

**Section P2**

**Public Comment Meetings on the Draft EIS  
Comment Responses**

On June 9, 2008, a public meeting was held in Baltimore, Maryland at the Patapsco High School. The following transcript identifies the commenters and summarizes their comments. A complete transcript of the proceedings is available at <http://elibrary.ferc.gov> (Docket #CP07-62, CP07-63, CP07-64 and CP07-65).

<b>Table P2-1 Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS</b>				
<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Jim Smith, Baltimore County Executive	BM1			
	BM1-1	(18) 4-11	The commenter stated that the Waterway Suitability Report should not be classified.	The public version is included in the FEIS. See appendix J.
	BM1-2	(17) 19-23	The commenter states that the people do not get to review AES's responses to issues raised by FERC in the DEIS.	All analyses and responses filed by the Applicant and reviews and comments by other agencies are publicly available at <a href="http://elibrary.ferc.gov">http://elibrary.ferc.gov</a> (Docket #CP07-62, CP07-63, CP07-64 and CP07-65). The docket is constantly expanding as new information becomes available. We have repeatedly encouraged and continue to encourage ongoing informed comment on the contents of the public docket. We do not believe all recommendations must be met prior to issuance of the EIS to understand the environmental impacts of the Project and fulfill the requirements of NEPA. All environmental conditions in the FERC Order must be met before related construction can begin.
	BM1-3	(17) 24 - (18) 1-3	The commenter stated that they believe the comment period is not long enough and the public will not get a chance to evaluate AES's information.	All relevant information received would be discussed in the FEIS. Parties to the proceeding can request rehearing of the FERC Order and ultimately seek judicial review. Please also see response to comment BM1-2.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM1-4	(18) 4-11	The commenter stated that the Water Suitability Report should not be classified.	As stated in section 4.12.5.3, the Coast Guard used the criteria developed by Sandia National Laboratories to define the outer limits of the hazard zones for assessing potential risks associated with the Project. Requests for copies of material used in developing the Coast Guard's preliminary determination on the suitability of the waterway should be made to the Coast Guard as indicated in the WSR (see appendix J).
	BM1-5	(18) 16-21	The commenter stated that security plan should not include resources from Baltimore County.	The WSR provided by the Coast Guard is based on specific levels of protection that must be provided in order to manage LNG marine traffic in the waterway. The resources required to implement these measures were not attributed to specific port stakeholders or agencies.
	BM1-6	(18) 22-25; (19) 1-9	The commenter states that security perimeter and exclusion zone is not adequate.	The design, construction, and operating requirements for the Project are contained in 33 CFR Parts 103 to 105, 33 CFR Part 127, and 49 CFR Part 193. Although these regulations do not require the use of SIGTTO publications, the design factors and terminal procedures described in the SIGTTO Information Paper No. 14, "Site Selection and Design For LNG Ports and Jetties," are consistent with the safety and security concepts considered during project review.
	BM1-7	(19) 10 -15	The commenter notes that Maryland has amended its Coastal Management Program to prohibit LNG terminals in the Chesapeake Bay.	Please see response to comment LA1-8.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM1-8	(19) 16-21	The commenter further notes that the amendment is under review by NOAA.	Please see response to comment LA1-8.
	BM1-9	(19) 22-25 - (20) 1-8	The commenter states that FERC should look at offshore alternatives.	Comment noted. Offshore alternatives are discussed in section 3.2.4.
John Griffin, Secretary Maryland DNR	BM2			
	BM2-1	(21) 13	The commenter is concerned about the safety of the Project.	Safety issues, including potential for terrorist attacks, related to the offshore, onshore, and pipeline components of the Project were considered during both the engineering review done by FERC staff and the U.S. Coast Guard's waterway suitability assessment process. The results of these reviews are provided in section 4.12.
	BM2-2	(21) 14	The commenter stated they are concerned for the Maryland environment and Chesapeake Bay.	This FEIS addresses the environmental impacts and mitigation measures that are recommended.
	BM2-3	(21) 15-16	The commenter stated a concern for the state economy.	See section 4.9.
	BM2-4	(22) 4-21	The commenter stated that the information requested from AES should have been included in the DEIS.	All information available at the time was included in the DEIS. The FEIS has been updated based on additional information obtained upon further evaluation by FERC. See also responses to BM1-2 and BM1-3.
	BM2-5	(22) 22-24	The commenter questions if the public will have the opportunity to comment on the information requested.	Please see responses to comments BM1-2 and BM1-3.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM2-6	(23) 2-4	The commenter requested a supplemental EIS be issued.	It is impractical, and sometimes impossible, to complete all studies and develop the plans necessary to successfully mitigate potential aspects of a natural gas project prior to the issuance of a Commission order. As described in the EIS, while the vast majority of impacts have been identified and necessary mitigation has been described, additional post-authorization plans and studies would serve to refine the mitigation to address site-specific circumstances prior to construction. In addition, many of the post-authorization conditions requiring site-specific plans and surveys are necessary because AES/Mid-Atlantic Express cannot gain access to certain land parcels to complete the surveys without the use of eminent domain. Lastly, the conditions we have imposed would enable the Commission to ensure compliance with all statutory and regulatory requirements and verify that the required mitigation measures are implemented at the appropriate points in the Project.
	BM2-7	(23) 6-8	The commenter is concerned with the safety of the Project and the proximity to adjacent communities.	Reliability and safety are discussed in section 4.12.
	BM2-8	(23) 11-13	The commenter is concerned about environmental justice.	Comment noted. Environmental Justice is discussed in section 4.9.7.
	BM2-9	(23) 16-19	The commenter noted that there is no dredged material placement plan.	The applicant's Consolidated Dredge Plan (CDP) is contained in appendix D of the FEIS.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM2-10	(23) 20-22	The commenter stated that dredging would impact water quality of the Patapsco.	As discussed in section 4.3.2.5, <i>Dredging</i> and in the Consolidated Dredge Plan, mitigation measures would be used to ensure that water quality impacts would be minimized. In softer, surface sediments, an environmental bucket would be used concurrent with reduced and controlled lowering speeds for the crane, and scows and containers would be solid hull construction and completely sealed and water tight to avoid release of dredge material. Additionally, a water quality sampling program would be instituted within a 1000-ft limit upstream and downstream of the proposed dredge area. Sampling would be conducted prior to, during, and 30 days post-dredging activities. Results would be submitted to the COE within 120 days of the completion of dredging activities.
	BM2-11	(23-24) 24-26, 1	The commenter stated that they are concerned about the pipeline impact on public lands.	The crossing of public lands is discussed in section 4.8.1.2.
	BM2-12	(24) 6-9	The commenter stated that the exclusion zone will impact boating traffic.	The FEIS has concluded that the effects of the exclusion zone would be minimal due to the number of ships arriving during any given week. See section 4.9.4.2.
	BM2-13	(24) 14-16	The commenter stated that they were concerned about environmental justice.	Environmental justice is discussed in section 4.9.7.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Barbara Mikulski, Senator	BM3			
	BM3-1	(25) 6-10	The commenter was concerned about how the mitigation measures will be enforced.	All mitigation conditions included in the final FERC order would be enforced by third party and FERC inspectors who would be on site to verify compliance. FERC has the authority to halt construction and/or delay project start-up if mitigation violations warrant.
	BM3-2	(25) 11-16	The commenter would like a response to her concerns of safety and environmental impacts.	We take all concerns seriously. All written and oral comments received during the public comment period and throughout the development of the FEIS have been considered and evaluated in the preparation of this FEIS. Responses to comments are contained in appendix P of this FEIS. Further please see FERC's letters dated July 3, July 17, and August 6, 2008. These letters are contained in the docket under Accession Nos. 20080707-0032, 20080730-0133, and 20080813-0283.
	BM3-3	(25) 17-20	The commenter stated concerns over dredged material disposal.	The disposal of the contaminated dredge material is discussed in the Consolidated Dredge Plan, located in appendix D of the FEIS.
	BM3-4	(26) 1-6	The commenter stated concerns over existing homes and utilities as well as impacts to schools and parks.	Existing homes including septic systems and utilities are discussed in section 4.8.1.1. Wells are discussed in section 4.3.1.1 and schools and parks are discussed in section 4.8.1.2.
	BM3-5	(26) 9-10	The commenter noted that Maryland has denied coastal zone consistency.	Please see response to comment LA1-8.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	BM3-6	(26) 15-17	The commenter is concerned about the water quality impacts to the Chesapeake Bay.	Water resources and quality impacts are discussed in section 4.3.
Irene Spatafore	BM4			
	BM4-1	(27) 9-11	The commenter stated a concern about the impacts of dredging.	Section 4.3.2.5 contains discussions on project dredging. Section 4.3.2.4 discusses sediment sampling and analyses, and fate and transport of contaminants in the marine environment. A Consolidated Dredge Plan is included in appendix D of the FEIS.
	BM4-2	(27) 12-13	The commenter stated concerns for future generations.	Comment noted.
	BM4-3	(27) 20-21	The commenter is concerned that Maryland will not receive any benefit.	While it is true that the applicants' have not identified specific customers in Maryland, the proposed pipeline would supply existing pipelines which have delivery points throughout the south and Mid-Atlantic states and the Northeast. The natural gas that would be added to the U.S. pipeline system from the proposed Terminal is a beneficial supply enhancement to all served by that system including customers in Maryland, and would be a diversification and supplement to our nation's energy supply. Socio-economic impacts are discussed in section 4.9. Project need is discussed in section 1.2.
Rupert Denney President, Maryland Maritime Association	BM5			
	BM5-1	(28) 10-14	The commenter stated that the docking of the LNG tankers will be quicker than the current vessels.	Comment noted.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	BM5-2	(28) 23-25	The commenter noted that docking will take 90 minutes, three times a week.	Comment noted.
	BM5-3	(29) 2-3	The commenter noted that superior tugs will benefit entire port.	Comment noted.
	BM5-4	(29) 23-25	The commenter noted small impacts to recreational boating.	Impacts to recreational boating are discussed in section 4.8.4.1.
Donna Roberts, Resident, Baltimore, MD	BM6			
	BM6-1	(30) 23-25	The commenter noted impacts to recreational activities on the Bay.	Recreation and public interest areas are discussed in section 4.8.1.2. Boating, fishing and hunting are discussed in section 4.8.4.1.
	BM6-2	(31) 2-3	The commenter states that there will be impacts to wetlands.	Wetlands are discussed in section 4.4.
	BM6-3	(31) 5-8	The commenter is concerned about dredging impacts, specifically chromium.	Chromium has been detected in the sediments; however, mitigation measures have been outlined for dredged materials in section 4.3.2.5 and the Consolidated Dredge Plan included in appendix D of the FEIS.
	BM6-4	(31) 9-10	The commenter is concerned about water rights.	Water resources are discussed in section 4.3.
	BM6-5	(31) 11-13	The commenter is concerned about the jobs the Project will contribute to the area.	Employment is discussed in section 4.9.1.
	BM6-6	(31) 16-17	The commenter is concerned about businesses in the area.	Socio-economic impacts are discussed in section 4.9.
	BM6-7	(31) 20	The commenter is concerned about environmental justice	Environmental Justice is discussed in section 4.9.7.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM6-8	(31) 22-23	The commenter is concerned about eminent domain.	While FERC's authorization under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act would convey eminent domain authority, specific terms would be determined by a state or local court if a negotiated agreement cannot be reached or an easement cannot be established.
	BM6-9	(32) 2-7	The commenter is concerned about the Project's impact on home sales and property values.	See section 4.9.5.
	BM6-10	(32) 7-9	The commenter questions the site selected for the Project.	Alternatives to this site are discussed in section 3.2 of the FEIS.
	BM6-11	(32) 10-13	The commenter states an alternative location off shore.	Please see response to comment BM6-10.
	BM6-12	(32) 16-18	The commenter is concerned about dependence on foreign energy sources.	Comment noted.
	BM6-13	(32) 25 - (33) 1	The commenter notes a lack of public consideration for the Project.	All written and oral comments received during the formal public comment period and later were considered and evaluated in the preparation of this FEIS. Landowner concerns have been addressed by responding to all comments within the scope of this FEIS. See also responses to BM1-2, BM1-3 and BM3-2.
	BM6-14	(33) 3	The commenter proposed windmills as an alternative.	Alternative energy sources are discussed in section 3.1.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Richard Muth, Baltimore Emergency Management Agency	BM7			
	BM7-1	(33) 25 - (34) 1-3	The commenter is concerned over safety of the terminal location adjacent to densely populated areas.	Based on the site-specific safety evaluation presented in section 4.12, the proposed design complies with the federal siting standards specific to onshore LNG facilities contained in 49 CFR 193. The exclusion zones associated with the Project would not extend beyond land owned by SPS Limited Partnership LLP (the owner of the terminal site).
	BM7-2	(34) 4-10	The commenter notes safety concerns of the LNG vessels traveling up the Chesapeake Bay.	As stated in section 4.12.5.4, the U.S. Coast Guard has preliminarily determined the measures necessary to responsibly manage LNG carrier operations in the waterway. Unless the required measures to ensure safe and secure operations were in place and serving their intended purpose, neither the Commission nor the U.S. Coast Guard would allow operation of the proposed facility.
	BM7-3	(34)10-11	The commenter is concerned about inadequate resources to control an LNG emergency event.	As discussed in section 4.12.6, AES would be required to develop an Emergency Response Plan. The plan would be developed in consultation with the Coast Guard, state, county, and local emergency planning groups, fire departments and law enforcement agencies. Unless the required measures to ensure safe and secure operations were in place and serving their intended purpose, neither the Commission nor the Coast Guard would allow operation of the proposed facility.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	BM7-4	(34) 14-25	The commenter is concerned about safety of the LNG facility.	Please see response to comment BM2-1.
	BM7-5	(35)1-5	The commenter is concerned about safety of the LNG vessels.	Please see response to comment BM7-3.
David Carroll, Director of Sustainability, Baltimore County	BM8			
	BM8-1	(36) 1-4; (36) 4-6	The commenter is concerned about dredging impacts.	The disposal of the contaminated dredge material is discussed in the Consolidated Dredge Plan, located in appendix D.
	BM8-2	(36) 10-12	The commenter is concerned about transportation impacts due to transportation of dredged material.	Please see response to comment LA1-14.
	BM8-3	(36) 13-15	The commenter states a concern about dredged material disposal.	The ultimate disposition of the PDM is dependent on the sediment characteristics, which would be determined once dredged. Details are provided in the Consolidated Dredge Plan located in appendix D.
	BM8-4	(36) 16-18	The commenter is concerned about future dredging activities.	Please see response to comment BM8-3.
	BM8-5	(36) 19-20	The commenter is concerned about dredged material disposal sites.	Please see response to comment BM8-1.
	BM8-6	(36) 22-23	The commenter noted a lack of information of maintenance dredging in the DEIS.	Section 4.3.2.5 has been revised to include more detailed information regarding maintenance dredging
	BM8-7	(36) 24-25	The commenter is concerned about voluntary cleanup at the site.	Comment noted.
	BM8-8	(37) 1-2	The commenter questions whether the Project should move forward.	Comment noted.
	BM8-9	(37) 10-12	The commenter noted that site should not be removed from voluntary cleanup list.	Comment noted.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Mary Harvey, Director, Baltimore County Office of Community Conservation	BM9			
	BM9-1	(38) 19-25; (39) 1-4, 8-10	The commenter noted that HUD is being asked to comment on the Project. The commenter also notes the siting of HUD-assisted projects near the LNG facility and the HUD siting requirements.	FERC has received comments from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In a July 3, 2008 letter from HUD, they state that the HUD projects in the vicinity of the proposed LNG facility are located at an acceptable separation distance (ASD).
	BM9-2	(39) 14-16	The commenter notes response time for reply	Comment noted.
	BM9-3	(39) 19-21	The commenter states concerns about environmental justice.	See section 4.9.7.
	BM9-4	(40) 1-2	The commenter is concerned about Community revitalization around LNG facility.	See section 4.9.
Frank Holden, Maryland Saltwater Sport Fishermen's Association	BM10			
	BM10-1	(40) 17-18	The commenter is concerned about safety.	Please see response to comment BM2-1.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM10-2	(41) 12-13	The commenter questions the costs and benefits of the Project.	Depending upon the resource area, we have qualitatively or quantitatively, as appropriate, assessed the impacts upon the natural and human environments. This FEIS has been completed in compliance with the requirements of NEPA, the CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA, and the FERC's regulations implementing NEPA. We have developed almost 200 specific mitigation measures designed to ensure the Project meets current environmental, safety, and regulatory standards to minimize the negative impacts to the natural and human environment. Section 4.12 contains a discussion on LNG Terminal and Pipeline Safety
	BM10-3	(41) 20-25	The commenter states a concern over impacts to recreational boating.	Recreational boating is discussed in section 4.8.4.1.
	BM10-4	(42) 7-9	The commenter notes impacts from dredging.	Please see response to comment BM2-10.
Norris McDonald, President, African American Environmental Association	BM11			
	BM11-1	(43) 24-25; (44) 1-5	The commenter is concerned that the DEIS does not address environmental justice.	Please see letters OC2 and OC3 and section 4.9.7.
	BM11-2	(44) 6-18	The commenter is concerned with cumulative impacts with the addition of another hazardous facility.	Cumulative impacts are discussed in section 4.13.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	BM11-3	(45) 2-4	The commenter noted that the state will issue air and water permits.	Comment noted.
	BM11-4	(45) 13-16	The commenter stated that ownership of the facility and pipeline should be by African-Americans.	Please see letters OC2 and OC3.
	BM11-5	(45) 19-21	The commenter noted that residents should be bought out.	Please see letters OC2 and OC3.
	BM11-6	(45) 24-25	The commenter states that AES should build a community center.	Please see letters OC2 and OC3.
Phyllis Seward, Resident of Turner Station	BM12			
	BM12-1	(47) 7-9	The commenter is concerned about safety.	Please see response to comment BM7-1.
	BM12-2	(48) 1-4	The commenter noted interest in the type of employment that will be created by the Project.	Employment is discussed in section 4.9.1.
	BM12-3	(48) 12-15	The commenter is concerned about the lack of available emergency response resources and funding.	As discussed in section 4.12.6, the Emergency Response Plan (ERP) must include a Cost Sharing Plan which would specify what AES would provide to cover the cost of state and local resources required for security and emergency management of the facility and LNG vessel. In comments to the DEIS, AES has stated that they would make the appropriate arrangements to pay for additional resources needed to satisfy the Coast Guard's recommendations regarding LNG ship transits associated with the Project.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Mark Hubbard, Interim Director, Baltimore County's Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Management, Assistant Fire Chief, Baltimore County Fire Dept.	BM13			
	BM13-1	(50) 9-11	The commenter noted that Baltimore County is reducing the amount of hazards in the county.	Comment noted.
	BM13-2	(50) 14-15	The commenter stated a concern about safety.	Please see response to comment BM7-1.
	BM13-3	(50) 16-17	The commenter stated that the Project would stress the emergency response system.	Please see response to comment BM7-3.
	BM13-4	(50) 21-22	The commenter noted that 35,000 Baltimore County residents live within three miles of this facility.	Please see response to comment BM13-2.
	BM13-5	(51) 2-5	The commenter stated safety and evacuation issues.	AES would be required to develop an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) and coordinate an emergency evacuation plan with the Coast Guard; state, county, and local emergency planning groups; fire departments; state and local law enforcement; and appropriate federal agencies. AES would be required to complete this plan for approval by FERC prior to authorization to construct the proposed facility.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM13-6	(51) 9-10	The commenter stated LNG vessel safety issues.	The hazards associated with LNG are presented in sections 4.12.1 and 4.12.5.3. The safety and security review prepared by FERC staff and the Coast Guard and discussed in section 4.12 included these hazards.
	BM13-7	(51) 11-12	The commenter noted safety issues.	Section 4.12.1 of the FEIS addresses the issue of the energy content of LNG versus its explosive potential.
	BM13-8	(51) 13-14	The commenter noted safety issues.	Please see response to comment BM13-6.
	BM13-9	(51) 18-20	The commenter noted safety and evacuation issues.	<p>Unlike highway or railroad scenarios, any LNG spill at the facility would be directed to on-site impoundments and contained. In order to minimize the potential for off-site impact, these impoundments must be located in accordance with the federal regulations under 49 CFR 193. Our analysis of the proposed design is discussed in section 4.12.4.</p> <p>As discussed in section 4.12.5.3, the Coast Guard used the criteria developed by Sandia National Laboratories to define the outer limits of the hazard zones for assessing potential risks associated with the Project. Unless the measures required for safe and secure operations were in place and serving their intended purpose (see the Coast Guard's WSR in appendix J), neither the Commission nor the Coast Guard would allow operation of the proposed facility.</p>

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM13-10	(51) 22-23	The commenter noted safety issues.	The WSR provided by the Coast Guard is based on specific levels of protection that must be provided in order to manage LNG marine traffic in the waterway. The resources required to implement these measures were not attributed to specific port stakeholders or agencies. Unless the required measures to ensure safe and secure operations were in place and serving their intended purpose, neither the Commission nor the Coast Guard would allow operation of the proposed facility.
	BM13-11	(51) 24-25	The commenter noted security issues for the facility.	Please see response to comment BM13-10.
Joseph Minnick, Member, House of Delegates, Maryland	BM14			
	BM14-1	(53) 22-25; (54) 1-2	The commenter stated a concern over where dredged material will be disposed of.	The Consolidated Dredge Plan in appendix D discusses disposal of dredged material.
	BM14-2	(53) 4-5	The commenter stated that no information on disposal location has been provided.	Please see response to comments BM2-10 and BM8-3.
	BM14-3	(53) 7	The commenter noted a concern over dredging impacts.	Please see response to comment BM2-10.
	BM14-4	(54) 10-12	The commenter stated that Project will affect cleanup of Chesapeake Bay.	Water resources are discussed in section 4.3.
John Olszewski, Sr., Member County Council, District 7	BM15			
	BM15-1	(55) 2-4	The commenter questioned the safety of the LNG vessels.	Please see response to comment SE1-11.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	BM15-2	(55) 9-11	The commenter stated a concern over responsibility for an accident.	As stated in section 4.12, the FERC, Coast Guard, and DOT share regulatory authority over the siting, design, construction and operation of LNG import terminals. All three agencies work in coordination to ensure safety and security issues are addressed.
	BM15-3	(56) 4-21	The commenter questioned whether the public's comments were being considered.	Please see response to comments BM1-2 and BM1-3.
	BM15-4	(57) 8-10	The commenter questioned the cost of the Project on the communities.	The impacts of the proposed Project on the community and environment are discussed throughout section 4.
	BM15-5	(57) 14-16	The commenter noted a general concern over environmental and safety impacts.	Environmental issues are discussed throughout section 4. Safety issues are discussed specifically in section 4.12.
	BM15-6	(57) 23-24	The commenter states concern over environmental justice.	See section 4.9.7
Dutch Ruppertsberger, U.S. Representative	BM16			
	BM16-1	(59) 3-6	The commenter noted a general concern for safety and environment.	Please see response to comment BM15-5.
	BM16-2	(59) 9-12	The commenter stated that the site is not suitable for the Project.	Comment noted.
	BM16-3	(59) 20-22	The commenter stated a concern for environmental justice.	Environmental Justice is discussed in section 4.9.7.
	BM16-4	(59) 23-25; (60) 1	The commenter noted a concern for environmental justice.	Environmental Justice is discussed in section 4.9.7.
	BM16-5	(60) 3 - (61) 13	The commenter stated concerns over safety at the facility.	Please see response to comment BM2-1.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM16-6	(60) 6-10; (60) 14-15; (60) 23-25	The commenter noted that the LNG vessels would have to travel up the Chesapeake Bay and under several bridges. The commenter expresses concern for an accident or attack near these bridges. According to the DEIS and the Water Suitability Report, the commenter feels that the Project needs to address several issues before being considered.	See section 4.12.5 for vessel safety and section 4.12.5.5 discusses the Coast Guard's requirements for LNG vessel operations.
	BM16-7	(61) 1-6	The commenter stated that there are more suitable locations for the facility.	Alternative sites were considered and are discussed in section 3.2.
	BM16-8	(61) 8-9	The commenter stated that the Coast Guard noted that there was a lack of a Safety and Security Plan.	Safety controls are discussed in section 2.7 and Reliability and Safety is discussed in section 4.12. See response to comment BM13-5.
	BM16-9	(61) 14-17	The commenter stated that Maryland would not get any of the benefit from the Project but would be paying for the security of the facility.	Please see response to comment BM4-3.
	BM16-10	(61) 14-24	The commenter noted that AES expects Maryland residents' taxes to fund the Project, including Coast Guard resources for security, without providing the residents with any benefits from the Project.	Please see responses to comments BM7-2 and BM12-3.
	BM16-11	(62) 3-5	The commenter noted that AES must meet several mitigation measures.	Comment noted.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	BM16-12	(62) 8-9	The commenter noted that the site is not appropriate for the facility.	Comment noted.
	BM16-13	(62) 17-19	The commenter noted that there is nothing living at the site because of pollution.	Comment noted.
	BM16-14	(62) 17-19	The commenter stated that there will be impacts to water quality and aquatic habitat.	Impacts to surface waters are discussed in section 4.3 and habitat in 4.6.
Maxine Thompson, Resident of Turner Station	BM17			
	BM17-1	(64) 11	The commenter stated concern over environmental justice and the lack of information on Turner Station in the DEIS.	See section 4.9.7.
	BM17-2	(64) 13-16	The commenter noted that AES has tried to convince Turner Station residence of Project benefits.	Comment noted.
	BM17-3	(65) 5-8	The commenter is concerned about environmental justice.	Environmental Justice is discussed in section 4.9.7.
	BM17-4	(65) 9-14	The commenter is concerned about safety at the LNG facility.	Please see response to comment BM7-1.
	BM17-5	(65) 16-18	The commenter stated a concern over property values.	Property values are discussed in section 4.9.5 of the FEIS.
	BM17-6	(65) 21-22	The commenter noted a concern about insurance coverage.	See section 4.9 of the FEIS.
	BM17-7	(66) 2-5	The commenter stated that Turner Station should be addressed in the FEIS.	Turner Station is discussed in section 4.9.7 of the FEIS.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Phyllis Elaine Driscoll, Resident of Baltimore	BM18			
	BM18-1	(66) 16	The commenter noted that there would be an impact on large populations surrounding the site.	Impacts to the populations surrounding the site are discussed in section 4.9 of the FEIS.
	BM18-2	(66) 18-20	The commenter is concerned about safety at the LNG facility.	Section 4.12.1 of the FEIS addresses the issue of the energy content of LNG versus its explosive potential.
	BM18-3	(66) 23-25	The commenter is concerned over impacts to the Chesapeake Bay.	See section 4.3 and 4.6 of the FEIS.
	BM18-4	(66) 25 – (67) 2	The commenter stated that the families in the surrounding communities should be taken into consideration.	The FEIS has evaluated the impacts to the natural and human environment within vicinity of terminal site. We have developed almost 200 mitigation measures designed to ensure the Project meets current environmental, safety, and regulatory standards to minimize the negative impacts to the natural and human environment. See section 4.9.
Linwood N. Jackson, Resident of Turner Station	BM19			
	BM19-1	(67) 14-16	The commenter noted the pollution at the site.	Pollutants present within the Project area are discussed in section 4.3.
	BM19-2	(67) 19-22	The commenter noted the unfavorable soil conditions at the site.	Soils present at the LNG Terminal site are discussed in section 4.2.1.
	BM19-3	(68) 2-4	The commenter stated difficulty with berthing ships at the site in the past.	The safety issues related to berthing ships is discussed in section 4.12.
	BM19-4	(68) 11-14	The commenter noted that construction of Key Bridge impacted Turner Station.	Comment noted.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Norman R. Stone, Jr., Senator, 6 <sup>th</sup> District, Maryland	BM20			
	BM20-1	(71) 8-12	The commenter noted that there are several strategic areas along the Bay that the LNG vessels must pass.	Please see response to comment BM16-6.
	BM20-2	(71) 8-10	The commenter noted safety concerns at the adjacent steel mill which employs 2300.	Please see response to comment BM7-1.
	BM20-3	(72) 1-3	The commenter stated a concern for dredging impacts.	Dredging impacts are discussed in sections 4.3, 4.6.2, 4.6.3 and in the Consolidated Dredge Plan in appendix D.
	BM20-4	(72) 13-17	The commenter stated that the Bay is listed as impaired and the dredging would cause more damage to the area.	See response to comment BM2-10 and section 4.3.
	BM20-5	(72) 23-25; (73) 1-5	The commenter noted that previous dredging has caused fish kills and environmental pollution.	The impact of dredging on aquatic life is discussed in sections 4.6.2 and 4.6.3.
	BM20-6	(73) 9-11	The commenter stated that there is a no further dredging order from agencies in the area surrounding Sparrows point.	Comment noted.
	BM20-7	(73) 23-25	The commenter noted that the stormwater runoff will be diverted to the Baltimore County Sewer system.	Mid-Atlantic Express would follow its ECP (appendix T) which includes requirements for sediment and erosion control. Mid-Atlantic Express would discharge stormwater in accordance with Maryland stormwater requirements.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM20-8	(74) 1-2	The commenter noted that the soil analysis shows toxins present.	Soil pollutants are expected to be adsorbed to soil particles therefore filtration is an adequate pretreatment process. See section 4.3.2.4 of the FEIS.
	BM20-9	(74) 20-22	The commenter stated a concern over clear cutting the construction right-of-way for the pipeline.	A 50-foot-wide permanent right-of-way would be maintained and allowed to revegetate. Impacts to vegetation are discussed in section 4.5.1 of the FEIS.
	BM20-10	(74) 23-25	The commenter noted that Blasting and clear cutting was never discussed in scoping meetings.	Comment noted. Vegetation clearing is discussed in section 4.5.1. Blasting is discussed in section 2.3.2.2 <i>Blasting</i> and 4.1.1.2 <i>Blasting</i> .
	BM20-11	(75) 1-3	The commenter stated that she disagreed with the granting of eminent domain to AES.	Please see response to comment BM6-8.
	BM20-12	(75) 8-23	The commenter disagrees with the DEIS that there will be minimal environmental impacts.	We have developed almost 200 specific mitigation measures designed to ensure that the Project meets current environmental, safety, and regulatory standards to minimize the negative impacts to the natural and human environment. The environmental impacts are discussed in section 4 and the conclusions are discussed in section 5.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM20-13	(75) 24-25; (76) 1-7	The commenter is concerned that the construction right-of-way will not be replanted with trees and construction debris will be burned on the ROW.	In order to appropriately inspect and patrol the pipeline, the planting of trees directly over the pipeline would not be permitted. Inspection and permanent monitoring would be conducted in accordance with 49 CFR 192. The permanent right-of-way would be allowed to revegetate with herbaceous vegetation. Maintenance of the permanent right-of-way would involve seasonal mowing. See section 2.6.2.  Section 2.3.2.1 includes a discussion on vegetation disposal. Mid-Atlantic Express would comply with all federal, state and local regulations.
	BM20-14	(76) 8-10	The commenter is concerned about construction in wetlands.	The use of timber matting to cross wetland areas (section 2.3.2.1) is a commonly-used and widely-accepted mitigative measure for minimizing wetland soil compaction.
	BM20-15	(76) 11-15	The commenter stated that he disagrees with the revegetation plan within wetlands.	Annual rye is commonly used in wetland restorations to provide a rapidly-establishing vegetative cover for soils while native plants are becoming established (section 2.3.2.2).
John Olszewski, Jr., Resident, Dundalk, MD	BM21			
	BM21-1	(77) 14-15	The commenter stated that he disagrees with the DEIS's statement that the Project will have no adverse environmental impact.	We acknowledge that some resources would be adversely affected by the Project. The conclusions reached in the FEIS include compliance with all mitigation recommendations made by FERC.
	BM21-2	(77) 19-21	The commenter noted that several sensitive areas will be impacted.	Please see response to comment SE1-3.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM21-3	(78) 3-5	The commenter noted that the LNG vessels will be within one mile of Water's Edge and Turner Station.	Comment noted.
	BM21-4	(78) 7-8	The commenter raised concerns over environmental justice.	Environmental Justice is discussed in section 4.9.7.
	BM21-5	(78) 11-12	The commenter noted safety concerns because of its close proximity to the steel mill.	See response to comment BM7-1. The 1,600 and 3,000 BTU/ft <sup>2</sup> -hr thermal exclusion zones from the storage tanks would extend beyond the property line of the facility to the north and east onto land owned by SPS Limited Partnership, LLC. However, the blast furnace is located outside of the exclusion zones.
	BM21-6	(78) 14-16	The commenter noted safety protocols for LNG vessels.	Safety controls are discussed in section 2.7 and Reliability and Safety are discussed in section 4.12.
	BM21-7	(78) 18-20	The commenter noted safety protocols for LNG vessels.	As discussed in section 4.8.5.2, routine Broadcast Notices from the Coast Guard would be transmitted to Mariners, informing the public of each forthcoming moving security zone. Additionally, escort tugs and any Coast Guard escort vessels would provide a further layer of on-scene notification.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM21-8	(78) 24-25	The commenter noted that the Project will impact quality of life.	We agree that quality of life impacts are not readily subject to quantification. They are highly subjective for each individual. Throughout our extensive EIS process we have been made aware of and have considered many individuals' concerns for their quality of life. We have developed almost 200 specific mitigation measures designed to ensure the Project meets current environmental, safety and regulatory standards to minimize impacts to the natural and human environment.
	BM21-9	(79) 5-11	The commenter noted concerns about the public comments being considered against the Project.	All written and oral comments received prior to printing the FEIS were considered and evaluated in the preparation of this FEIS.
Benjamin L. Cardin, U.S. Senator for Maryland	BM22			
	BM22-1	(79) 22-24	The commenter noted that he disagrees with the DEIS's findings of no safety or environmental concerns.	Comment noted.
	BM22-2	(79) 25 – (80) 2	The commenter stated that the DEIS ignored concerns raised by the state, county and residents.	All written and oral comments received during the public comment period were considered and evaluated in the preparation of this FEIS. Landowner concerns have been addressed by responding to all comments within the scope of this FEIS.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM22-3	(80) 3-8	The commenter noted that the DEIS had too many mitigation measures that need to be incorporated.	If certain project components appear to result in significant environmental impacts, we have imposed mitigation measures to lessen said impacts. The conditions we have recommended would enable the Commission to ensure compliance with all statutory and regulatory requirements and verify that the required mitigation measures are implemented at the appropriate points in the Project.
David Jones, Resident, Perry Hall	BM23			
	BM23-1	(81) 16-18	The commenter stated concerns for fish and wildlife.	Aquatic and terrestrial wildlife are discussed in section 4.6.
	BM23-2	(81) 24-25	The commenter stated concerns regarding the site selection.	Alternative sites are discussed in section 3.2.
	BM23-3	(82) 12-13	The commenter requested information as to the funding of the FERC.	FERC is a government agency that is funded by fees recovered from the regulated companies.
	BM23-4	(82) 17-19	The commenter stated concerns regarding the expenses for police and firefighters.	To address any potential financial impacts to those agencies from emergency response, the FERC, under Section 3A(e) of the NGA, requires an applicant to include a Cost-Sharing Plan in the ERP that contains a description of any direct cost reimbursements to these agencies. See section 4.12.6 <i>Emergency Response and Evacuation Planning</i> .
	BM23-5	(82) 24-25	The commenter states that there will be no benefit to the public.	Please see response to comment BM4-3.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Matt Jones, Resident, 128 Creekview Court, Street, MD	BM24			
	BM24-1	(85) 4-23	The commenter stated that AES is a "funder" of the FERC.	FERC is a government agency that is funded by fees recovered from the regulated companies.
John Polek, Resident, 1606 Sandy Hollow Circle, Baltimore, MD	BM25			
	BM25-1	(87) 13-25; (88) 1	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to recreational boating and marinas.	Recreational Boating is discussed in section 4.8.4.1 Property values are discussed in section 4.9.5.
	BM25-2	(88) 2-4	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to Chesapeake Bay Critical Areas.	Surface waters are discussed in section 4.3.2.
	BM25-3	(88) 4-9	The commenter stated concerns regarding the burden on the Coast Guard, Department of Natural Resources, and Baltimore County police agencies due to increased security requirements.	Please see response to comment BM7-2.
	BM25-4	(88) 10-23	The commenter stated concerns regarding the perception of recreational boating in Baltimore and Maryland due to the presence of Coast Guard escorts and gunboats.	Please see response to comment BM25-1.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Russell Donnelly, Environmental Coordinator LNG Opposition Team	BM26			
	BM26-1	(89) 16-21	The commenter stated concerns for environmental damage, loss of critical areas, wetlands, woodlands and private property.	Surface waters are discussed in section 4.3.2. Wetlands are discussed in section 4.4. Existing residences are discussed in section 4.8.1.1.
	BM26-2	(89) 22-23	The commenter stated concerns regarding terrorism.	Please see response to comment BM2-1.
	BM26-3	(89) 24-25	The commenter stated concerns regarding what can best be described as "abuse of power."	The comments are beyond scope of this FEIS.
	BM26-4	(90) 3-5	The commenter stated concerns regarding property values and insurance.	Property values and insurance are discussed in section 4.9.5.
	BM26-5	(90) 7-25	The commenter stated several concerns associated with dredging.	See revised section 4.6.1. Section 4.3.2.5 contains discussions on project dredging, sediment sampling and analyses, and fate and transport of contaminants in the marine environment. The Consolidated Dredge Plan is included in appendix D of the FEIS.
	BM26-6	(91) 1-12	The commenter stated concerns with regard to the Project's impacts to a federally funded Fort Carroll Oyster bed restoration project less than 1,500 feet from the dredge area.	See section 4.6.2.2 <i>Dredging Impacts</i> for a discussion of the Fort Carroll Oyster Restoration Project.
	BM26-7	(91) 18-20	The commenter stated concerns regarding the size of the pipeline right-of-way.	The construction right-of-way would be 75 feet wide and 100 feet wide in agricultural areas. The permanent right-of-way would be 50 feet wide.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM26-8	(91) 22-25; (92) 1-2	The commenter stated concerns that the Coast Guard cannot provide suitable protection.	Please see response to comment BM7-2.
Pat McDonough, 120 Riverform Road, Member, Maryland House of Delegates Representing Eastern Baltimore and Harford Counties	BM27			
	BM27-1	(93) 1-2	The commenter stated concerns regarding Coast Guard's comment that they do not have the assets to do this job. The commenter also stated concerns regarding the burden on taxpayers.	As discussed in section 4.12.6, AES would be required to provide a Cost Sharing Plan which would identify the mechanisms for funding all project-related security/emergency management costs that would be imposed on state and local agencies. Any Coast Guard assets required to implement the risk management measures would be funded by the Coast Guard. In comments to the DEIS, AES has stated that they would make the appropriate arrangements to pay for additional resources needed to satisfy the Coast Guard's recommendations regarding LNG ship transits associated with the Project.
	BM27-2	(93) 15-23	The commenter stated that the Project would not benefit the residence of the State of Maryland or help the U.S. become energy independent.	Please see response to comment BM4-3.
	BM27-3	(94) 4-5	The commenter stated that an energy power generator has not been built in the Maryland in more than 20 years.	Comment noted.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Buddy Cefalu, International Ironworkers Union of the Mid-Atlantic States; V.P. Baltimore Building Trades	BM28			
	BM28-1	(95) 16-20	The commenter stated support for the Project based upon temporary and permanent jobs.	Comment noted.
	BM28-2	(95) 21-24	The commenter stated support for the Project because it provides a means of alternative fuel.	Comment noted.
	BM28-3	(96) 11-13	The commenter stated support for the Project because it can be accomplished safely.	Safety controls are discussed in section 2.7 and Reliability and Safety are discussed in section 4.12.
Donald Milsten, Energy Consultant, Baltimore County, MD	BM29			
	BM29-1	(96) 23-25 (97) 1-25	The commenter stated many economic factors involved in costs of natural gas.	Comments noted
	BM29-2	(98) 5-17	The commenter stated that a new natural gas facility would help relieve the current insufficient natural gas capacity.	Comment noted.
Carolyn Jones, President of Greater Dundalk Alliance, 3016 Dunmore Road, Dundalk, MD	BM30			
	BM30-1	(98) 25	The commenter stated that the capacity at Cove Point is being doubled, and there does not seem to be a need for this project.	Alternatives are discussed in section 3.2. See also section 1.2.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM30-2	(99) 9-11	The commenter stated that the construction jobs are short-term.	Employment is discussed in section 4.9.1.
	BM30-3	(99) 11-13	The commenter stated concerns that the Project will cause other corporations not to expand, or come to Baltimore County.	Socioeconomics are discussed in section 4.9.
	BM30-4	(99) 13-14	The commenter expressed concerns that the Project is designed to meet minimal standards.	FERC is preparing this EIS to make sure the Project meets the standards set to protect the environment. Reliability and Safety is discussed in section 4.12.
	BM30-5	(99) 15-19	The commenter stated concerns regarding the impacts of dredging, especially in relation to restoration projects funded by state and federal governments.	Surface waters are discussed in section 4.3.2. The Consolidated Dredge Plan is included in appendix D of the FEIS.
	BM30-6	(99) 20-25	The commenter stated that only 69 of the known and documented 103 toxins in the dredging location are addressed in the EIS.	The FEIS reported those chemicals detected in laboratory analysis of the sediments collected from various locations within the study area. Also please see response to comment BM2-10.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM30-7	(100) 1-4	The commenter stated concerns regarding the reuse of contaminated sediments.	As discussed in the Consolidated Dredge Plan (appendix D), the contaminated sediments would be solidified and stabilized to prevent leaching of materials. This procedure is widely accepted by Federal and state agencies for remediation of hazardous materials as solidification and stabilization removes the potential for exposure (i.e., inhalation, ingestion, dermal contact) through physical binding and it removes toxicity by negating bioavailability (i.e., the availability of the chemical for systemic circulation within the organism). If there is no exposure to the organism, there is no risk.
	BM30-8	(100) 5-7	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to crabs and birds.	Wildlife is discussed in section 4.6.
	BM30-9	(100) 7-10	The commenter stated concerns regarding the burial of trees cleared from the pipeline right-of-way in sediment 200-feet deep.	There are no plans to bury trees in sediment. Disposal of vegetation is discussed section 2.3.2.1.
	BM30-10	(100) 13-15	The commenter stated that the "consent decree" for Sparrows Point has yet to be properly addressed by the government agencies.	The Project would not interfere with the intent of the consent decree.
	BM30-11	(100) 15-17	The commenter stated that the cancer rate in the area is 14%, while national average is 7%.	Comment noted.
	BM30-12	(100) 21-25; (101) 1-4	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to property rights and values, and insurance.	Property values are discussed in section 4.9.5.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	BM30-13	(101) 6-10	The commenter stated concerns regarding the effect on Maryland's bond rating.	Socioeconomics are discussed in section 4.9.
	BM30-14	(101) 12-13	The commenter stated that AES is currently paying claims in California and the Dominican Republic for its operations.	This comment is beyond the scope of this FEIS. We note that this Project would be reviewed by the appropriate local, county, state and federal agencies.
Guido Guarnaccia, LNG Opposition Team	BM31			
	BM31-1	(102) 5-25	The commenter stated concerns regarding terrorism, and that an explosion on an LNG tanker would be the equivalent of 55 Hiroshima bombs.	This is not accurate. Please see response to comment BM18-2.
	BM31-2	(103) 3-9	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to waterbodies.	Waterbody crossings are listed in appendix I. See also section 4.3.2.
	BM31-3	(103) 10-21	The commenter stated concerns regarding hazardous waste and existing Superfund sites in the Project area.	See section 4.8.3.
	BM31-4	(103) 22-25; (104) 1-9	The commenter stated concerns regarding "variation 4" and the resultant safety concerns.	Route alternatives are discussed in section 3.3.3. Pipeline safety is discussed in section 4.12.9.
John Truskowski, Resident, 4226 Rivers Edge Way, Baltimore, MD	BM32			
	BM32-1	(105) 2-4	The commenter stated that Corps of Engineers has not commented on the Project.	The COE is a cooperating agency for the development of the FEIS and has commented on the Project.
	BM32-2	(105) 6-8	The commenter stated that the Coast Guard should present information of the security risks.	Please see response to comment BM27-1.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM32-3	(105) 13-16	The commenter stated concerns regarding the safety of his home in the event of an explosion.	Pipeline safety standards are discussed in section 4.12.9.
	BM32-4	(105) 18-25	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to the Beltway.	Traffic impacts from construction and operation of the LNG terminal are discussed in section 4.9.4.1.
	BM32-5	(106) 1-4	The commenter stated concerns regarding the effectiveness of automatic shutoff valves in the event of a pipe rupture.	Pipeline safety standards are discussed in section 4.12.9.
Frank Buddy Howard, Resident, 2331 Serals Road, Dundalk, MD	BM33			
	BM33-1	(106) 13-18	The commenter described what was termed a "minor" explosion approximately 30 years ago that "knocked out" 500 cars. The commenter expressed concerns as to the intensity of an LNG explosion.	Please see response to comment BM7-1.
	BM33-2	(106) 23-24	The commenter stated that AES previously stated it would not build the Project if the public didn't want it.	Comment noted.
Ernie Greco, President, Metropolitan Baltimore Council of the AFL-CIO Unions	BM34			
	BM34-1	(107) 24-25; (108) 1-25; (109) 1-2	The commenter stated support for the Project due to short term and long term jobs.	Employment is discussed in section 4.9.1.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Tom Powers, Resident, Essex, MD Board Member, Chesapeake Bay Yacht Club Association	BM35			
	BM35-1	(109) 17	The commenter stated concern regarding dredging.	The Consolidated Dredge Plan is included in appendix D of the FEIS.
	BM35-2	(109) 19-25; (110) 1-7	The commenter stated several concerns regarding the impact of LNG tankers to existing port operations.	Vessel traffic is discussed in section 4.9.4.2.
	BM35-3	(110) 12-13	The commenter stated concerns regarding the loss of jobs.	Employment is discussed in section 4.9.1.
Terry Rosso, Resident, 208 Waterfountain Court, Glen Burnie, MD	BM36			
	BM36-1	(111) 4-25	The commenter stated concerns regarding contaminated sediments, the lack of detailed information in the Environmental Justice section of the EIS, and the concerns regarding a nearby asphalt plant.	Existing conditions of the Project area are described in the appropriate EIS sections. The impact of the Project in combination with other projects in the area is discussed in section 4.13, Cumulative Impacts. The Environmental Justice section has been revised. See section 4.9.7.
	BM36-2	(112) 1-18	The commenter stated that the Project would not comply with the intent of Environmental Justice.	Environmental Justice is discussed in section 4.9.7.
	BM36-3	(112) 20-22	The commenter stated that the Project area has had many environmentally detrimental accidents, and another hazardous operation should not be permitted.	Cumulative Impacts are discussed in section 4.13.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Rebecca Kolberg, Resident, 7605 Bay Street, Pasadena, MD	BM37			
	BM37-1	(113) 7-15	The commenter stated that there are many small communities that are not aware of the Project.	A public notice was issued on the FERC website and mailed to all parties on the Project mailing list including local newspapers of circulation in the Project area. Additionally, in accordance with the Army Corps of Engineers regulations, a public notice was posted in several area newspapers. Section 1.4 contains a discussion on the stakeholder involvement process.
	BM37-2	(113) 16-22	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to recreational boating.	Impacts to recreational boating and fishing are discussed in section 4.8.4.1.
	BM37-3	(113) 23-25; (114) 1-12	The commenter stated concerns regarding the Patapsco River, and requested that the Army Corps mandate dissolved oxygen mitigation measures.	Impacts on surface waters including dissolved oxygen are discussed in section 4.3.2.5.
Russ Spangler, Board Member, Maryland Watermans Association	BM38			
	BM38-1	(115) 1-4	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts of LNG tanker traffic to crab fishing.	Boating and fishing are discussed in section 4.8.4.1.
	BM38-2	(115) 7-12	The commenter stated concerns regarding wakes from the LNG tankers.	Wakes from the LNG tankers are not anticipated to be any larger than cargo ships currently using the channel to get to the Port of Baltimore.
	BM38-3	(115) 14-17	The commenter stated concerns regarding large vessels running aground.	See section 4.12.5.3.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM38-4	(115) 18-23	The commenter stated concerns regarding LNG tanker traffic on other large vessels.	Vessel Traffic is discussed in section 4.9.4.2.
	BM38-5	(116) 1-2	The commenter stated that a "handful" of jobs is not worth impacts to a "way of life."	Employment is discussed in section 4.9.1.
	BM38-6	(116) 3-4	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to commercial fishing.	See section 4.9.3.2 <i>Impacts on Commercial Shipping, Fishing, and Waterfowl Hunting.</i>
	BM38-7	(116) 8-19	The commenter stated that the LNG facility should be located along the coastline.	Alternative sites are discussed in section 3.2.
Ron Henry, Chair of the Greater Baltimore Group and the Maryland Chapter of the Sierra Club	BM39			
	BM39-1	(120) 1-19	The commenter outlined several possible ignition sources that could threaten the Project, as well as specific effects to the ship channel and Bay Bridge.	Safety controls are discussed in section 2.7 and Reliability and Safety is discussed in section 4.12.
	BM39-2	(120) 20-25	The commenter stated concerns regarding dredging.	The Consolidated Dredge Plan is included in appendix D of the FEIS.
	BM39-3	(121) 7-19	The commenter stated that the FERC appears to be too lenient to AES with regard to submittal of supporting documentation.	All required information must be provided before approvals to begin construction would be issued.
Erin Garrigan, Girl Scout, Sparrows Point, Maryland	BM40			
	BM40-1		The commenter stated concerns regarding recreational boating and crabbing.	Impacts to recreational boating and fishing are discussed in section 4.8.4.1, <i>General Recreation.</i>

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM40-2	(122) 11-23	The commenter stated concerns regarding several recreational areas, including parks and the Sparrows Point Country Club.	Parks and golf courses are discussed in section 4.8.1.2.
	BM40-3	(122) 23	The commenter stated concerns regarding safety.	Public safety issues related to the LNG terminal were considered during both the engineering review done by FERC staff and the U.S. Coast Guard's waterway suitability assessment process. The results of these reviews are provided in section 4.12. The FEIS provides 55 recommendations to ensure that the LNG terminal would be constructed and operated in a manner that does not impact public safety.
	BM40-4	(122) 24-25	The commenter stated concerns for future veterans living at the renovated Fort Howard VA.	The Fort Howard VA Medical Center is located greater than one mile east of the proposed LNG terminal site and therefore is not included in section 4.8.
	BM40-5	(123) 5-6	The commenter suggested shipping the gas directly to Pennsylvania.	Alternatives are discussed in section 3.0.
	BM40-6	(123) 8-10	The commenter stated a concern regarding the need for siting of the facility in her community.	Need is discussed in section 1.2.
	BM40-7	(123) 17	The commenter stated her support for jobs finding alternative sources for safer energy, and that the long term jobs should take precedence over short term jobs.	Employment is discussed in section 4.9.1. Also please see response to comment BM40-3.
	BM40-8	(123) 19-20	The commenter expressed concern for the safety of the Francis Scott Key Bridge.	See section 4.12.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Mike Vivirito, President, Bowleys Quarters Improvement Association	BM41			
	BM41-1	(124) 9-16	The commenter stated concerns regarding an explosion at the facility.	Please see response to comments BM7-1 and BM18-2.
	BM41-2	(124) 23-25; (125) 1	The commenter stated concerns regarding fishing and boating.	Impacts to recreational boating and fishing are discussed in section 4.8.4.1.
	BM41-3	(125) 2-11	The commenter stated concerns regarding the impacts of LNG tanker traffic.	Vessel Traffic is discussed in section 4.9.4.2. Impacts to boating and fishing are discussed in section 4.8.4.1.
	BM41-4	(125) 13-14	The commenter stated that 50 jobs is not worth the long term effects.	Please see response to comment EW3-4.
	BM41-5	(125) 21-25	The commenter stated that there has been some improvement to water quality in Chesapeake Bay.	Comment noted.
	BM41-6	(126) 2-11	The commenter stated concerns regarding dredging, especially the need for continual dredging.	Section 4.3.2.5 contains discussions on project dredging. See section 4.3.2.4 for discussions on sediment sampling and analyses, and fate and transport of contaminants in the marine environment. The Consolidated Dredge Plan is included in appendix D of the FEIS.
	BM41-7	(126) 12-21	The commenter stated that Fort Howard has plans for redevelopment and the Project would affect it adversely.	Please see response to comment BM40-4.
	BM41-8	(126) 22-25; (127) 1-2	The commenter stated that AES does not have a good safety background.	Comment noted. We note that this Project would be reviewed by the appropriate local, county, state and federal agencies.
	BM41-9	(127) 16-18	The commenter stated concerns regarding decreased property values.	Property values are discussed in section 4.9.5.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Dennis McCartney, Resident, 8452 Cavanaugh Road, Dundalk, MD	BM42			
	BM42-1	(129) 12-25; (130) 1-25; (131) 1-25; (132) 1-17, 21-22	The commenter offered a broad overview of several landmarks and their proximity to the Project, and the likely environmental consequences to them. The commenter stated concerns regarding dredging as well.	Impacts to land use and existing develop are discussed in section 4.8.1.1. Section 4.3.2.4 contains discussions on sediment sampling and analyses, and fate and transport of contaminants in the marine environment. Section 4.3.2.5 and the Consolidated Dredge Plan (appendix D) contain discussions on project dredging. Schools and other public use properties are discussed in section 4.8.5.1.
Terry Ratcliff, Resident, Dundalk, MD	BM43			
	BM43-1	(134) 4-12	The commenter stated opposition to the Project.	Comment noted.
Tom Nelson, Resident, 2615 North Green Ave., Sparrows Point, MD	BM44			
	BM44-1	(134) 23-25; (135) 1-7	The commenter stated he will protest the Project.	Comment noted.
Dunbar Brooks, Resident, 102 East Ave., Turner Station, MD, Representing the Turner Station Development Corp. and the Turner Station Community Conservation Team	BM45			
	BM45-1	(135) 17-19	The commenter stated opposition to the Project.	Comment noted.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM45-2	(136) 1-11	The commenter stated that it appears that by providing over 151 recommendations, the FERC has compromised objectivity.	We have developed almost 200 specific mitigation measures to ensure the Project meets current environmental, safety, and regulatory standards to minimize the negative impacts to the natural and human environment.
	BM45-3	(136) 9-11	The commenter states an opinion that FERC researchers have mischaracterized Turner Station in the environmental justice section 4, page 4-87.	Please see response to comment OC9-3.
	BM45-4	(136) 20-24	The commenter states an opinion that misinformation on Turner Station was supplied by the FERC to the State of Maryland.	Please see response to comment OC9-3.
	BM45-5	(137) 1-3	The commenter stated concern over the lengthy exclusion zone distances provided in the DEIS based on new information in studies.	Exclusion zone calculations for the on-shore facility were performed by FERC staff in accordance with the procedures listed in 49 CFR 193. As stated in section 4.12.5.3, the Coast Guard used the criteria developed by Sandia National Laboratories to define the outer limits of the hazard zones for accessing potential risks associated with the Project.
	BM45-6	(137) 6-12	The commenter stated concerns regarding Turner Station being within Exclusion Zones 2 and 3, which can cause serious injury in event of a catastrophic event or events.	As discussed in section 4.12.5.3, the Coast Guard used criteria developed by Sandia to define the outer limits of the hazard zones to assess the potential risks associated with an LNG vessel. The zones in the Sandia Report should not be misconstrued as impact areas, but rather are used to identify the level of security measures needed to protect the public and infrastructure.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	BM45-7	(137) 15-17, 22-24	The commenter stated concerns regarding terrorism.	Please see response to comment BM7-2.
	BM45-8	(138) 2-10	The commenter stated concerns regarding the implementation of the Waterway Suitability Report as developed by the Coast Guard.	Please see response to comment BM7-2.
	BM45-9	(138) 11-20	The commenter stated that local monies will likely be necessary to help fund the Project.	As discussed in section 4.12.6, AES would be required to provide a Cost Sharing Plan which would identify the mechanisms for funding all project-related security/emergency management costs that would be imposed on state and local agencies. Any Coast Guard assets required to implement the risk management measures would be funded by the Coast Guard. In comments to the DEIS, AES has stated that they would make the appropriate arrangements to pay for additional resources needed to satisfy the Coast Guard's recommendations for LNG ship transits associated with the Project.
	BM45-10	(138) 18-25	The commenter stated concerns regarding property values.	Property values are discussed in section 4.9.5.
	BM45-11	(139) 3-5	The commenter stated concerns regarding the emergency management and evacuation plan.	Please see response to comment BM7-3.
Fred Thiess, LNG Opposition Team	BM46			
	BM46-1	(140) 3-4	The commenter stated broad opposition to the Project.	Comment noted.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM46-2	(140) 13-25; (141) 1-5	The commenter stated concerns regarding dredging and fish contamination.	Section 4.3.2.5 contains discussions on project dredging, sediment sampling and analyses, and fate and transport of contaminants in the marine environment. The Consolidated Dredging Plan is included in appendix D of the FEIS.
	BM46-3	(141) 6-19	The commenter stated several issues relating to vessel traffic and bridge closures, especially turn-around requirements and the likelihood to close off Bear Creek.	Passage of LNG carriers under the William Preston Lane Jr. Memorial Bridge was examined by the Coast Guard during review of the waterway suitability. The conclusions of that analysis are presented in the WSR included in appendix J and discussed in section 4.12.5.5.
John Romecki, Resident, 18 Midway Avenue, Baltimore, MD	BM47			
	BM47-1	(142) 4-11	The commenter stated that he was unable to build a garage due to his property being within 1,000 yards of water.	AES is required to obtain all federal, state and local permits for the construction of the facility.
	BM47-2	(142) 14-24	The commenter stated that the water is currently polluted, and that dredging will worsen conditions.	Section 4.3.2.5 contains discussions on project dredging. Section 4.3.2.4 contains a discussion on sediment sampling and analyses, and fate and transport of contaminants in the marine environment. The Consolidated Dredge Plan is included in appendix D of the FEIS.
	BM47-3	(143) 1-3	The commenter noted the proximity of the Project to Fort McHenry.	Fort McHenry is located out side of the Area of Potential Effect. See section 4.10.
	BM47-4	(143) 4-20	The commenter stated concerns regarding recreational fishing and crabbing.	Impacts to recreational boating and fishing are discussed in section 4.8.4.1.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Alexander Pappas, Resident, 7613 Chestnut Ave., Fort Howard, MD	BM48			
	BM48-1	(144) 18-25	The commenter stated that the Project is not in the public's best interest.	Comment noted.
Thomas Suneson, Member, Marine Engineers Beneficial Association	BM49			
	BM49-1	(145) 17-25; (146) 1-11; (147) 7-10	The commenter stated concerns regarding security. The commenter also stated concerns that the crew of LNG ships should also have Americans.	As discussed in section 4.12.8, ships are required to provide a 96-hour advance notification with a ship manifest to the Coast Guard. There is no federal mandate requiring the use of U.S. mariners on LNG vessels calling on near-shore or on-shore facilities. Arrangements for the use of U.S. mariners have developed under voluntary agreements between the U.S. Maritime Administration and the on-shore facility operators.
Rick Chadsey, landowner	BM50			
	BM50-1	(147) 20-25	The commenter has 322 building lots that abut the proposed pipeline right-of-way, and he was not aware of the Environmental Impact Statement.	A formal notice was published in the Federal Register on April 25, 2008 announcing that the draft EIS was available and had been mailed to individuals and organizations on the distribution list prepared for the Project. FERC regulations require that all directly affected and abutting landowners be informed. We try very hard to identify these individuals, but sometimes public landowner records are outdated or inaccurate. We expect the applicant to be as diligent as possible in identifying these landowners.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	BM50-2	(149) 2-3	The commenter stated concerns regarding the “take” of portions of his properties.	Section 4.9.5 contains a discussion on property value including compensation for easements on land for both the temporary (construction) and permanent (operation) right-of-way. Mid-Atlantic Express would compensate the landowner for use of the land and the temporary loss of crops or other land use. Section 4.8.2.3 contains a discussion on impacts associated with construction close to residences and mitigation measures that would be employed.
	BM50-3	(149) 9-17	The commenter stated that the application process for the Project appears to be proceeding more rapidly than typical applications.	There are a multitude of factors that govern application review time periods for regulatory agencies. The processing of this Project is consistent with other FERC projects of this nature.
Larry Silverman, Environmental Lawyer, Takoma Park, MD	BM51			
	BM51-1	(152) 4-25; (153) 1-25; (154) 1-25; (155) 1-13	The commenter stated his opinion that the Coast Guard does not have the appropriate assets.	As stated in section 4.12.5.5, the U.S. Coast Guard has preliminarily determined the measures necessary to responsibly manage LNG carrier operations in the waterway. Unless the required measures to ensure safe and secure operations were in place and serving their intended purpose, neither the Commission nor the U.S. Coast Guard would allow operation of the proposed facility.

**Table P2-1 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Baltimore, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Andy Fellows, Chesapeake Regional Director for ( <i>inaudible</i> ) Water Action	BM52			
	BM52-1	(157) 2	The commenter stated concerns regarding dredging.	Section 4.3.2.5 contains discussions on project dredging. Section 4.3.2.4 contains discussions on sediment sampling and analyses, and fate and transport of contaminants in the marine environment. The Consolidated Dredge Plan is included in appendix D of the FEIS.
	BM52-2	(157) 11-16	The commenter stated concerns regarding environmental justice.	Environmental Justice is discussed in section 4.9.7.
	BM52-3	(157) 18-23	The commenter reiterated his concerns regarding dredging.	Please see response to comment BM52-1.
	BM52-4	(157) 24-25; (158) 1	The commenter stated concerns regarding terrorism.	Please see response to comment BM2-1.

On June 11, 2008, a public meeting was held in Downingtown, Pennsylvania at the East Brandywine Fire Hall. The following transcript identifies the commenters and summarizes their comments. A complete transcript of the proceedings is available at <http://elibrary.ferc.gov> (Docket #CP07-62, CP07-63, CP07-64 and CP07-65).

<b>Table P2-2 Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS</b>				
<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Matthew Jones, 128 Creekview Court, MD	DT1			
	DT1-1	(16) 6-7	The commenter stated that the pipeline would come very close to his home.	Impacts to existing residences are discussed in section 4.8.1.1 of the FEIS. For residences within 25 feet of the construction right-of-way, AES would develop site specific construction plans.
	DT1-2	(16) 20-21	The commenter is worried about the impact on property during construction of the pipeline.	Impacts to existing residences are discussed in section 4.8.1.1. Construction impacts would be temporary and construction is not expected to last more than one week in any one location for residences requiring a site-specific plan.
	DT1-3	(16) 22-23	The commenter is worried about the effects the pipeline would have on agricultural land.	Impacts to agricultural land are discussed in section 4.8.1.3.
	DT1-4	(16) 23-24	The commenter is worried about the affects the pipeline would have on property values and insurance rates.	Property values and property insurance are discussed in section 4.9.5.
	DT1-5	(17) 5-6	The commenter is concerned about the safety of the pipeline.	Safety is discussed in section 4.12.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT1-6	(17) 11-13	The commenter is concerned that eminent domain for this pipeline is not in the best interest of the community, and that it usually precedes construction of significant undesirable projects.	Comment noted. While FERC's authorization under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act would convey eminent domain authority, specific terms would be determined by a state or local court if a negotiated agreement cannot be reached or an easement cannot be established.
	DT1-7	(18) 9-13	The commenter noted that the LNG Opposition Team has offered AES several alternatives to the Project's location.	Section 3.0 evaluates a range of alternatives for design and construction. FERC has considered all alternatives suggested by the public as well as those identified by FERC.
	DT1-8	(19) 3-4	Commenter stated that the communities in Pennsylvania and Maryland are all against the proposed Project.	Comment noted.
	DT1-9	(20) 1-6	The commenter is concerned about the safety of the LNG facility.	Please see response to comment IN8-1.
Rupert Rossetti, 215 Dr. Jack Road, Port Deposit, MD; Appointee to MD Tributary Strategy Team	DT2			
	DT2-1	(21) 23-24	The commenter is concerned that the LNG facility, pipeline, and the proposed turning basin that is to be dredged would have a negative impact on the areas water quality.	Impacts on water resources, including water quality, are discussed in section 4.3.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT2-2	(22) 10-13	Commenter notes that a large proportion of the overall pipeline waterbody crossings would occur in the Octoraro Creek watershed.	Appendix I lists the Octoraro Creek and tributary waterbody crossings. Approximately 15% of all waterbody crossings by the pipeline would affect Octoraro Creek and its tributaries.
	DT2-3	(22) 14-16	The commenter is concerned about the impact to migrating (anadromous) fish spawning habitat in the Octoraro Creek watershed.	Section 4.3.2.5 <i>HDD and Dry Crossings</i> contains discussion about the added restriction that crossing of the Octoraro Creek (and other anadromous waterbodies) would be restricted from February 15 through June 15 to avoid the anadromous fish spawning period.
	DT2-4	(22) 17-24	The commenter points out that the Octoraro is a Pennsylvania scenic river, and that there would be visual impacts from the widening of right-of-ways needed at waterbody crossings. Commenter also states that damming of the mainstream would temporarily impact boating and fishing during construction. The commenter believes Mid-Atlantic Express should be required to consult with the Octoraro Watershed Association about the 26 waterbody crossings within the watershed.	Section 4.8.1.2 <i>Special Status Waterbodies</i> contains a recommendation for Mid-Atlantic Express to consult with agencies including the Octoraro Creek Watershed Association to develop construction and mitigation plans minimizing tree clearing and visual impacts, and to maintain boating access. Section 4.8.5.2 addresses visual impacts. Discussions regarding crossing of the Octoraro Watershed have been conducted with NMFS, MDNR, and the Chester Water Authority.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT2-5	(23) 2-7	The commenter is interested in how stream crossings would be accomplished, and that the dam and pump method be considered at a minimum. The commenter is concerned why the Octoraro and Deer Creeks were not evaluated or recommended for HDD crossing.	See discussion in section 4.3.2.5 <i>HDD and Dry Crossings</i> about added restrictions that the pipeline would cross Octoraro Creek at a perpendicular angle, and the potential for HDD crossings of Octoraro and Deer Creeks.
	DT2-6	(23) 19-21	The commenter believes that AES should be required to consult with the FWS and NMFS.	As the lead agency, the FERC is required to comply with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA), Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (HNPA), and Section 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA). Compliance with these acts requires consultation with several agencies including FWS and NMFS. See section 1.3 for additional information.
	DT2-7	(24) 4-5	The commenter states that the crossing of any waterbodies within the watershed can adversely affect the water quality in the mainstem. The commenter notes that there is a threat to the water supply in the Octoraro Reservoir from construction.	Impacts on water resources are discussed in section 4.3.2.5. See section 4.3.2.2 for a discussion of water intakes. Mid-Atlantic Express would be required to implement surface water protective measures contained in its Environmental Construction Plan (appendix T), which includes a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). A draft Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan (SPCC) has been filed and is included in appendix W.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT2-8	(24) 20-24	The commenter noted that the Project would have impacts to waterbodies, wetlands, critical areas, wildlife, historical sites and private landowners, as well as LNG facility impacts at Turner Station, Edgemere and Dundalk.	Sections 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.8 and 4.9 contain discussions of impact and mitigation measures for these resources and communities.
	DT2-9	(25) 2-3	The commenter does not agree with FERC's conclusion that there would be no adverse environmental impacts from the Project.	We acknowledge that some resources would be adversely affected by the Project. The conclusions reached in the FEIS include compliance with all mitigation recommendations made by FERC.
James Bullitt 231 Brabson Road, Nottingham, PA	DT3			
	DT3-1	(26) 2-4	The commenter is concerned about the impacts that the pipeline would have on water quality of high quality tributaries within the Octoraro watershed, including Reynolds Run.	Please see response to comment DT2-7.
	DT3-2	(26) 5-8	Commenter is concerned that the Project's size would negatively impact the environment, aesthetic value of communities, and landowners' use and enjoyment of their properties.	We acknowledge that some resources would be adversely affected by the Project. Section 5.1 discusses FERC's conclusions on the Project's environmental impacts.
	DT3-3	(26) 13-14	The commenter objects to the pipeline running through the Kirks Mill Historic District.	Section 3.3.3 discusses FERC's recommended route variation for avoiding the Kirks Mill Historic District.
	DT3-4	(26) 17-18	The commenter notes the proposed pipeline runs between two historical homes.	Comment noted. See response to comment DT3-3.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT3-5	(26) 19-21	The commenter notes that the pipeline would affect the Old Mill Pond within the Kirks Mill Historic District that he believes is a wetland.	Wetlands and waterbodies, including ponds, affected by the Project are discussed in section 4.3 and 4.4. See response to comment DT3-3.
	DT3-6	(26) 22-23	The commenter notes that there are several potential historic archaeological sites that the pipeline would affect.	Section 4.10 contains additional discussion on cultural resources, including the Kirks Mill Historic District. See response to comment DT3-3.
	DT3-7	(27) 4-6	The commenter believes that the pipeline route needs to be defined though the historic district.	Please see response to comment DT3-3.
	DT3-8	(27) 9-11	Commenter is concerned about the affects the pipeline would have on tax breaks to property in Clean and Green program.	Section 4.8.1.3 discusses pipeline impacts to conservation easement programs.
	DT3-9	(27) 12-14	Commenter is concerned about clean and green property and also the development of hardwood tree stands on his property.	Section 4.8.1.3 discusses pipeline impacts to conservation easement programs.
	DT3-10	(27) 15-18	The commenter would like Mid-Atlantic Express to contact them prior to coming on their property, and feels that there is a lack of communication from Mid-Atlantic Express.	Comment noted. Section 4.8.1.1 contains a requirement to provide site-specific residential plans, for review and comment by residents within 50 feet of the proposed construction work areas. Section 5 discusses FERC's recommended landowner complaint resolution procedure.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Jeffery Piper 1423 Glenside Road (Parents 1209 Romansville Road, Coatesville)	DT4			
	DT4-1	(28) 19-21	The commenter believes that the pipeline would cross Broad Run Creek, which he believes is recognized as a pristine environmental creek.	Section 4.3.2.3 discusses Broad Run Creek as a Pennsylvania state-listed sensitive waterbody due to environmental impairments.
	DT4-2	(28) 22 - (29) 2	The commenter would like Mid-Atlantic to provide liability insurance before they survey property.	The landowner and company representatives would be expected to resolve issues related to obtaining survey access.
	DT4-3	(29) 8-9	The commenter is concerned about the pipelines affect on hardwood stands.	Section 4.8.1.3 discusses impacts to timber resources and section 4.5.1 discusses impacts to vegetation.
	DT4-4	(29) 11-12	The commenter is concerned that the pipeline will affect agricultural land (hayfield) on his parent's property.	Section 4.8.1.3 contains a discussion of impacts to agricultural land, including FERC's added requirement to develop an Agricultural Impacts Mitigation Plan for agricultural land crossed by the proposed pipeline.
	DT4-5	(29) 13-15	The commenter is concerned the pipeline will destroy a well that is currently being used. The commenter noted that the pipeline will affect springs that feed Broad Run Creek and that Mid-Atlantic would not repair damage done by construction.	Section 4.3.1.1 discusses FERC's added requirement to identify all wells within 150 feet of the initial proposed construction right-of-way, and FERC's added groundwater well mitigation requirement.
	DT4-6	(30) 11-12	The commenter believes that this additional pipeline will have a negative impact on property values.	Property values are discussed in section 4.9.5.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT4-7	(30) 13-14	The commenter notes that there is a Federal Aviation Administration radar station right-of-way on the farm.	Comment noted.
	DT4-8	(30) 19-21	The commenter is concerned that the impacts to farmland will affect income for parent's farm and asked about compensation.	Impacts to agricultural land are discussed in section 4.8.1.3. Easement compensation would either be negotiated between the landowner and applicant or be determined in a condemnation proceeding by a state or local court.
	DT4-9	(31) 1-3	The commenter states that 2 acres of farm land will be affected on his parent's property and will decrease the value of land.	Agricultural land would be allowed to be farmed after construction has been completed. Property value is discussed in section 4.9.5.
	DT4-10	(31) 5-7	Commenter is concerned that he will lose income from trees that will be cleared as a result of pipeline construction.	Section 4.8.1.3 has been updated to include more discussion on impacts to timber land.
	DT4-11	(31) 9-10	Commenter states that vegetation and wildlife will be affected by pipeline construction.	Vegetation is discussed in section 4.5 and wildlife is discussed in section 4.6 of the FEIS.
	DT4-12	(31) 19-20	The commenter is concerned about safety from a terrorist attack on the LNG facility and pipeline.	Section 4.12 contains a discussion related to LNG and pipeline safety.
Russell Donnelly, Representing LNG Opposition Team, Environmental Coordinator	DT5			
	DT5-1	(32) 9-11	The commenter is concerned that there are no conclusions drawn to any of the aspects of the Project.	Conclusions are discussed in section 5.1.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT5-2	(32) 13-15	The commenter does not believe that all the concerns have been answered in the EIS and believes that a permit will be issued without answers.	FERC staff is recommending that conditions be included in the order authorizing the Project should the Commission determine that an approval is warranted. Each condition has a timing requirement that dictates when the information must be provided.
	DT5-3	(32) 18-19	Commenter believes that this does not adhere to the FERC process.	Comment noted.
	DT5-4	(32) 21-22	The commenter believes that AES should not be endowed or afforded U.S. Government authoritative power.	While FERC's authorization under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act would convey eminent domain authority, specific terms would be determined by a state or local court if a negotiated agreement cannot be reached or an easement cannot be established.
	DT5-5	(33) 2-5	The commenter would like a discussion on the 100 year flood plain that the terminal sits in, but was not discussed in the DEIS.	Construction within the 100-year floodplain would be regulated by the appropriate municipal, county, state, and federal building codes, laws, and regulations for building in floodplains. As indicated in section 4.12.2, certain critical equipment at the LNG terminal would be elevated to at least 10 feet NAVD88. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map indicates the 500-year (Zone "B") flood limits do not encroach onto the proposed terminal site (FEMA, 1996). If the 500-year flood limits do not encroach on the site, then the 100-year limits would not affect the site.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT5-6	(33) 6-12	The commenter believes that there cannot be minimal impacts if the Project were constructed.	Conclusions for the Project are discussed in section 5.1.
	DT5-7	(33) 14-16	The commenter believes that FERC's determination is based on AES's data.	The Commission's staff has used all available sources for its determination, including data from the applicant, input from other federal, state and local agencies, input from our own research, and input from the public.
	DT5-8	(33) 17-19	The commenter would like the terms 'minimal' and 'significant' defined.	Depending upon the resource area, FERC staff qualitatively or quantitatively, as appropriate, assessed the impacts upon the natural and human environments. This FEIS has been completed in compliance with the requirements of NEPA, the CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA, and the FERC's regulations implementing NEPA.
	DT5-9	(33) 20-24	The commenter stated that impacts to the Chesapeake Bay Watershed would exceed limitations of regulations.	Impacts on water resources are discussed in section 4.3. Potential impacts are reviewed by Federal and State regulatory agencies prior to issuance of their respective authorizations to construct.
	DT5-10	(33) 25; (34) 3, 4-8	The commenter stated that the Project would impact the estuary ecosystem of the Chesapeake Bay, and in particular, degrade the already severely impaired water quality within the Bay.	As stated in the FEIS, the Project would impact the Chesapeake Bay estuary. The scope of and mitigation for these potential impacts are discussed in sections 4.3.2.5 and 4.3.2.6.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT5-11	(34) 10-16	The commenter is concerned that blasting was never mentioned before the issuance of the DEIS.	Specific areas for blasting would not be identified until construction begins. Blasting would not be done until AES has submitted a site specific Blasting Plan and it is approved by the Commission. Blasting is discussed in sections 2.3.1.3 and 4.1.1.2.
	DT5-12	(34) 16-19	The commenter states that they would like to know AES's limit of liability for damage done to wells, septic systems and structures during construction of the Project.	Section 4.3.1.1 contains a discussion on public and private water supply wells. We recommended in section 4.3.1.1 that Mid-Atlantic Express identify all wells within 150 feet of the construction work areas. In the event that a potable water well is damaged by construction activities, Mid-Atlantic Express has agreed to provide a temporary source of water. Additionally, Mid-Atlantic Express would be responsible for the repair/replacement (to original capacity) of any potable water supplies damaged by construction activities. Septic systems are discussed in section 4.8.1.1. Mid-Atlantic Express' Septic System Contingency Plan contains details regarding the steps that would be taken to avoid disturbance to septic systems; mitigate for damage to septic systems; and restore/replace septic systems.
	DT5-13	(34) 20-24	The commenter states that the dredging will have a devastating impact on NOAA Project 64, which is for the restoration of Maryland's native oyster.	Revised section 4.6.2.2 <i>Dredging</i> contains a discussion of the Fort Carroll Oyster Restoration Project.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT5-14	(35) 1-5	The commenter is concerned that the suspension of toxic sediment during dredging would kill the oysters.	Please see response to comment DT5-14.
	DT5-15	(35) 7-11, 17-18	The commenter believes that the suspension of toxic sediments during dredging is classified as a criminal offense under several areas of federal, state and local law. The commenter states that any attempt to execute this Project would be in direct violation of Maryland state law.	Disposal of dredge material would be conducted in compliance with all federal and state permits and authorizations. This FEIS has been completed in compliance with the requirements of NEPA, the CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA, and the FERC's regulations implementing NEPA. As discussed in section 4.3.2.5, <i>Dredging</i> and in the Consolidated Dredge Plan (appendix D), mitigation measures would be used to ensure that water quality impacts would be minimized. In softer, surface sediments, an environmental bucket would be used concurrent with reduced and controlled lowering speeds for the crane, and scows and containers would be solid hull constructing and completely sealed and water tight to avoid release of dredge material. Additionally, a water quality sampling program would be instituted within a 1000-ft limit upstream and downstream of the proposed dredge area. Sampling would be conducted prior to, during, and 30 days post-dredging activities. Results would be submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers within 120 days of the completion of dredging activities.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT5-16	(35) 12-16	The commenter states that AES cannot dredge at Sparrows Point because AES is not registered in Baltimore City.	The authorization to conduct dredging at Sparrows Point would be determined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
	DT5-17	(35) 20-24	The commenter states that bird colonies at Fort Carroll are closer than 1.5 miles that is stated in the DEIS.	Thank you for the information. Lori Bryne from Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) confirmed that the two waterbird colonies within the vicinity of the Project area are located over 0.5 miles from the Project area. The MDNR recommends protection of waterbird colonies during the nesting season by observing a 0.25 mile buffer around the colony on which disturbance is limited or prohibited. Since these colonies are located outside of the 0.25 mile buffer, no adverse impacts to these nesting sites are expected. See sections 4.6.1.1 and 4.6.1.3.
	DT5-18	(35) 25 - (36) 1	The commenter states that the AES Project will have detrimental effects to the colonies if built.	Please see response to comment DT5-1.
Lisa Van Houten, 1608 Renee Lane, Downingtown, PA, Representing the Homeowners Association of Victoria Crossing	DT6			
	DT6-1	(36) 12-16	The commenter states that the neighborhood homeowners association would like site specific consultations about pipeline route.	Section 4.8.1.1 contains a requirement that Mid-Atlantic Express provide site-specific residential plans, for review and comment by residents within 50 feet of the proposed construction work areas.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT6-2	(36) 17-25	The commenter is interested in documentation about pipeline safety with respect to degradation and multiple pipeline crossovers.	Pipeline safety and reliability are discussed in section 4.12.
	DT6-3	(37) 2-3	The commenter states that there are already 2 Columbia gas lines that are not at full capacity and questions why they cannot be used.	Section 3.3 discusses existing pipeline alternatives to achieve the stated Project purpose and need.
	DT6-4	(37) 9-13	The commenter would like to know if there is a chemical incompatibility of the LNG with the current lines and what it would take to treat it.	The LNG stored at the facility would be re-gasified before being transported through the pipeline.
	DT6-5	(37) 17-19	The commenter states that there should be an additional public hearing.	The Commission's docket for the Project remains an open exchange of information that would receive comments on the Project throughout preparation of the FEIS and the Commission's review. FERC staff performed an additional site visit the week of August 12, 2008.
	DT6-6	(37) 2-6	The commenter states that homes affected by the Project should be identified in the EIS.	Existing residences are discussed in section 4.8.1.1 and a list of structures within 50 feet of the construction work space is listed in appendix F.
	DT6-7	(38) 3-6	The commenter states that maps in EIS should use satellite imagery.	Comment noted.
	DT6-8	(38) 9-15	The commenter states that the homeowners association proposed a route alternative that is not included in the EIS.	Section 3.3 of the FEIS has been updated to include all proposed route alternatives.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT6-9	(38) 21 - (39) 1	The commenter states that table I is confusing.	Footnote a in table I in appendix I starts with state stream class 2 (Maryland and Pennsylvania) rather than 1 because the Project does not cross any class 1 state streams. Only state stream class codes crossed by the Project were included in the footnote. State stream classes are defined by PDEP in Pennsylvania.
	DT6-10	(39) 2-3	The commenter states the classification 4B is missing from table I.	There is a state stream classification 4B; however, no waterbodies that would be crossed are classified as such and only water classification codes relevant to the Project were included in table I in appendix I.
	DT6-11	(39) 4-7	The commenter noted that she could not interpret table I, Category 5.	Comment noted.
	DT6-12	(39) 10-12	The commenter states that more affirmative language should be used to replace recommendations.	Recommendations in the EIS are measures FERC staff recommends to be included as required conditions of the Commission's Certificate. AES would have to adhere to all applicable federal, state and local laws, regulations and standards as well as any conditions that may be attached to the FERC Certificate and other agency permits and approvals if approved/issued.
Joan Deen, 350 Brown Road, Nottingham, PA	DT7			
	DT7-1	(40) 15 - (41) 2	The commenter noted that the Crown Landing LNG project was denied the coastal zone permit but is still listed in table 3.2-1.	Table 3.2-1 has been revised.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT7-2	(41) 14-15	The commenter states that the Project will further our dependence on foreign oil.	Alternative energy sources are discussed in section 3.1 and project need in 1.2.
	DT7-3	(41) 16-18	The commenter states that the LNG vessels will disrupt peoples' use of the Bay.	Section 4.8.4.1 discusses potential conflicts with recreational boating. Recreational boating conflicts are under consideration by the Coast Guard.
	DT7-4	(41) 18-19	The commenter is concerned that dredging is going to destroy the federally-funded native oyster restoration project.	Please see response to comment DT5-14.
	DT7-5	(41) 21-23	The commenter is concerned about the safety of the terminal and pipeline.	Please see response to comment EW3-4.
	DT7-6	(42) 2-8	The commenter is concerned about the crossing of the Kirks Mill Historic District by the pipeline, and questions why consultations with the PA State Historic Preservation Office and other concerned parties were not included in the DEIS.	The Kirks Mill Historic District is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is discussed in section 4.10. Section 4.10.1 discusses consultations with the PA-SHPO. Section 3.3.3 discusses FERC's recommended route variation for avoiding the Kirks Mill Historic District.
	DT7-7	(42) 16-19	The commenter believes that the recommendations under Section 4.10.4, should be completed before a permit is issued.	Please see response to comment to DT5-2 and DT6-12.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT7-8	(43) 21 - (44) 2	The commenter states that all the information should be presented before the application is approved.	All analyses and responses filed by the Applicant and reviews and comments by other agencies are publicly available at <a href="http://elibrary.ferc.gov">http://elibrary.ferc.gov</a> (Docket #CP07-62, CP07-63, CP07-64 and CP07-65). The docket is constantly expanding as new information becomes available. We have repeatedly encouraged and continue to encourage informed comment on the contents of the public docket. We do not believe all recommendations must be met prior to issuance of the EIS to understand the environmental impacts of the Project and fulfill the requirements of NEPA.
Dan Shanor, 27 Kingpin Road, Nottingham, PA	DT8			
	DT8-1	(44) 18-21	The commenter states that this Project is all about money.	Comment noted.
	DT8-2	(45) 3-4	The commenter states that Lancaster County has the lowest per capita income along the pipeline.	Socioeconomics is discussed in section 4.9 of the FEIS.
	DT8-3	(45) 7-23	The commenter states that his local representative is not doing anything to fight the Project.	This comment is beyond the scope of this EIS.
	DT8-4	(46) 6-8	The commenter stated that the EIS does not address the impact to the psyche of people affected by the Project.	Please see response to comment SE1-13.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT8-5	(46) 20-22	The commenter states that money to review this Project should be redirected to alternative energy sources.	FERC is required to review all applications filed with the Commission for natural gas pipelines and LNG terminals that are onshore or in state waters irrespective of location and number of applications received, approved or rejected.
	DT8-6	(47) 2-24	The commenter states that the demand for LNG has decreased and the Project is not needed.	The purpose and need of the Project is discussed in section 1.2 of the FEIS.
	DT8-7	(49) 12-18	The commenter stated that the original plan to place the terminal closer to Philadelphia was denied by the coast Guard because of safety concerns.	Federal requirements for terminal siting are discussed in section 2.7.1 and table 2.7.1-1.
	DT8-8	(50) 3-4	The commenter stated that there is a concern over the safety of LNG vessels.	LNG hazards are discussed in section 4.12.1 of the FEIS.
	DT8-9	(50) 6-14	The commenter states that the Coast Guard is responsible for the LNG vessel from its entrance into U.S. waters until it is docked at the terminal.	The Coast Guard has authority over LNG facilities that affect the safety and security of port areas and navigable waterways. The Coast Guard is responsible for matters related to navigation safety, vessel engineering and safety standards, and all matters pertaining to the safety of facilities or equipment located in or adjacent to navigable waters up to the last valve immediately before the receiving tanks. The Coast Guard also has authority over security plan review, approval and compliance verification and siting as it pertains to the management of vessel traffic in and around the LNG facility. Section 1.3.2 contains a discussion on the Coast Guard's regulatory authority.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT8-10	(51) 5-7	The commenter states that he would never buy property along a natural gas pipeline.	Comment noted.
	DT8-11	(51) 10-14	Commenter states that the Cove Point LNG facility was recently expanded.	See section 3.2.1, section 3.2.2, and section 3.2.3 for a discussion on the alternatives analysis which includes Cove Point and section 4.13 for a cumulative impacts analysis.
	DT8-12	(51) 23-25	The commenter states that a permit cannot be granted unless the exact location of the pipeline is known.	The filed route proposed by Mid-Atlantic Express is the route that is being reviewed, along with route variations recommended by FERC staff. Any changes to the route would need to be submitted and approved by the Commission.
	DT8-13	(52) 2-4	The commenter stated concern over additional pipelines along the right-of-way in the future.	Any plans for future pipelines would be subject to their own environmental review and permitting.
	DT8-14	(52) 17-20	The commenter states that using existing energy sources would be more beneficial than this Project.	See section 3.1 for the alternatives analysis discussing existing energy sources including non-renewable fuels and renewable energy sources.
David Sweeny, 315 Rock Raymond Road, Downingtown, PA	DT9			
	DT9-1	(53) 18-20	The commenter stated that previous pipeline caused damage to area.	Comment noted.
	DT9-2	(53) 21-23	The commenter states that he would like to know the depth of the pipeline.	The depth of the pipeline varies depending on soil conditions and geology. Under most conditions the DOT requires the pipeline to be a minimum of 30-36 inches below grade. Pipeline safety is discussed in section 4.12.9.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT9-3	(53) 24 - (54) 1	The commenter would like to know where the dredged material will be disposed of and if it is toxic.	Details of the dredged material processing and disposal are in the Consolidated Dredge Plan found in appendix D.
	DT9-4	(54) 2-8	The commenter believes that we need to look into alternative fuels and not foreign sources of energy.	Section 3.1 of the FEIS evaluates a variety of alternatives to the proposed Project. These alternatives encompass other non-renewable fuels, renewable energy sources, and energy conservation.
	DT9-5	(54) 14-15	The commenter is concerned that opposition to the Project is not being taken into account.	We take all concerns seriously. All written and oral comments received during the public comment period and later were considered and evaluated in the preparation of this FEIS. Concerns have been addressed by responding to all comments within the scope of this FEIS.
Teri Dignazio, located at mile markers 56.99-57.77	DT10			
	DT10-1	(55) 7-10	The commenter was concerned about missing satellite images on the FERC DEIS CD-ROM.	Comment noted.
	DT10-2	(55) 16-18	The commenter stated that they could not determine mile markers on maps.	Comment noted. Mileposts were included on the maps included in appendix B.
	DT10-3	(55) 19 - (56) 4	The commenter believes that information about the pipeline on his property is inaccurate.	We encourage landowners to provide additional information about their properties if they feel a description is inaccurate. If the Project is approved, you may also discuss any discrepancies with the applicants during any easement negotiations.
	DT10-4	(56) 9-17	The commenter states that he is nervous about the Project and believes there is a larger agenda.	Comment noted. Please also see response to comment SE1-13.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT10-5	(56) 21-23	The commenter is concerned about the mitigation for timber cut along the pipeline route.	Easement agreements are made between AES and the landowner. This EIS does not cover easement agreements. The restoration of vegetation clearing is discussed in section 2.3.2.1, section 2.3.2.2, section 4.5.1, and section 4.8.1.3.
	DT10-6	(57) 1-12	The commenter stated that they would like the mitigation of forest land to include the replacement of trees by circumference.	Easement agreements are made between AES and the landowner. This EIS does not cover easement agreements. The restoration of vegetation clearing is discussed in section 2.3.2.1, section 2.3.2.2, section 4.5.1, and section 4.8.1.3.
	DT10-7	(57) 13-15	The commenter is concerned about impacts to the tree canopy, especially along Tweed Run.	Impacts to water resources, including vegetation around water resources, are discussed in section 4.3 of the FEIS.
	DT10-8	(57) 21-24	The commenter would like to know what the definition of 'densely populated' is, and if "smart pigs" would be used over the entire pipeline.	Population density as it relates to pipeline safety is determined by DOT regulations and are discussed in section 4.12.9 of the EIS. Corrosion monitoring (potentially with "smart pigs") would be in accordance with DOT standards in 49 CFR Part 192.
Eric Newman, 316 Lyndon Drive, Upper Uwchlan	DT11			
	DT11-1	(58) 20-21	The commenter stated that he just received notification of the Project.	Please see response to comment BM37-1. Based on additional route variations additional landowners have been notified.
	DT11-2	(58) 25 – (59) 1	The commenter stated that the pipeline route runs directly through his house.	Affects to existing residences are discussed in section 4.8.1.1. The pipeline would not be authorized to go through or under any occupied residence or structure. A site-specific construction plan would be required for all properties less than 50 feet from the construction right-of-way.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT11-3	(59) 2-5	The commenter stated that the pipeline would affect his well and septic system.	Affects to existing residences, including septic systems, are discussed in section 4.8.1.1. Wells are discussed in section 4.3.1.1 of the FEIS.
	DT11-4	(59) 9-12	The commenter is concerned about a wastewater runoff basin and wetland that would be affected by the pipeline.	Surface water resources and impacts and mitigation are found in section 4.3.2.5.
	DT11-5	(59) 14-18	The commenter stated that the pipeline would affect cable, electric and public water service if the pipeline was routed on his property.	Section 4.8.1.1 discusses potential impacts to utilities for private residences.
John Goodall, Brandywine Conservancy	DT12			
	DT12-1	(60) 20-25	The commenter is concerned about 250 acres of land that is under conservation easements granted to the Brandywine Conservancy that would be affected by the pipeline.	Conservation easements are discussed in section 4.8.1.3.
	DT12-2	(61) 1-7	The commenter states that the purpose of the easements are to maintain the land in its undeveloped state.	Conservation easements are discussed in section 4.8.1.3.
	DT12-3	(61) 7-8	The commenter is concerned that the pipeline will adversely affect area that is designated by the Audubon as an important bird habitat area.	The proposed pipeline crosses the State Line Barrens IBA (Site 59) in Pennsylvania. We have recommended that AES consult with PGC regarding the State Line Barrens IBA prior to the start of construction. See revised sections 4.6.1.1 and 4.6.1.3.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT12-4	(61) 9-12	The commenter is concerned about the 90 acres of conservation easement land that will be affected by the pipeline.	Conservation easements are discussed in section 4.8.1.3.
	DT12-5	(61) 20-24	The commenter stated that the permanent right-of-way will increase in size and is not consistent with the terms of the easements.	Conservation easements are discussed in section 4.8.1.3. The use of the land would return to its former use after construction, with the exception of portions of forested areas.
	DT12-6	(62) 6-12	The commenter states that the proposed activities within the conservation easements would need to be reviewed for consistency with the easement purposes.	Conservation easements are discussed in section 4.8.1.3.
	DT12-7	(62) 19-24	The commenter states that there are more stream crossings than are listed in the Brandywine River System.	Water resources are discussed in section 4.3 and a list of water crossings is located in appendix I.
	DT12-8	(62) 25 - 63 (5)	The commenter supports the use of third party environmental inspectors.	Comment noted.
	DT12-9	(63) 6-8	The commenter supports Pennsylvania and Chester County oversight of environmental impacts.	Comment noted.
	DT12-10	(63) 11-13	The commenter states that the Federal government should encourage the development of alternative sources of energy.	Comment noted. See also section 3.1.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT12-11	(63) 16-17	The commenter states that the Columbia gas pipeline should be used to capacity before any new pipelines are built.	It is our understanding that the Columbia gas pipeline would not have the capacity to move the volumes of natural gas proposed with the Project.
	DT12-12	(63) 18-20	The commenter states that building new pipelines should be used as a last resort to address energy needs.	Comment noted. See also section 3.1.
Dan Shanor, 27 Kingpin Road, Nottingham, PA	DT13			
	DT13-1	(64) 8-9	The commenter stated that the Coast Guard does not have the resources to handle the addition of LNG tankers in the Bay.	Please see response to comment EW3-4.
Russell Donnelly, Representing LNG Opposition Team, Environmental Coordinator, 2114 Oak Road, Sparrows Point, MD	DT14			
	DT14-1	(65) 21 – (66) 2	The commenter stated that there would be an impact to the commercial and recreational use of the Chesapeake Bay.	See sections 4.8.1.2 and 4.9.4.2 <i>Impacts on Commercial Shipping, Fishing and Waterfowl Hunting.</i>
	DT14-2	(66) 2-3	The commenter states that AES is being given power of authority reserved for federal and state agencies.	AES receives no delegated authority under the FERC certificate.
	DT14-3	(66) 4-15	The Commenter stated that the LNG vessels will delay cargo and cruise ships and will cost the port of Baltimore money.	The socioeconomic impacts associated with LNG vessel transit are discussed in section 4.9.4.2.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Sue Bullitt, 231 Brabson Road, Nottingham, Little Britain	DT15			
	DT15-1	(66) 24 - (67) 3	The commenter stated that she did not receive any information about environmental and Archaeological surveys done in the Kirks Mill Historic District.	See section 3.3 (Alternatives) and section 3.10 (Cultural Resources) regarding consideration of route variations and ongoing consultation to avoid and minimize possible impacts to the Kirks Mill Historic District.
	DT15-2	(67) 8-9	The commenter stated that there are more species in the area than were included in the EIS.	Wildlife is discussed in section 4.6 of the FEIS.
	DT15-3	(67) 15-19	The commenter stated that she is unaware of how the surveys are completed.	The applicants must perform surveys for sensitive resources in order to avoid and minimize potential impacts to these resources.
	DT15-4	(67) 20-21	The commenter would like to have a copy of the survey report for her property.	All publicly available information is contained on the FERC docket, available at <a href="http://elibrary.ferc.gov">http://elibrary.ferc.gov</a> (Docket #CP07-62, CP07-63, CP07-64 and CP07-65). Please contact Mid-Atlantic Express directly for information specific to your property.
Lisa Van Houten, 1608 Renee Lane, Downingtown, PA, Representing the Homeowners Association of Victoria Crossing	DT16			
	DT16-1	(68) 3-6	The commenter would like to know who the owner of the commercial well is at MP 77.6.	The owner of the well is the Bradford Glen Water Company.
	DT16-2	(68) 7-9	The commenter states that she believes the word negative should be added to cumulative impacts.	Comment noted.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT16-3	(68) 10-12	The commenter states that there is no justification for benefit to personal income on a project like this.	Comment noted.
	DT16-4	(68) 13-16	The commenter questions how homeowner tax burden will be decreased by the Project.	See section 4.9.6.
	DT16-5	(68) 17-19	The commenter asked if there was any landowner approval.	AES should negotiate with each landowner for compensation /mitigation specific to their property.
	DT16-6	(68) 20-23	The commenter stated there were not site specific plans as stated in table F-1.	The FEIS has been updated with site-specific plans for residences within 25 feet of the construction work space. See appendix U.
	DT16-7	(68) 24-25	The commenter questioned what "adjacent" referred to.	"Adjacent" refers to resources or residences that are not <u>directly</u> crossed or affected by the workspace, but are abutting (adjacent to) the construction work space.
	DT16-8	(69) 3-4	The commenter stated they were unsure of what the proposed mitigation was for the residences in table F-1.	The forms of mitigation and possible combinations are as presented at the bottom of table F-1.
	DT16-9	(69) 5-8	The commenter stated that the association should be consulted on any common land the pipeline will cross.	Common land would be discussed with the association/agency responsible for maintaining the land.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT16-10	(69) 9-19	The commenter stated that floodplains of streams are not addressed in table I.	<p>Authorization of waterbody crossings would be issued by COE once they have completed their review of the Project area, which would include their verification of an accurate stream width estimate.</p> <p>The Waterway and 100-Year Construction Regulations require that activities in a waterway or its floodplain do not create flooding at upstream or downstream properties. The pipeline crossing would not cause flooding.</p>
Paula Latta Coyne, 3111 Darun Church Road, East Fallowfield, PA	DT17			
	DT17-1	(70) 2-3	The commenter stated that the period for public comments is short.	The comment period for this Project is consistent with other projects. We continue to consider all comments received prior to finalizing the EIS.
	DT17-2	(70) 18-20	The commenter was concerned that there was only one public meeting in Pennsylvania.	The pipeline is approximately 88 mile long, with about 48 miles in Pennsylvania and 48 mile in Maryland. The public meeting sites were selected to limit driving distances for interested parties along the entire route. Additional site visits were held in Pennsylvania in August, 2008.
Joe Civis, 1022 Wilshires Way, Downingtown PA	DT18			
	DT18-1	(71) 16	The commenter is concerned of the proximity of the pipeline to his house.	Impacts to existing residences are discussed in section 4.8.1.1.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT18-2	(71) 17-18	The commenter stated that he was not notified of a public meeting about the Project.	Every reasonable attempt was made to contact all affected parties. This included all interested land owners, newspapers, public agencies, and libraries.
	DT18-3	(71) 20-23	The commenter request a copy of the DEIS and to be put on the mailing list.	FERC (Ms. Wachholder) provided Mr. Civis with a CD of the DEIS during the Downingtown, PA public comment meeting. Mr. Civis was also added to the mailing list.
Dan Shanor, 27 Kingpin Road, Nottingham, PA	DT19			
	DT19-1	(72) 19-22	The commenter was stating that everyone within a half mile of the pipeline should have been notified.	FERC regulations require that all directly affected and abutting landowners be informed. See response to comment DT18-2.
	DT19-2	(73) 3-4, 6-7	The commenter asked if there was any public notification of the meeting and who is responsible for it.	Please see response to comment DT18-2.
Mr. Bullitt	DT20			
	DT20-1	(74) 12-15	The commenter stated that numerous people have not received mailings about the Project.	FERC regulations require that all directly affected and abutting landowners be informed. We try very hard to identify these individuals, but sometimes public landowner records are outdated or inaccurate. We expect the applicant to be as diligent as possible in identifying these landowners.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Audience	DT21			
	DT21-1	(74) 16	The commenter stated that the list of landowners is outdated.	Comment noted. See response to comment DT20-1.
Lisa Van Houten, 1608 Renee Lane, Downingtown, PA, Representing the Homeowners Association of Victoria Crossing	DT22			
	DT22-1	(74) 22-25	The commenter stated that she believed that every homeowner within 300 feet of the centerline should have been notified.	Please see response to comment DT20-1.
Audience	DT23			
	DT23-1	(75) 22-24	The commenter stated that newspaper circulations have declined in the area so fewer people were aware of the meeting.	Comment noted.
Lisa Van Houten, 1608 Renee Lane, Downingtown, PA, Representing the Homeowners Association of Victoria Crossing	DT24			
	DT24-1	(81) 23-25	The commenter asked if there was a minimum safe distance for pipeline crossovers.	The minimum separation per DOT safety regulations is one foot.
	DT24-2	(82) 13-16	The commenter is concerned about the safety of the pipeline that is only 30 inches underground.	Depth of cover would comply with DOT safety regulations. See section 4.12.9.

**Table P2-2 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Downingtown, Pennsylvania Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	DT24-3	(82) 18 – (83) 5	The commenter is concerned about the depth of the pipeline at a crossover of an older pipe and potential for the pipeline to sag at the crossover.	Pipeline crossovers are standard construction activities and would be conducted in compliance with all applicable DOT safety regulations.
Russell Donnelly, 2114 Oak Road	DT25			
	DT25-1	(84) 1-10	The commenter stated that they have proposed an offshore alternative to AES for the terminal site.	Section 3.1 of the FEIS evaluates a variety of alternatives to the proposed Project. These alternatives encompass other non-renewable fuels, renewable energy sources, and energy conservation.

On June 12, 2008, a public meeting was held in Edgewood, Maryland at the Richlin Ballroom. The following transcript identifies the commenters and summarizes their comments. A complete transcript of the proceedings is available at <http://elibrary.ferc.gov> (Docket #CP07-62, CP07-63, CP07-64 and CP07-65).

<b>Table P2-3 Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS</b>				
<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
Guido Guarnaccia, LNG Opposition Team	EW1			
	EW1-1	(16) 3-14, 19-25; (17) 1-12, 18-25; (18) 1-2	The commenter stated several concerns regarding security and safety.	Please see responses to comments IN10-5 and IN22-2.
	EW1-2	(16)15-18	The commenter stated that the Coast Guard has determined that Chesapeake Bay is not currently suitable for this type of facility.	The WSR stated that the Chesapeake Bay could be made suitable with the additional measures provided. Section 4.12.5.5 contains a discussion on the WSR and the WSR and additional recommended mitigation measures are contained in appendix J.
	EW1-3	(17) 13-17	The commenter stated concerns regarding the proposed LNG volume versus the Coast Guard's allowable limits.	The Coast Guard has approval authority over the cargo size of the LNG tanker.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW1-4	(17) 14-16	The commenter stated that the Coast Guard has limits to 148,000 m <sup>3</sup> vessels, AES has demanded 217,000 m <sup>3</sup> .	As stated in section 4.12.5.5 of the EIS and the WSR, the Coast Guard has put a restriction on the size of LNG carriers allowed to transit to the Project to 148,000 m <sup>3</sup> until a site-specific risk analysis for larger LNG carriers is approved by the Coast Guard COTP Baltimore.
	EW1-5	(17) 18-20	The commenter stated that the Coast Guard has established a hundred yard radius security zone. AES says it wants 300 yards.	Please see response to comment OC5-40.
Frank Holden, 315 Margaret Avenue, Essex, MD, Maryland Salt Water Sport Fishermen's Association	EW2			
	EW2-1	(18) 20 – (19) 3	The commenter stated several concerns regarding security and safety.	Section 4.12.1 of the EIS addresses the issue of energy content of LNG versus its explosive potential.
	EW2-2	(19) 6-9	The commenter stated concerns for recreational and fishing vessels.	Please see response to comment OC9-7.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	EW2-3	(19) 11-12	The commenter stated concerns regarding the environmental impacts of heavy metals and other pollutants that will be disturbed during dredging.	Please see response to comment IN8-1.
	EW2-4	(19) 12-16	U.S. Coast Guard has expressed inability to safeguard ships in such a busy port.	Please see response to comment IN10-5.
	EW2-5	(19) 17-23	500 yard security area is much smaller than in practice, ships chase others out at much farther distances than that.	Please see response to comment OC5-40.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Valerie Twanmoh, 2421 Haddon Hurst Court, Fallston - Speaking in part as Special Assistant to Senator Barbara Mikulski	EW3			
	EW3-1	(21) 23-25; (22) 1-2	The commenter stated the concerns of <u>Senator Mikulski</u> regarding the ability of the FERC to oversee the implementation and management of the mitigation measures outlined in the DEIS.	Please see the Commission's responses in the public record <a href="http://elibrary.ferc.gov">http://elibrary.ferc.gov</a> (Docket #CP07-62, CP07-63, CP07-64 and CP07-65) dated 3/20/2008, 5/24/2008, 7/3/2008 and 7/17/2008 which respond to the Senator's letters. Mitigation measures/conditions contained in the Certificate would be tracked and confirmed by FERC. FERC would implement and manage a third-party Environmental Compliance Monitoring and Reporting Program. See section 2.5 of the FEIS for additional information on environmental compliance, inspection and mitigation monitoring. Additionally, other federal and state agencies may conduct oversight and inspection as deemed necessary. After construction, the FERC would continue to conduct oversight inspection and monitoring of the Project.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW3-2	(22) 5-11	The commenter stated the concerns of Senator Mikulski regarding the pipeline route through urban and suburban communities, and the destruction of homes, schools, wells and septic systems.	Project construction and operation land use impacts on residential, community and industrial / commercial land uses have been assessed and are discussed in section 4.8. The pipeline would not be authorized to go through or under any occupied residence or structure. Impacts and mitigation measures for construction near water wells are described in section 4.3.1.1. Septic systems are discussed in section 4.8.1.1 of the FEIS.
	EW3-3	(22) 10-11	The commenter stated the concerns of Senator Mikulski regarding the pipeline's impacts to state parks and other recreation areas.	Impacts and mitigation measures on public interest and recreation areas are discussed in section 4.8.1.2

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW3-4	(22) 15-16	The commenter stated the concerns of Senator Mikulski regarding safety and security, and concerns that several of the Senator's previous information requests have not been addressed thus far.	As discussed in section 4.12.6, AES would be required to develop an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) (including evacuation). The plan would be developed in consultation with the Coast Guard, state, county, and local emergency planning groups, fire departments and law enforcement agencies. The ERP would include a Cost-Sharing Plan identifying the mechanisms for funding all project-specific security/emergency management costs that would be imposed on state and local agencies. In comments to the DEIS, AES has stated that they would make the appropriate arrangements to pay for additional resources needed to satisfy the Coast Guard's recommendations regarding LNG ship transits associated with the Project.
	EW3-5	(23) 11-24	The commenter stated concerns regarding the pipeline's proximity to public schools, recreational fields, the Deer Creek watershed, Rock State Park, the County 4-H camp, the historic village of Berkeley, historic Hosanna School, historic Jerusalem Mill, Harford Glen and the Harford County Equestrian Center.	Pipeline safety is discussed in section 4.12.9. Impacts on public safety are discussed in section 4.12.11. Parks and schools are discussed in section 4.8.1.2. Youth's Benefit Elementary School (mentioned by the commenter) is located greater than 0.25 mile from the proposed pipeline route.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW3-6	(23) 25 - (24) 1-6	Commenter stated that safety concerns that were raised before have yet to be adequately addressed by the applicant.	All analyses and responses filed by the Applicant and reviews and comments by other agencies are publicly available at <a href="http://elibrary.ferc.gov">http://elibrary.ferc.gov</a> (Docket #CP07-62, CP07-63, CP07-64 and CP07-65). The docket is constantly expanding as new information becomes available. All written and oral comments received during the formal public comment period and later were considered and evaluated in the preparation of this FEIS.
Linwood Jackson, 621 New Pittsburgh Avenue, Turner Station	EW4			
	EW4-1	(24) 15-25; (25) 1-15	The commenter expressed concerns regarding many hazardous materials known to be at the proposed LNG site, and outlined the many products that used to be manufactured at the site.	Comment noted. The federal and state agency database search identified 22 hazardous, potentially hazardous and solid waste sites within 0.25 mile of the LNG terminal site and the proposed pipeline route. Section 4.8.3 contains discussions on the hazardous waste sites identified with 0.25 mile of the Project. Section 4.2.1 contains a discussion on soil contamination at the LNG terminal site. Section 4.3.2.4 discusses sediment sampling and analyses of contaminants in the marine environment. Section 4.3.2.5 contains discussions on project dredging. The Consolidated Dredge Plan is included in appendix D of the FEIS.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW4-2	(25) 16-25; (26) 1-11	The commenter noted that the proposed LNG site contains contaminated soils from many sources.	Section 4.2.1 contains a discussion on soil contamination at the LNG terminal site.
	EW4-3	(27) 3-13	The commenter stated that the proposed LNG site is located on a peninsula, with only two roads available for evacuation off the peninsula. The commenter also stated that the proposed emergency whistles to warn of an emergency would not be sufficient.	Please see response to comment LA1-23.
Donna Ichniowski, 128 Creek View Court, Street, MD	EW5			
	EW5-1	(29) 10-15	The commenter described an explosion of a blast furnace at Bethlehem Steel many years ago that was felt throughout Dundalk.	Comment noted.
	EW5-2	(29) 18-19	The commenter stated that the proposed LNG site is fill material.	The geology, soils, safety and reliability, and engineering aspects of the proposed Project are discussed in sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.12, respectively.
	EW5-3	(29) 22-25; (30) 1-2	The commenter stated the proposed LNG site is contaminated.	Section 4.2.1 contains a discussion on soil contamination at the LNG terminal site.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW5-4	(30) 3-25; (31) 1-16; (32) 5-13	The commenter stated concerns about the large (3.7 million cubic yards, plus future dredging requirements) amount of dredge material, as well as the contaminated nature of that dredge material. The commenter stated concerns regarding the disposal and/or decontamination of the dredge material.	Section 4.3.2.4 discusses sediment sampling and analyses of contaminants in the marine environment. Section 4.3.2.5 contains discussions on project dredging. The Consolidated Dredge Plan is included in appendix D of the FEIS. FERC staff's conclusions, recommendations and mitigation measures are contained in section 5.
	EW5-5	(31) 16-24	The commenter stated concerns regarding the truck and railroad traffic resulting from the transport of dredge material.	Information pertaining to traffic impacts from dredge material transport is contained in the Consolidated Dredge Plan located in appendix D of the FEIS.
	EW5-6	(31) 25; (32) 1-4	The commenter stated concerns regarding pollution from trucks and trains transporting dredge material.	Please see response to comment EW5-5.
	EW5-7	(32) 15-18	The commenter stated concerns regarding the Securities and Exchange Commission report regarding the level of AES's debt.	This comment is beyond the scope of this EIS.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Pat McDonough, Member of the House of Delegates, Representing Harford County	EW6			
	EW6-1	(33) 3-6, 10-13	The commenter stated that this is the first port or terminal that this company is constructing that requires LNG ships to travel 150 miles inland on inland waterways.	Comment noted.
	EW6-2	(33) 19-24	The commenter stated that those responsible for security do not have experience with a project sited geographically similar to the proposed Project.	Currently in the U.S., there are five operating LNG import terminals that the Coast Guard has authority over in accordance with Title 33 CFR Part 105. See section 4.12.5.5 for further discussion.
	EW6-3	(33) 25; (34) 1-7	The commenter stated concerns regarding the safety and security of the pipeline component of the Project, as well as the proximity to schools.	Pipeline safety is discussed in section 4.12.9 and land use impacts and mitigation measures are discussed in section 4.8
	EW6-4	(34) 13-14	The commenter stated that neither Maryland nor the U.S. would benefit from the Project.	Please see response to comment BM4-3.
	EW6-5	(34) 16-19	The commenter stated concerns regarding the disturbance of the material planned for dredging.	Section 4.3.2.4 discusses sediment sampling and analyses of contaminants in the marine environment. Section 4.3.2.5 contains discussions on project dredging. The Consolidated Dredge Plan is included in appendix D of the FEIS.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW6-6	(34) 20-24	The commenter stated concerns regarding the traffic resulting from the transport of dredge material.	Please see response to comment EW5-5.
	EW6-7	(35) 8-11	The commenter stated that the Project would be dependent upon foreign energy.	Section 3.1 of the FEIS evaluates a variety of alternatives to the proposed Project. These alternatives encompass other non-renewable fuels, renewable energy sources, and energy conservation. The alternatives analyses compared quantitative impacts and concluded that alternative projects, singly or in concert, could not satisfy the projected energy needs of the target markets. As discussed in section 2.1.2.1, LNG could be shipped from a variety of sources around the world.
	EW6-8	(35) 14-22	The commenter stated that it would be more beneficial for the economy if natural gas was from U.S. sources which would create more U.S. jobs, versus 385 jobs and 55 permanent jobs to support the proposed Project.	Comment noted. Please see response to comment EW6-7. The LNG terminal would not preclude local development.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Ron Henry. Chair of Greater Baltimore Group, Chair of MD Chapter of Sierra Club and Harford County Resident	EW7			
	EW7-1	(36) 22-23	The commenter reiterated his past concerns regarding safety and security.	Please see response to comment IN8-1.
	EW7-2	(37) 2-20	The commenter stated that available data regarding safety were inadequate.	Comment noted.
	EW7-3	(38) 13-14	The commenter stated concerns regarding the proximity of the pipeline to schools and residences.	Pipeline safety is discussed in section 4.12.9. Land use impacts and mitigation measures are discussed in section 4.8 including existing and planned residences and developments in section 4.8.1.1 and schools in section 4.8.1.2
	EW7-4	(38) 16-18	The commenter stated disagreement with environmental impacts being considered minimal or low.	We acknowledge that some resources would be adversely affected by the Project. The conclusions reached in the FEIS include compliance with all mitigation recommendations made by FERC. See FERC staff's conclusions, recommendations and mitigation measures in section 5.
	EW7-5	(38) 22-24	The commenter stated concerns regarding safety and security, as well as environmental impacts to Chesapeake Bay.	Section 2.7.1 contains a discussion on LNG terminal safety controls. LNG safety and reliability is discussed in section 4.12. Environmental impacts are discussed in section 4 of the EIS.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW7-6	(39) 3-5	In relation to the proposed dredging of contaminated sediments, the commenter stated the applicability of a past "Superfund" cleanup of the late 1980s.	Please see response to comment EW6-5.
	EW7-7	(39) 9-15	The commenter stated that innovative techniques with yet-to-be developed studies and analytical methods of approaching the various problems should have already been done.	Please see response to comment BM2-6.
William Kumm	EW8			
	EW8-1	(41) 6-9	The commenter stated that the LNG tankers would be fueled by oil, which would cause pollution.	Section 4.11.1 and table 4.11.1-6 contains a discussion on air emissions from the LNG vessel transit and hoteling, tug boats, security and escort boats and dredging.
	EW8-2	(41) 11-20	The commenter offered suggestions to utilize hydrogen as a fuel source, and to utilize solar-energy-manufactured ammonia to transport the hydrogen.	Comment noted. Section 3.1 of the FEIS evaluates a variety of alternatives to the proposed Project. These alternatives encompass other non-renewable fuels, renewable energy sources, and energy conservation.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Peter Reid, 2407 Taylor Avenue, Parkville MD, Maryland Salt Water Sport Fishermen's Association	EW9			
	EW9-1	(42) 3-12	The commenter stated that the concerns of the previous commenters need to be considered and addressed.	Comments all noted.
Heather Cambell on behalf of Senator Ben Cardin and Congressman Ruppberger	EW10			
	EW10-1	(42) 14 – (43) 9	The commenter stated that Senator Cardin continues to have concerns about safety, security and environmental impacts. The Senator stated in a letter that 151 mitigation measures outlined in the DEIS to limit the Project's environmental impact are too many.	We believe the EIS addresses the environmental impacts of the Project and that our recommended mitigation measures would reduce environmental impacts below significant levels. Section 4 of the FEIS contains the environmental analysis completed for the Project including reliability and safety in section 4.12. Section 5 contains FERC Staff's conclusions and recommendations.
	EW10-2	(43) 15-17	The commenter stated concerns regarding the proximity of the pipeline to the Fallston High and Middle Schools.	Pipeline safety is discussed in section 4.12.9. Land use impacts and mitigation measures are discussed in section 4.8 including schools in section 4.8.1.2.
	EW10-3	(43) 17-20	The commenter stated that none of the residents of Harford and the Baltimore area would see any benefits from the Project.	Please see response to comment BM4-3. Estimated tax revenues for Maryland is discussed in section 4.9.6 of the FEIS.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW10-4	(43) 21-23	The commenter stated that the region is recovering from an MTBE spill in the drinking water, and a proposed pipeline could pose an additional threat to the region's drinking water.	Natural gas, being lighter than air, would not migrate down to groundwater in the event of a spill. Impacts to groundwater and surface water, including drinking water, are discussed in section 4.3 of the FEIS.
	EW10-5	(43) 24-25; (44) 1	The commenter stated concerns that the pipeline would impact 18 private wells.	Section 4.3.1.1 contains a discussion on public and private water supply wells, including a recommendation that prior to the start of construction, Mid-Atlantic Express file with the Secretary the location of all water wells within 150 feet of the construction right-of-way. In the event that a potable water well is damaged by construction activities, Mid-Atlantic Express has agreed to provide a temporary source of water. Additionally, Mid-Atlantic Express would be responsible for the repair/replacement (to original capacity) of any potable water supplies damaged by construction activities. Furthermore, we recommended that within 30 days of placing the pipeline facilities in service, Mid-Atlantic Express file a report with the Secretary identifying all water supply wells/systems damaged by construction and how they were repaired.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW10-6	(44) 4-8	The commenter outlined Congressman Ruppertsberger's concerns regarding safety and the pipeline's impacts to Interstate 695, residential areas, schools and wetlands.	Existing and Planned Residences and Developments are discussed in section 4.8.1.1. Recreation and Public Interest Areas including schools are discussed in section 4.8.1.2. Impacts and mitigation measures on wetlands are discussed in section 4.4. Reliability and safety are discussed in section 4.12.
Ronnie Adams, Harford County Resident	EW11			
	EW11-1	(44) 20-23	The commenter stated that Sparrows Point was originally an orchard and a farm, and remains a "premiere" waterfowling area.	Comment noted. Waterfowl are discussed in section 4.6.1 and section 4.8.4.2.
	EW11-2	(45) 1	The commenter briefly reiterated previous safety considerations.	Reliability and safety are discussed in section 4.12.
	EW11-3	(45) 3-4	The commenter stated concerns for conservation, environment, recreation, culture and social issues that the terminal will directly impact.	Section 4 of the FEIS contains the environmental analysis completed for the Project.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW11-4	(45) 5-10	The commenter stated that the area is a historic waterfowl concentration area, designated by the Maryland Department of Environment and by the MDNR, and is afforded protections under the Coastal Area Management policies, as well as protections under the migratory species of the U.S. Government.	See revised section 4.6.1 of the FEIS. Please also see response to comment OC1-2.
	EW11-5	(45) 14-19	The commenter stated concerns regarding dredging impacts and water depth increases to waterfowl feeding.	See revised section 4.6.1 <i>Waterway for LNG Marine Traffic</i> .
	EW11-6	(45) 20-21	The commenter stated that citizens of Maryland would not benefit from the Project.	Please see response to comment BM4-3.
	EW11-7	(45) 24 - (46) 4	The commenter stated that there would be detrimental effects on at least 12 different species of waterfowl.	Section 4.6.1 <i>Waterway for LNG Marine Traffic</i> and table 4.6.1-1 has been updated to include waterfowl species listed by MDNR and Maryland Waterfowlers Association.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Roxanne Lynch, Director of Government Community Relations, Harford County, Representing County Executive Dave Craig	EW12			
	EW12-1	(47) 5-7	The commenter stated concerns regarding the pipeline's impacts at 36 stream crossings in the Deer Creek Watershed.	Section 4.3.2.5 discusses potential impacts to stream crossings, appendix I presents a list of all waterbody crossings, and appendix S presents the HDD Monitoring and Contingency Plan.
	EW12-2	(47) 8-11	The commenter stated concerns regarding the clearing of forests and the resultant impacts to water bodies.	Vegetation clearing associated with stream crossings is discussed in Section 4.3.2.5 <i>Surface Water Resources Impacts and Mitigation</i> , and impacts to forested habitat are discussed in section 4.5.
	EW12-3	(47) 13-15	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to 18 private wells and 39 residences.	Groundwater impacts and mitigation are discussed in section 4.3.1.1. Land use impacts and mitigation measures are discussed in section 4.8 including existing and planned residences and developments in section 4.8.1.1

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW12-4	(47) 17-25; (48) 1-3	The commenter stated that there would be cumulative impacts resulting from the Project and a permitted landfill operation, which is scheduled to begin in 2008. The landfill operations will involve blasting near the proposed Project, and is scheduled to continue for 10 years.	Section 4.13 discusses cumulative impacts. We have found no records of a new landfill in Harford County that would be crossed by the proposed pipeline.
Harry Argentino, Harford County Resident	EW13			
	EW13-1	(48) 13-21	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to forests necessary to create the pipeline.	Impacts to forested habitat are addressed in section 4.5.
Tony Paszkiwicz, 1801 Peachtree Court, Fallston	EW14			
	EW14-1	(49) 7-8	The commenter stated that the development of newer, cleaner, and renewable energy sources needs to be pursued.	Section 3.1 of the FEIS evaluates a variety of alternatives to the proposed Project. These alternatives encompass other non-renewable fuels, renewable energy sources, and energy conservation.
	EW14-2	(49) 10-11	The commenter stated that the Project would keep the U.S. dependent upon foreign sources.	Please see response to comment EW6-7.
	EW14-3	(49) 16-21	The commenter stated political conflicts of interest, and impacts to low-income residential areas.	Environmental Justice is discussed in section 4.9.7.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW14-4	(50) 4-6	The commenter stated that the FERC has held only a few public hearings, but has held over 83 closed door sessions with oil executives and lobbyists.	The EIS has been conducted in accordance with NEPA, the CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA, and the FERC regulations for implementing NEPA. All written and oral comments received during the public comment period and later were considered and evaluated in the preparation of this FEIS. Concerns have been addressed by responding to all comments within the scope of this FEIS.
	EW14-5	(50) 12-13	The commenter stated concerns for safety along the pipeline.	Pipeline safety is discussed in section 4.12.9, section 4.12.10, and section 4.12.11.
	EW14-6	(50) 15-23	The commenter stated that AES is not an environmentally responsible company.	Comment noted. We note that this Project would be reviewed by the appropriate local, county, state and federal agencies.
	EW14-7		The commenter stated that AES will abandon the plant in 25 years, and it will take 25 to 150 years for the damage to be repaired, if ever.	AES states that the approximate life of the plant is 25 years, and following that it may be updated and continue to operate or be dismantled.
	EW14-8	(50) 24 – (51) 1	The commenter stated concerns regarding the loss of private property.	Comment noted. While FERC's authorization under Section 7 of the Natural Gas Act would convey eminent domain authority, specific terms would be determined by a state or local court if a negotiated agreement cannot be reached or an easement cannot be established.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	EW14-9	(51) 5	The commenter stated concerns for Chesapeake Bay.	Comment noted.
Deborah Mance, Representing Saint Anne Community, Northern Harford County	EW15			
	EW15-1	(52) 4-18	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to 10 of 49 residences in what realtors call a "highly desirable" community resulting in property value decreases throughout the community.	FERC has recommended that Mid-Atlantic Express include variation 6 in their final plans for the pipeline route. This would limit the impact to this community.
	EW15-2	(53) 4-9	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to wetlands, streams, woodlands and natural wildlife areas.	Please see response to comment EW15-1.
	EW15-3	(53) 17-19	The commenter stated that the FERC needs to consider Alternate 6 as described in the EIS.	Please see response to comment EW15-1.
	EW15-4	(53) 21-23	The commenter stated concerns for environmental impact on water body crossings, forested areas.	Please see response to comment EW15-1.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW15-5	(53) 25 - (54) 2	The commenter stated that there isn't any public or political support for the Project.	Comment noted.
Russell Donnelly Environmental Coordinator for LNG Opposition Team	EW16			
	EW16-1	(54) 22-25; (55) 1-25	The commenter stated that past and very recent studies have shown that the sediments in Baltimore Harbor are contaminated and there are high concentrations of the protozoan "acanthamoeba" at Sparrows Point, and that the entire harbor was zoned into highly, moderately low, and slightly toxic zones.	Please see response to comment EW6-5.
	EW16-2	(56) 3-10	The commenter stated that the public safety distance is, as of February 2007, 2500 meters, which puts the public at risk.	Reliability and Safety are discussed in section 4.12.
	EW16-3	(56) 15-20	The commenter stated the proximity of the Maryland Transportation Authority Headquarters and Severstal corporation (a "flame source"), Turners Station residents and Edgemere residents, to the Project.	Please see response to comment OC4-6.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW16-4	(56) 24 - (57) 1	The commenter stated that the proposed facility would be in violation of NFPA 59A (2001) due to proximity to a planned ethanol plant (construction slated for 1/09), less than 3,000 feet from the proposed Project.	Please see response to comment OC4-6.
	EW16-5	(57) 19-23	The commenter stated that it is against Maryland law to utilize contaminated material (dredge spoils) for beneficial reuse.	As discussed in the Consolidated Dredge Plan (appendix D), AES' proposed dredge recycling program is consistent with and supportive of the State of Maryland's Dredged Material Management Program, which was renewed by the Dredged Material Management Act of 2001. Among other things, the Act defined a hierarchy of preferences for the disposition of dredged materials from the tidal waters of Maryland's portion of Chesapeake Bay. The hierarchy of preferences includes innovative re-use (recycling).

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Dr. Roman Ratych, 2833 Cross Country Court, Fallston MD, Representing Greater Fallston Association	EW17			
	EW17-1	(58) 7-25; (59) 1-11	The commenter stated concerns that Fallston is subject to many environmental risks from existing energy projects (gas and nuclear), leaking underground storage tanks, a leaking underground petroleum aqueduct, and military operations nearby. And has experienced the first and second largest Maryland environmental disasters, and that the FERC must consider the cumulative risks.	Cumulative impacts are discussed in section 4.13.
Linda Heilman 122 Sturbridge Road, Fallston, MD	EW18			
	EW18-1	(60) 1-2	The commenter stated concerns regarding the proximity of the pipeline to her property.	Comment noted.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW18-2	(60) 1-3	The commenter stated concerns regarding the disturbance of toxic chemicals at Bethlehem Steel.	The Consolidated Dredge Plan is located in appendix D of the FEIS.
	EW18-3	(60) 8-20	The commenter stated concerns regarding the disposal of vegetative material by landfill and onsite, or through windfall burns at the corner of the rights-of-way. The commenter also stated concerns regarding changes to drainage, the flooding, and the impact on private wells and septic systems.	Section 2.3.2.1 indicates that Mid-Atlantic Express would dispose of cleared vegetation in accordance with local ordinances at approved disposal facilities. Marketable timber cleared from right-of-way would be managed in accordance with the landowners' agreements, and other timber may be given back to the landowner, used as timber matting in wetland crossings, or properly disposed of as construction debris. Impacts to wells are discussed in section 4.3.1.1. Impacts to septic systems and septic fields are discussed in section 4.8.1.1.
Kelsey Paszkiavicz, 1801 Peachtree Court, Baltimore, MD, (Fallston High School Student)	EW19			
	EW19-1	(61) 9-22	The commenter stated concerns regarding evacuation from the Fallston Middle and High Schools, due to current overcrowded conditions, as well as concerns for the containment of a fire at the Project.	Safety controls are discussed in section 2.7, and safety and reliability are discussed in section 4.12.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW19-2	(62) 1-2	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to wells.	Impacts on wells are discussed in section 4.3.1.1.
	EW19-3	(62) 4-10	The commenter stated concerns regarding the devaluation of his property.	Possible effects on property value are discussed in section 4.9.5
	EW19-4	(62) 10-15	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to wildlife.	Impacts to wildlife are discussed in 4.6.
	EW19-5	(62) 17-25; (63) 1-5	The commenter stated concerns regarding the impacts to the blue crab population, which is currently at risk, from the dredging.	Impacts to aquatic species are discussed in section 4.6.2. The Consolidated Dredge Plan is located in appendix D.
	EW19-6	(63) 9-12	The commenter stated concerns regarding safety and questions the need for the Project if it is just to provide profit to AES.	Safety is discussed in section 4.12. The purpose and need for this Project is discussed in section 1.2.
Marian Sweeny, 1112 Sturbridge Road Fallston, MD	EW20			
	EW20-1	(63) 23-25; (64) 1-8	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to property values.	Possible effects on property value are discussed in section 4.9.5
	EW20-2	(64) 10-14	The commenter stated concerns regarding future upgrades to septic systems and new well installations.	Please see response to comment EW10-5.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	EW20-3	(64) 22-23	The commenter stated concerns regarding the take of property and the payment of taxes on the right-of-way land.	Please see response to comments EW20-1 and BM6-8.
	EW20-4	(64) 24-25	The commenter stated concerns for safety and security.	Safety controls are discussed in section 2.7, and safety and reliability are discussed in section 4.12.
Lee Crush	EW21			
	EW21-1	(65) 22-24	The commenter stated the need to pursue alternative energy sources.	Section 3.1 of the FEIS evaluates a variety of alternatives to the proposed Project. These alternatives encompass other non-renewable fuels, renewable energy sources, and energy conservation.
Matt Jones 128 Creekview Court, Street, MD	EW22			
	EW22-1	(67) 24-25	The commenter reiterated the concerns of commenter EW15.	Please see response to comment EW15-1.
	EW22-2	(68) 21 – (69) 1	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to wells.	Private wells are discussed in section 4.3.1.1.
	EW22-3	(69) 3	The commenter stated concerns regarding insurance rates.	Section 4.9.5 indicates that insurance advisors consulted on other natural gas projects reviewed by FERC have indicated that LNG terminals and associated pipeline infrastructure do not have an impact on homeowner insurance rates.
	EW22-4	(69) 4-6	The commenter stated concerns regarding property values.	Property values are discussed in section 4.9.5.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW22-5	(69) 11	The commenter stated concerns regarding the payment of taxes along the Project.	Section 4.9.5 indicates that a landowner can appeal an assessment and subsequent property taxation to the local property tax agency.
	EW22-6	(70) 16-19	The commenter stated concerns regarding the applicability of eminent domain for a private, for-profit company.	Please see response to comment EW14-8.
	EW22-7	(71) 11-15	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to specific schools, churches and hospitals along the proposed route and route variation 4.	Neither the proposed pipeline route nor route variation 4 would cross Franklin Square Hospital property. Just north of I-95 and Rossville Boulevard, route variation 4 would move away from the interstate to avoid a structure. The variation would pass between the structure and a building of the Essex Community College. The pipeline would be within about 100 feet of both the building and the structure. Route variations are discussed in section 3.3.3. Schools, churches and hospitals are discussed in section 4.8.1.2.
	EW22-8	(71) 17-21	The commenter stated concerns that the Coast Guard cannot offer suitable protection.	The Coast Guard has set requirements in their WSR in order for the Project to be approved by them.
	EW22-9	(71) 23-25	The commenter stated concerns regarding fire.	Reliability and safety are discussed in section 4.12.
	EW22-10	(72) 6-10	The commenter stated concerns regarding dredging.	The Consolidated Dredge Plan is located in appendix D.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment No.</b>	<b>Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines</b>	<b>Summary of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	EW22-11	(72) 10-14	The commenter stated concerns regarding the cost to Maryland residents each time the LNG tankers arrive.	Comment noted.
	EW22-12	(72) 15-20	The commenter stated that AES, as of December 31, 2007, had approximately \$18 billion of outstanding debt.	This comment is beyond the scope of this EIS.
Harold Spurgeon 1303 Malus Court, Fallston	EW23			
	EW23-1	(74) 10-12	The commenter stated concerns regarding direct impact to his home.	The pipeline would not be authorized to go through or under any occupied residence or structure. A site-specific construction plan would be required for all properties less than 25 feet from the construction right-of-way. These plans are included in appendix U.
	EW23-2	(74) 23-25	The commenter stated concerns regarding safety.	Reliability and safety are discussed in section 4.12.
	EW23-3	(74) 10-14	The commenter stated concerns regarding impacts to Winter Run, the water supply for the City of Bel Air.	Please see response to comment OC4-6.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW23-4	(75) 22-25; (76) 1-8	The commenter stated that a portion of the pipeline will be co-located in an electric line right-of-way which is being considered for additional electric lines.	Identification of utility crossings and potential impacts to utilities from construction of the pipeline are discussed in section 2.3.2 of the FEIS. Where the proposed pipeline would coincide with electric transmission lines, Mid-Atlantic Express would maintain minimum clearances between the power line and pipeline construction equipment. Mid-Atlantic Express would consult with all existing utility providers prior to and during construction. Any damage to utility lines would be repaired to pre-construction or better conditions.
	EW23-5	(76) 9-11	The commenter stated concerns regarding corrosion.	Corrosion protection and monitoring is discussed in section 2.7.2.1.
	EW23-6	(76) 18-25; (77) 1-15	The commenter stated concerns regarding the need for the Project.	Purpose and need is discussed in section 1.2
Adrienne Brown & James Olgastowski (ph.), 11901 Caspian Road, Kingsville, MD	EW24			
	EW24-1	(79) 10	The commenter stated concerns regarding terrorism.	Reliability and safety are discussed in section 4.12.
	EW24-2	(79) 10	The commenter stated concerns regarding property values.	Please see response to comment IN8-1.
	EW24-3	(80) 1-2	The commenter stated concerns regarding corrosion.	Corrosion protection and monitoring is discussed in section 2.7.2.1.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW24-4	(80) 9-11	The commenter stated concerns regarding emergency response to terrorism.	Reliability and safety are discussed in section 4.12. Safety controls are discussed in section 2.7.
	EW24-5	(80) 5-7	The commenter questioned the benefit of the four years of construction related jobs the Project would provide versus the threat of terrorism.	Comment noted.
Christone Heisey, 1805 Brickhouse Lane, Fallston	EW25			
	EW25-1	(81) 4-5	The commenter stated concerns regarding the proximity of the Project to schools, and the poor evacuation routes in an emergency.	Please see response to comment EW19-1.
	EW25-2	(81) 12-15	The commenter stated general concerns for the route of the pipeline, and specifically the impacts to the Maryland and Pennsylvania trail.	There would be no impacts to the recreational portion of the MAPA trail. This is discussed in section 4.8.1.2.
	EW25-3	(81) 20-25	The commenter stated concerns regarding property loss, as well as the impacts during construction.	Property values are discussed in section 4.9.5. Construction impacts are discussed in section 2.0.
	EW25-4	(82) 5-9	The commenter stated concerns regarding dredging.	The Consolidated Dredge Plan is located in appendix D.
	EW25-5	(82) 12-18	The commenter stated concerns regarding the impacts to the crab population.	Impacts to aquatic and terrestrial wildlife are discussed in section 4.6.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW25-6	(80) 9-11	The commenter stated there is no way local emergency response entities could mitigate an accident or an act of terror.	Please see response to comment EW3-4.
Carolyn Hicks	EW26			
	EW26-1	(83) 12-14	The commenter stated strong opposition to the Project by elected officials.	Comment noted.
	EW26-2	(83) 19- (84) 5	The commenter stated concerns regarding the proximity of the Project to schools.	Parks and schools are discussed in section 4.8.1.2. Youth's Benefit Elementary School is located greater than 0.25 miles from the proposed pipeline route.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Larry Silverman, Environmental Attorney of Washington D.C. Bar, 7308 Birch Avenue, Takoma Park, MD. Chair of Montgomery County Water Quality Advisory Group, President of Patuxent River Keeper	EW27			
	EW27-1	(85) 7- 19	The commenter stated that Commander Penoyer of the Coast Guard acknowledged that the Coast Guard at this time does not have the resources to provide safety to this facility at Sparrows Point.	Please see response to comment EW3-4.
	EW27-2	(85) 19 - (86)7	The commenter stated that the Office of Pipeline Safety cannot assure protection for the current amount of pipelines under its jurisdiction.	Comment noted.
	EW27-3	(86) 15-17	The commenter wanted to understand the physical state of the gas as it is transported in the pipeline.	The gas would be vaporized at the LNG terminal and then compressed through the pipeline.
	EW27-4	(88) 1-2	The commenter questioned whether the cost was worth the environmental impacts.	Purpose and Need are discussed in section 1.2

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW27-5	(88) 14-24	The commenter stated the roles of the EPA and HUD in the decision making process.	Comment Noted. EPA and HUD comment letters are FA5 and FA1 and FA6, respectively.
Caroline Seamon, 8004 Yellowstone Road, Kingsville, MD	EW28			
	EW28-1	(90) 11-12	The commenter stated concerns regarding her property's proximity to the BG&E right-of-way, and the cumulative impacts of co-locating a pipeline with the electric line.	Please see response to comment EW23-4.
Louis Knopacki, 123 Bayside Drive, near Bear Creek	EW29			
	EW29-1	(91) 24-25; (92) 1-12	The commenter stated concerns regarding disturbance of sediments by propellers.	The impacts of propeller wash sediments were modeled and submitted in October 2006 as the "Sparrows Point LNG Terminal - Propeller Wash Sediment Impact Study".
	EW29-2	(92) 14	The commenter stated concerns regarding terrorism.	Please see response to comment IN8-1.
	EW29-3	(92) 21 - (93) 3	The commenter stated concerns regarding an explosion and 10 fires at Sparrows Point in one week in May, 2008. The commenter believes more fires occur there that are not made public.	Comment noted.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
Amy Woolf, 1301 Malus Court, Fallston	EW30			
	EW30-1	(93) 11-13	The commenter had several comments that can best be categorized in Purpose and Need and Environmental Justice.	We have developed almost 200 mitigation measures designed to ensure the Project meets current environmental, safety and regulatory standards to minimize the negative impacts to the natural and human environment. Environmental justice is discussed in section 4.9.7.
Russell Donnelly Environmental Coordinator for LNG Opposition Team	EW31			
	EW31-1	(93) 24-25	The commenter requested the FERC to deny all permits.	The FERC would consider the findings in this FEIS in its determination of whether the Project should be approved. A final approval would only be granted if, after consideration and balancing of both environmental and non-environmental issues, the FERC finds that the proposed Project is in the public interest. Section 1.3 of the FEIS contains a discussion on FERC's regulatory authority. Other major federal and state permits, approvals and consultations required are summarized in table 1.3-1.

**Table P2-3 (continued)**  
**Summary of the Transcript from the Edgewood, Maryland Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS**

Name	Comment No.	Location of Comment in Transcript (Page) Lines	Summary of Comment	Response
	EW31-2	(94) 6-7	The commenter stated that the LNG site is located on a geologic fault.	According to the U.S.G.S. and the Maryland Geological Survey, there are no active faults under or anywhere near the proposed plant site. Please see response to comment OC5-49 and Seismic design requirements as discussed in section 4.1.1.1.
	EW31-3	(94) 9-18	The commenter stated that the LNG site is fill material and unstable to build on.	Please see responses to comments OC5-50 and OC5-51. See sections 4.1 for a discussion of geology and section 4.2 for a discussion of soils.
	EW31-4	(94) 19- (95) 5	The commenter stated concerns regarding "liquefaction," and that Bethlehem Steel has experienced problems at the site.	Please see responses to comments OC5-50 and OC5-51. Seismic design requirements are discussed in section 4.1.1.1.
Linwood Jackson, 611 Pittsburgh Avenue	EW32			
	EW32-1	(95) 22-23	The commenter stated concerns regarding the equipment needed to extinguish a fire.	Comment noted. Reliability and safety are discussed in section 4.12.
	EW32-2	(96) 1	The commenter stated concerns regarding evacuation from the peninsula.	Please see response to comment EW3-4.