

3.0 GENERAL COMMENTS RECEIVED

In this section we have identified general comments we received regarding the proposed Broadwater Project. The issues raised were not specific to the draft EIS but identified general environmental and safety concerns. We identified 23 general environmental or safety issues that were commonly raised in the written and verbal comments as summarized in Table 3.0-1. In Table 3.0-1, we identify the sections of the final EIS that address these issues. Each issue presented in Table 3.0-1 is numbered to correspond to the list of general comments received by these commentors.

Table 3.0-1 – Summary of Key Concerns in Comment Letters Regarding the Broadwater LNG Project

**Table 3.0-1
Summary of Key Concerns in Comment Letters
Regarding the Broadwater LNG Project¹**

Issue #	Summary of Concerns Stated in Letters	Sections of the Final EIS and/or the WSR² That Address the Issues Listed
1	More energy is not needed, especially not more fossil fuel	Final EIS, Section 1.0
2	There are other sources of LNG and natural gas that could provide the needed natural gas to the region without Broadwater as well as other energy sources, such as renewable energy.	Final EIS, Section 4.0
3	Broadwater's statement that the Project would save consumers \$300 to \$400 per year isn't accurate and FERC shouldn't base its decision on that estimate.	Savings to consumers is not a component of the NEPA environmental review process; the draft and final EISs did not address that issue.
4	The Broadwater Project would adversely impact the long-term plans for cleanup of Long Island Sound and the cleanup work already completed for the Sound.	Final EIS, Section 3.0
5	Pipeline installation would disturb the benthic habitat and resources, especially lobsters	Final EIS, Sections 3.1.2.2, 3.3.1.2, and 3.3.2.2
6	Water intakes for the Project would kill biological resources, especially fish eggs and larvae	Final EIS, Section 3.3.2.2
7	The Broadwater Project would pollute Long Island Sound, raise water temperature, and have major environmental impacts.	Final EIS, Sections 3.2.3, 3.3.1.2, and 3.3.2.2
8	Underwater noise from the Project would impact biological resources, such as fish, marine mammals, and sea turtles	Final EIS, Sections 3.3.2.2, 3.3.4.2, and 3.4.1
9	LNG carrier traffic could impact biological resources, such as marine mammals and Threatened and Endangered species.	Final EIS, Sections 3.3.2.2, 3.3.4.2, and 3.4.1
10	The FSRU and LNG carriers would impact visual resources.	Final EIS, Section 3.5.6
11	An industrial facility should not be placed in Long island Sound since it could serve as a precedent for further industrialization of the Sound.	Final EIS, Section 3.5.2.2

¹ The concerns listed are summaries of the issues stated in letters submitted to FERC after issuance of the draft EIS (November 16, 2006) and that did not specifically address the draft EIS. Table 3.1-1 lists the authors of the letters and issues included in each letter.

² The WSR is the U.S. Coast Guard's report entitled *U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port of Long Island Sound Waterways Suitability Report for the Proposed Broadwater Liquefied Natural Gas Facility* issued September 21, 2006 and included as Appendix C to the final EIS.

Table 3.0-1 – Summary of Key Concerns in Comment Letters Regarding the Broadwater LNG Project

**Table 3.0-1
Summary of Key Concerns in Comment Letters
Regarding the Broadwater LNG Project³ (continued)**

Issue #	Summary of Concerns Stated in Letters	Sections of the Final EIS and/or the WSR⁴ That Address the Issues Listed
12	Broadwater would adversely impact commercial fishing, recreational fishing, the seafood industry, and tourism.	Final EIS, Sections 3.5.5.1, 3.6.8, and 3.7.1.4
13	The Project would limit public access to the Sound, violates the public trust doctrine ⁵ , and is not consistent with the New York State Coastal Zone Management Program and state and local land use plans.	Final EIS, Sections 3.5.5.2 and 3.5.7
14	Broadwater would be costly to the public, including higher taxes and lower property values.	Final EIS, Sections 3.6.5, 3.6.6, and 3.6.7
15	Emissions from the Broadwater Project would impact air quality.	Final EIS, Section 3.9.1.2
16	LNG carriers would impact commercial marine shipping and recreational boating, particularly in the Race.	Final EIS, Sections 3.5.5.1 and 3.7.1.4
17	LNG releases from the FSRU or LNG carriers could impact the environment, including humans and the human environment.	Final EIS, Sections 3.1 through 3.10
18	The Broadwater Project would be a safety risk, a terrorist target, and could not be adequately protected.	Final EIS, Section 3.10; WSR Sections 4, 5, and 8
19	Broadwater and the Coast Guard do not have an emergency response plan.	Final EIS, Section 3.10.6; WSR Section 6.2
20	The sight of gunned security vessels would be disturbing and would destroy the peace and tranquility of the Sound.	Final EIS, Section 3.5
21	A no-fly zone would be required and would result in enormous noise and air traffic impacts.	Final EIS, Section 3.5.2.2; WSR Sections 5.5.6 and 8.4.2

³ The concerns listed are summaries of the issues stated in letters submitted to FERC after issuance of the draft EIS (November 16, 2006) and that did not specifically address the draft EIS. Table 3.1-1 lists the authors of the letters and issues included in each letter.

⁴ The WSR is the U.S. Coast Guard's report entitled *U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port of Long Island Sound Waterways Suitability Report for the Proposed Broadwater Liquefied Natural Gas Facility* issued September 21, 2006 and included as Appendix C to the final EIS.

⁵ Legal issues related to public trust lands are not a component of a NEPA environmental review process and are therefore not included in the final EIS.

Table 3.0-1 – Summary of Key Concerns in Comment Letters Regarding the Broadwater LNG Project

Table 3.0-1
Summary of Key Concerns in Comment Letters
Regarding the Broadwater LNG Project⁶ (continued)

Issue #	Summary of Concerns Stated in Letters	Sections of the Final EIS and/or the WSR⁷ That Address the Issues Listed
22	FERC and other government agencies should prepare a regional energy plan before reviewing specific proposals to provide new sources of energy.	Final EIS Section 1.1
23	The Project would increase employment and provide a source of cheaper and cleaner energy.	Final EIS, Sections 1.1 and 3.6.3

⁶ The concerns listed are summaries of the issues stated in letters submitted to FERC after issuance of the draft EIS (November 16, 2006) and that did not specifically address the draft EIS. Table 3.1-1 lists the authors of the letters and issues included in each letter.

⁷ The WSR is the U.S. Coast Guard's report entitled *U.S. Coast Guard Captain of the Port of Long Island Sound Waterways Suitability Report for the Proposed Broadwater Liquefied Natural Gas Facility* issued September 21, 2006 and included as Appendix C to the final EIS.

3.1 GENERAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Table 3.1-1 presents the general written comments we received by author of the issue raised. Although in some cases the names on the submittals were not legible, we included the issues raised in the table. The issue number noted in the table refers to the number of the issue more completely stated, and the response presented in Table 3.0-1.