My name is Courtney Williams. I am a resident of Peekskill, NY. My home is 400ft from Spectra Energy's Algonquin Pipeline. My children's school is 400ft from the route of Spectra Energy's new Algonquin Incremental Pipeline Expansion. I also hold a PhD in Molecular Biology and work as a cancer researcher. I am here today to give testimony as a scientist, and as a mother.

As a scientist, I am familiar with the rigor of the scientific method and the standards upheld by the peer review process. It is my testimony that FERC does not follow the scientific method, nor meet the standards to which the scientific community holds itself. FERC's work product, environmental impact statements, on which they base their decisions are incomplete, inaccurate, and unfairly biased in favor of the applicants.

You have heard testimony from Paul Blanch regarding the siting of the AIM Pipeline next to Indian Point Nuclear Power Plant. He testified that FERC has ignored the safety data and permitted Spectra to construct their 42" fracked gas pipeline only 105ft from critical safety infrastructure necessary for the safe operation of the plant, endangering millions who live within its evacuation radius.

That is far from the only evidence they have ignored.

Throughout every impact statement they produce, FERC says that any and all impacts can be mitigated. Yet nowhere does FERC actually measure or accurately report the information necessary to measure those impacts.

When FERC released the draft environmental impact statement on the AIM expansion, it took me 30 minutes of research in the scientific literature outside my field to refute their claims about the impact clear-cutting would have on Blue Mountain Reservation in Westchester County, NY. FERC had clearly ignored or failed to read the relevant scientific literature to inform their conclusions.

Another example of FERC's dereliction involves emissions from gas infrastructure. FERC relies upon self-reported information provided by applicants. Nowhere do they report whether or not they have independently verified that information. The estimates reported are total yearly emissions. These data are useless in determining impacts to human health. The rate at which these emissions are released is critical, yet nowhere is that information reported because that information is never gathered.

As a cancer researcher, I know that the dose makes the poison. If a chemotherapeutic agent is given as a massive bolus, the patient dies. If the agent is dosed periodically over weeks or months, the tumor shrinks and the patient lives. The rate at which gas infrastructure pollutes the air is critical to know and yet completely ignored by FERC.

The emerging scientific literature supports the consensus amongst the scientific community that fracking is harmful for the environment and human health, yet FERC continues to conclude that any harm from fracked gas infrastructure emissions can be mitigated, emissions they neither verify nor properly measure.

Here I have mentioned only three examples, of many, to illustrate the ways in which FERC ignores science to the detriment of the public and the benefit of the fossil fuel industry. Their environmental impact statements do not meet standards for scientific rigor, nor would they pass peer review, as a result the public health and the environment suffer.

Submitted by:
Courtney M. Williams, PhD
Peekskill, NY