

3.2 GENERAL FORM LETTERS

We received various form letters that were signed by multiple individuals. In general, the content of these form letters was not specific to the draft EIS, but identified general opposition or support for the proposed Broadwater Project. An example of each of these form letters is presented below.

FERC has received approximately 5,800 letters in support of the proposed Broadwater Project with the following content.



ORIGINAL

ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS FOR REFORM NOW
91 North Franklin Street #209A, Hempstead, NY 11550
516-481-6769 www.acorn.org

I SUPPORT BROADWATER!

Dear Governor Spitzer:

I am writing to express my *full* support for the Broadwater LNG facility located 9 miles offshore in Long Island Sound. My reasons for support are as follows.

- We pay some of the highest energy prices in the country and they continue to increase. Broadwater will help reduce future energy prices by an estimated \$300 per household per year!
- Natural gas is the most efficient and cleanest burning fossil fuel to help improve the air that we breathe and address global warming, which impacts every community.
- Reliable and less costly supplies of natural gas would help promote repowering of the region's oldest and *dirtiest* power plants.
- Broadwater would have minimal environmental impacts and its offshore location provides safety and security benefits according to third-party regulators and academics.

For these reasons, we urge you to support the Broadwater Energy project!

Sincerely,

Lynis E. Clarence
Signature

LYNIS Clarence
Print Name

FILED
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY
AUG 17 P 12:36
45-36
John Street
Address
Central Islip NY 11782
Town Zip

FERC has received approximately 298 letters in support of the proposed Broadwater Project with the following content.

Unofficial FERC-Generated PDF of 20061228-0076 Received by FERC OSEC 12/22/2006 in Docket#: CP06-54-000

CP06-54-000

ORIGINAL

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY

December 14, 2006

Ms. Magalie R. Salas
Federal Energy Regulatory
888 First St. N.E., Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

2006 DEC 22 P 3:49

REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Dear Ms. Salas:

I am writing to express my support for the Broadwater Energy Liquefied Natural Gas terminal proposed in the Long Island Sound. As a Long Island resident I am very concerned about rising energy costs and the need for affordable, clean and safe energy supplies to meet Long Island's energy demands.

The proposed Broadwater LNG facility in Long Island Sound is vitally important for Long Island's economy, environment and long-term future. Our residents and businesses are already paying some of the highest natural gas prices in the nation because of the disparity between domestic energy supplies and our increasing energy demands.

The Broadwater project will increase the supply of natural gas to this region and provide enough natural gas to heat 4 million homes. The bulk of the natural gas is expected to be used by the region's power plants to provide residents with cleaner, more affordable electricity year round. Plus, Broadwater is expected to save the region over \$680 million in energy costs annually, which equates to an annual \$300 savings for the average homeowner. The increased supply of clean-burning natural gas will help New York to meet its growing need for energy, while progressing our air quality and climate change goals.

With a location in the Sound over nine miles from the nearest coastline, the public will be safe and the vessel will be barely visible on a clear day. The U.S. Coast Guard found that Broadwater can be operated safely and securely in Long Island Sound and the Federal Energy Regulatory Committee's Draft Environmental Impact Statement found that Broadwater would have limited adverse environmental impacts. I am confident that Broadwater can be built and operated in such a way that will have little impact on its current uses and would have profound benefit for all energy consumers in the region.

My support of the Broadwater LNG project is rooted in the positive impact it will have on a range of economic, environmental and quality of life issues on Long Island and in the entire New York region. I urge you to consider the significant benefits that Broadwater would bring to Long Island and New York City during your analysis of this project.

Sincerely,

Calvin P. Baker

FERC has received approximately 234 letters in support of the proposed Broadwater Project with the following content.

Unofficial FERC-Generated PDF of 20070208-0126 Received by FERC OSEC 02/02/2007 in Docket#: CP06-54-000

ORIGINAL

CP06-54-000

FILED
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY

2007 FEB -2 P 4: 10

COMMUNICATIONS

For the Record of NY State Docket F-2006-0345

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing this letter as an indication of my support for the Broadwater project.

My support is based on the following:

1. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) said that with the mitigation measures and recommendations proposed by Broadwater, the FERC and the Coast Guard, Broadwater will have limited adverse environmental impacts.
2. The project will help reduce regional energy prices and what I pay as a consumer. I cannot think of many new energy projects that are built with private money and save me money too.
3. In order to make progress in meeting our air quality goals, we need more natural gas to replace fuel sources such as oil and coal in older power plants.

Thank you for taking my letter into consideration.

Sincerely,

HERSHEL WALDEN
44 MASSAUI DR
GREAT NECK, NY 11021-1441

Signature: *Her Walden*

Date: 1/8/06

FERC has received approximately 63 letters in opposition to the proposed Broadwater Project with the following content.

ORIGINAL

For the Record of NY State Docket
F-2006-0345

I am writing to express my opposition to the Broadwater proposal because:

Numerous federal and state governmental agencies and independent scientific experts who have spent decades studying Long Island Sound have indicated that the DEIS prepared by FERC is seriously inadequate. The concerns of these experts outlining how Broadwater could harm our fisheries, birds, water and air quality, as well as traditional water-dependent uses of the Sound, cannot be dismissed.

Print Name Mazy Hansen
Street Address 10 Fern Ave Rd
City, State, ZIP Stamford, CT 06853
Signature [Handwritten Signature]
Date 4/2/07

STAMFORD CT 068

FILED
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY

MARCO
KIDNEY
GIVE TO THE
KIDNEY FOR




2007 APR 10 A 10:51

The Fed. Energy Regulatory Commission
Re: Docket No. CP06-54-000, CP06-55-000, CP06-56-000

REGULATORY SECRETARY
888 First St. N.E. Room 1A

Washington, DC 20426



FERC has received approximately 80 letters in opposition to the proposed Broadwater Project with the following content.

Unofficial FERC-Generated PDF of 20070613-0058 Received by FERC OSEC 05/24/2007 in Docket#: CP06-54-000

ORIGINAL

For the Record of NY State Docket
F-2006-0345

I am writing to express my opposition to the Broadwater proposal because


I do not believe Shell Oil's claim that they will pass savings on to me if their facility is built. Even so, I would still oppose the Broadwater facility because Long Island Sound is our region's heritage, not a commodity to be sold off in the hopes that slightly cheaper foreign fossil fuel will come our way.

Print Name Mr. William Nickerson
Street Address 35 Quail Rd
City, State, ZIP GREENWICH, CT 06831
Signature Mr. Nickerson
Date May 8, 2007



To:
The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
Re: Docket No. CP06-54-000, CP06-55-000, CP06-56-000
688 First Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20426

FILED
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY
MAY 10 2007
P 4:47
FEDERAL ENERGY
REGULATORY
COMMISSION



FERC has received approximately 19 letters in opposition to the proposed Broadwater Project with the following content.

Unofficial FERC-Generated PDF of 20070613-0175 Received by FERC OSEC 06/11/2007 in Docket#: CP06-54-000

Governor Eliot Spitzer
The Executive Chamber
State Capitol
Albany, NY 12224

FILED
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY

Dear Governor Spitzer:

I am writing to tell you that I am opposed to Shell Oil and TransCanada's desire to construct a LNG floating re-gasification terminal in the middle of the Long Island Sound.

2007 JUN 11 P 4:34

This ill-conceived idea known as Broadwater will not provide those of us on the eastern end of Long Island with any of the gas that this terminal will store nor will it "save us \$300" in energy costs as Mr. John Hritcko of Broadwater keeps claiming. Once more, as in the Shoreham nuclear plant fiasco, we are being sold a bunch of lies.

What it will do, however, is affect not only our quality of life but seriously jeopardize the quality of the Long Island Sound and the safety of its residents.

This floating gas terminal will be almost 400 feet long and 75 to 100 feet tall and will sit just 9 miles off the coast of Long Island – hardly "barely perceptible" as Broadwater falsely claims. The federal government, as well as both New York and Connecticut have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to restore and protect the quality of this national treasure designated in 1987 as an "Estuary of National Significance." And now, if this facility is allowed to be built, there will be approximately 16,000 gallons of warm chlorinated water dumped into the Sound every day. Over 14,000 sq ft of prime lobster grounds will be permanently damaged and a known trawling lane will be disrupted.

And although Broadwater is insisting that LNG is a safe operation, a 2004 congressional research service report presented to Congress called "Liquefied Natural Gas Import Terminals: Siting, Safety and Regulations", LNG tankers could indeed be vulnerable to terrorism. The report states that tankers may be physically attacked in a variety of ways to destroy their cargo or commandeered for use as weapons against coastal targets.

The conclusion of that report also made the following statement: "The construction and subsequent closure of the Shoreham nuclear power plant in the 1980s due to new public safety requirements offers an example of the need to resolve safety concerns before capital is invested.

I am asking you to do the right thing for the citizens of this part of New York State and say NO to Broadwater. You are our last hope. If Broadwater is permitted to build this in the Long Island Sound, what commercial, profit driven project will be permitted next?

Thank you,

Jennifer Laveta

CP06-54-000

cc: Department of State
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

FERC has received approximately 1,340 letters in support of the proposed Broadwater Project with the following content.

Unofficial FERC-Generated PDF of 20070613-0175 Received by FERC OSEC 06/11/2007 in Docket#: CP06-54-000

CP06-54-000

Dear Broadwater,

I encourage you to use this letter as a demonstration of my support as the New York Secretary of State moves forward on a determination of your application for a Consistency Determination under the New York Coastal Zone Management Act (Docket F-2006-0345):

I am writing this letter as an indication of my support for the Broadwater Energy project.

My support is based on the following:

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) said that Broadwater would have limited adverse environmental impacts with the mitigation measures proposed by Broadwater and the recommendations proposed by FERC and the Coast Guard.

As a business owner here on Long Island, I pay some of the highest energy prices of any consumers in the United States. By bringing in a large volume of natural gas, Broadwater would help me save on my energy bills and stabilize energy prices for this region.

The Sound is an important body of water, however we must remember it is a mixed-use body of water important to local and international commerce and trade.

Broadwater has committed to helping to restore and enhance the Sound through their Social Investment Program — this means additional dollars toward many important conservation programs.

Finally, someone is proposing a practical solution. In conclusion — if not now, when?

Thank you for taking my letter into consideration.

Company:	TORIGO Japanese Restaurant	Name:	Aki Hirahata
Street Address:	196 Terada Tpk	Title:	President
City/State/ZipCode:	Floral Park	Email Address:	
Additional Comments:			

FILED
 JUN 11 2007
 1 P M
 3

FERC has received approximately 26 letters in support of the proposed Broadwater Project with the following content.

Unofficial FERC-Generated PDF of 20070718-0022 Received by FERC OSEC 07/16/2007 in Docket#: CP06-54-000

CP06-54-000

Dear Governor Rell,

ORIGINAL

I write you today to offer my support for the proposed Broadwater Energy project. I believe that the Broadwater facility is an important step in securing a stable energy future for our region.

As a homeowner and an employee at a machine shop, I have seen the devastating effects skyrocketing energy prices have on family budgets and small businesses.

While we must do all we can to develop alternative sources of clean, renewable energy and bolster conservation efforts, it is highly unlikely that demand for natural gas and electricity will decrease anytime in the near future. Connecticut's working families and small businesses need natural gas and the energy it helps to generate.

At a time when energy bills continue to rise, by substantially increasing the supply of *natural gas* Broadwater would help lower energy bills for New York residents and businesses.

Broadwater will supply natural gas directly to the region - providing approximately 30% of our daily natural gas requirements, enough energy to power 4 million homes.

It is estimated that the project would reduce future natural gas and electricity prices for an average family by at least \$300 each year. Connecticut businesses would save thousands more which would allow them to create new jobs and provide improved wages and benefits to their employees.

I hope you will seriously considering joining me in supporting this important initiative.

Thank you,

[Handwritten signature]

FILED
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY
2007 JUL 16 P 4:00
JOURNAL OF THE COMMISSION

[Faint handwritten text]

FERC has received approximately 384 letters in opposition to the proposed Broadwater Project with the following content.

ORIGINAL Docket No. CP06-055-000 Broadwater Pipeline
Docket N. CP06-054-000 Broadwater Energy

As a member of the New London Environmental Education Coalition we are opposed to the Broadwater initiative. Thank you.

Kasey Goss
A Living Museum



File Caption: November 2004, Rocky Mountains

Margalite R. Salas, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE
Washington DC 20426

o . bbbbbb

FERC has received approximately 28 letters in opposition to the proposed Broadwater Project with the following content.

LONG ISLAND SOUND
OUR WATER NOT BROADWATER
www.savethesound.org

Add my name to the list of people who are saying **NO TO BROADWATER!**

Name Diane Burke, Brian Burke + Bu

E-mail* dia.burke@verizon.net

Address 29 3rd N

City Rocky Point State NY ZIP 11778

Phone (631) 744-3150

FILED
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY
23 A
NOV 2008

* Please help us save by providing your e-mail for future communications.

LONG ISLAND BY FLE
Your first-class stamp will
save us much needed funds

NO POSTAGE
NECESSARY
IF MAILED
IN THE
UNITED STATES

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
FIRST CLASS MAIL PERMIT NO. 187 NEW HAVEN CT

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

SAVE THE SOUND
CONNECTICUT FUND FOR THE ENVIRONMENT
205 WHITNEY AVE
NEW HAVEN CT 06511-9182

██

FERC has received approximately 11 letters in opposition to the proposed Broadwater Project with the following content.

EP06-54-006

ORIGINAL

OUR WATER, NOT BROADWATER!

I am writing to express my **opposition** to the Broadwater proposal for these reasons:

- **Long Island Sound is a public treasure that is critical to our region's economy.** *It is held in trust by the government for the region's citizens. The massive exclusion zones surrounding the industrial complex and each of the 2-3 weekly LNG supply tankers would unacceptably curtail the right of citizens to use the Sound while setting a dangerous precedent of giving away public lands to private corporations.*
- **Broadwater endangers our environment.** *The project and its new 22 miles of pipeline would endanger our lobster, shellfish and coral populations, damage water quality, change underwater habitats, and impact air quality. We have spent thirty years and billions of dollars protecting and restoring the Sound. Broadwater has the potential to jeopardize this progress in one fell swoop.*
- **Broadwater poses a serious safety and security hazard.** *The risks of vapor clouds, superheated natural gas fires, and terrorist attacks—and the hidden costs to tax payers who will be forced to pay for the increased Coast Guard presence required to protect the facility— must be taken into account when evaluating the proposal.*
- **There are other energy options for Connecticut and New York.** *This proposal is not necessary for our energy or natural gas supplies— other LNG projects in our region are already under construction. Furthermore, there are energy system and siting alternatives that do not jeopardize our safety or our environment.*
- **Broadwater will not lower my energy bill.** *Experts have shown that Broadwater will do nothing to lower energy costs or to reduce our dependence on foreign fossil fuels. We do not need Broadwater, we need wise planning. Conservation and efficiency efforts are the only ways to guarantee savings in the long run—these are the real programs that will save citizens and businesses money while bolstering the regional economy.*

Broadwater is asking that I trade in Long Island Sound and sacrifice our region's heritage for the mere hope of saving a few dollars on my monthly energy bill. But when was the last time an oil company opted to pass along any potential savings to citizens when the alternative was to keep the profits in their pocket?

Sincerely,

Ana Maria Killian
Signature

9-13-06
Date

NAME:

Ana Maria Killian
(Please Print)

ORGANIZATION:

ADDRESS:

94 School Road
Street

Bolton
City

CT
State

06063
Zip

2006 OCT 29 P 2:58
FEDERAL ENERGY COMMISSION

FILED
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY

FERC has received approximately 10 letters in opposition to the proposed Broadwater Project with the following content.

ORIGINAL

CP06-54

Broadwater Isn't Worth the Cost

I am writing to express my concern over Shell Oil's proposal to build Broadwater, a Liquefied Natural Gas complex to be located in Long Island Sound. As a small business ^{owner,} ~~owner,~~ ^{employee} I am concerned about the Broadwater project for the following reasons:

- **Broadwater's known risks are not likely to outweigh any hypothetical benefit.** *I like to support other local businesses whenever possible. Instead of asking me to support my local businesses, Broadwater is asking me to trade an existing and substantial part of our state's economy (Long Island Sound contributes \$5.5 billion to the regional economy every single year) for their vague promise of energy bill savings.*
- **Experts have shown that we do not need Broadwater.** *What we need is wise planning to lower operating costs and improve productivity to keep Connecticut employers competitive - and in Connecticut. To reduce energy costs, we must choose conservation and efficiency efforts first; it is the only way to create lasting local jobs and to guarantee savings in the long run.*
- **Broadwater comes with significant hidden costs.** *In addition to tying us to new foreign fossil fuels, the Broadwater project will require us to subsidize its business. Broadwater comes with significant hidden costs: revamping state and local emergency and security response plans, training and exercises for town emergency responders, the taxes we pay to substantially increase the Coast Guard's staffing and equipment so that it can adequately guard and defend the facility and its 2-3 weekly tanker shipments, sacrificing the public's open waters for the exclusive benefit of one private company, and the damage their project will cause to the environment.*
- **There are alternative energy options for Connecticut and New York.** *Along with the common sense alternative of energy conservation and efficiency, there are energy system, supply, and siting alternatives for the region that do not entail building an industrial complex in the middle of this estuary of national significance.*

Betting on Broadwater is a risky gamble that long-term natural gas prices will stay as they are today. Is that a bet we want to take when the result is to increase our dependence on imported gas and the exploding global LNG market? **Broadwater says they will help with my energy bill, but betting my business's future on the goodwill of natural gas suppliers like Shell does not sound like a wise business strategy.**

Sincerely,

Jeremy D. Freitas
Signature

9.27.07

NAME:

Jeremy Freitas
(Please Print)

BUSINESS:

Noank Village Boatyard

ADDRESS:

38 Bayside Ave.
Street

Noank
City

CT
State

06340
Zip

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY
2007
OCT 25
P 2:20
REGULATORY DIVISION

