-12, 1-24, 3-1, 3-2, 3-3, 3-4, 3-5, 3-6, 3-7, 3-8, 3-10, 3-11, 3-12, 3-13, 3-14, 3-15, 4-15, 4-20, 4-32, 4-36, 4-38, 4-79, 4-137, 4-147, 5-1, 5-10, 5-11
- American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), 4-137, 4-161, 4-166, 4-168, 4-169, 4-170, 4-171
- American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), 4-154, 4-185, 4-190, 5-21, 5-26
- Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA), 1-7, 1-8, 1-22, 4-54, 4-78, 4-80
- ballast water, 2-23, 4-26, 4-27, 4-28, 4-48, 4-49, 4-57, 4-63, 4-64, 4-66, 4-71, 4-215
- Bayou Casotte, ES-3, ES-4, ES-6, ES-8, 1-1, 1-2, 1-17, 2-1, 2-4, 2-6, 2-9, 2-11, 2-21, 2-23, 3-11, 4-2, 4-6, 4-20, 4-21, 4-24, 4-26, 4-27, 4-51, 4-58, 4-59, 4-61, 4-62, 4-63, 4-64, 4-65, 4-70, 4-71, 4-72, 4-82, 4-85, 4-88, 4-98, 4-99, 4-100, 4-101, 4-102, 4-105, 4-128, 4-143, 4-146, 4-180, 4-193, 4-196, 4-197, 4-198, 4-199, 4-200, 4-201, 4-202, 4-203, 4-204, 4-207, 4-208, 4-209, 4-210, 4-211, 4-213, 4-214, 4-215, 4-216, 4-217, 4-219, 4-221, 4-222, 4-224, 4-225, 4-226, 4-227, 4-231, 5-5, 5-6, 5-7, 5-8, 5-11
- Bayou Casotte Dredge Material Management Site (BCDMMS), 1-3, 1-18, 1-19, 2-4, 2-9, 2-10, 2-19, 3-8, 3-10, 3-11, 3-12, 4-2, 4-6, 4-13, 4-24, 4-26, 4-36, 4-43, 4-45, 4-50, 4-51, 4-55, 4-56, 4-82, 4-83, 4-85, 4-86, 4-88, 4-163, 4-164, 4-171, 4-199, 4-204, 4-210, 4-211, 4-213, 4-217, 5-2, 5-11
- best management practice (BMP), 4-29, 4-46, 4-213, 4-215, 4-217, 4-219
- Biological Assessment (BA), ES-6, 1-8, 1-10, 1-19, 4-66, 4-73, 4-74, 5-6
- blue whale, ES-6, 5-6
- boiling liquid vapor explosion (BLEVE), 4-149, 4-175, 4-177
- brown pelican, ES-6, 4-52, 4-79, 4-80, 5-7
- Carolina grasswort, ES-6, 4-49, 4-79, 4-81, 4-220, 5-7, 5-15
- Clean Air Act (CAA), 1-9, 1-14, 1-19, 1-22, 1-24, 4-110, 4-111, 4-113, 4-115, 4-117
- Clean Water Act (CWA), 1-5, 1-8, 1-12, 1-15, 1-19, 1-20, 1-21, 1-22, 1-23, 4-24, 4-26, 4-32, 4-61, 4-214, 4-216, 4-219, 5-2, 5-3
- climate change, 1-13, 4-228, 4-229, 4-230
- Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA), 1-5, 1-19, 1-22, 1-24, 4-32, 4-90, 4-91
- Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP), ES-6, 1-18, 1-24, 4-90, 5-7, 5-15
- compensatory mitigation, ES-5, 1-13, 4-33, 4-34, 4-38, 4-39, 4-41, 4-42, 4-51, 4-52, 4-56, 4-62, 4-66, 4-91, 4-216, 4-221, 5-3, 5-4, 5-6
- construction emissions, 1-22, 4-117, 4-119, 4-120, 4-121, 4-122
- construction noise, ES-7, 4-131, 4-133, 4-231, 5-9
- Construction Support Area (CSA), ES-3, ES-4, ES-5, ES-6, ES-9, 1-3, 1-9, 2-11, 2-12, 2-14, 2-15, 2-16, 2-18, 2-22, 3-1, 3-12, 3-15, 4-7, 4-9, 4-10, 4-11, 4-12, 4-16, 4-17, 4-18, 4-19, 4-20, 4-30, 4-33, 4-34, 4-36, 4-38, 4-42, 4-45, 4-46, 4-52, 4-53, 4-55, 4-65, 4-83, 4-84, 4-86, 4-98, 4-100, 4-105, 4-106, 4-107, 4-203, 4-213, 4-225, 4-226, 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, 5-5, 5-8, 5-10, 5-11, 5-12, 5-15
- cooling water, 4-27, 4-64, 4-189, 5-25
- Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), 1-5, 1-11, 4-196, 4-207

critical habitat, 1-7, 1-13, 1-19, 4-24, 4-73, 4-77, 5-6

Destin Pipeline Company, LLC, ES-3, 1-3

earthquake, 4-3, 4-4, 4-163, 4-166, 4-167, 4-168, 4-169, 4-192, 5-28

eastern black rail, ES-6, 4-76, 5-6

emergency response, 1-5, 2-24, 2-25, 4-143, 4-150, 4-155, 4-175, 4-177, 4-180, 4-182, 4-186, 4-190, 4-192, 4-194, 4-215, 4-232, 5-17, 5-22, 5-26, 5-28

Emergency Response Plan (ERP), 1-5, 1-23, 2-24, 2-25, 4-97, 4-146, 4-155, 4-180, 4-182, 5-18

emergency shutdown (ESD), 2-24, 4-134, 4-141, 4-153, 4-155, 4-158, 4-160, 4-183, 4-184, 4-185, 4-186, 4-187, 5-19, 5-20, 5-22, 5-24

employment, 4-92, 4-94, 4-95, 4-223, 5-8

Endangered Species Act (ESA), ES-6, ES-9, 1-5, 1-7, 1-8, 1-18, 1-19, 1-20, 1-22, 4-24, 4-54, 4-55, 4-66, 4-73, 4-74, 4-220, 5-6, 5-15

environmental justice, 4-101, 4-104, 4-226

Essential Fish Habitat (EFH), ES-4, ES-5, ES-9, 1-4, 1-8, 1-10, 4-57, 4-66, 4-67, 4-68, 4-69, 4-70, 4-71, 4-72, 4-219, 5-1, 5-5, 5-6

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), 1-20, 4-178, 4-179, 4-181, 5-16, 5-17

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), 1-20, 4-171, 4-172

Federal Register (FR), ES-4, 1-9, 1-11

fin whale, ES-6, 5-6

flare tower, ES-2, 1-2, 2-6, 2-14, 2-15, 2-22, 3-11, 4-8, 4-34, 4-51, 4-52, 4-55, 4-79, 4-80, 4-88, 4-89, 4-90, 4-91, 4-178, 4-218, 5-7

flaring, 4-34, 4-44, 4-51, 4-55, 4-90, 4-114, 4-126, 4-222

flooding, 4-3, 4-4, 4-5, 4-10, 4-166, 4-172, 4-229, 4-230

floodplain, 1-20, 4-5, 4-171

fossil fuel, 3-2, 3-13, 3-14, 4-109, 4-117, 4-119, 4-229

Free Trade Agreement (FTA), ES-2, 1-3, 1-6, 1-21, 2-1, 3-3, 4-127, 4-132

fugitive dust, ES-7, 4-109, 4-119, 4-120, 4-121, 4-227, 5-8

fugitive emissions, 4-109, 4-112, 4-117, 4-121, 4-122, 4-126

geologic hazards, 4-3

geotechnical, 1-10, 4-2, 4-3, 4-162, 4-163, 4-165, 4-166, 4-168, 4-169, 4-180, 5-16

green sea turtle, 6, 4-78, 5-6

greenhouse gas (GHG), 1-13, 1-14, 3-13, 3-14, 3-15, 4-109, 4-112, 4-113, 4-114, 4-117, 4-118, 4-119, 4-120, 4-121, 4-122, 4-123, 4-125, 4-126, 4-227, 4-228, 4-229, 4-230

gulf sturgeon, ES-6, 4-24, 4-74, 4-77, 4-78, 5-6

Gulfstream Natural Gas System, LLC, ES-3, 1-3

hawksbill sea turtle, ES-6, 5-6

hazardous air pollutants (HAP), 4-109, 4-112, 4-114, 4-115, 4-116, 4-122, 4-227

hospitals, 4-97, 4-111, 4-127, 4-143, 4-149, 4-169, 4-201, 4-208, 4-216, 4-217, 4-223, 4-225

housing, 4-88, 4-92, 4-95, 4-96, 4-102, 4-200, 4-201, 4-208, 4-216, 4-217, 4-218, 4-221, 4-223, 4-224, 5-7

humpback whale, ES-6, 5-6

hurricanes, 4-4, 4-51, 4-163, 4-166, 4-169, 4-170, 4-171, 4-172, 4-210, 4-229

interior least tern, ES-6, 4-78, 5-6

invasive species, 4-47, 4-50, 4-53, 4-63, 4-64, 4-71

least tern, ES-5, 5-6

leatherback sea turtle, ES-6, 5-6

Letter of Determination (LOD), ES-8, 1-7, 4-135, 4-138, 4-166, 4-170, 4-193, 5-10

Letter of Recommendation (LOR), 1-6, 1-21, 2-4, 4-101, 4-141, 4-142, 4-146, 4-193, 5-10

loggerhead sea turtle, ES-6, 5-6

low-income, 1-13, 4-101, 4-102, 4-105, 4-223, 4-226, 5-8

Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), 1-8, 1-18, 1-20

mean sea level (msl), 1-17, 2-5, 2-6, 2-19, 2-21, 4-1, 4-2, 4-3, 4-9, 4-18, 4-41, 4-52, 4-58, 4-60, 4-64, 4-71, 4-72, 4-80, 4-134, 4-163, 5-2

Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), 1-7, 1-8, 1-22, 4-54

minority, 1-13, 4-101, 4-102, 4-103, 4-105, 4-223, 4-226, 5-8

Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), ES-7, 1-8, 1-10, 1-13, 1-14, 1-15, 1-17, 1-18, 1-21, 1-22, 1-24, 2-24, 4-13, 4-15, 4-16, 4-18, 4-21, 4-24, 4-29, 4-32, 4-38, 4-41, 4-42, 4-56, 4-61, 4-68, 4-110, 4-112, 4-113, 4-117, 4-119, 4-123, 4-125, 4-203, 4-210, 4-212, 4-215, 4-216, 4-227, 4-228, 4-230, 5-2, 5-3, 5-9

Mississippi Department of Marine Resource (MDMR), ES-5, ES-6, ES-9, 1-10, 1-15, 1-18, 1-22, 1-23, 1-24, 2-18, 2-19, 4-25, 4-32, 4-38, 4-41, 4-42, 4-49, 4-56, 4-90, 4-216, 4-221, 5-3, 5-7, 5-15

Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fish, and Parks (MDWFP), ES-6, ES-9, 1-10, 1-23, 4-52, 4-73, 4-75, 4-76, 4-78, 4-79, 4-80, 4-81, 5-6

Mississippi Office of the Secretary of State, 1, 1-4, 1-22

National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), 1-13, 3-15, 4-109, 4-110, 4-111, 4-112, 4-117, 4-123, 4-124, 4-125, 4-227

National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP), 4-116

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), ES-1, ES-8, 1-1, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 1-7, 1-8, 1-9, 1-11, 1-19, 1-24, 3-1, 4-66, 4-102, 4-135, 4-174, 4-193

National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), 1-7, 2-5, 2-10, 2-23, 2-24, 4-136, 4-137, 4-138, 4-149, 4-152, 4-153, 4-154, 4-155, 4-156, 4-157, 4-159, 4-160, 4-161, 4-162, 4-163, 4-165, 4-166, 4-167, 4-168, 4-174, 4-176, 4-184, 4-186, 4-188, 4-189, 4-191, 5-20, 5-22, 5-24, 5-25, 5-27

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), 1-5, 1-18, 1-19, 1-22, 1-23, 4-106, 4-107, 4-108, 5-8

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), ES-1, ES-5, ES-6, ES-9, 1-4, 1-8, 1-10, 1-13, 1-18, 1-19, 1-20, 4-24, 4-38, 4-41, 4-58, 4-59, 4-60, 4-66, 4-67, 4-68, 4-69, 4-73, 4-74, 4-76, 4-77, 4-78, 4-220, 5-1, 5-5, 5-6, 5-15

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), 1-8, 1-23, 4-19, 4-27, 4-29, 4-63, 4-64, 4-65, 4-70, 4-71, 5-3

Natural Gas Act (NGA), ES-1, 1-1, 1-3, 1-5, 1-6, 1-20, 1-24, 3-3, 4-54, 4-136

New Source Performance Standards (NSPS), 3-15, 4-114, 4-115, 4-118, 4-125

New Source Review, 4-113, 4-118

Noise Sensitive Area (NSA), ES-7, 4-128, 4-129, 4-130, 4-131, 4-132, 4-133, 4-134, 4-230, 4-231, 5-9, 5-16

non-jurisdictional, 1-15, 1-17, 2-5, 3-14, 4-198, 4-216, 4-217, 4-221, 4-227, 4-231, 5-10

North American Vertical Datum, 1-19, 2-1, 2-10, 2-19, 2-20, 4-3, 4-6, 4-39, 4-86, 4-163, 4-171, 4-173, 4-199, 4-211

Notice of Availability (NOA), ES-4, 1-1, 1-9, 1-11, 4-102

Notice of Intent (NOI), ES-3, 1-9, 1-22, 4-107

Office of Energy Projects (OEP), ES-1, 1-1, 4-74, 4-132, 4-180, 4-181, 4-190, 4-192, 5-12, 5-13, 5-14, 5-15, 5-16, 5-17, 5-27, 5-29

operating basis earthquake (OBE), 4-167, 4-168

operational noise, ES-7, 4-52, 4-127, 4-132, 4-134, 4-231, 5-9

peregrine falcon, ES-6, 4-79, 5-7

pile driving, ES-7, 2-20, 2-21, 4-25, 4-57, 4-58, 4-59, 4-60, 4-69, 4-131, 4-132, 4-215, 4-231, 5-6, 5-9, 5-15, 5-16

Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), ES-1, ES-8, 1-4, 1-7, 1-22, 4-138, 4-166, 4-175, 4-176, 4-177, 4-179, 4-181, 4-193, 4-194, 5-1, 5-10, 5-17

piping plover, ES-5, 4-73, 5-6

potential to emit (PTE), 4-112, 4-113, 4-116

Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD), ES-7, 1-14, 1-22, 1-24, 4-111, 4-113, 4-117, 4-118, 4-123, 4-124, 4-125, 4-197, 4-227, 4-230, 5-9

public comment session, ES-4, 1-11

public scoping, ES-3, ES-4, 1-9, 1-11, 3-12, 4-102

residence, ES-6, 2-22, 4-100, 4-105, 4-127, 4-132, 4-143, 4-230, 5-8

rufa red knot, ES-5, 5-6

safe shutdown earthquake (SSE), 4-167, 4-168

saltmarsh topminnow, ES-6, 5-6

schools, ES-6, 4-97, 4-100, 4-127, 4-169, 5-8

Secretary of the Commission (Secretary), 2-19, 4-32, 4-36, 4-41, 4-55, 4-56, 4-102, 4-132, 4-133, 4-134, 4-180, 4-181, 4-191, 5-1, 5-12, 5-13, 5-14, 5-15, 5-16, 5-17, 5-28

sei whale, ES-6, 5-6

ship traffic, 4-27, 4-181, 5-16

smalltooth sawfish, ES-6, 4-74, 4-77, 5-6

snowy plover, 6, 4-79, 5-7

sound pressure, 4-58, 4-69, 4-127, 4-133, 5-6

sperm whale, ES-6, 5-6

Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC), 4-13, 4-14, 4-19, 4-20, 4-29, 4-30, 4-31, 4-38, 4-65, 4-70, 4-215, 5-2, 5-3

State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), 1-10, 1-13, 1-18, 1-22, 4-106, 4-107, 4-108, 5-8

State Implementation Plan (SIP), 4-117, 4-227

state-listed species, 4-220, 5-7

stormwater, 1-12, 4-29, 4-30, 4-31, 4-57, 4-65, 4-70, 4-71, 4-157, 4-213

supply dock, ES-2, ES-4, ES-5, ES-7, ES-9, 1-2, 1-15, 1-17, 1-18, 1-23, 2-6, 2-7, 2-8, 2-9, 2-10, 2-13, 2-14, 2-18, 2-20, 2-21, 2-22, 3-1, 3-7, 3-10, 3-11, 3-15, 4-6, 4-7, 4-9, 4-10, 4-13, 4-18, 4-24, 4-25, 4-26, 4-27, 4-34, 4-41, 4-43, 4-44, 4-45, 4-50, 4-52, 4-56, 4-57, 4-58, 4-59, 4-60, 4-61, 4-62, 4-63, 4-65, 4-67, 4-68, 4-69, 4-70, 4-71, 4-72, 4-83, 4-84, 4-85, 4-88, 4-101, 4-106, 4-119, 4-131, 4-198, 4-211, 4-214, 4-216, 4-218, 4-219, 4-220, 4-222, 5-2, 5-3, 5-5, 5-8, 5-9, 5-10, 5-11

tax revenue, 4-92, 4-95, 5-8

traffic, ES-5, ES-6, ES-7, ES-8, ES-9, 1-5, 1-6, 1-13, 1-17, 2-4, 2-6, 2-16, 4-26, 4-27, 4-28, 4-52, 4-63, 4-69, 4-73, 4-86, 4-87, 4-88, 4-89, 4-98, 4-99, 4-100, 4-101, 4-102, 4-105, 4-119, 4-122, 4-135, 4-141, 4-142, 4-146, 4-174, 4-175, 4-193, 4-212, 4-214, 4-215, 4-218, 4-222, 4-223, 4-224, 4-225, 4-226, 4-228, 4-231, 5-7, 5-8

Traffic Impact Analysis, ES-6, 1-17, 2-16, 4-98, 4-225, 5-8

tribe, 4-107

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), ES-1, ES-5, ES-9, 1-4, 1-5, 1-8, 1-10, 1-15, 1-17, 1-18, 1-19, 1-20, 1-23, 2-4, 2-9, 2-10, 2-14, 2-18, 2-19, 2-20, 3-8, 3-10, 4-6, 4-13, 4-21, 4-25, 4-26, 4-27, 4-32, 4-33, 4-34, 4-36, 4-38, 4-41, 4-42, 4-43, 4-44, 4-49, 4-51, 4-56, 4-57, 4-60, 4-61, 4-64, 4-68, 4-71, 4-72, 4-80, 4-82, 4-83, 4-85, 4-86, 4-101, 4-110, 4-163, 4-171, 4-173, 4-199, 4-200, 4-201, 4-202, 4-203, 4-204, 4-207, 4-208, 4-209, 4-210, 4-211, 4-213, 4-214, 4-216, 4-219, 4-220, 4-221, 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, 5-6

U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), ES-1, ES-8, ES-9, 1-4, 1-5, 1-6, 1-7, 1-10, 1-21, 2-4, 2-6, 2-23, 3-3, 3-4, 4-15, 4-27, 4-48, 4-49, 4-64, 4-71, 4-101, 4-122, 4-135, 4-138, 4-139, 4-140, 4-141, 4-142, 4-146, 4-147, 4-148, 4-157, 4-159, 4-190, 4-193, 4-215, 5-1, 5-10, 5-27

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), ES-1, 1-4, 1-6, 1-10, 1-21, 3-3, 4-136, 4-179, 5-1

U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), ES-1, ES-8, ES-9, 1-4, 1-7, 1-17, 1-22, 2-5, 2-18, 2-23, 2-25, 3-3, 3-4, 4-118, 4-135, 4-136, 4-137, 4-138, 4-147, 4-148, 4-155, 4-156, 4-157, 4-159, 4-163, 4-166, 4-167, 4-170, 4-174, 4-175, 4-176, 4-177, 4-178, 4-179, 4-181, 4-193, 4-194, 4-195, 4-203, 4-209, 4-212, 5-1, 5-10, 5-16, 5-17

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), ES-1, ES-4, 1-4, 1-8, 1-9, 1-10, 1-11, 1-21, 1-23, 1-24, 3-12, 3-13, 3-14, 3-15, 4-1, 4-13, 4-15, 4-16, 4-27, 4-32, 4-36, 4-39, 4-41, 4-60, 4-

64, 4-71, 4-101, 4-102, 4-110, 4-111, 4-112, 4-113, 4-116, 4-117, 4-119, 4-120, 4-123, 4-126, 4-127, 4-128, 4-165, 4-174, 4-175, 4-176, 4-177, 4-179, 4-196, 4-202, 4-209, 4-215, 4-228, 4-230, 5-1, 5-11

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), ES-1, ES-5, ES-6, ES-9, 1-4, 1-7, 1-10, 1-13, 1-18, 1-19, 1-22, 4-38, 4-41, 4-51, 4-52, 4-54, 4-55, 4-73, 4-74, 4-75, 4-76, 4-77, 4-78, 4-79, 4-80, 4-90, 4-124, 4-218, 4-220, 5-1, 5-5, 5-6, 5-15

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), 3-2, 4-2, 4-3, 4-4, 4-15, 4-21, 4-167, 4-168, 4-169, 4-172, 4-173, 4-174

U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP), 4-228, 4-229, 4-230

underwater noise, 4-60, 4-63, 4-69

vibration, 4-132, 4-133, 4-167, 4-231

visual resources, 4, 1-4, 4-82, 4-88, 4-89, 4-90, 4-91, 4-196, 4-221, 5-7

water quality, 1-8, 1-12, 1-14, 1-15, 1-18, 1-22, 1-23, 4-19, 4-20, 4-24, 4-25, 4-26, 4-27, 4-28, 4-30, 4-31, 4-32, 4-64, 4-67, 4-71, 4-215, 4-217, 4-219, 5-3

Waterway Suitability Assessment (WSA), ES-8, 1-6, 1-21, 2-4, 4-101, 4-141, 4-142, 4-143, 4-146, 4-193, 5-10

West Indian manatee, ES-6, 5-6

wetland, ES-1, ES-4, ES-5, ES-7, ES-9, 1-4, 1-5, 1-9, 1-10, 1-12, 1-14, 1-15, 1-20, 1-22, 1-23, 2-9, 2-11, 2-15, 2-17, 2-18, 2-19, 3-2, 3-7, 3-8, 3-10, 3-11, 3-12, 4-6, 4-8, 4-9, 4-10, 4-11, 4-12, 4-13, 4-25, 4-29, 4-30, 4-32, 4-33, 4-34, 4-35, 4-36, 4-37, 4-38, 4-39, 4-41, 4-42, 4-43, 4-44, 4-45, 4-46, 4-47, 4-49, 4-50, 4-51, 4-52, 4-53, 4-54, 4-55, 4-56, 4-57, 4-60, 4-61, 4-62, 4-65, 4-67, 4-68, 4-69, 4-71, 4-72, 4-73, 4-77, 4-80, 4-81, 4-82, 4-83, 4-84, 4-88, 4-91, 4-102, 4-107, 4-108, 4-131, 4-163, 4-164, 4-198, 4-199, 4-200, 4-201, 4-202, 4-207, 4-212, 4-214, 4-216, 4-217, 4-218, 4-219, 4-220, 4-221, 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, 5-4, 5-5, 5-6, 5-7, 5-9, 5-11, 5-13, 5-15

wood stork, ES-5, 5-6

APPENDIX N

List of Preparers

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

Rana, Anthony – Project Manager, Geology and Water Resources

M.S., International Development, Tulane University, 2012
Graduate Studies, Hydrogeology and Geochemistry, Oklahoma State University, 1988
B.S., Geology, New Jersey City University, 1984

Griffin, Robin – Deputy Project Manager, Land Use, Visual Resources, Socioeconomics

M.S., Environmental Management, Illinois Institute of Technology, 1999
B.A., English Composition, DePauw University, 1992

Armbruster, Ellen – Cultural Resources

M.A., Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, 1986
B.A., Anthropology, Bryn Mawr College, 1979

Balsom, Arianne – Wildlife and Aquatic, Vegetation, Threatened and Endangered Species

M.S., Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Tennessee, 2003
B.S., Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Tennessee, 2000
B.A., Marine Biology, University of Tennessee, 2000

Judy, Harry – Air Quality, Noise, Reliability and Safety

B.S., Mechanical Engineering, The Pennsylvania State University, 2000

Peng, Andrew – Reliability and Safety

B.C.E., Civil Engineering, University of Delaware, 2014

Schreiber, Seth, P.E. – Reliability and Safety

M.S., Chemical Engineering, Washington University in St. Louis, 2006

Silvera, Liliana – Reliability and Safety

B.S., Chemical Engineering, University of Maryland College Park, 2003

Cardno, Inc.

DiSanto, Lavinia – Project Manager, Introduction, Project Description

B.A., Biological Sciences, University of Delaware, 1999

Sechrist, Kim – Deputy Project Manager, Social Sciences Task Lead, Socioeconomics

M.S., Environmental Science, Towson University, 2006
B.S., Biology, McDaniel College, 2004

Staeger, Bill – Deputy Project Manager, Alternatives, Reliability and Safety

M.S., Fisheries Biology, Oregon State University, 1974
B.A., Biology, Lafayette College, 1967

Brena, Jeanette – Air and Noise

M.S., Environmental Engineering, Washington State University, 1997
B.S., Civil Engineering, Seattle University, 1996

Brewer, John – Biological Resources Task Lead, Aquatic Resources, EFH, EFH Assessment, Alternatives, and Reliability and Safety

M.S., Marine Biology, University of Alaska, Fairbanks, 2007
B.S., Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, Animal Science, University of Florida, 1997

Briggs, Stephanie – Physical Resources Task Lead, Water Resources, Vegetation, and Wetlands
B.S., Biological Sciences, Marine Biology, University of Maryland, 1998

Craig, Donald – Cultural Resources
M.S., Archeology, University of Southern Mississippi, 2011
PBAC, Anthropology, University of Southern Mississippi, 2004
B.A., English, Oregon State University, 1990

Ferris, Jennifer – Cultural Resources
M.A., Anthropology (Archaeology), Washington State University, 2008
B.A., Anthropology, University of Washington, 2001

Hess, Jonathan – Physical Resources Task Lead, Geology and Soils
B.A., Environmental Geology, Millersville University, 2008

Koonjebharry, Amanda – Wildlife, Threatened and Endangered Species, and Biological Assessment, Cumulative Impacts
BS, Zoology & Botany, University of the West Indies, Trinidad & Tobago, 2000

Layton, Jackie – Editor
A.A.S., Architectural Engineering, Delaware Technical and Community College, 1992

Pahl, Oliver – Social Sciences Task Lead, Land Use
B.S., Environmental Economics Policy and Management, minor in Natural Resource and Environmental Law and Policy, Oregon State University, 2003

Ryan, Sally – Air Quality and Noise
B.S., Civil & Environmental Engineering, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1985

Cardno, Inc. is a third party contractor assisting the Commission staff in reviewing the environmental aspects of the project application and preparing the environmental documents required by NEPA. Third party contractors are selected by Commission staff and funded by project applicants. Per the procedures in 40 CFR 1506.5(c), third party contractors execute a disclosure statement specifying that they have no financial or other conflicting interest in the outcome of the Project. Third party contractors are required to self-report any changes in financial situation and to refresh their disclosure statements annually. The Commission staff solely directs the scope, content, quality, and schedule of the contractor's work. The Commission staff independently evaluates the results of the third-party contractor's work and the Commission, through its staff, bears ultimate responsibility for full compliance with the requirements of NEPA.