

Subject: November 5 Hearing
Resent-From: GCOS.Inquiries@noaa.gov
Date: Tue, 7 Oct 2003 10:53:32 EDT
From: KKennedyMD@aol.com
To: gcos.inquiries@noaa.gov

Branden Blum
Senior Counselor
Dear Mr. Blum:

I am writing regarding the Public Hearing for the Islander East Pipeline Appeal scheduled for November 5, 2003. First, I would like to let you know how much the impacted communities appreciate the decision by the Department of Commerce to hold a public hearing on this appeal. We recognize that this is not an opportunity that we are routinely entitled to.

However, I would like to make you aware that the decision to hold this public hearing in New Haven creates a significant barrier for attendance by many of the impacted shoreline residents.

To date, we have had several public hearings held in Branford, one of the shoreline communities impacted by the Islander East Pipeline project. The public hearing was held at the local high school. Most shoreline residents are very familiar with the location of the high school; the high school is easy and quick to get to and parking is plentiful and free.

Some of the barriers to holding the hearing in New Haven include the following factors:

1. Driving to New Haven takes longer and will deter many shoreline residents. A trip to New Haven without traffic takes at least 15 minutes, if not more. Driving to a shoreline venue saves at least 10 minutes if not more, as detailed below.

2. Increased reticence about driving into New Haven along Interstate 95 will deter many shoreline residents. Heavily congested traffic from the eastern shoreline towns into New Haven along the main access corridor of Interstate 95 has increased over the past several months due to on-going construction related to the expansion/widening of I-95. Under routine conditions, traffic congestion along Interstate 95 has been troublesome, but fairly predictable based on time-of-day factors, e.g. "rush hour"; however, over the past several months, construction has resulted in worsening congestion with unpredictable and extensive delays. As a result, shoreline residents are increasingly reticent about trips into New Haven.

3. Unfamiliarity with New Haven and the location of the Omni Hotel will deter many shoreline residents. Many shoreline residents are not familiar with the location of the Omni Hotel and may be reticent about driving to a site that they are not familiar with; these residents will need to get directions and this will be a deterrent. Moreover, many of the streets of New Haven are one way, including the streets necessary to drive to the entrance of the Omni Hotel, making driving to the Omni Hotel somewhat difficult. Finally, many shoreline residents may not be clear about the safety of different areas of New Haven, especially in the evening, and may be reticent about driving into New Haven at all.

4. Locating and paying for parking will deter many shoreline residents. Parking is difficult to find in New Haven because of the high demand and the one way streets. Moreover, many shoreline residents may balk at having to pay for parking, whether it is several quarters for on-street parking or several dollars for a parking lot.

In light of these barriers, we respectfully request that the venue for the public hearing be relocated to a Branford venue, like Branford High School, that is easy to find and has ample, free parking. We realize that this may not be possible to do; if that is the case, then we respectfully request that at least the issue of parking be mitigated, perhaps by making ample parking at the Omni Hotel lot available at no cost to public hearing attendees.

Finally, we have one more issue that is unrelated to the venue. We are concerned that the times for the commencement and duration of the evening portion are unclear. Specifically, we are concerned that people who work or cannot attend during the day for other reasons, may not be able to get to the hearing to register until 7 PM or later. We would like to know how long registration will be kept open, even if there are no registered speakers. For

Subject: Comments on Islander East proposed project

Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov

Date: Fri, 3 Oct 2003 14:07:23 +0000

From: Andrew Josephson <ajosephson@conservation-trust.org>

To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

The National Conservation Trust objects to the Long Island Sound proposed pipeline project's commencement. The waters of Long Island Sound have long been subjected to steady streams of pollution resulting from industrial, commercial, and other runoff and many have collected in the bottom sediment.

Close to the entirety of Long Island Sound, with the exception of far eastern segments have levels of many dangerous heavy metals and other contaminants that are well above levels safe for wildlife and humans. These pollutants are not in a state yet where the bottom area may be safely disturbed and allowed to resettle without probable dissolution of these contaminants into far more volatile areas of the sound.

Environmentally sensitive projects must continue only in a fashion where prevention and cleanup can be reasonably assumed. The pipeline project does not meet preventative criteria, and, in fact, would severely exacerbate pollution problems in the already debilitated Sound as the slated procedures are undertaken. This type of problem was illustrated earlier in the Sound's history when a similar pipeline project through another part of the Sound was found to exterminate a winter flounder population to unsustainable levels during production due to toxic and other pungent problems due to standard operations of the benthic plow. The completed pipeline then later exploded, bringing further severe environmental problems that have not yet been remedied. I fear that any new pipeline or project with a history of debilitating consequence would have similar, if not greater environmental harm.

As you continue listening to comments regarding this pipeline, I strongly urge you to stand with the State of Connecticut in disallowing construction of the Islander East pipeline and to support its efforts to locate more sustainable energy solutions.

Sincerely,
Andrew Josephson

Andrew Josephson
Executive Director
National Conservation Trust
305 Townsend Avenue
New Haven, CT 06512
203-668-1358
<http://www.conservation-trust.org>

example, even if there are no registered speakers at 6 PM, will registration for the hearing remain open until a specified time, say 8 PM, in order to allow for people who cannot come during the day enough time to get to the hearing later e.g. after work? We would appreciate additional clarification around this issue.

Again, thank you so much for giving the public the opportunity to comment on the Islander East appeal. We appreciate your attention and time to our concerns detailed above. Please do not hesitate to contact me at 203-772-2090 or by return e-mail with any questions/clarifications.

Respectfully submitted,

Katherine Kennedy
Spokesperson, CT Stop the Pipeline

Subject: Islander East pipeline permit
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Tue, 29 Jul 2003 12:38:31 -0400
From: "Peter Brown" <pbrown@hpearce.com>
Organization: H. Pearce Company
To: <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>

Dear Noaa: Attached is a letter from the Thimble Islands Association.

We are also today sending a hard copy of this letter to you via post office.

Please don't ignore the pleas of your citizenship. Please take regard for the valuable ocean waters you are pledged to protect.

We are counting on you and your organization to do the right thing and stop this ill conceived project.

Thank you,

TIA, President

Peter B. Brown
2 Hart Ave
Branford, CT

& Pot Rock Island
Stony Creek, CT

(203) 488-2769

	TIALetterpipelineltermnoaa..doc	Name: TIALetterpipelineltermnoaa..doc Type: WINWORD File (application/msword) Encoding: base64 Download Status: Not downloaded with message
---	---	--

The Thimble Islands Association, Inc.

3093 Whitney Avenue Hamden, CT 06518

Peter B. Brown, President

July 29, 2003

Office of General Counsel for Ocean Services
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
U.S. Department of Commerce
1305 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

RE: Islander East

Dear General Counsel:

Thank you for reviewing and considering comments from parties and citizens regarding the proposed Islander East Pipe Line, proposed to run under Long Island Sound from Branford CT to Long Island, NY. The Thimble Islands Association is a local property owners group made of some 100 families that own and seasonally occupy the Thimble Islands off the coast of Branford.

The Thimble Islands Association absolutely, unanimously and unequivocally objects to this project. In the interests of the citizens, the environment and public safety, our association is relying on the NOAA and the Department of Commerce to deny the application. As you are probably aware, the Thimble Islands are very unique and geologically rare. They comprise approximately 300 pink granite rocks and islands off the Branford, Connecticut coast. These rare granite out-croppings, not only provide summer residential sites, but are economically important recreational boating and fishing areas. Additionally, commercial and recreational shellfishing for many of us is a way of life. The islands provide a unique and important natural habitat and sanctuary for wildlife that includes, but is not limited to, clam and oyster beds, rookeries, tidal pools, glacial pot holes, sandy beaches, craggy ledges loaded with sea weeds, barnacles, mussels, marine life, plus there are salt marshes and mud flats. Undisturbed clean sea water is essential to this island life. Other special resources in the Thimbles include a Federal Wildlife "Stuart B McKinney" preserve on Outer Island and a Yale University, Peabody Museum, natural habitat laboratory on Horse Island.

We object to the "Islander East Pipeline" on the following grounds:

- 1) There will be destructive and disturbing environmental impact during the construction of this line. You should not permit irreparable harm to come to our delicate and rare habitat, only to trade it for transmission of a nonrenewable, temporary fix, energy source. The gas will dry up. There will be permanent environmental damage to life in our waters that will never heal.
- 2) The continuous environmental impact and damage during the decades the pipe is laying on the sea bed. The lobster population in our little area has proven to be very delicate even without unnatural disturbances. There is no adequate provision or bonding for removal or abandonment of the pipe. Following years of corrosion the pipe will be left behind for our grandchildren to remove and a disturbed sea bed to try to restore.
- 3) Safety. We question the sensibility and safety of locating the pipe in a high traffic barge channel on the skirt of our islands. Heavy barges laden with crushed stone can break loose. They can sink. We have witnessed such events. There is potential for thousands of tons of iron and stone to fall crushing the pipe. Corrosion will be safety's hidden enemy. Add to this the rail line. The pipe, weakened by rust

plus a barge or rail accident will spell disaster. High pressure gas transmission lines can kill people. We live here.

- 4) There will be no local benefit. Not one Thimble Island will be supplied with gas from Islander East. No Branford homes will be warmed by this project. Even the benefits to Long Islanders are in question. The only real winners will be the shareholders of Keystone Energy and Duke Power. Further, the energy companies and their owners are sheltered from the risks; residents and islanders are not. It is an abuse of the power of eminent domain. Eminent domain is being used for public harm rather than public good. At least, when government takes land for a highway the public is allowed access. This is a private project with a very limited public benefit, excepting just a few private business investors.
- 5) If need be, there are better alternatives to crossing the Sound then here at the Thimble Islands. At Milford, Connecticut there already exists a connecting point that could make much more feasible project. Disturbing new areas seems to show not regard for the Sound.

Please, in your power and your mandated authority to protect these special environmental habitats and to assist marine safety and transportation consider these issues and take the correct stand. We Thimble Islanders request that you deny the IslanderEast pipe line permit. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Peter Brown
President

Subject: In opposition to Islander East Pipeline proposal
Resent-From: IslanderEast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Tue, 29 Jul 2003 15:17:08 EDT
From: <WELDJJP@aol.com>
To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov

Jane P. Weld
 18 Remsen Street, Brooklyn, New York 11201
 Tel. (718) 643-6190 | Fax (718) 643-6191
 e-mail: weldjpp@aol.com

By E-mail and Letter

July 29, 2003

Office for the General Counsel for Ocean Services
 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
 U. S. Department of Commerce
 1305 East-West Highway
 Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am writing to oppose the application of Islander East Pipeline Company to construct a new gas pipeline through the waters of Long Island Sound adjacent to the Thimble Islands, Branford, CT.

As a summer resident of the Thimble Islands, I join with all other Islands residents to ask you to oppose this pipeline. This is not a question of æœœnot in my backyard.æœœ The pipeline presents serious long-term environmental dangers in an area which is already very fragile. We are counting on you to recognize these dangers and begin to address the multiple problems with clarity and professionalism.

æœœ The proposed areas of construction and transmission are composed of significant spawning and nesting areas and a shellfish industry already in trouble. Any disruption of these areas may in fact lead to destruction and loss forever. I call your attention to the several-part series now being run in *The New York Times* which has documented the fragility of this area of Long Island Sound.

æœœ The location of a gas pipe in a high-traffic barge channel in Branford seems a very poor choice. In addition, New Haven is an increasingly-used port, and multiple ships anchoring over the area present additional hazards.

æœœ A much more appropriate, less invasive alternative pipeline route already exists in the Milford, CT to Long Island corridor and has capacity for additional pipelines. As far as we can tell, only corporate greed prevents the energy companies from using the existing Milford corridor. I find this so appalling that I sold my stock in Duke Energy Company.

Thank you for your serious consideration of all the issues.

Sincerely,

Jane P. Weld

Subject: Comments on Islander East appeal by the Branford Land Trust
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Sun, 1 Jun 2003 18:57:58 -0700 (PDT)
From: Bill Horne <billhorne48@yahoo.com>
To: IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov
CC: "Rich, work Shanahan" <richard.shanahan@raymondjames.com>,
Joan Merrick <merr22@aol.com>

Mr. Branden Blum

Senior Counselor

c/o Office of Assistant General Counsel for Ocean Services

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

<?xml:namespace prefix = st1 ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:smarts" />U.S. Department of
Commerce

Dear Mr. Blum,

The Branford Land Trust is submitting comments on the appeal by Islander East of the finding of nonconsistency with Connecticut's Coastal Zone management Plan. The comments, together with three attachments, are contained in the attached pdf file. Please confirm receipt of the file and your ability to incorporate the comments into the record. If you have difficulties with this method of submission, please let me know and I will submit by US mail.

Thank you,

Bill Horne

Do you Yahoo!?
Free [online calendar](#) with sync to Outlook(TM).

| | |
|--|---|
|  Secy of Commerce submission 5-26.pdf | Name: Secy of Commerce submission 5-26.pdf
Type: Acrobat (application/pdf)
Encoding: base64
Description: Secy of Commerce submission 5-26.pdf
Download Status: Not downloaded with message |
|--|---|