8.0 PUBLIC MEETINGS

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS

Middle Island, New York
May 7, 2002

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
NY - May 7, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM1-1	5-6	S. Bail, President, Wading River Civic Association - Commented that DEIS was surprising and disappointing because it did not take into consideration the concerns of the community made during the scoping process.	Thank you for your comment.
PM1-2	7	S. Bail - Questioned why the proposed route of the Calverton Lateral rejected routing the pipeline down the center median of the William Floyd Parkway.	Comment noted. The median of the William Floyd Parkway was not recommended for the reasons stated in section 4.4.6 of the EIS.
PM1-3	7	B. Patterson, Project Manager, The Nature Conservancy - Concerned about the routing of the proposed pipeline through the Long Island Pine Barrens.	This issue has been expanded upon in FEIS section 3.8.3, and new construction methods have been proposed by Islander East that would significantly reduce surface disturbance in the Central Pine Barrens of Long Island.
PM1-4	8	B. Patterson - Encouraged FERC to build only one pipeline across Long Island Sound, either the pipeline prposed by Islander East or Iroquois, not both, further stating that building both would be ridiculous.	Thank you for your comment.
PM1-5	9	B. Patterson - Stated that a single pipeline (as opposed to two pipelines) would reduce the impact to the Long Island Pine Barrens and other habitats to be cleared.	Thank you for your comment.
PM1-6	9-10	B. Patterson - Pleased that the DEIS recommended the original proposed route along NY State Route 25A, minimizing impacts to the Pine Barrens, although not eliminating them entirely.	Thank you for your comment.
PM1-7	10	B. Patterson - Concerned about FERC enforcing the use of native species during revegetation of the route and right-of-way and encouraged FERC to revisit the revegetation plan.	See response to comment 22 in letter F3.
PM1-8	11	R. Kohlus - Concerned that different standards or logic were used for the analysis of the proposed route and the route variations.	Staff believes we have used the same standards.
PM1-9	12-34	R. Kohlus - Read from his letter sent to the FERC.	See letter G4 for letter and response.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
NY - May 7, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM1-10	35	E. Avery, Priceless Parrot Preserve - Concerned that construction of pipeline route, which is next to his property, will effect the quality of the well-water.	Impacts to groundwater resources are addressed in section 3.3.1.2 of the FEIS.
PM1-11	35	E. Avery - Concerned that the pipeline will spring a leak and the gas will kill the birds he keeps on his property.	The pipeline would be designed, installed, and maintained pursuant to the requirements of 49 CFR 192. Islander East's inspection and maintenance program for operation of the pipeline is designed to detect and complete repairs of potential leaks before they occur. In the unlikely event of undetected/unrepaired leaks, an automated system will immediately shut down the gas flow between valves in the area of the leak until Islander East can make the required repairs. As discussed in section 3.12, methane is not toxic but rather acts as an asphyxiate in high concentrations. However, in the open air it is buoyant and disperses rapidly. In the extremely unlikely event that a leak occurred near your property, the gas would disperse in open air and would not threaten animals in the area.
PM1-12	35	E. Avery - Concerned about the long-term effects of the pipeline on his property.	Short- and long-term effects of the pipeline are described throughout the FEIS.
PM1-13	36	E. Avery - Concerned about the effects of dust and noise from pipeline construction on the birds on his property.	Islander East has revised its original pipeline alignment in this area to allow use of horizontal directional drilling between MPs 37.58 and 38.27. The horizontal directional drilling would take the pipeline past Mr. Avery's property, and would exit at a point about 350 feet away from the property. The directional drilling equipment would be located at the other end of the 2,886 foot boring segment. Islander East estimates that pipeline installation in this area would take no more than two or three weeks. The revised pipeline alignment should provide enough separation from the outdoor aviary to avoid any noise or dust impacts.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
NY - May 7, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM1-14	37	E. Avery - Agreed with a previous speaker that proposed pipeline route will become a right-of-way for high transmission lines.	FERC appreciates the commentor's concern that the right-of-way could be used to collocate high transmission lines. However, such lines are not a component of any current plans or proposals, and thus, cannot be evaluated as cumulative impacts within the context of "reasonably foreseeable actions.
PM1-15	37	E. Avery - Stated that maps of proposed route and stakes on his property conflict regarding the width of the proposed right-of-way and he would like clarification.	The stakes on your property represent the boundaries of the corridor surveyed for threatened and endangered species. This cooridor is wider than the proposed right-of-way.
PM1-16	37	E. Avery - Concerned that the construction and maintenance of the proposed pipeline will have negative effects his birds, and thus negatively effect his livelihood (income).	Islander East has proposed a new route variation that would utilize horizontal directional drilling in the area of your residence. The drill would exit approximately 350 ft from your property. The impacts of this variation are presented in section 4.
PM1-17	38	L. Storms, Long Island Pine Barrens Society - Concerned about how the Connecticut one-year moritorium on gas pipeline and electric cable projects is going to effect the timetable, environment and in-service stage for construction of the proposed pipeline and would like to see these issues addressed in the final EIS.	Thank-you for your comment. FERC cannot judge the extent, if any, that the moratorium could alter the Islander East project schedule. If the project start date were delayed, other project milestones would be delayed to the same extent. The potential beneficial and adverse impacts of the project would not be substantively altered by such a change, with the exception of the dates for service availability. Energy needs are discussed in Section 1.1 of the EIS.
PM1-18	39	L. Storms - Stated that the DEIS is vauge about the effects of the project on species that are not on any endangered or threatened lists and that final EIS should be very specific.	Potential impacts to listed species would be evaluated on the basis of individual organisms and their habitat as well as on a population basis. Potential impacts to species that are not listed as threatened, endangered, or under other special status categories are typically evaluated on a regional, or population, basis that is less specific than the consideration given listed species.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
NY - May 7, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM1-19	39	L. Storms - Stated that the use of straw bales for erosion control during construction often introduces invasive species into the environment and would like Islander East to use other erosion control methods.	As stated in the Section 3.5.2 of the FEIS, Islander East will require contractors to clean equipment prior to the beginning of work on the right-of-way and use silt fence to the maximum extent possible while generally avoiding the use of hay bales.
PM1-20	39-40	L. Storms - Questioned the need for the pipeline, and specifically for the Calverton Lateral, considering that the power plant that is to connect to the Calverton Lateral is not yet built, and has not yet even begun the permitting process in New York State.	FERC agrees that the availability of an electrical generating plant at the Calverton site is not a foregone conclusion. The proposed action in this FEIS includes the Calverton Lateral because it is a component of the activities within FERC's jurisdictional review, and because it would be improper of FERC to segment this action for the purposes of NEPA review. Inclusion of the Calverton Lateral in the NEPA review process does not constitute approval of a permit. Additionally, if the Calverton Lateral were a component of a permit approved by FERC, this does not imply that a power plant should, or would be built at the Calverton site.
PM1-21	41	L. Storms - Stated that the construction of the Calverton Lateral should be looked at from an environmental perspective first, and then a necessity perspective.	Comment noted.
PM1-22	41-42	L. Storms - Questioned why Islander East is not working with the Pine Barrens Commission, a New York State Agency, regarding routing the pipeline through the Pine Barrens and thinks it would be appropriate for FERC to require Islander East to work with the Commission.	The Central Pine Barrens Commission is listed as a state agency in Table 2.6-1, and the potential need for a hardship permit is also listed. FERC expects Islander East to comply with all requirements for individual permits and certifications.
PM1-23	42	L. Storms - Stated that would like FERC to approve only one of the two proposed pipelines through Long Island Sound, preferrably the most environmentally benign one.	Thank you for your comment.
PM1-24	42-43	L. Storms - Concerned that FERC is not requiring Islander East to work with the appropriate state agencies to produce and file forest and wetland revegetation procedures and states that the appropriate agency would be the Pine Barrens Commission. (References page 3-74 of DEIS.)	The FEIS includes the Central Pine Barrens Commission as a resource agency to be contacted to review any wetland mitigation or revegetation plans.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
NY - May 7, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM1-25	44	E. Kaplan, Riverhead Coordinator, North Fork Council - Stated that the purpose and need of a gas pipeline on Long Island, NY needs to be expanded upon in the DEIS from just the current one sentence in Section 1.1.	The need for the project is determined by the Commission in the orders that are issued in this proceeding. The Commission issued a preliminary determination for this project on December 19, 2001. Section 1.1 of the FEIS refers to this document.
PM1-26	44-45	E. Kaplan - Stated that the environmental effects of future development, such as the power plant that is to connect to the Calerton Lateral, should also be examined in the EIS.	Cumulative effects are addressed in section 3.13 of the FEIS.
PM1-27	46	E. Avery - Questioned why a new gas power plant cannot be constructed on the site of a former nuclear power plant, especially considering there are transmission lines already coming from the former nuclear power plant that are connected to the grid.	Thank you for your comment.
PM1-28	46	An unidentified man - Questioned why a new gas power plant cannot be constructed on the site of a former nuclear power plant, thus avoiding environmental impacts of constructing the proposed gas pipeline.	Thank you for your comment.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS

Branford, Connecticut
May 8, 2002

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-1	6	A. DaRos, First Selectman, Town of Branford - Commented that DEIS was disappointing and is weighted in favor of industry, leaving the community little, if any, chance to raise legitimate issues.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-2	8	A. DaRos - Questioned why the DEIS did not include the sedimentation study.	Islander East had not completed the study at the time of issuance of the DEIS. Section 3.3.3.2 of the FEIS includes this information.
PM2-3	9	A. DaRos - Stated that the Town of Branford conducted a review of the Islander East application and recommended that it be rejected.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-4	10	A. DaRos - Requested that FERC respect the recent bill passed in Connecticut that calls for a one-year moratorium on the construction of siting and permitted gas pipeline and electric cables to cross Long Island Sound.	See response to comment letter S1, comment 1.
PM2-5	12	R. Blumenthal, Attorney General, State of Connecticut - Stated that the DEIS ignores or minimizes the depth, magnitude and intensity of both on-shore and off-shore environmental impacts of the proposed pipeline.	Thank-you for your comment. FERC agrees that the potential impacts of the proposed action are not insignificant. It is for this reason that FERC has conducted an EIS level of NEPA review for the proposed action. In evaluating a proposed action, both potential beneficial and potential adverse effects must be considered. Potential adverse impacts must be minimized, and mitigation for these impacts must be provided under certain circumstances. While it is seldom, if ever, possible to eliminate adverse impacts that may result from taking an action, some actions may still proceed if beneficial impacts are greater than adverse impacts.
PM2-6	13	R. Blumenthal - Stated that the DEIS virtually ignores potential impacts to the sand eel, the principal food source for cod, blue fish, flounder and many other species of the area.	Section 3.4.1.2 of the FEIS has been revised to include a discussion of potential impacts to sand eels. See response to comment PM2-32.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-7	13	R. Blumenthal - Stated that the DEIS, which is required by federal law to consider all cumulative impacts, fails to take into consideration all of the proposals and projects under consideration in the area.	FERC agrees that consideration of cumulative impacts is important. Section 3.13 of the FEIS has been updated with additional information on other potential projects in the area.
PM2-8	14	R. Blumenthal - Requested that FERC respect the recent bill passed in Connecticut that calls for a one-year moratorium on the construction of siting and permitted gas pipeline and electric cables to cross Long Island Sound and wait before taking any final action on this proposed pipeline project.	See response to comment letter S1, comment 1.
PM2-9	14	R. Blumenthal - Requested that Islander East withdraw its application to FERC and begin again for a full and fair consideration of all issues of the proposal in light of the recent moratorium.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-10	15-16	V. Candelora, Council Member, Town of North Branford - Stated that the Council of the Town of North Branford has voted unanimously to opposed the proposed pipeline project and disagrees with the DEIS that impacts to the environment will be minimal.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-11	16	V. Candelora - Concerned that construction of proposed pipeline, which is within the Farm River Watershed, will irreconcilably damage the private wells and septic systems in the neighborhoods the pipeline is proposed to go through.	Potential impacts to subsurface infrastructure are addressed in sections 3.1.1.2 and 3.3.1.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-12	16-17	V. Candelora - Concerned that blasting of bedrock with have negative impacts to wells and septic systems.	Potential impacts to subsurface infrastructure from blasting are addressed in section 3.1.1.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-13	17	V. Candelora - Concerned that blasting at Milepost (MP) 5.5, a contaminated site, will cause contaminants to migrate to both public and private wells underground, and that the stockpiling of excavated soil will cause contaminants to migrate from runoff from the soil aboveground.	Potential impacts on contaminated groundwater migration are addressed in section 3.3.1.2 of the FEIS. If contaminated soil is encountered, Islander East would be required to handle and store it in accordance with all applicable Federal, state, and local regulations that are designed to eliminate any spread of contamination from excavated soil.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-14	17-18	V. Candelora - Questioned why the DEIS stated there would be minimal environmental impact in a known contaminated area when remediation reports on the contaminated site recommend no development of the area lest the contamination be further spread due to the fractionalized nature of the bedrock.	The DEIS did not state that there would be minimal environmental impact in any known contaminated areas. We have recommended that Islander East conduct further studies near MP 5.5 to better determine the potential for affecting contaminated groundwater migration from construction activities. See section 3.3.1.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-15	19	V. Candelora - Recommended that FERC do independent studies on the environmental impacts of the proposed pipeline project due to environmental and health issues not addressed in the DEIS.	FERC staff reviews all filed information and analyzes the potential impacts associated with the proposed project.
PM2-16	22	A. Farwell, President, New Haven Urban Society League - Concerned that the proposed pipeline route is to go through the Westwoods Nature Preserve.	Thank you for your comment. The Sachem Head Route Alternative would be located adjacent to the Westwoods Nature Preserve. However, we are not recommending this alternative. The proposed pipeline route is located approximately 2.5 miles west of Westwoods Nature Preserve.
PM2-17	22	A. Farwell - Stated support for the one-year moratorium in Connecticut on the construction of siting and permitted gas pipeline and electric cables crossing Long Island Sound, having FERC wait to make final determination on the proposed pipeline project.	See response to comment letter S1, comment 1.
PM2-18	23	H. Berdick, resident of Branford - Stated that the proposed pipeline through Connecticut to benefit Long Island residents to heat swimming pools is without merit.	Thank you for your comment.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-19	23	H. Berdick - Concerned about the impact of construction/maintenance of the proposed pipeline to four families of ospreys in an estuary on the Connecticut side of Long Island Sound.	Comment is noted. However, the FWS, CTDEP, or the NYSDEC in their correspondence with Islander East did not list the osprey as a species of concern. The FEIS will include the osprey as wildlife species that occurs in the vicinity of the project area. As stated in Section 3.4.2.2 of the DEIS, Islander East has minimized impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat by reducing the width of the permanent right-of-way in wetlands, collocating the proposed right-of-way with existing rights-of-way, and limiting routine vegetation maintenance to once every 3 years and outside of the nesting season.
PM2-20	26	C. Balestracci, First Selectman, Town of Guilford - Concerned about multiple issues relating to the pipeline: safety, right of eminent domain, property values, damage to road and other infrastructure, effects on the environment.	See section 3 for discussion of these topics.
PM2-21	27	C. Balestracci - Stated support for the one-year moratorium in Connecticut on the construction of siting and permitted gas pipeline and electric cables crossing Long Island Sound, having FERC wait to make final determination on the proposed pipeline project.	See response to comment letter S1, comment 1.
PM2-22	27	C. Balestracci - Requested that FERC wait to make a final determination on the proposed pipeline project until a true-needs assessment of energy for the area could be made.	The need for the project is determined by the Commission in the orders that are issued in this proceeding. The Commission issued a preliminary determination for this project on December 19, 2001. Section 1.1 of the FEIS refers to this document. The EIS presents an analysis of the environmental impacts of the project as proposed, mitigation measures to reduce those impacts, and alternative routes and route variations that would reduce the impacts.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-23	27	C. Balestracci - Requested that FERC, once a true need for the area is determined, approve the least amount of routes necessary and the most environmentally benign routes.	See response to comment number PM2-22.
PM2-24	28	R. Denhardt, Third Selectman, Town of Branford - Concerned that the are potential safety problems along proposed pipeline route that parallels the Tilcon railroad tracks where many derailments have occurred over the years.	See response to comment letter G3, comment 4.
PM2-25	29	R. Denhardt - Concerned about the potential safety issues along the proposed pipeline route located close to a school (Wightwood School).	The pipeline would be designed, installed, and maintained pursuant to the requirements of 49 CFR 192. As discussed in section 3.12, these regulations establish class locations which are dependant on the population density within 220 yards of the pipeline centerline. The number of students present at the school and population of surrounding areas dictates the class location, which is Class 3 for this segment of the proposed route. See section 3.12.1 of the FEIS for a more detailed discussion. FEIS section 3.8.3 discusses the pipeline siting in relation to the Wightwood School and addresses safety concerns for this area.
PM2-26	29-30	J. Wilson, resident of Branford - Concerned that the DEIS does not accurately cover safety to people from potential pipeline explosions and ignores data from numerous pipeline accidents that occur each year.	We believe that safety issues are accurately and thoroughly discussed in section 3.12. Section 3.12.2 contains the most recent verified data currently available on pipeline accidents.
PM2-27	31	J. Wilson - Requested that FERC amend the DEIS to include data from numerous pipeline accidents.	Section 3.12.2 contains the most recent verified data currently available on pipeline accidents.
PM2-28	31	J. Wilson - Requested that the Reliability and Safety section of the DEIS be amended to include kill zones from pipeline explosions that take into consideration land contours where natural gas would flow if a leak would occur.	The primary component of natural gas is methane. At atmospheric temperatures, methane is less dense than air and is therefore buoyant. In open air it disperses rapidly and does not follow the land contours.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-29	31-32	A. Wilson - Requested that the Reliability and Safety section of the DEIS be amended to include the effects of a pipeline explosion that is 70 feet away from the Wightwood School using field data that is available from a recent similar explosion in Jeffersonville, Kentucky.	See response to comments PM2-25 and PM2-27.
PM2-30	32	A. Wilson - Requested that FERC put a freeze on all permits to Duke Energy and its subsidiaries (Islander East) until a federal criminal investigation regarding price fixing by Duke Energy and called for by California Senator Dianne Feinstein is completed.	Such an action is out of the scope of the EIS.
PM2-31	33	A. Wilson - Concerned that the proposed pipeline has nothing to do with necessary supply for Long Island, but political favoritism.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-32	33	A. Wilson - Requested that the FERC oppose the pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-33	35-36	S. Richards, resident of Guilford - Concerned that constructing the proposed pipeline in the winter will cause considerable damage to the food supply, such as sand eels, of many important species of fish as well as the Roseate tern chicks.	See section 3.4.1.2 of the FEIS concerning the sand eels. Many species regularly consume sand eels as a portion of their diet, although none of these species rely solely on sand eels as a food source. Any project-related temporary disturbance to sand eel habitat or associated temporary reduction in sand eel abundance during construction will not be expected to affect sand eel predators because other food sources will remain available within and outside of the project area. In addition, sand eels would be expected to return to the construction right-of-way following pipeline installation. The FWS has concurred that because construction in the Long Island Sound will occur during the winter months when roseate terns are not expected to be present in the project area, Islander East's project is not likely to adversely affect roseate terns. Further, the CTDEP has reviewed the project and has concurred that the project will not adversely affect state-listed species.
PM2-34	37	D. Fair, resident of North Branford - Stated support for the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-35	38	L. Radulski - Concerned that the quality of her children's lives are in danger due to potential environmental impacts of the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-36	39-40	L. Radulski - Concerned that construction and right-of-way maintenance impacts of the proposed pipeline route will have negative environmental effects on the estuary and species of the Trolley Trail area.	The pipeline will not cross any estuary habitat. As outlined in Section 3.4.2.2 of the FEIS, Islander East has minimized impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat by reducing the width of the permanent right-of-way in wetlands, collocating the proposed right-of-way with existing rights-of-way, and limiting routine vegetation maintenance to once every 3 years and outside of the nesting season.
PM2-37	41	M. M. Visnic - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-38	41	M. M. Visnic - Concerned about the potential for an explosion of the proposed pipeline.	Section 3.12 contains a complete discussion of the reliability and safety of the proposed pipeline.
PM2-39	42	M. M. Visnic - Requested that FERC pick the safest pipeline route across Long Island Sound among the alternatives.	We believe that we have recommended the best route for crossing the Sound. See section 4 for a complete discussion of route alternatives.
PM2-40	43	C. Van Bruinisse - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-41	43	C. Van Bruinsse - Stated that issues regarding the proposed pipeline project have not been adequately addressed by either state or federal agencies.	State and other Federal agencies were involved in the scoping of this EIS and were also given opportunity to comment on the DEIS.
PM2-42	44	C. Van Bruinssee - Concerned about effects of construction of the proposed pipeline near his property and the quality of his well water. Stated that the effects of construction of pipeline near his property in 1968 caused silt to migrate into his well.	Impacts to groundwater resources are addressed in section 3.3.1.2 of the FEIS. In the event of damage to a well, Islander East would be required to restore the well to its previous quality, or replace the well.
PM2-43	44	C. Van Bruinssee - Concerned that the designated work area for construction of the proposed pipeline, which is in his hayfield, will compact the topsoil and subsoil, damaging the field and his ability to raise crops in it.	Soil compaction impacts and mitigation are addressed in section 3.2.2 of the FEIS.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-44	46	G. Case - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project because it will only benefit New York, not Connecticut.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-45	46	G. Case - Stated disagreement with the conclusion of the DEIS that there will only be limited environmental impacts from the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-46	47	K. Nelson, Chairman, Branford Shellfish Commission; Vice President, Republican Town Committee, Branford - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-47	47	K. Nelson - Concerned that there will be negative impacts to wildlife, fish and shellfish from the proposed pipeline project.	As outlined in Section 3.4.2.2 of the FEIS, Islander East has minimized impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat by reducing the width of the permanent right-of-way in wetlands, collocating the proposed right-of-way with existing rights-of-way, and limiting routine vegetation maintenance to once every 3 years and outside of the nesting season. Section 3.4.1.1 of the FEIS discusses the potential impacts to fish and shellfish along the proposed pipeline route.
PM2-48	47	K. Nelson - Stated that the Commission should consider the Iroquois ELI line alternative because it will have less environmental impact than the Islander East proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment. A separate EIS is being prepared for the ELI Extension Project. The ELI System Alternative is discussed in section 4.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-49	47	K. Nelson - Stated that due to different energy demand projections for Long Island by both Iroquois and Islander East, the FERC Commission should re-evaluate the energy demand projections and then make a decision on the best pipeline project.	Determining energy demands is outside of the scope of the FEIS.
PM2-50	48	K. Nelson - Stated that the proposed pipeline project will damage, if not destroy, limited and valuable shellfish resources in Branford.	Section 3.4.1.2 of the FEIS has been revised to include a discussion of potential short and long-term impacts to shellfish and shellfish habitat in Long Island Sound.
PM2-51	49	K. Nelson - Stated that the construction techniques to be utilized in the proposed pipeline project are destructive.	Construction techniques that would be used for the proposed project are the least environmentally damaging available.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-52	49 & 51	K. Nelson - Stated that Islander East has failed to fully account for the environmental damage that would be caused by its construction techniques and requested that the FERC Commission force Islander East to provided data on potential environmental damage of those techniques.	Environmental impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project are analyzed in the EIS. Some data is provided by the applicant and other data is researched by FERC staff.
PM2-53	49-50	K. Nelson - Concerned that the horizontal directional drill method of construction, as yet untried by Islander East, will not be adequate to avoid impacts to shellfish beds.	We believe that the HDD method of construction has a good probability of succeeding at the proposed location at the Connecticut shore and that impacts to nearshore shellfish beds would be avoided to the extent possible.
PM2-54	50	K. Nelson - Concerned that the contingency plan for the horizontal directional drill, dredging, will destroy all shellfish resources.	Impacts to shellfish resources are addressed in section 3.4.1.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-55	51	B. Horne, President, Branford Land Trust - Questioned the need for energy on Long Island and quoted, as evidence of the lack of energy need, from a letter from other energy companies in the area (Duke and Keyspan) canceling a project to bring additional gas energy to Long Island from New Jersey because of the lack of market development on Long Island for the gas.	See response to comment number PM2-22.
PM2-56	52	B. Horne - Stated that the undeveloped land of the Branford Land Trust was meant to be kept undeveloped in perpetuity, not to be used as a corridor with right-of-way for the proposed pipeline project.	FEIS section 3.8.3 discusses the issue of the project and land trusts in more detail.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-57	53	B. Horne - Stated that individual landowners will not have the power or the means to require Islander East to conduct meaningful restoration of the temporary workspaces on or near the landowners' property once the FERC gives their approval to the proposed project.	Landowners will retain their authority to negotiate with Islander East regarding restoration of temporary workspaces on their property during easement negotiations and throughout construction, through the channels of Islander East's field land agents, inspectors, and the contractor. In the event these channels do not yield satisfaction, the FERC field inspectors and the FERC Enforcement telephone hotline are available to receive any significant and unresolved landowner complaints. FERC has the authority to deny or postpone Islander East's request to begin operating the pipeline until restoration is proceeding satisfactorily or completed.
PM2-58	53	B. Horne - Stated that the DEISs' statement that recovery from the proposed pipeline construction will take 150 years is not a temporary environmental impact as the DEIS concludes.	Thank you for your comment
PM2-59	53-54	B. Horne - Concerned that the greatest impact of the proposed pipeline project will be to the water around the Thimble Islands with the horizontal directional drill creating mounds of dredge sediment ten feet or higher, possibly visible at low tide and extending for more than a mile.	Some turbid water is likely to result during construction in the Long Island Sound. However, construction across the Sound will be conducted during the winter, avoiding the summer tourism season. We believe that the proposed construction and drilling mud containment measures will effectively limit sedimentation and turbidity to an acceptable level, and the effect will be temporary and limited to the period of construction, following which the water will regain its clarity.
PM2-60	54	B. Horne - Concerned that turbulence from moderate waves or winds around Thimble Island will significantly erode large amounts of dredged sediment created by the horizontal directional drill and disburse the sediments to ocean beds between the trench of Stony Creek.	Since issuance of the DEIS, Islander East has completed a computer modeling study of the potential for erosion of the dredged material. Section 3.3.3.2 of the FEIS includes this information.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-61	54-55	B. Horne - Stated support for the alternative routes that incorporate the existing Iroquois pipeline because they will not require as much disturbance to the environment and will avoid the Branford area altogether.	Thank you for your comment. Alternatives are discussed in section 4 of the FEIS.
PM2-62	55-56	K. Brownell - Stated opposition to the proposed route of the pipeline due to concerns about environmental damage and safety.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-63	56	K. Brownell - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-64	57	E. Dock, Branford Land Trust - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-65	57	E. Dock - Stated that the undeveloped land of the Branford Land Trust was meant to be kept undeveloped in perpetuity, and by putting a gas pipeline corridor in it, it will be difficult to convince future landowners that any property they would donate to the Trust would be remain undeveloped.	The pipeline would be located parallel and adjacent to existing developed rights-of-way (pipeline and railroad) in the Branford Land Trust properties, and would be consistent with these particular existing uses. Following construction, the pipeline would not interfere with the designated "open land" uses prescribed in these areas in the sense that the pipeline would buried, the right-of-way would be restored, and no aboveground structures such as buildings would be constructed.
PM2-66	58	E. Dock - Stated that if the proposed pipeline project is approved, Islander East must have a long-term replanting and monitoring management plan to control for invasive plant species that would move into the disturbed land.	See response 22 in letter F3.
PM2-67	58	E. Dock - Stated that unless Islander East is required to have and execute a long-term replanting and monitoring management plan to control for invasive species, the burden would be left to the land management volunteers of the Branford Land Trust for many years to come.	FEIS section 3.8.3 has been expanded and updated the regarding Islander East's coordination and planning activities related to restoration of the Branford Land Trust properties.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-68	59	K. Kennedy, CT Stop the Pipeline - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project and handed into FERC representatives a petition with 5577 signatures also in opposition to the project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-69	60-63	K. Kennedy - Stated that the additional projects Islander East is planning that are to be affiliated with the proposed pipeline project (e.g., compressor stations to meet contractual obligations Islander East has with other companies) need to be included in a full EIS.	See comment letter G67, responses 7 and 8.
PM2-70	63	K. Kennedy - Questioned the validity and reliability of all data in the DEIS based on inconsistencies in the projected energy demand on Long Island and undeclared Islander East future projects not included in this EIS.	See comment letter G67, response 3.
PM2-71	64	E. Baron - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-72	64-65	M. Normand, resident of Branford - Questioned the underlying justification for the need of the project, which is based on a national security need.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-73	65	M. Normand - Questioned what security measures would be taken to protect the proposed pipeline from potential attack.	We do not believe that the Islander East pipeline would be subject to any greater risk from outside forces or terrorists than any other pipeline.
PM2-74	66	M. Normand - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-75	66 & 68	A. Howe, Branford Concentration and Environment Commission, Branford Land Trust - Stated opposition to the proposed project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-76	66-67	A. Howe - Stated that the undeveloped land of the Branford Land Trust was meant to be kept undeveloped in perpetuity for the benefit of the public and the city of Branford, and not for the benefit of the Islander East Gas Company and the United States government.	See PM2-65

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-77	67	A. Howe - Stated belief that the proposed pipeline project would cause irreversible damage to the Branford Land Trust and shellfish beds in Long Island Sound.	Section 3.4.1.2 of the FEIS has been revised to include a discussion of potential short and long-term impacts to shellfish and shellfish habitat in Long Island Sound.
PM2-78	68	A. Howe - Stated that a more comprehensive study of the issue should be undertaken.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-79	68	L. Adams, resident of Killingworth and the Thimble Islands - Concerned that the Thimble Islands will be negatively impacted by the proposed pipeline project.	See response to Comment PM2-59.
PM2-80	69	L. Adams - Stated that there are already a number of utility corridors surrounding Branford and does not want a corridor to go through Branford.	Comment noted.
PM2-81	70	A. Josephson, Executive Director, Orange Ribbon Foundation - Stated that he does not believe the DEIS is nearly as comprehensive or coordinated as necessary to accurately assess the full impacts of the proposed pipeline project.	We believe that the FEIS thoroughly and accurately assesses the full environmental impacts of the proposed project.
PM2-82	70	A. Josephson - Stated that given there are currently four proposals for gas pipelines under Long Island Sound, a EIS should be written that looks at all possibilities and their potential impacts.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-83	70-72	A. Josephson - Concerned that construction of the proposed pipeline project in Long Island Sound will negatively impact water quality by resuspending toxins and pollutants in the sediment.	Potential impacts to the water quality of the Sound from construction of the proposed pipeline are addressed in section 3.3.3.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-84	72	A. Josephson - Concerned that there will be deaths to oysters and birds from the proposed pipeline project as there were after the Iroquois pipeline was constructed in 1992.	As outlined in Section 3.4.2.2 of the FEIS, Islander East has minimized impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat by reducing the width of the permanent right-of-way in wetlands, collocating the proposed right-of-way with existing rights-of-way, and limiting routine vegetation maintenance to once every 3 years and outside of the nesting season. The FEIS has been revised to include a discussion of potential short and long-term impacts to shellfish and shellfish habitat in Long Island Sound.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-85	72-73	A. Josephson - Concerned that horizontal directional drill construction will resuspend toxins and pollutants from the sediment and into the water, thus contaminating invertebrate species and the higher species that feed on the invertebrates.	Potential impacts to the water quality of the Sound from the HDD construction method are addressed in section 3.3.3.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-86	74	K. Hotchkiss, resident of Branford - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-87	74-75	K. Hotchkiss - Stated that the undeveloped land of the Branford Land Trust, and specifically the 27-acre Trolley Trail Nature Preserve, was meant to be kept undeveloped in perpetuity and should not be used for the proposed pipeline project.	See response to PM2-65.
PM2-88	75-76	G. Gepalle - Stated that the bird the American bittern has recently been identified in the area but was not mentioned in the DEIS, and suggested that more work is needed to identify all the species in the area.	Comment is noted. However, the FWS or the CTDEP in their correspondence with Islander East did not list the American bittern as a species of concern or as occurring in the proposed project area. The American bittern is not listed by the FWS, however is listed by the CTDEP as endangered. Regardless, measures to minimize impacts to bird and wildlife species are included in section 3.4.2.2. These include limiting right-of-way maintenance to once every three years and avoiding disturbance during nesting periods.
PM2-89	76	G. Gepalle - Questioned how the salt water would effect the gas pipeline in Long Island Sound and questioned how repairs to the pipeline in the Sound would be done.	The pipeline would be designed, installed, and maintained pursuant to the requirements of 49 CFR 192, which contain specific requirements for pipelines in submerged environments. As discussed in section 3.12, the pipeline would be coated with a protective coating and also have a cathodic protection anti-corrosion system. Repairs, if necessary, would be conducted using highly trained divers.
PM2-90	76	G. Gepalle - Questioned what would happen to the proposed pipeline if it were constructed but then no longer needed.	As discussed in section 2.5 of the EIS, Islander East has no plans to abandon the pipeline, but if proposed, the abandonment would be subject to approval by FERC.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-91	76-77	G. Gepalle - Questioned if the same strict maintenance requirements would be maintained by another company if Islander East transferred or sold the pipeline.	The same requirements apply to whomever owns/operates the pipeline.
PM2-92	77	G. Gepalle - Concerned that large boats needing emergency anchor in Long Island Sound near the buried pipeline would rupture the gas pipeline.	As mentioned in section 3.8.1.2 of the EIS, the proposed project avoids designated anchorage and lightening areas. Large boats would be required to avoid anchoring in the vicinity of the proposed pipeline. In addition, the pipeline's presence would be noted on nautical charts to alert mariner's to the pipeline's location in the Sound. We believe that these are adequate precautions that would avoid damage to the pipeline from boat anchors.
PM2-93	78	C. Sullivan, Maugatuck Audubon Society, Branford Concentration and Environment Commission - Concerned that impacts from construction of the proposed pipeline near the Thimble Islands will chase away or otherwise negatively effect harbor seals known to be near the Islands.	The presence of harbor seals in the Long Island Sound is indicated in Section 3.4.2.1 of the DEIS.
PM2-94	79	C. Sullivan - Concerned that noise, in particular, will negatively effect the harbor seals near the Thimble Islands.	Islander East has contacted the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) regarding the concerns over disturbance to harbor seals and grey seals in the vicinity of the Thimble Islands. The NMFS does not anticipate any significant project-related impacts to harbor seals or grey seals, and has indicated that Islander East does not need to seek authorization for a "take" of marine mammals. Islander East will continue to coordinate with NMFS on this issue.
PM2-95	79-80	C. Sullivan - Stated belief that proposed pipeline project would qualify as harassment to the oyster and harbor seal population, causing harbor seals to leave the area and thus is a violation of the Marine Mammal Protection Act.	See comment letter G47.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-96	80	C. Sullivan - Stated that any project that has the potential to disturb marine mammals must apply for an incidental harassment authorization to followed by a public comment period.	See comment letter G47.
PM2-97	82	P. Huang, resident of Branford - Questioned whether Islander East, a limited liability company, can be held liable for accidents and damage from the proposed pipeline.	Liability issues are not within the scope of the EIS.
PM2-98	83-84	G. Rivezzi, resident of Branford - Concerned that construction of the proposed pipeline project, which may require the blasting of bedrock, will negatively effect Branford's water supply spreading PCE contamination already known to exist in the groundwater of a nearby property (MP 5.5, the Hartt Property).	We believe that not enough site-specific information is available to determine the effects of blasting on contaminated groundwater migration near MP 5.5. We have recommended that Islander East conduct further studies of this area in order to make this determination. See section 3.3.1.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-99	84-85	G. Rivezzi - Questioned why the DEIS in Section 3.0, page 3-22, paragraph 5 stated that site specific information on the bedrock and contaminated groundwater on the Hartt Property was yet to be submitted since the state of Connecticut has been monitoring the property for the past 13 years.	The Hartt Property is located approximately 0.1 mile from the proposed pipeline route. "Site-specific" in this instance refers to the area that the proposed pipeline would cross, not an area 0.1 mile away. See response to comment PM2-98.
PM2-100	85-86	G. Rivezzi - Concerned that Islander East is not a credible company considering their recent uncooperative behavior regarding bedrock testing on her property.	This is not within the scope of the EIS.
PM2-101	86-87	G. Rivezzi - Concerned that Islander East, in drilling holes on her property to test the bedrock, now wants to drill farther into the bedrock, potentially spreading the PCE contaminated groundwater to other wells.	Any future drilling activity on Ms. Rivezzi's property would be pre-approved by the CTDEP. The potential for affecting contaminated groundwater migration would be a factor considered in their review.
PM2-102	87	J. Tait, Professor of Oceanography and Environmental Geosciences, Southern Connecticut State University - Stated that the DEIS should list potential contaminates to the tidal wetland in the vicinity of the Tilcon barge facility and railway, which is already severely stressed by current environmental conditions.	See comment letter G66, response 2.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-103	87-88	J. Tait - Stated that the DEIS incorrectly characterizes the tidal wetland in the vicinity of the Tilcon barge facility and railway.	See comment letter G66, response 1.
PM2-104	88	J. Tait - Stated that the DEIS cannot possibly make the conclusion that the tidal wetland will not be directly impacted by construction and operation of the pipeline as there is no understanding exhibited in the DEIS of the specific stressor mechanisms, modalities and rates of marsh deterioration and possible changes over time.	See response to PM2-102.
PM2-105	88-89	J. Tait - Commented that he wants to the Commission to understand how important coastal wetlands are to Connecticut's natural heritage and that the quality of Connecticut's coastal wetlands have continued to deteriorate in the last 30 years based on his observations.	Thank you for your comment
PM2-106	89-90	C. Vargas, resident of New Haven - Concerned that not all of the proposed pipeline construction projects across Long Island Sound are being looked at so a total impact of the projects can be understood.	Section 3.13 has been revised to include more information from other gas and electric utility transmission line projects.
PM2-107	90	C. Vargas - Commented that a recent report issued by the State University of New York, Albany and Long Island Power Association stated that there is enough wind off the southern coast of Long Island to produce 5 gigawatts of electricity, thus negating the need for cables and pipeline to cross Long Island Sound.	The use of wind power as an alternative energy source is discussed in section 4.1 of the FEIS.
PM2-108	91	T. Cleveland, member of the Branford Land Trust - Commented that he preferred an alternative route that moved additional gas to Long Island through the Iroquois gas line that already exists in Milford, CT.	Thank you for your comment. There is no existing pipeline running from Connecticut to Eastern Long Island, New York. We have examined the ELI System Alternative in section 4.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-109	91	T. Cleveland - Commented that the Land Trust, established to keep land undeveloped in perpetuity, is a concept in stark contrast with the greed of pipeline companies or any need to put a pipeline through such an area.	See response to PM2-65.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-110	91	T. Cleveland - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-111	92	R. Donohoe, resident of North Branford - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-112	93	R. Donohoe - Concerned about safety issues that arise due to the location of the pipeline corridor next to the Tilcon railway and the potential of a gasline explosion from a derailment of railcars onto the pipeline.	See response to comment letter G3, comment 4.
PM2-113	93	R. Donohoe - Questioned who would be liable for a derailment that led to a pipeline explosion, the pipeline company or the Tilcon Railway.	Liability issues are not within the scope of the EIS.
PM2-114	95	R. Donohoe - Concerned that the vibrations generated by the rock-laden freight cars that use the railway will cause the pipeline to be unsafe.	See response to comment letter G3, comment 1.
PM2-115	97	G. Kelman, resident of Stony Creek - Stated opposition to the project pipeline project based on observation of the destructive effects to Long Island Sound from the installation of a previous gas pipeline laid across the Sound.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-116	98	J. McMahon, resident of Branford - Concerned that construction of the pipeline near the Tilcon Railway facility will disrupt and drive away many of the birds and mammals that inhabit that area.	As stated in Section 3.4.2.2 of the DEIS, Islander East has minimized impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat by reducing the width of the permanent right-of-way in wetlands, collocating the proposed right-of-way with existing rights-of-way, and limiting routine vegetation maintenance to once every 3 years and outside of the nesting season.
PM2-117	98	J. McMahon - Concerned that the pipeline construction will kill off lobster in Long Island Sound.	Potential impacts to lobsters from construction of the pipeline are addressed in section 3.4.1.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-118	99	J. McMahon - Stated that the proposed pipeline, which is proposed to run along and cross the Tilcon railroad line, should be reinforced with concrete and buried deep to avoid a potential gas explosion if there should be a derailment.	See response to comment letter G3, comment 4.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-119	99	J. McMahon - Concerned about the potential safety issues along the proposed pipeline route located close to a school (Wightwood School).	See response to comment PM2-25.
PM2-120	99-100	J. McMahon - Concerned about ships anchors dragging across the bottom of Long Island Sound in the vicinity of the proposed pipeline and rupturing the line underwater.	See response to comment PM2-92.
PM2-121	100	L. Lowe, resident of Stony Creek - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-122	100	L. Lowe - Concerned about the general safety of the gas pipeline.	See response to comment PM2-38.
PM2-123	100	L. Lowe - Concerned that pipeline construction in Long Island Sound will kill commercial fish and shellfish.	Section 3.4.1.2 and appendix I (essential fish habitat assessment) of the FEIS discusses potential pipeline construction impacts on fishery resources.
PM2-124	100	N. Lowe, resident of Stony Creek - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-125	101	N. Lowe - Concerned about general safety of the gas pipeline.	See response to comment PM2-38.
PM2-126	101	J. Shaff - Stated that the comparison of deaths from automobile accidents to deaths from gas pipelines is not comparable because so many more people drive cars than live near gas pipelines and should not have been used in the DEIS.	Table 3.12.3-2 of the EIS provides data on accidental deaths nationwide occurring from various activities, including automobile accidents.
PM2-127	102	J. Shaff - Stated that the Commission should review all plans regarding the proposed pipeline project before approval.	As stated in various sections of the FEIS, where appropriate, the Commission would review and approve plans before construction would commence.
PM2-128	102	J. Shaff - Supports the alternative that uses an existing pipeline.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-129	104	M. DeFelice, resident of North Branford - Requested that FERC respect the recent bill passed in Connecticut that calls for a one-year moratorium on the construction and siting of permitted gas pipeline and electric cables to cross Long Island Sound and wait before taking any final action on this proposed pipeline project.	See response to comment letter S1, comment 1.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-130	104-105	M. DeFelice - Concerned about the effects of construction of the pipeline on well-water, and specifically how contaminates may spread from Gina Rivezzi's contaminated well-water to the well-water of other property owners nearby.	See responses to comments PM2-98 and PM2-99.
PM2-131	105	M. DeFelice - Concerned about loss of value of property along the proposed pipeline corridor.	Impacts to property values are addressed in Section 3.10.5.
PM2-132	105	M. DeFelice - Concerned that the proposed pipeline will be buried on his property too close to the Iroquois pipeline (10 feet apart instead of 20 feet) and causing unsafe conditions.	Minimum separation distances are established under 49 CFR 192. These regulations provide for an adequate margin of safety.
PM2-133	105	M. DeFelice - Requested that the Commission carefully weigh and understand the true needs for gas and the motives of the companies involved so the company doesn't become another "Enron," manipulating energy markets for profits.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-134	107	J. Merrick, Vice President, Branford Land Trust - Stated that the undeveloped land of the Branford Land Trust was meant to be kept undeveloped in perpetuity for the benefit of the public and the city of Branford, and that putting a gas pipeline through it compromises the value of open space.	See response to PM2-65.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-135	107	J. Merrick - Stated that the 30 to 50 foot wide buffers required by the right-of-way will compromise the already narrow strips of Branford Land Trust properties that connect open space in the community, greatly reducing wildlife habitat.	As outlined in Section 3.4.2.2 of the FEIS, Islander East has minimized impacts to wildlife and wildlife habitat by reducing the width of the permanent right-of-way in wetlands, collocating the proposed right-of-way with existing rights-of-way, and limiting routine vegetation maintenance to once every 3 years and outside of the nesting season. Additionally, to further reduce impacts to wildlife resources, particularly those affected within the boundaries of the Branford Land Trust properties and within the Central Pine Barrens, Islander East has incorporated 23 route variations into its proposed alignment. As a result of these modifications the Branford Land Trust properties' crossing length would be reduced by 170 feet and the impact area would be reduced by 49 percent.
PM2-136	107-108	J. Merrick - Stated that the DEIS recommendation that Islander East inspect and design site-specific plans for affected properties/property owners does not address the real issues/concerns.	The intent of site-specific plans is, through advance planning, to create more detailed construction plans than a 'typical' plan, tailored to each property, to minimize impacts on specific features which are/may be different on each property. The intent of creating these site-specific plans is to address landowners' real issues and concerns about their personal property. These plans may not be able to address all types of landowner concerns and questions; however, the FEIS addresses other types of landowner concerns expressed to the FERC throughout the review period.
PM2-137	108	J. Merrick - Stated that the recommendations made for the Wightwood School in particular were "glittering generalities" that did not address the negative impacts of having a gas pipeline so close to a school.	FEIS section 3.8.3 discusses the pipeline siting in relation to the Wightwood School and addresses safety concerns for this area.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-138	108-109	J. Merrick - Stated that the Pine Orchard Alternative was not adequately compared to the proposed route as the Pine Orchard Alternative is only 0.2 miles longer (incorrectly stated in the DEIS as 2 miles longer) and crosses two golf course waterbodies, which are already artificial environments and relatively easy to repair or rebuild, compared to the Goss Pond, in a forested area that attracts egrets, dragonflies and marsh mammals.	Thank you for your comment. The text in the FEIS has been changed to reflect the 0.2 mile difference. Measures have been incorporated in the proposed route to minimize impacts on Branford Land Trust property.
PM2-139	110	J. Merrick - Stated that the Commission should consider the Iroquois proposal instead of the Islander East proposed because Iroquois would expand the gas supply without adding a new route.	Thank you for your comment. A separate EIS is being prepared for the ELI Extension Project. The ELI Project as proposed does not meet the objective or meet indirect needs as outlined in section 1.1 of this EIS.
PM2-140	110	J. Merrick - Stated that an evaluation of real need and cost need to be made to justify a gas pipeline.	See response to comment PM2-22.
PM2-141	111	J. Waters, Long Island Shellfish - Concerned about the effects to near-shore clam beds from the exit hole of the HDD.	Section 3.4.1.2 of the FEIS has been revised to discuss the potential impacts to shellfish near the HDD exit hole.
PM2-142	111	J. Waters - Stated support for the alternative that would not require digging up the bottom of Long Island Sound.	Thank you for your comment. See response to comment PM2-61.
PM2-143	113	P. Borgemeister, cofounder, Madison Land Conservation Trust - Stated that the undeveloped land of the Branford Land Trust was meant to be kept undeveloped in perpetuity, and that the pipeline violates the wishes of those who donated the land.	See response to PM2-65.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-144	113-114	P. Borgemeister - Stated that impacts of the heavy equipment and grassy right-of-way will have devastating effect on the land, with regeneration of the forest taking 25 to 150 years according to the DEIS.	Islander East has minimized impacts on forestland by routing the pipeline parallel and adjacent to existing corridors to the maximum extent practicable. Depending on the tree species, regeneration of the forest in temporary workspaces will take between 25 and 150 years, as reflected in the EIS. However, during this time, vegetative cover types associated with natural succession will benefit certain wildlife species adapted to, and in progression with, each stage of succession. The workspaces will be revegetated and the soils kept stable throughout the period of vegetative succession. Therefore, we do not agree that this project would have a long-term devastating effect on the land.
PM2-145	115	L. Fox - Stated that the documentation in the DEIS does not support the statement on page 2-8 (section 2.2.2) that the impacts from construction to the 3,000 areas will be temporary.	We have recommended in section 3.4.1.2 that Islander East monitor the offshore impacts to the Sound. The monitoring would help determine the temporal extent of the offshore impacts and may be used to develop mitigation measures to accelerate restoration of the Sound.
PM2-146	115	L. Fox - Questioned why the DEIS did not say how many lay barges would be used during construction of the pipeline in Long Island Sound.	The exact number of lay barges used does not determine the environmental impact of construction in the Sound. Anchor scars and cable sweep from all barges used determines the impact; this is addressed in sections 3.3.3.2 and 3.4.1.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-147	117	L. Fox - Stated that the effects to the sediment of Long Island Sound are not adequately described in the DEIS given that the number of holes the separate barges will make during construction of the pipeline in the Sound is not given in the DEIS.	Potential impacts to the sediments of the Sound are addressed in section 3.3.3.2 of the FEIS, including an estimate of the number of anchor scars and acreage affected.
PM2-148	117	L. Fox - Stated that considering the different environmental impacts from the subsea plow or the sea jetting sled, Islander's East approach of using whatever equipment was available for underwater construction at the time they will need it, is a "loose way" to approach the project.	The FEIS has been updated to reflect that Islander East would use the subsea plow method where technically feasible.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-149	117	L. Fox - Stated that the islands in Long Island Sound are designated on the Connecticut historical register and will provide the Commission with such documentation.	Section 3.9 of the FEIS has been updated to reflect that the Thimble Islands are within the Stony Creek/Thimble Islands National Register District.
PM2-150	118	N. Berkun, volunteer, Madison Land Trust and Guilford Land Trust - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-151	119	N. Berkun - Stated that the proposed pipeline project, which will change the shape of the surface of the sediment in Long Island Sound, will negatively effect the circulation in current movements within the Sound, causing anoxic bottom waters and changes in sediment flow.	Potential impacts to the current regime within the Sound are addressed in section 3.3.3.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-152	119	N. Berkun - Commented that bird species living in the area, specifically turkeys, peacocks and osprey, were not included in a table of local bird species on page 3-70 of the DEIS.	Section 3.4.2.1 of the FEIS includes the turkey and osprey as representative wildlife species. The peacock is a domestically raise bird and is not considered as "wildlife."
PM2-153	120	N. Berkun - Commented that disagreed with the conclusion of the DEIS that impacts from the project will be temporary and minimal given the scope of the project.	The EIS does not conclude that all impacts would be temporary and minimal, and acknowledges that some impacts would be long-term.
PM2-154	120	N. Berkun - Stated that 40 percent of the bentonite, rich in heavy metals, used as a lubricant for the horizontal directional drilling, will escape into Long Island Sound.	Since issuance of the DEIS, Islander East has proposed containment methods for the drilling fluid. Section 3.3.3.2 of the FEIS includes this information.
PM2-155	120	N. Berkun - Stated that construction in Long Island Sound will re-release into the water column heavy metals, polychlorinated biphenyl PCBs and other contaminates already in the sediment from previous industrial activities.	Potential impacts from resuspension of contaminated sediments within the Sound are addressed in section 3.3.3.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-156	121	N. Berkun - Stated that construction in the Branford River, which drains into Long Island Sound, will release mercury contamination from the river sediment into the water column, with negative effects on both the animals and human inhabitants of the area.	As stated in section 3.2.1 of the EIS, no areas of known contamination were identified in consultations with state agencies and searches of databases for the proposed crossing locations at any of the waterbodies proposed to be crossed by the proposed pipeline.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-157	121	N. Berkun - Commented that the Islander East project should not go through Connecticut and Long Island Sound, but around it.	Thank you for your comment. See response to comment PM2-61 above.
PM2-158	122	P. Brown, Vice President, Thimble Islands Property Association - Commented that putting proposed pipeline project through the area is a gross misuse of government power and eminent domain.	
PM2-159	123	P. Brown - Concerned about the potential for pipeline explosions given the high number of explosions across the country (based on an internet search).	See response to comment PM2-26.
PM2-160	123	P. Brown - Concerned about the potential for earthquakes in the area and their effects on the pipeline that would be put through the local Stony Creek granite.	Potential for seismic events is addressed in section 3.1.3.1 of the FEIS and potential impacts are addressed in section 3.1.3.2 of the FEIS.
PM2-161	124	P. Brown - Concerned about how corrosion will effect the pipeline that is laid in Long Island Sound.	See response to comment PM2-89.
PM2-162	125	P. Brown - Stated general concerns about how the horizontal directional drilling will effect clams and other shellfish near the shores of Long Island Sound.	Section 3.4.1.2 of the FEIS has been revised to discuss the potential impacts of the HDD on shellfish resources.
PM2-163	126	L. Stewart, Professor of Marine Sciences, University of Connecticut - Stated general concerned about the effects of pipeline construction on fish and shellfish that humans consume.	Section 3.4.1.2 and appendix I (essential fish habitat assessment) of the FEIS discusses potential pipeline construction impacts on fishery resources.
PM2-164	127	L. Stewart - Stated that several species were missing from the list of species in Long Island Sound such as tautog and striped bass, and the pushy crab, which are important for migrating birds and necessary for habitat diversity.	The species list in section 3.4.1.1 of the DEIS included crabs and striped bass. The species list in section 3.4.1.1 of the FEIS has been revised to include tautog.
PM2-165	128	L. Stewart - Stated that the bentonite fluids used in the horizontal directional drilling that escape into the water column of Long Island Sound be toxic to the shellfish.	Thank you for your comment.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-166	128	L. Stewart - Questioned why dynamic positioning of ships, which would not require anchors to be put into the Long Island Sound sediment, could not be used when installing in the pipeline in the Sound.	Due to the forces involved in installing a pipeline in the marine environment, anchors are required to provide adequate stability for the construction equipment.
PM2-167	129	C. Granata, effected landowner, resident of North Branford - Stated opposition to the proposed pipeline project.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-168	129	C. Granata - Commented that the proposed pipeline, which will go through her backyard, will require that the trees that currently buffer her property from industrial businesses will be removed and only replaced with grass for the right-of-way, exposing herself and her husband, who has asthma, to the dust and noise created by those industries.	Section 3.8 has been revised to discuss impacts to tree screening.
PM2-169	130	C. Granata - Commented that any blasting in the area of Cedar Lake will spread contamination from underground sources to Cedar Lake, killing plant and animal life in the lake and making it unsafe for neighborhood children to swim in the lake.	See responses to comments PM2-98 and PM2-99.
PM2-170	130	C. Granata - Questioned who would be accountable if Cedar Lake was contaminated.	Liability is beyond the scope of this EIS.
PM2-171	130	C. Granata - Questioned how much the value of her property would depreciate if the tree buffer were lost behind her home and her property was exposed to the industrial businesses.	Impacts to property values are addressed in Section 3.10.5.
PM2-172	130-131	C. Granata - Questioned the general safety of gas pipelines given the number of explosions, injuries and deaths as documented by the Office of Pipeline Safety.	See response to comment PM2-26.
PM2-173	131	C. Granata - Stated belief that given the great amount of opposition to the project from the public, and the continuing efforts of Islander East to push the project through, that FERC had already approved the project and that the EIS was just being completed to go through the motions to appease the public.	Thank you for your comment.

Public Comment Meeting on the Draft EIS
CT - May 8, 2002

Comment Number	Transcript Pages(s)	Commenter - Comment Summary	Response
PM2-174	132-133	C. Granata - Asked that the Commission approve a different route than the proposed route because the proposed route would cause too much environmental damage.	Thank you for your comment. See response to comment PM2-61 above.
PM2-175	133-138	R. Gincavage - Read from his letter sent to the FERC.	See letter G8 for letter and for response.
PM2-176	139	P. Kaminsky, co-chair of the Conservation and Environment Commission of Branford - Stated that the undeveloped land of the Branford Land Trust was meant to be kept undeveloped in perpetuity, and that the proposed pipeline that is to go through the Land Trust is a violation.	See response to PM2-65.
PM2-177	139	P. Kaminsky - Commented that the gas pipeline will only encourage more energy use on Long Island and this is not a sound policy to pursue.	This is not within the scope of the EIS.
PM2-178	139	P. Kaminsky - Commented that benefits to Connecticut residents from gas pipeline project were not well defined in DEIS.	Thank you for your comment.
PM2-179	139-145	G. Bussman - Commenter read from a letter by Terry Backer of Soundkeeper sent to the FERC.	See letter G13 for letter and for response.