

## **2.2 RESPONSES TO VERBAL COMMENTS AT PUBLIC MEETINGS**

This section presents tabular summaries by speaker for verbal comments specific to the draft EIS made at each of the four public comment meetings on the draft EIS (Tables 2.2-1 through 2.2-4). We summarized the speakers' comments based on the text of the comments recorded in the transcripts of the public comment meetings on the draft EIS (the transcripts are available in the Project docket). The tables also include our responses to the comments. For those speakers who also provided their comments in writing, we responded to their comments above in the responses to written comments and did not duplicate their verbal comments in the public comment tables. In addition, we have provided responses to comments provided by technical experts that previously testified to the LNG Task Force in a meeting we had with them on January 16, 2007 (Table 2.2-5).

**Table 2.2-1 - New London Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project  
Mitchell College, New London Connecticut  
January 9, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Jenny Contois	39 to 40	21-25 and 1 and 2	The draft EIS failed to address the approach stewards of the Sound have employed in recent decades.	Section 3.0 of the final EIS has been revised to provide additional information on the restoration efforts for Long Island Sound. The final EIS describes the existing environmental conditions of the Sound relevant to the proposed Project, including the conditions that have resulted from recent restoration efforts, and evaluates the potential for impacts to those conditions. Impacts to the relevant areas of the ecosystems of the Sound are addressed in Sections 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 of the final EIS; impacts to public access are presented in Sections 3.5.5.1 and 3.7.1.4.
	41	6 - 10	Dr. Ralph Lewis, retired Connecticut state geologist, stated that FERC used out-of-date information and discounted seismic activity as a hazard.	Section 3.1 of the final EIS has been revised to address comments provided by Dr. Ralph Lewis during our meeting on January 16, 2007 (as provided in subsection PM-5 of his appendix).
Edward Jutila			State Representative Jutila summarized information in a comment letter submitted by the Harbor Management Commission for the Town of East Lyme.	We have addressed each of these comments on the draft EIS as part to our response to written comments (see our responses to Representative Jutila's written comments for Letter LA-15).
Diana Urban	64 and 65	24 -25 and 1 - 11	Dr. Ralph Lewis and Dr. Roman Zajak provided technical comments on deficiencies of the draft EIS related to geology and sediment	Section 3.1 and Section 3.3 of the final EIS have been revised to address specific comments provided by Dr. Ralph Lewis and Dr. Roman Zajak during our meeting with them on January 16, 2007 (as provided in subsection PM-5 of this appendix).
	65	17 - 20	The fact that the Broadwater proposal has received serious consideration is an insult to every Connecticut resident.	FERC is required to review applications for LNG terminals and natural gas pipelines with regard to need, safety, security, and impacts to the environment.

**Table 2.2-1 - New London Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Mitchell College, New London Connecticut  
January 9, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
John W. Sheehan	67	17 - 22	It appears that the worst-case thermal radiation level extends 3,595 feet from the center of a spill that has ignited.	As summarized in Section 3.10 of the final EIS, thermal hazard model results are presented in Section 1.4 of the WSR (Appendix D of the final EIS).
	68	8 - 23	The EIS needs to include scenarios of loss of steering and throttle control followed by a high-speed grounding, hull rupture, LNG loss, and ignition. This should address impacts if it were to occur at the Race or near highly populated beaches in Connecticut at high tide with an onshore wind in the summer. The analysis should include a determination of the closest point to the beach for an LNG carrier at top speed.	Sections 3.0 and 3.10.4.4 of the final EIS have been revised to address the potential hazards associated with an LNG carrier incident.
	68 and 69	24 - 25 and 1 - 11	The EIS needs to include a scenario of loss of steering and throttle control followed by a high-speed grounding, hull rupture, LNG loss, and ignition offshore of the Millstone Nuclear Power Plant at high tide. The analysis should include a determination of the closest point to the plant for an LNG carrier at top speed.	Section 3.6.2.1.1 of the WSR (Appendix D of the final EIS) addresses the potential grounding of an LNG carrier in the vicinity of the Millstone nuclear plant. As noted in that section, the grounding location of an LNG carrier would be over a mile from the nuclear plant and an LNG fire at the LNG carrier would not reach the nuclear plant.

**Table 2.2-1 - New London Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Mitchell College, New London Connecticut  
January 9, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
John W. Sheehan (continued)	69	16 - 19	Local governments, first responders, and operators of the Millstone Nuclear Plant must have an opportunity to prepare for such an emergency.	If the Project receives initial authorization to proceed, Broadwater would work with federal, state and local agencies to develop a Facility Security Plan as outlined in 33 CFR 101-105 and a Facility Response Plan as outlined in 33 CFR 154. Further FERC would have to approve the Emergency Response Plan developed by Broadwater. Final operation of the facility would not be authorized until these plans were completed and approved.
Robert Bayusik	78	6 - 9	Thanked FERC for its considerable effort and consideration that was put into the draft EIS.	Thank you for your comment.
Kevin Conroy	89 and 90	22 - 25 and 1 - 3	Stated New England Council's support of the findings of FERC in the draft EIS regarding diversification of the natural gas supply and that there will be an increase in price pressure and volatility if the supply of natural gas remains at its current level.	Thank you for your comment.
Emett Pepper	101	11 - 14	FERC ignored disruptions that Broadwater would cause to commercial boaters even though it could take up to 35 minutes for each boat that goes through the Race.	The potential impacts to commercial fishing and commercial shipping are explicitly addressed in Section 3.7.1.4 of the final EIS including the duration and frequency of disruptions to commercial boaters.

**Table 2.2-1 - New London Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Mitchell College, New London Connecticut  
January 9, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Emett Pepper (continued)	101	15 -16	FERC ignored the impact of the presence of armed guards on the social value of Long Island Sound.	The Coast Guard currently provides security escorts to submarines entering and exiting the Sound and enforces other safety and security zones in Long Island Sound. In Section 3.6.5 of the final EIS, we reviewed the existing economic literature to assess potential impacts to property values as an indicator of social value. The available literature, which includes studies related to LNG facilities, suggests that effects do not extend more than a few miles from the facility. As such, the available data do not support the assertion of a potentially significant change in social well being.
	101	17 - 23	FERC ignored the devastating impacts the Project would have on the lobster industry, and financially compensating lobstermen for their losses does not protect lobsters and does not preserve the historic maritime culture.	Sections 3.3 and 3.7.1.4 of the EIS address potential impacts to lobster and commercial lobster fishermen. As described in Sections 3.3 and 3.7.1.4 of the final EIS, implementation of the Project would not result in significant impacts to lobster or to the lobster industry.
	101 and 102	24 - 25 and 1 - 2	FERC ignored the impact of the Project on recreational boaters.	Section 3.5.5.1 of the final EIS has been updated to provide additional information on potential impacts to recreational boaters and fishermen.
	102	3 - 8	FERC ignored air quality impacts, including the deposition of nitrogen, the number two source of nitrogen introduced into the Sound. Stated that it is unacceptable to put off the assessment of air emissions.	Section 3.9.1 of the final EIS provides an extensive overview on potential air quality impacts of the proposed Project, including quantification of nitrogen emissions, and the various measures to be implemented to minimize potential air quality impacts.

**Table 2.2-1 - New London Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Mitchell College, New London Connecticut  
January 9, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Emett Pepper (continued)	102	9 - 13	FERC ignored the financial impact to the public and to the tax base, including the "veiled costs" of cost sharing.	Section 3.6 of the EIS addresses the potential economic impacts of the proposed Project. As stated in Section 6.2.3.2 of the WSR (Appendix D of the final EIS), Section 311 of the EPAct requires that a "cost sharing plan" be included in the emergency response plan. The extent to which Broadwater would fund the costs incurred by state and local agencies would be established during development of the emergency response plan and stipulated in the "Cost Sharing Plan" portion of the document. A similar approach would be taken for the security plan. If funding agreements cannot be developed to the satisfaction of the participating agencies and Broadwater, and if the needed resources are not available, FERC would not authorize operation of the Project.
	102	14 - 19	The draft EIS is based more on political science than environmental science and not great political science because FERC received over 55,000 names on petitions and ignored the public sentiment, public opinion, and public good.	Our environmental review has focused on the technical merits of the Project. This review was conducted in by experienced scientists, engineers, and planners with input provided by numerous other agencies and their staff. The final EIS has been updated to incorporate scientific information provided by technical experts from federal and state resource agencies, academia, non-governmental organizations, and the public. We believe that the final EIS openly and accurately addresses all relevant potential impacts.

**Table 2.2-1 - New London Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)**

**Mitchell College, New London Connecticut  
January 9, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Donald Landers	104 and 105	24 - 25 and 1 - 2	FERC's conclusions on environmental impacts are unfounded and based on limited, simplistic survey data and nonexistent statistical analyses.	Please see the previous response.
	105	3 - 7	Deficiencies in the draft EIS were noted by experts at the Long Island Task Force meeting. They found the draft EIS to be sloppy and rushed.	The final EIS has incorporated comments provided by the local experts at our meeting on January 16, 2007 (as summarized in subsection PM-5 of this appendix).
	105	8 - 14	The draft EIS has little in it regarding the impacts of invasive species that could arrive in ballast water or on the hulls of LNG carriers arriving from foreign ports.	Section 3.2.3.2 of the final EIS has been expanded to further assess the potential for invasive species. It should be noted that it is not likely that the LNG carriers would be discharging ballast water in Long Island Sound.
	105	15 - 23	It is not clear why Broadwater is moving forward since Islander East was denied a water quality certificate by the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection due to sediment disruption.	The two projects would affect different benthic habitats and resources.
	105 and 106	24 -25 and 1 - 7	FERC should reexamine alternatives to consider the two newly approved LNG terminals in Massachusetts; expansion of the Algonquin, Texas Eastern, and Maritimes and Northeast pipelines; and pipelines in the Atlantic Ocean or in appropriate areas of Long Island sound.	Information on these potential alternatives has been updated in Section 4.0 of the final EIS.

**Table 2.2-1 - New London Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Mitchell College, New London Connecticut  
January 9, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Donald Landers (continued)	106	11 - 14	The safety analysis is based on flawed assumptions in modeling since it is an untried design in a body of water of national significance surrounded by tens of millions of people.	While the proposed combination of technologies has not been used in a single offshore terminal, the separate LNG receiving, storage, regasification, and send-out technologies are proven. As stated in the EIS, regulations, industry standards, and classification society rules will govern the safe design, construction, and operation of the FSRU.
	106	22 - 25	Hopes that regulatory agencies from Connecticut are included in the final EIS consultation.	Although the state of Connecticut does not have regulatory authority for the proposed Project, we have received comments on the draft EIS from several state and local agencies in Connecticut. We have responded to those comments in this appendix and have revised the final EIS where appropriate in response to those comments.

**Table 2.2-2 - Smithtown Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project  
Smithtown West High School, Smithtown, New York  
January 10, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Harris Wiener (representing Congressman Steve Israel)	26	2 - 8	Because the Broadwater Project has a unique design, the associated environmental effects are unknown.	The basic design components of the proposed Broadwater project are well established and the associated environmental effects are identified throughout Section 3.0 of the final EIS.
	26	9 - 13	Local scientists have stated that the impact of the Project on marine life has been underestimated in the draft EIS.	The final EIS has been revised to address comments on the draft EIS provided by academia, the general public, and federal, state, and local agency representatives.
Peter Maniscalco	88 and 89	20 - 24 and 1 - 3	The spirituality of Long Island Sound has not been addressed in the draft EIS as requested during the scoping process.	FERC has conducted an environmental review in accordance with NEPA guidelines.
Megan Smith	117 and 118	18 - 24 and 1 - 11	Independent experts on Long Island Sound have reviewed the draft EIS and have found substantial holes in the research, as well as missing quantitative data and impacts.	The final EIS, especially Sections 3.1 and 3.3, has been revised to address comments provided by the local experts that testified before the Connecticut LNG Task Force based on our meeting with them on January 16, 2007. In addition, our specific responses to their technical comments are provided in subsection PM-5 of this appendix.
Jason Kulzik	119	19 - 20	Scientists have labeled the draft EIS as incomplete, at best.	As noted above, the final EIS has been revised to address comments provided by the experts based on our meeting on January 16, 2007 and our responses to their technical comments are provided in subsection PM-5 of this appendix.

**Table 2.2-2 - Smithtown Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Smithtown West High School, Smithtown, New York  
January 10, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Marge Acosta	171	7 - 15	The EIS should assure the public that the fragile balance of Long Island Sound would not be significantly injured by the dredging 25 miles of pipeline and the thousands of square feet disturbed by the footings and anchorage of the facility.	As stated in Sections 3.2.3 (water resources), 3.3.1.2 (benthic resources), 3.3.2.2 (fisheries), 3.3.3 (fisheries of special concern), 3.3.4.2 (marine mammals), 3.3.5.2 (avian species), and 3.4 (threatened and endangered species) of the final EIS, construction and operation of the Project would result in a minor environmental impact with incorporation of our recommendations to minimize the extent and duration of seafloor disturbance. As discussed in Section 3.1.2.2 of the final EIS, Broadwater proposes the use of subsea plowing as the primary method for pipe laying and installation.
	171	16 - 21	The EIS should address whether or not the intake of water from Long Island Sound and the discharge of water into foreign waters result in some residual water being mixed and bringing foreign species into the Sound.	As described in Section 3.2.3.2, LNG carriers would be required to exchange ballast water 200 nautical miles offshore in accordance with international and federal shipping requirements. In addition, no discharge of ballast water from LNG carriers would be expected in Long Island Sound, since the LNG carriers would not need to reduce ballast water during or following offloading their LNG cargo.

**Table 2.2-3 - Shoreham Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project**

**Albert G. Prodell Middle School, Shoreham, New York  
January 11, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Richard Ampro	56	1 - 12	The draft EIS states that the Project is "an environmentally sound action."	The Executive Summary of the final EIS states that "If the proposed Project is found to be consistent with the public interest and is constructed and operated in accordance with Broadwater's proposed mitigation methods and the mitigation measures recommended by FERC and Coast Guard, we conclude that it would result in limited adverse environmental impacts."
	57	3 - 11	The draft EIS states that the water temperature around the facility would increase by 3.6 degree Fahrenheit. Such an increase in temperature would have an effect on the environmentally sensitive Sound.	As discussed in Section 3.2.3.2 of the final EIS, discharges from the FSRU would not influence water temperatures. Broadwater estimates that the cooling water from the 150,000-m3 steam-powered LNG carrier would initially be 19.4°F higher than ambient water temperatures but would approximate ambient conditions within 75 feet of discharge (within 1°F) and would readily comply with NYSDEC thermal water quality criteria. The thermal plume would rise upward and outward from the carrier hull, equilibrating as it mixes with cooler ambient water. Impacts to marine resources (including lobster) are not expected.
Adrienne Esposito	62 and 63	13 - 24 and 1 - 21	The draft EIS did not seriously discuss alternatives, particularly offshore alternatives such as the proposed projects in Massachusetts that do deny public access.	At the time the draft EIS was issued, both projects were being reviewed by the Coast Guard, the State of Massachusetts, and other regulatory review agencies. Both projects have since been approved. Section 4.3.2 of the final EIS has been revised to provide further discussion on our evaluation of the Northeast Gateway and Neptune Projects as alternatives to the proposed Project.

**Table 2.2-3 - Shoreham Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Albert G. Prodell Middle School, Shoreham, New York  
January 11, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Adrienne Esposito (continued)	63 and 64	22 - 23 and 1 - 12	Claims that the draft EIS states that there are "no environmental impacts" and compares that statement to the impacts associated with the offshore proposals in Massachusetts.	As described throughout Section 3.0 of the final EIS, we identified primarily minor impacts associated with the construction and operation of the proposed Project, with some impacts considered moderate. In Section 4.0, we compared those impacts to the impacts of alternatives that could meet the purpose and need of the proposed Project and determined that the Project would have fewer environmental impacts than the alternatives considered.
Bill Crain	87	8 - 20	The draft EIS assesses impacts by first stating what could happen, then assessing impacts likely to happen and comparing them to what could happen, and also comparing impacts in the Project area to the size of Long Island Sound. That approach is not acceptable.	The EIS has been prepared in accordance with NEPA requirements.
John Frank	90	12 - 13	Broadwater does not plan to backfill the pipeline trench.	As described in Section 3.1.2.2 of the final EIS, Broadwater did not propose to backfill the entire pipeline trench. Therefore, we have included a recommendation in Section 3.1.2.2 that Broadwater backfill the entire trench.

**Table 2.2-3 - Shoreham Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Albert G. Prodell Middle School, Shoreham, New York  
January 11, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
John Frank (continued)	93	5 - 7	Several long-established boat races would be forced to find another course.	Potential impacts to and mitigation measures for recreational boating, including regattas, are described in Section 3.5.5. As a result of the mitigation measures described in Section 3.5.5 of the final EIS, regattas are unlikely to be impacted by an LNG carrier transit.
	92 and 93	21 - 24 and 1 - 5	The Project would put commercial fishermen out of business or force them to move since the Coast Guard would keep all boats almost three quarters of a mile from the plant and the carriers.	Section 3.6.8 of the final EIS addresses potential economic impacts to commercial fishermen and describes Broadwater's commitment to establish compensation agreements for commercial lobster and trawl fishermen displaced from their usual fishing grounds within the fixed safety and security zone. In addition, Broadwater has committed to establishing a mechanism whereby fishermen can receive compensation for damage to fishing gear due to project implementation.  As described in Section 3.7.1.4 of the final EIS, any losses associated with temporary displacement of fishermen while a LNG carrier passes would be minor because only a small portion of the transit path of an LNG carrier would be an exclusion zone at any one time, not the entire route. All other unrestricted portions of the Sound, including the area in front of, behind, and adjacent to a carrier's safety and security zone, would be available for use. Further, as described in Section 3.7.1.4 of the final EIS, the amount of time for the LNG carrier and associated safety and security zone to pass any single point would be about 15 minutes. If the Coast Guard issues a Letter of Recommendation finding the Project Waterway to be suitable for LNG marine traffic, as part of the proposed moving safety and security zone the Coast Guard would conduct routine Broadcast Notice to Mariners, notifying the public of implementation of the safety and security zones and the impending LNG carrier transit.

**Table 2.2-3 - Shoreham Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Albert G. Prodehl Middle School, Shoreham, New York  
January 11, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
John Frank (continued)	93	11 - 12	The FSRU would have a 282-foot high tower to burn off extra gas.	The flare stack would not be used to burn off extra gas; it would only be used in emergency situations where natural gas needed to be vented safely from the FSRU.
	93	16 - 19	Homeland Security will probably require a permanent no-fly zone over a large area near the FSRU.	As stated in both the WSR (Section 8.4.2 in Appendix D of the final EIS) and the final EIS (Section 3.5.2.2), if the Project is authorized by FERC, the Coast Guard would coordinate with the Transportation Safety Administration (TSA) and FAA to determine what, if any, flight restrictions should be put in place for the FSRU or the LNG carriers. However, the FAA generally establishes no-fly zones in response to specific threats or problems and generally does not establish no-fly zones around energy facilities such as oil or petroleum product storage tank areas, oil platforms, or nuclear plants. If the FAA determines that flight restrictions are appropriate, FERC would require that they be in place before operation of the Project is authorized.

**Table 2.2-3 - Shoreham Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Albert G. Prodell Middle School, Shoreham, New York  
January 11, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Phil Cardinale (Supervisor, Town of Riverhead)	96	7 - 23	The Project's emergency response plan and security plan would require that the Town of Riverhead provide resources that it does not have and cannot afford, and taxpayers should not have to pay the bill for security. The plans are unworkable.	<p>As stated in Section 6.2.3.2 of the WSR, Section 311 of the Energy Policy Act requires that a "cost sharing plan" be included in the emergency response plan. The extent to which Broadwater does or does not fund costs incurred by state and local agencies would be confirmed during development of the emergency response plan, and would be stipulated in the "Cost Sharing Plan" portion of the document. If funding agreements cannot be developed to the satisfaction of the participating agencies and Broadwater, FERC would not authorize Project construction.</p> <p>If the Project receives initial authorization to proceed, Broadwater would work with federal, state and local agencies to develop a Facility Security Plan as outlined in 33 CFR 101-105 and a Facility Response Plan as outlined in 33 CFR 154. Further FERC would have to approve the Emergency Response Plan developed by Broadwater. Final operation of the facility would not be authorized until these plans were completed and approved.</p>

**Table 2.2-3 - Shoreham Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Albert G. Prodel Middle School, Shoreham, New York  
January 11, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Phil Cardinale (continued)	97	2 - 11	The Project is inconsistent with the Town of Riverhead's plan for management of its coastlines and its waterways, the Town's draft plan for waterfront revitalization, and the Town's vision as a gateway to the recreational resources of the East End of Long Island.	Broadwater submitted a coastal consistency certification to NYSDOS and to FERC that contains Broadwater's analysis of the Project's consistency with New York State coastal policies, including applicable policies of the Long Island Sound CMP and the applicable local land management plans. It is our understanding that NYSDOS will file its determination with FERC after the final EIS has been issued.
James Mead	150	3 - 8	The draft EIS states that the YMS would be designed to withstand a Category 5 hurricane, but the wind speeds listed are those of a Category 3 hurricane.	The wind speeds reported in Section 3.10.2.3 of the EIS are accurate, but the scales differ between the design criteria (100-year storm) and hurricane category. As stated in Section 3.10.2.3 of the final EIS and in Section 4.3.5 of the WSR (Appendix D of the final EIS), the design basis for the YMS is the 100-year storm (based on 1-hour average speeds) and the Saffir-Simpson hurricane scale is based on 1-minute averages. Thus the 1-hour average speeds provided for a 100-year storm event are in excess of a Category 5 hurricane.
	150	9 - 16	The draft EIS does not include information regarding consultation with the National Weather Service regarding wind speeds and there is no information regarding the FSRU and the influence of wind speed.	As noted above, the YMS has been designed to withstand the forces of a Category 5 hurricane, and therefore, the FSRU would not be adversely affected by storms of magnitudes up to and including a Category 5 hurricane. The wind speed information presented in the EIS is from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

**Table 2.2-3 - Shoreham Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Albert G. Prodehl Middle School, Shoreham, New York  
January 11, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
James Mead (continued)	152 and 153	1 - 24 and 1 - 6	The Leidy to Long Island Expansion project should be considered an alternative to Broadwater since it would not have a significant environmental impact, and the Safe Harbor Project should also be considered an alternative since it has fewer environmental impacts and provides twice the volume of gas as Broadwater.	Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 of the final EIS have been updated to present an environmental impact assessment of those alternatives based on the most current available information the projects.
	153 and 153	12 - 24 and 1 - 8	Information in the draft EIS on need for an increase in the supply of natural gas to the New York metropolitan area is speculative at best.	As described in Section 1.1 of the final EIS, there is a general consensus that the demand for natural gas in the region is expected to increase due to a combination of increasing demand from electrical generators, increasing population, and increasing per capita energy consumption. At the same time, net pipeline imports, primarily from Canada, are expected to decrease substantially. Section 1.1 of the final EIS has been updated with additional information on recent studies on regional energy needs.

**Table 2.2-4 - Branford Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project  
Branford High School, Branford, Connecticut  
January 16, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Paul Palmento (for Congressman Chris Shays)	34 and 35	24 - 25 and 1 - 3	The hydrodynamics of Long Island Sound are unique and information available on FSRUs may not be of much value when applied to the Sound	As described in Section 3.10.2, the proposed FSRU and YMS have been designed to readily withstand the hydrodynamic and meteorological characteristics of Long Island Sound.
Patricia Widlitz (State Representative)	37	6 - 10	Scientists of the Undersea Research Center at Avery Point have raised significant concerns as to the adequacy of the scientific information on which the draft EIS is based	Sections 3.1 and 3.3 of the final EIS have been revised to address comments provided by scientists of the Undersea Research Center at Avery Point. In addition, this text has been updated to incorporate benthic surveys conducted by representatives of the Undersea Research Center along portions of the pipeline route in 2007.
	37 and 38	24 - 25 and 1 - 3	Save the Sound's alternatives analysis identified other energy sources available to meet the needs of the region and these should be investigated further.	Sections 1.1 and 4.2 of the final EIS address the alternative energy issues identified by Save the Sound.
Jack Dooley	67	7 - 10	Many of the legends in the charts and graphs are almost impossible to read due to the small type and the clarity of the type.	Thank you for your comment. The figures in the final EIS have been updated and made easier to read.
Joseph Schnierlein	71 and 72	23 - 25 and 1 - 5	The exposed, heated pipeline would increase the frequency and duration of hypoxic events and remove cooler, deeper waters that fish retreat to during hypoxic events.	Broadwater had proposed to allow the trench to backfill naturally. The recommendation in Section 3.1.2.2 of the final EIS requires that the trench be actively backfilled which would result in no increase in the temperature of the overlying water column above the subsea pipeline, and therefore would not influence hypoxia.

**Table 2.2-4 - Branford Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)**

**Branford High School, Branford, Connecticut  
January 16, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Joseph Schnierlein (continued)	72	6 - 16	Water warmed by the Project pipeline would rise and increase the temperature of the surface water. That would create a land and air circulation pattern that would be different than what normally takes place on summer days. It would also affect the vertical migration of plankton.	As discussed in Section 3.2.3.2 of the final, the FSRU and the subsea pipeline would not influence water temperatures, and the pipeline riser at the YMS would not influence water temperature more than 4 feet from the riser itself. Discharges of LNG carriers would be comparable to other large commercial vessels and would comply with state thermal requirements within 75 feet of the discharge point. Thus, the proposed Project would not warm the waters of Long Island Sound in general, nor affect the vertical migration of plankton or influence weather patterns.
	72 and 73	17 - 24 and 1 - 3	The draft EIS does not mention the record catch of oysters in 1992 and address the importance of oysters as a food source, particularly if avian flu or mad cow disease influence food sources in the area.	We recognize that oysters are an important food source and are important to the economy of the Long Island Sound area. However, as described in Section 3.3.1.2 of the final EIS, construction and operation of the Project would not have an adverse effect on oyster populations. Therefore, we have not expanded the discussion of oysters as a biological or commercial resource.
	73	4 - 10	The draft EIS doesn't address the diadromous species in Connecticut that have recovered or the catadromous and anadromous species and the effect on them of the discharges and the increase in temperature.	Section 3.3.2.2 of the final EIS describes the potential impacts to all finfish species within Long Island Sound, including species such as the alewife, American eel, blueback herring, and sea-run brown trout. As stated in the final EIS, the primary impact to finfish species would be entrainment/impingement. Based on the scientific data we reviewed, the expected impingement/entrainment of ichthyoplankton would total less than 0.1 percent of the estimated total ichthyoplankton stock in the central basin of Long Island Sound. As a result, there would be a negligible long-term impact on ichthyoplankton and, therefore, on the general fisheries resources of the Sound.

**Table 2.2-4 - Branford Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Branford High School, Branford, Connecticut  
January 16, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Lonnie Reed	74	16 - 17	In the draft EIS, the Coast Guard's WSR is being spun as an approval of Broadwater.	In the final EIS, we objectively summarize the results of the Coast Guard's detailed analysis of the current uses of Long Island Sound and the effect of the proposed use by the Broadwater Project, primarily Sections 3.7 and 3.10. In addition, we provide the WSR in Appendix D of the final EIS. The Coast Guard determined that use of the waterway by the LNG carriers is consistent with current use and that the addition of LNG carriers would be manageable with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures. That finding does not signify that the Coast Guard approves of the proposed Project and we do not imply that in the EIS.
	75	19 - 24	The draft EIS has been called sloppy and flawed by some respected scientists and the five FERC commissioners should take control of the EIS and rewrite it.	The final EIS, especially Sections 3.1 and 3.3, has been revised to address comments provided by the local experts. For additional information please see our summary of our meeting with them on January 16, 2007 (as provided in subsection PM-5 of this appendix).
Kiki Kennedy	149	1 - 4	The EIS should present a complete analysis of the worst-case accident scenario in the Race as a part of emergency response planning.	Section 3.0, especially 3.10, of the final EIS has been updated to describe potential impacts of an accident including a release of LNG. If the Project receives initial authorization to proceed, prior to initiation of construction the Coast Guard would coordinate with state and local agencies to develop an emergency response plan (see Section 6.2 of the WSR and Section 3.10.6 of the final EIS). If the necessary resources are not available and are not properly funded, FERC would not provide the additional approval needed to operate the Project.

**Table 2.2-4 - Branford Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)**

**Branford High School, Branford, Connecticut  
January 16, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Kiki Kennedy (continued)	149	14 - 20	Scientific experts working for the Long Island Sound Task Force described the draft EIS as sloppy, incomplete, and glossed over, and they asserted that there was not enough data provided to reach any conclusions about the environmental impact.	As stated above, the final EIS, especially Sections 3.1 and 3.3, has been revised to address comments provided by the local experts. For additional information please see our summary of our meeting with them on January 16, 2007 (as provided in subsection PM-5 of this appendix)
Moshe Gai	157 and 158	23 - 25 and 1 - 2	The draft EIS and the WSR hid the need for a no-fly zone for the Project	As stated in Section 8.4.2 of the WSR (Appendix D) and Section 3.5.2.2 of the final EIS, if the Project is authorized by FERC, the Coast Guard would coordinate with the FAA to determine what, if any, flight restrictions should be put in place for the FSRU or the LNG carriers. However, the FAA generally establishes no-fly zones in response to specific threats or problems and generally does not establish no-fly zones around energy facilities such as oil or petroleum product storage tank areas, oil platforms, or nuclear plants.
Gary Perdo	165 and 166	23 - 25 and 1 - 5	A water spout occurred in the Sound but was not assessed as hazard. The EIS should address water spouts.	Section 3.2.1.2 of the final EIS has been revised to discuss water spouts.
Carmela Cuomo	179	12 - 22	The draft EIS does not meet any rigorous scientific criteria. It lacks substance and most records used are out of date. The more recent ones are misinterpreted and incorrectly applied. Much of the "science" that's quoted is from large-scale generalizations about marine systems.	The EIS was prepared, in cooperation with federal and state resource agencies, by experienced scientists, engineers, and planners in compliance with NEPA guidelines, CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA, and FERC's regulations for implementing NEPA. We believe that the final EIS openly and accurately addresses all relevant potential impacts.

**Table 2.2-4 - Branford Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)**

**Branford High School, Branford, Connecticut  
January 16, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Carmela Cuomo (continued)	180	2 - 4	The draft EIS shows a complete misunderstanding of hypoxia, sediment chemistry, and benthic sediment geological dynamics.	The authors of the EIS have a complete understanding of hypoxia, However, as required by CEQ, the EIS is written in plain language in order to convey information to a broad audience with varying familiarity with and understanding of science. Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the final EIS have been revised to provide additional information on hypoxia and sediment chemistry as they relate to potential impacts of the proposed Broadwater project.
	180	4 - 7	Organisms are considered independent of their ecological framework which is contrary to the NOAA ecosystems-based management mandates.	In accordance with NEPA, the standard EIS structure includes assessing impacts on a resource by resource basis.
	180	8 - 12	The effects of sediment disruption are minimized repeatedly, and the conclusions reached are based on observational data, not hard data, on the Iroquois Pipeline.	Section 3.3.1.2 of the final EIS has been revised to further address potential impacts to benthic habitats. In addition, the revised text presents supplemental information from post-construction monitoring reports for several similar pipeline projects, including the Iroquois Pipeline.
	180	13 - 18	Although there is no agreement among benthic scientists as to how long recovery would take in the Sound, the draft EIS repeatedly stated that recovery would take 6 months, or 1 to 2 years, or 3 years. There is no scientific evidence for the conclusions	Please see response above.
	180	23 - 24	The draft EIS underestimated the amount of sediment disturbance.	Section 3.1.2 of the final EIS has been updated to include a more definitive estimate of the extent and duration of sediment disturbance.

**Table 2.2-4 - Branford Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)**

**Branford High School, Branford, Connecticut  
January 16, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Carmela Cuomo (continued)	180 and 181	24 - 24 and 1 - 4	The draft EIS did not show a good understanding of the recent history of the Sound and did not cite the tremendous volume of literature published in the past 7 years, particularly regarding the lobster die off.	The final EIS has been updated to reflect the current literature on Long Island Sound including studies conducted and published after the draft EIS was completed. This has included updating the discussion of lobster biology in Long Island Sound based on recent work conducted by resource agencies and academia (see Section 3.3.1 of the final EIS).
	181	8 - 11	The draft EIS does not address the impact of the Project-related temperature change on lobster.	As described in Section 3.3.1.2 of the final EIS, the potential impacts of the proposed Project on lobster populations has been updated, and concludes that any highly localized temperature increase associated with the proposed Project would have a negligible impact on lobster populations (if any).
	181	12 - 18	Hard data, the models used, specifics on sampling, and statistical analyses are missing from the draft EIS. The draft EIS is not scientific and it's an insult.	The EIS was prepared, in cooperation with federal and state resource agencies, by experienced scientists, engineers, and planners in compliance with NEPA guidelines, CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA, and FERC's regulations for implementing NEPA. We believe that the final EIS openly and accurately addresses all relevant potential impacts.
	181 and 182	25 and 1 - 4	None of the people who prepared the draft EIS are active researchers in or experts on Long Island Sound and the draft EIS reflects their lack of understanding of the Sound.	The final EIS was prepared by scientists, engineers and planners with expertise in marine biology, geosciences, social sciences, and the requirements of NEPA. In addition, the document was reviewed by independent experts from academia, non-governmental organizations, and representatives from federal, state, and local resource agencies that represent a diverse and knowledgeable cross-section of local expertise on Long Island Sound.

**Table 2.2-4 - Branford Public Meeting**

**Responses to Oral Comments on the  
Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
for the Proposed Broadwater LNG Project (continued)  
Branford High School, Branford, Connecticut  
January 16, 2007**

Name	Transcript		Summary of Comment	Response
	Page No.	Lines		
Carmela Cuomo (continued)	182	5 - 9	More research and work and assessment needs to be done before this even qualifies as a scientifically based draft EIS; it is completely inadequate for assessment of the environmental impact of the Project on this area.	As noted above, the EIS was prepared by scientists, engineers, and planners in compliance with NEPA guidelines, CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA, and FERC's regulations for implementing NEPA. We believe that the final EIS openly and accurately addresses all relevant potential impacts.
Roger Lowlicht	194	20 - 23	The draft EIS does not include information from people like Chuck Pareau from Yale who is an expert in disasters	Section 3.10 and the WSR (Appendix D) in the final EIS incorporate extensive literature on potential accidents that represent the most updated and technically-valid information available on potential problems associated with weather, geology, maritime accidents, and LNG releases and fires (including accidental and intentional releases.).
	195	10 - 16	The draft EIS should address the impacts of the worst-case scenario of the FSRU breaking free and drifting into New Haven Harbor, blowing up, and hitting the oil rigs.	If the Project were authorized, the Coast Guard would work with the appropriate state and local agencies to develop an emergency response plan that would address a wide variety of abnormal operating conditions, including breakaway of the FSRU. Each resource subsection of Section 3.0 of the final EIS has been updated to describe the potential impacts of credible incidents associated with LNG releases. However, we do not consider the scenario described by the commentor as credible based on the measures identified in the final EIS (Section 3.10 and Appendix D) and the bathymetry and hydrology of Long Island Sound.

**Table 2.2-5 - January 16, 2007 Connecticut Meeting Summary**

**Summary of Technical Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Broadwater LNG Project Provided in the January 16, 2007 Connecticut meeting**

<b>COMMENTOR</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
Dr. Ralph Lewis	Geologic setting needs to be expanded, especially associated with bedrock, coastal geology, glacial geology, post-glacial geology, and geologic and seismic history.	Section 3.1.1.1 of the final EIS has been updated to more thoroughly discuss these geologic issues.
Dr. Ralph Lewis	Geologic setting needs to cite more technical and updated references, such as Lewis 1995, Lewis and DeGiacomo Cohen, JCR, Stone et al., and the Bedrock Geologic Map of Connecticut.	More recent work in the Long Island Sound was reviewed and Section 3.1.1.1 of the final EIS has been updated as appropriate to incorporate relevant information from the sources identified by Dr. Lewis as well as other current literature.
Dr. Ralph Lewis	The potential existence of a rift basin under Long Island Sound needs to be described and the potential complications to the proposed Project.	Section 3.1.1.1 of the final EIS has been updated to more thoroughly describe the potential occurrence of a rift basin under Long Island Sound.
Dr. Ralph Lewis	The correct delineation between the central basin and the eastern basin needs to be identified (Mattiuck Sill).	Thank you. The delineation has been corrected in the final EIS.
Dr. Ralph Lewis	Eliminate the mention of both basalt and marble mining in Long Island Sound since there are no basalt or marble outcrops in Long Island Sound.	The EIS does not mention "basalt," and the text associated with the "Dolomitic Marble Quarry No. 1" identified by USGS in Long Island Sound has been omitted from the final EIS since it could confuse the reader and is not germane to environmental review of the proposed Project.
Dr. Ralph Lewis	Provide a better description of the potential for gas deposits in Long Island Sound since their potential occurrence could influence the substrate support of the pipeline.	Section 3.1.1.1 of the final EIS has been revised to further describe the potential occurrence of gas deposits based on mapping for Long Island Sound, which indicated there were no substantial gas deposits in the vicinity of the proposed YMS or pipeline.
Dr. Peter Auster	The EIS discussion of sound impacts on marine mammals was cursory.	The discussion of underwater noise has been expanded in the final EIS including Sections 3.3.2.2 (fish), 3.3.4.2 (marine mammals), and 3.4.1 (threatened and endangered species). These discussions include information on potential noise levels during construction and operation, potential impacts, and potential threshold levels and mitigation measures to minimize potential impacts.
Dr. Peter Auster	The organization of the biological section is confusing by discussing fish separately from marine mammals.	The general structure of Environmental Impact Statements is determined by FERC and the Broadwater EIS, including the biology sections, was prepared following the general organization for FERC EISs.

**Table 2.2-5 - January 16, 2007 Connecticut Meeting Summary**

**Summary of Technical Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Broadwater LNG Project Provided in the January 16, 2007 Connecticut meeting (continued)**

<b>COMMENTOR</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>RESPONSE</b>
Dr. Peter Auster	There needs to be a better discussion of potential noise impacts to fish.	Section 3.3.2 of the final EIS has been revised to include more detailed information regarding potential noise impacts to fish.
Dr. Peter Auster	Characterization of the benthic community should not be based on video surveys.	As discussed in the Section 3.3.1.1 of the EIS, the benthic community is not characterized based on the video survey. The benthic characterization was explicitly based on site-specific sampling and existing literature. The results of the video survey were explicitly provided in the EIS as anecdotal observations.
Dr. Peter Auster	There is no mention of cold water corals or sponge communities, or biological communities associated with slopes or shell piles.	Section 3.3.1 of the final EIS have been revised to include information regarding coral and sponge communities within Long Island Sound including recent EPA surveys conducted in the vicinity of the proposed Project (EPA 2007).
Dr. Peter Auster	There is no mention of the "chumming" effect that plowing would have on the fisheries.	The sub-sea plow moves at such a slow speed (one to two miles per day) that mobile organisms would be expected to readily avoid contact with pipeline installation equipment and spoil sidecasting activities. Some less mobile fish species or lifestages could be killed or injured due to the plow. However, any opportunistic species that would come to the area to feed on dead or injured species would also be expected to avoid the plow.
Dr. Peter Auster	Describe the potential for invasive species from foreign ships.	As stated in Section 3.2.3.2 of the final EIS, LNG carriers would not discharge ballast water into Long Island Sound; thus, there would not be any vector for invasive species via LNG carrier ballast.
Dr. Peter Auster	Why does the pipeline need to be buried?	Section 3.1.2.2 of the final EIS has been revised to explain that pipeline burial is preferred by the NYSDEC and required by USDOl.
Dr. Roman Zajac	There needs to be a more thorough discussion of benthic recovery.	Section 3.3.1.2 of the final EIS has been revised to include additional information regarding benthic recovery.
Dr. Roman Zajac	There needs to be a more thorough discussion of benthic species and communities present.	Section 3.3.1.1 of the final EIS has been revised to include additional information regarding benthic communities in the vicinity of the proposed YMS and pipeline.

**Table 2.2-5 - January 16, 2007 Connecticut Meeting Summary**

**Summary of Technical Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Broadwater LNG Project Provided in the January 16, 2007 Connecticut meeting (continued)**

COMMENTOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Dr. Roman Zajac	Invasive species could become established on the imported rock substrate and other hard surfaces associated with the Project	Section 3.3.1.2 of the final EIS has been revised to describe the potential for invasive species to utilize imported hard substrate, and we have included a recommendation for Broadwater, in coordination with appropriate federal and state resource agencies, to minimize substrate conversion associated with backfilling the trench.
Dr. Roman Zajac	Invasive species could become established on the FSRU and YMS due to the higher temperatures.	Section 3.2.3.2 of the final EIS has been updated to discuss potential impacts of warmer water at the pipeline riser as it could relate to nuisance organisms. Operation of the FSRU itself would not influence water temperatures.