

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

The Atlantic Building
950 F Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004-1404

202-239-3300
Fax: 202-654-4964
www.alston.com

Andrea Wolfman

Direct Dial: 202-239-3943

Email: andrea.wolfman@alston.com

November 9, 2015

The Honorable Kimberly D. Bose
Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First St., N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: National Grid LNG, LLC,
Fields Point Liquefaction Project
Docket No. PF15-28-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

National Grid LNG, LLC (“NGLNG”) proposes to construct and operate a natural gas liquefier at its existing liquefied natural gas storage facility located in Providence, RI (called the “Fields Point Liquefaction Project”). On July 2, 2015, the Director of the Office of Energy Projects approved a request by NGLNG to use the Commission’s Pre-Filing review process for NGLNG’s proposed Fields Point Liquefaction Project. On September 25, 2015, a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Document was issued by the Commission staff that initiated a scoping process with the comment period ending on October 26, 2015. Pursuant to Section 157.21(f)(9) of the regulations, NGLNG files these responses to the issues raised during the scoping comment period.

Sincerely,

/s/ Andrea Wolfman

Andrea Wolfman

Counsel for National Grid LNG, LLC

cc: Kenneth Warn, OEP
Christina Hoffman, Environmental Resources Management

National Grid LNG, LLC
Fields Point Liquefaction Project
Docket No. PF-15-28-000
November 9, 2015

RESPONSE TO SCOPING PERIOD COMMENTS

National Grid LNG, LLC (“NGLNG”) will be filing an application with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) under Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (“NGA”) for authorization to add liquefaction capability to its existing liquefied natural gas (“LNG”) storage facility (called the “Fields Point Liquefaction Project” or “Project”). NGLNG owns and operates a Commission-jurisdictional LNG storage facility located in Providence, Rhode Island that is used by its three firm storage customers for peak-shaving to ensure the ability to provide reliable gas service in the winter months.

NGLNG proposes to construct and operate a natural gas liquefier at its existing LNG storage facility. The storage facility is located in an industrialized area and the site has been used for LNG storage since 1974. The existing LNG storage facility does not have liquefaction capability and only receives LNG by truck. The stored LNG is then vaporized for redelivery to the customers via pipeline, although there is the capability to redeliver to the customers’ trucks. The storage facility is physically connected to the distribution system of The Narragansett Electric Company downstream of one of its city-gate interconnections with the Algonquin Gas Transmission System. The distribution system of The Narragansett Electric Company is used for redelivery by displacement to the Algonquin Gas Transmission system.

On July 2, 2015, the Director of the Office of Energy Projects approved a request by NGLNG to use the Commission’s Pre-Filing review process for NGLNG’s proposed Fields Point Liquefaction Project. On September 25, 2015, a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Document (“NOI”) was issued by the Commission staff that initiated a scoping process with the comment period ending on October 26, 2015.

Public comments were received at a Public Scoping Meeting that was held by the Commission staff on October 8, 2015 in Providence, R.I., and in the form of written comments filed in Docket No. PF15-28-000. A range of comments were received during the scoping comment period. As noted in the NOI, the focus of the scoping process was to identify potential environmental effects, reasonable alternatives, and measures to avoid or lessen environmental impacts. Therefore, these responsive comments focus on the issues raised during the scoping meeting and in the written comments that are appropriately evaluated in the environmental document. Comments that are not pertinent to the environmental impacts of the Project will be addressed by NGLNG in the application phase.

This Response is organized into a general response to the comments by subject matter category followed by a comment summary matrix that summarizes each comment received and includes references to the Resource Report sections that address the subject raised in the comment.¹

Environmental Justice Comments

A number of comments concerned the potential environmental justice impacts of the proposed Project.² As part of these comments, the stakeholders highlighted impacts to the local area from potential public safety risks of the proposed facility, potential air quality and related public health impacts from the proposed facility, and potential traffic impacts. In this category stakeholders also commented on the need for the proposed Project.

NGLNG chose the proposed Project site and certain design features specifically to minimize the impacts on the nearby neighborhoods, minimize safety risks, and minimize potential air emissions from the Project. These features are discussed in Resource Report 5, section 5.7, Resource Report 9, section 9.1, Resource Report 10, section 10.5, and Resource Report 11, section 11.1.

The findings in the Resource Reports are that the primary impacts of the proposed Project are expected during the construction phase of the Project. These will be temporary traffic impacts that can be mitigated by various best management practices. The evaluation in the Resource Reports finds that the proposed Project, once operational, will not have a significant impact on air quality and no related public health impacts, and that the safety risks of the proposed Project are low. As shown in the Resource Reports, construction of the Project will not have direct or indirect Environmental Justice impacts and there will not be a contribution to cumulative impacts on Environmental Justice populations. The Project would not lead to disproportionate adverse environmental, health, social, or economic effects on minority groups and low-income communities. The construction and operation of the proposed Project will impact all communities in the vicinity of the Project area equally but these impacts are anticipated to be largely

¹ Draft Resource Reports 1 through 12 were filed on November 2, 2015 and draft Resource Report 13 was filed on November 4, 2015. The citation references are to the drafts filed on those days.

² *E.g.*, Comment of Jan Luby, Scoping Meeting Tr. 25:18-25; Comment of Money McNeil, Scoping Meeting Tr. 24:21-14; Comment of Peter Nightingale, Scoping Meeting Tr. 22:24-23:6; Comment of Gina Rodrigues-Drix, Scoping Meeting Tr. 54:24-55:6; Comment of Marti Rosenberg, Scoping Meeting Tr. 37:4-14; Comment of Servio, Scoping Meeting R. 71:21-72:3; Comment of Peter Sugrue, Scoping Meeting Tr. 40-8-18; Rebecca Kislak Comment; Allan Shapiro Comment; Carole Marshall Comment; Amy Torrence Comment; Darcie Dennigan Comment; Environmental Justice League Comment at pp 12-20; Rhode Island Department of Health Comment; Robert Malin Comment; and Jan Very-Creamer Comment.

temporary during the construction phase and NGLNG is committed to taking required actions to minimize these impacts.

Project Site

The location for the Project was selected based on several factors, discussed in Resource Report 10, section 10.5. The siting decision was based on the characteristics of the current use of the site that has been used for LNG storage since 1974. The location proposed for the liquefaction equipment is an industrialized waterfront area known as Fields Point on the Providence River in Providence, Rhode Island. This area is occupied by a variety of industrial facilities, including the existing National Grid LNG plant; a cement import terminal, storage, and distribution center (Holcim, Inc.); a chemical distribution company (Univar); a petroleum import terminal, storage, and distributor (Motiva); a marine terminal operator known as Port of Providence (“ProvPort”); and a wastewater treatment plant operated by the Narragansett Bay Commission (“NBC”). The current and historical uses of this location as an industrial site since 1910 are discussed in Resource Report 1, section 1.1.2.

The Project will be located within the boundaries of the existing plant property and will not require the relocation of the existing piping, storage, or vaporization equipment. The location of the proposed Project on the existing plant property in an area furthest away from residential buildings minimizes the impacts on the nearby residential properties. The potential impacts on the residential and commercial properties within 0.25 miles and other nearby areas are discussed in Resource Report 5, sections 5.4, and 5.7, and Resource Report 8, sections 8.1.5, 8.2, 8.3.6. The primary impacts are expected during the construction of the Project and these will be temporary traffic impacts that are expected to be mitigated by various construction practices.

Public Safety Risks

The Project is being designed in accordance with Department of Transportation, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (“PHMSA”) regulations for LNG facilities and the National Fire Protection Association (“NFPA”) 59A Standards for the production, storage, and handling of LNG. These requirements impose an obligation to conduct thorough computer simulations of potential releases and spills, and to model thermal radiation and vapor dispersions to design appropriate exclusion zones. These studies will be provided to the Commission for evaluation as part of its review of the proposed Project.

The design of the Project, as required by the regulations, will ensure that all potential releases or spills are contained within the plant boundaries. As a result, the public safety risks from the proposed Project are expected to be low. The primary hazard to the public associated with the Project is the natural gas, as discussed in Resource Report 11, section 11.1.4, but by designing, building, and operating the facility in accordance with existing safety regulations the public will be protected (Resource Report 11, section 11.1.3). The existing LNG storage facility has been in operation at the current location since 1974 without incident.

Some of the stakeholder comments³ cited the Commission's decision in 2005 to deny a Natural Gas Act Section 3 application for the conversion of the LNG storage facility to an LNG import terminal on the grounds that the proposed facility would not meet Department of Transportation safety standards.⁴ That order considered a very different project than the one NGLNG is now proposing. The proposal evaluated by the Commission in 2005 would have significantly changed the function of the existing storage facility. The proposed Project does not include any changes for or to the existing storage facility, which meets all safety requirements for its current use.

Natural disasters are critical factors being taken into account in the design of the Project. Resource Report 6, section 6.4 evaluates the potential geologic hazards in the vicinity of the Project. It finds that the likelihood of a major earthquake occurring in the Project area during the operating life of the proposed facility is low (Resource Report 6, sections 6.4.2 and 6.4.3). Potential impacts from coastal flooding, storms, hurricanes and tsunamis were also evaluated (see Resource Report 6, section 6.4.9) and a Coastal and Hydraulic Modeling Analysis was performed. As a result of the potential for coastal flooding at the site, the Project had been designed to accommodate 500-year flood events and to account for anticipated sea level rise in the area, although existing regulations do not require this. As discussed in Resource Report 11, section 11.1, adherence to existing code-prescribed design parameters will mitigate rainfall, high wind speeds, and seismic events.

The existing LNG storage facility has a Facility Response Plan ("FRP"), to follow if emergency events occur, and that plan will be updated to include the liquefier. Proposed updates for the FRP to reflect the addition of the liquefier will be filed with the certificate application.

Air Quality

As discussed in Resource Report 9, potential air quality impacts associated with the Project will primarily be temporary because the majority of emissions from the Project are associated with the construction phase. Resource Report 9, Tables 9.1-5 and 9.1-9 show that the emissions from construction of the proposed Project will be minimal. Minor air emissions will be associated with the operation of the Project (See Resource Report 9, Table 9.1-6 in Section 9.1.3.2) from the new emergency generator, small heater and fugitive emissions associated with emergency relief valves for the natural gas system. Given the small size of the heater, and the emergency generator that will only be operated for testing less than 1 hour/week under normal operating circumstances for maintenance purposes, and the exclusive use of natural gas to fuel the equipment, no adverse air

³ Comment of Helen MacDonald, Scoping Meeting Tr. 96:22-93:6; Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island Comment at pp 5-6.

⁴ *KeySpan LNG, L.P.*, 112 FERC ¶ 61,028 (2005).

quality impacts are expected from Project emissions. (See Resource Report, section 9.1.3.2).

The Project was designed specifically to minimize the potential for greenhouse gas (“GHG”) emissions. The Project will use electric driven motors for the gas feed compressor and nitrogen compressor rather than turbines or engines fueled with natural gas. Because of the electric motors chosen to minimize emissions, the Project requires a larger amount of electric power, as noted in the comments.⁵ Also, nitrogen will be used for cooling instead of mixed refrigerants. These elements are discussed in Resource Report 9, sections 9.1.4, and 9.1.5.3.

The cumulative impact analysis for the incremental air quality impact resulting from the proposed Project evaluated the impact within the Metropolitan Providence Interstate Air Quality Control Region (“AQCR”) in which the Project is located (see Resource Report 9, section 9.1.1.2). Other oil and gas field development projects, transportation projects, large utility projects, other energy development projects, and Commission jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional projects with the AQCR boundary were considered for the cumulative impact evaluation (see Resource Report 1, Table 1.9-2 and Figure 1.9-4; and Resource Report 9, section 9.1.4).

As discussed in Resource Report 9, section 9.1.4, the contribution of the proposed Project, and the LNG tank containment enhancement project to be constructed contemporaneously, to the cumulative impacts of all other projects would be temporary and minimal. Project construction emissions will be de minimis relative to the general conformity rule which protects AQCRs that are not in attainment of the NAAQS (see Resource Report 9, section 9.1.3.3). Other construction projects have varying construction schedules and would take place over a relatively large geographic area, limiting the amount of any cumulative impacts. The Project’s associated operating emissions are minor and the new facility-wide potential emissions for existing and Project sources will be below Major Source and Title V thresholds. Thus, the analysis in Resource Report 9 concludes, while there are multiple other projects within the area, the proposed Project is relatively minor and will not result in significant long-term impacts. Therefore, the Project is not expected to substantially contribute to any cumulative impact resulting from the other identified projects.

Traffic impacts

The traffic impacts from the proposed Project are evaluated in Resource Report 5, section 5.4, and Resource Report 8, section 8.1.5, and also discussed in Resource Report 10, section 10.1. The primary traffic impacts will be during the construction phase, which may result in minor, short-term traffic congestion on some roads and highways due to the movement of delivery equipment, materials, and workers. As discussed in the Resource Reports, the volume of traffic during this phase is not anticipated to adversely

⁵ Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island Comment at p 21.

affect existing industrial and commercial operations in the area or resident traffic traveling in the area.

Traffic impacts from the operation of the Project also are not anticipated to adversely affect vehicular traffic since the volume of trucks transporting LNG to and from the existing facility is expected to be the same with the proposed Project. Currently, the maximum number of truck trips has been no more than 2,586 per year and the proposed number of yearly truck trips would be up to 2,346. The existing facility's maximum truck handling capability is 20 trucks per day and the proposed Project would not change that capability. Therefore, no significant increase in truck traffic near the existing facility is anticipated from the Project. Regionally, the proposed Project will reduce the number of trucks traveling on the roads within the New England region by displacing the number of loads historically sourced by truck to fill the LNG storage tank, which is 2,586 as described above.

Public Notice

Some stakeholders commented on the quality of the public notification that has been provided to local residents for the proposed Project.⁶ Resource Report 5, section 5.7.2 discusses the public outreach undertaken by NGLNG to communicate with the environmental justice populations near the proposed Project. Consistent with the Commission's regulations, notification letters about the Project were sent to approximately 2,250 property owners and tenants within one-half mile of the Project in both English and Spanish (with a translation of material available upon request in Portuguese). In addition, a double-sided flyer was also sent with Spanish translated content. A news release and op-ed were published in Spanish in *Nuevos Horizontes* in October 2015. NGLNG has a Project website that summarizes the Project scope and impacts with a Spanish language option. NGLNG also had available a Spanish speaking employee at the public open house and provided a Spanish language translator for the FERC public scoping meeting.

Project Need

Some stakeholders commented on the need for the Project when balanced against the impacts of the Project.⁷ Resource Report 10, sections 10.1 and 10.2, discuss the need for the Project. The local distribution companies that are the NGLNG customers will use the LNG created by the proposed liquefier to serve the peak day demand of their retail customers and for pressure regulation on their distribution systems. Currently, those local distribution companies have a single source of LNG supply available to them and

⁶ *E.g.*, Comment of Juan Pichardo, Scoping Meeting Tr. 91:13-18 – 92:4; Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island Comment p 4; Robert Malin Comment.

⁷ *E.g.*, Comment of Julian Rodriguez-Drix, Scoping Meeting Tr. 60:13-61:9; Anna Highsmith Comment; Mikaila Arthur Comment; Donald Baier Comment; Jesse Marsden Comment; N. Nicholson Comment; Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island Comment a p 3.

that supplier has not always been able to fulfill their LNG supply needs. The proposed Project will provide them an additional source of LNG to increase the reliability of their distribution operations. While some of the LNG created by the proposed Project will be trucked to other states, a significant amount will be used by The Narragansett Electric Company for its Rhode Island operations, including its service to the areas near the facility. Since the Resource Reports find that the impacts of the proposed Project will be temporary and not significant, the need for the Project outweighs its impacts without creating a disproportionate burden on the local population.

Comments on Scope of the Environmental Review

Connected Actions

One comment urged that the environmental effects of the proposed Project must be considered in the same environmental document as pipeline projects sponsored by subsidiaries of Spectra Energy Partners, LP in New England, specifically the AIM, Atlantic Bridge, and Access Northeast projects⁸ These pipeline projects and the proposed Project, however, do not qualify as “connected actions” under the Council on Environmental Quality (“CEQ”) regulations⁹ and, therefore, it would not be appropriate to review them in the same environmental document.

Connected actions are defined as actions closely related so they (i) automatically trigger other actions which may require environmental impact statements; (ii) cannot or will not proceed unless other actions are taken previously or simultaneously; and (iii) are interdependent parts of a larger action and depend on the larger action for their justification.¹⁰ The proposed Project would be undertaken even if those pipeline projects did not or do not proceed. As explained in Resource Report 10, section 10.2, one of the purposes of the proposed Project is to enable the customers to use their existing interstate pipeline capacity more efficiently by transporting gas in the summer to be liquefied in the proposed Project for winter storage. Therefore, the proposed Project does not depend on the pipeline expansion projects. In addition, the proposed Project has independent utility because the LNG that is created is needed to refill LNG storage that is connected to local distribution facilities in other parts of New England to provide pressure support and peaking supplies. Thus, the proposed Project is an unconnected single action that has independent utility so it would not be appropriate to consider it in the same environmental analysis with any of the pipeline expansion projects.

Cumulative impacts

A number of comments concern the cumulative impacts of the proposed Project and other current and potential future actions. Draft Resource Report 1 identifies

⁸ E.g., Comment of Nick Katkevich, Scoping Meeting Tr. 52:2-53:13;

⁹ 40 C.F.R. § 1508.25(a).

¹⁰ *Id.*

potential cumulative effects, by type of project, that may result from existing or reasonably foreseeable projects.

A number of comments maintain that the effects of the pipeline expansion projects and natural gas extraction from shale formations should be evaluated with the potential impacts of the proposed Project. As the Commission recently stated in connection with the AIM project,¹¹

The CEQ regulations define cumulative impacts as “the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.” A cumulative impacts analysis may require an analysis of actions unrelated to the proposed project if they occur in the project area or region of influence of the project being analyzed.

As discussed in the draft Resource Reports (Resource Report 5, section 5.9.2, and Resource Report 8, sections 8.1.5 and 8.2.3), the impacts of the proposed Project are expected to be localized and temporary during the construction period. Nonetheless, the cumulative impact analysis in the draft Resource Reports does evaluate a broader area. The Cumulative Impact Assessment Area (“CIAA”) used for the cumulative impact analysis for Resource Reports 2, 3, and 8 is the Seekonk-Providence River watershed, the CIAA for Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.4 (Air and Noise Quality) is the Metropolitan Providence Interstate Air Quality Control Region (AQCR), and the CIAA for Resource Report 5, Section 5.9.2 (Socioeconomic Impacts) includes Providence County. The CIAA for Resource Reports 4, 6, and 7 is a 0.25-mile radius. The CIAAs used in these draft Resource Reports are consistent with those used for other natural gas projects evaluated by the Commission. Both the pipeline expansion projects and the upstream natural gas extraction activities are outside the area of influence as defined by the CIAAs identified in the draft Resource Reports.

Further, the Commission has previously found that any impacts from potential upstream natural gas production activities are not reasonably foreseeable as contemplated by CEQ's regulations.¹² The natural gas that will be used as feedstock for the proposed liquefier can be produced in a number of different upstream production areas. The NGLNG customers may purchase their gas to be liquefied from trading hubs where supplies are aggregated from a variety of production areas including Canada. The proposed Project does not depend on natural gas produced from any particular production area or by any particular production method.

¹¹ *Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC*, 150 FERC ¶ 61,163 P 113 (2015) (“AIM”) (citing 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7 (2014), and CEQ Guidance, Considering Cumulative Effects under the National Environmental Policy Act (January 1997)).

¹² AIM at P 123.

Comments on Rate and Cost Impacts on Retail Gas Customers

A number of comments raise issues concerning the rate impact of the proposed project on retail rates. The customers of NGLNG are local distribution companies (“LDCs”) that have statutory, regulatory, or contractual obligations to serve natural gas consumers subject to regulation by state regulatory commissions. NGLNG is not proposing any change in LDC rates and Commission approval of the proposed project would not establish retail rates. State public utility commissions regulate retail rates and there are a variety of potential outcomes of such state regulation so that a retail rate increase is not a reasonably foreseeable outcome of the proposed Project. Therefore, issues concerning impacts on retail rates are not within the scope of the environmental analysis to be undertaken by the Commission.

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

Commenter/Date	Comment(s)	Response
Ben Boid 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 32:10-25)	It is a well-documented fact that more often than not any sort of hazardous materials, facilities are constructed in the low income or neighborhoods with people of color. While this is something that everyone in the state and the surrounding area needs to use, it's completely unfair to ask this neighborhood to shoulder so much of the burden and the risk to their health when everyone is going to use it. So we should all share the risk until we have clean, sustainable energy.	Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).
Stephen Dahl 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 33:13-18) 10-26-15 Filed Comment	Now we have been tricked into believing that liquid natural gas, including three gas plants proposed in Rhode Island, will provide clean energy for our children's future. Nothing could be further from the truth.	Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.0 (General Project Description). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts) and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures). Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.2 (page 10-4 through 5) (Analysis of No Action Alternatives).
Vanessa Flores-Maldonado 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 95:22 – 96:3)	This area is the center of operation for some of the most polluted industries in the city and state. In February, the MEPA inspection revealed that the dust in the wind seal contained 50 times, 50, five, zero times the legal limit for lead concentration.	Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts) and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).
Vanessa Flores-Maldonado 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 96:8-15)	There is a school within a two-mile radius, George Alvarez, and that is built on a polluted site. So what you are telling me about this proposal is that you don't care about our kids. You don't care about kids of color.	The condition of the George Alvarez school land is not relevant to the proposed Project. Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).
Vanessa Flores-Maldonado 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 96:15-17)	You don't care about the environment and really it's all about the money, so no to this proposal.	Expression of commenter's view.

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

<p>Greg Gerritt 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 29:5-19)</p>	<p>Climate change is the crisis of our times. It's time FERC actually started to take climate change into account and say no to things that will include more drilling.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter's view. Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures); also see the discussion in the cover letter. Refer to Resource Report 6, Section 6.4.1 (page 6-4), Section 6.4.8 (page 6-10), and Section 6.4.9 (page 6-11) (climate and weather related risks).</p>
<p>Liberty Goodwin 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 46:2-17)</p>	<p>How would you feel if you approve this project and a devastating accident happened here? Do you really trust the assurances of safety from large corporate interests given history?</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (13-105 through 13-109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Liberty Goodwin 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 46:7-22)</p>	<p>The adjacent community doesn't want to be an ugly, toxic industrial site neighbor. Why should many of the dollars continue to flow into the coughers of yesterday's dirty, polluting and dangerous technologies when the clean renewable technology of the future is rapidly developing as you deliberate?</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures). Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.2 (page 10-5) (Analysis of No Action Alternatives).</p>
<p>Claudia Gorman 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 69:18-23)</p>	<p>I question National Grid's contention of a 40 year-old storage facility conversion to a liquefaction facility will supply us in Rhode Island with cheaper and more abundant energy supply.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter's view. Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.2 (page 10-5) (Analysis of No Action Alternatives).</p>
<p>Claudia Gorman 10-19-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>Right now the Northeast is being bombarded with an overwhelming number of oil and gas proposals. All are counting on a Marcellus Shale extraction future. This is foolhardy! We know the resource is finite. We know the extraction and</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

	<p>infrastructure have serious health and climate consequences. We know it is impacting residents in communities who have the least resistance.</p> <p>Here in RI we have a massive infrastructure proposal that will ride on the backs of communities in other states, transport a dirty, toxic fracked fuel (leaking methane along the way) to parts unknown.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (Alternatives).</p>
<p>August Guang 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 93:23 – 94:10)</p>	<p>Rhode Island made a forward thinking and much needed commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve the state’s resilience against climate impacts. Expanding liquified natural gas is a step in the wrong direction. Not only will this project support fracking and increase the state’s dependence on fossil fuels, it will also bring an environmental hazard to a community already negatively impacted by a chemical storage facility and an existing LNG storage tank.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (Alternatives).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), and Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>August Guang 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 94:11-21)</p>	<p>The fracking process is toxic to the community where natural gas is being extracted. In addition, the infrastructure from beginning to end is by -- is this what the Ocean State wants to support? We will be looking at health and environmental damage at great cost to not only Rhode Island but people who live in the state coerced by the gas and oil industry to squeeze out every last drop primarily for their profit.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.2.4 (pages 9-8 and 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (Alternatives).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), and Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones).</p>
<p>Jesus Holguin 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 81:1-8)</p>	<p>This community is already facing a lot of problems with high rates of asthma because of the chemical facilities that are already here. We have Motiva. We have I-95 that cuts right across this whole neighborhood, and that’s already a lot of bad air quality and to add something onto that is just like roadkill.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

		Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).
Jesus Holguin 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 81:9-12)	This facility is not going to benefit us in any way. Something that would benefit us is just transition away from fossil fuels.	Expression of commenter’s view.
Jesus Holguin 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 81:16-22)	We want jobs within our own communities in south Providence that are life-sustaining and support healthy communities, not toxic risk. We demand climate justice, which means racial justice, economic justice and no new investments in fossil fuels.	Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice), Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics), and Section 5.8.2 (jobs). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).
Nick Katkevich 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 52:2 – 53:13)	So the gas that is going to come to this liquefaction facility is going to be coming through the Spectra Pipeline System. Right now there’s a one billion-dollar expansion to Spectra’s pipeline project called the AIM project. After that there’s an 800 million-dollar expansion called the Atlantic Bridge project, and after that there’s a 3 billion-dollar project called Access Northeast and all of those projects are backed by National Grid. And all of these projects must be considered one project legally; otherwise, it’s something called “impermissible segmentation.” And starting with the Supreme Court, it says that FERC has to deal with proposals that are for actions of accumulative environmental impact upon a region pending concurrently before an agency must be considered together. Furthermore, FERC has the authority under the National Environmental Policy Act that says that connected actions, which means that they are closely related, and, therefore, should be discussed in the same impact statement and actions are connected if they are interdependent parts of a large action and depend on the larger action for their justification. So there is three Spectra pipeline expansions and this project and other projects that are dependent on the Spectra pipeline expansions must be considered as one project, and the impacts must be measured all together.	Comment is addressed in the Response to comment by subject matter. Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.9.2 (page 5-24) (Cumulative Impacts). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts).
Paul Klinkman 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 43:24 – 44:8)	If this LNG liquefaction plan is built, it cannot possibly be making money for the time period specified in the permit request. Either an ever shrinking pool of utility rate payers will be left holding the bag or else the utility will go bankrupt, and lawyers for their bondholders will come looking for somebody else to blame for this shortsightedness.	Expression of commenter’s view.
Michelle Lacey	We will fight you tooth and nail. This is not going to happen here. It’s just not.	Expression of commenter’s view.

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 108:14 – 109:2)		
William Lambek 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 109:12-16)	I just wanted to add my voice to the chorus of the Providence residents, Rhode Island residents who are opposed to this project and we hope that you will listen to the voice of the people.	Expression of commenter’s view.
Jan Luby 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 25:18-25)	I made note also that no power plant production or storage facilities like of this type are proposed for Barrington, East Greenwich or Lincoln where wealthy people reside. But the south end of Providence is fair game and Pascoag is also fair game.	Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics). Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.5 (Alternative Sites for New Aboveground Facilities).
Jan Luby 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 26:3 – 27:15)	Saying that natural gas creates fewer greenhouse gases than coal [sic] and is a way to move toward a greener energy future does not take into account the methane and other pollution emitted when gas is extracted and piped into power plants and other customers. The EPA’s new analysis doubles its previous estimates for the amount of methane gas that leaks from loose piping fittings and it vented from gas wells. It makes no sense to rush forward until more studies have been done, and I think actually enough studies have been done to tell us that this is not the direction to take. There are so many reasons we should not be heading in this direction. The kind of shale gas drilling in New York, Pennsylvania, Texas led to high emissions of greenhouse gases just as dirty as coal.	Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures). Refer to Resource Report 10, Sections 10.1 (Alternatives) and 10.2 (Analysis of No Action Alternatives).
Jan Luby 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 27-16-24)	So far explosions at natural gas plants or facilities like this in New Jersey, Virginia, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and California have created death and destruction of property and further polluted our air. Much of the natural gas pipeline system is old, deteriorating and leaking leading to environmental and safety concerns.	Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Jan Luby 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 27:25 – 28:6)	Natural gas pipelines need to be shut down during road construction, pipeline repair work and emergency situations or extreme weather events, which we’re getting more and more of with all our climate change which can lead homeowners without heat for hours or even days.	Refer to Resource Report 6, Sections 6.4.1, 6.4.8 and 6.4.9 (climate and weather related risks) (pages 6-4, 6-10 – 6-12). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

		9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).
Jan Luby 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 28:8-13)	Natural gas is not renewable energy and that is where our focus should be. That is where we need to be spending our time, energy and money and in research and development of renewable energy sources.	Expression of commenter’s view.
Helen MacDonald 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 96:22 – 93:6)	In 2005 a proposed LNG import facility was rejected because of high risk for disaster. While the main focus in opposition to that proposal was the large tanker ships that would have delivered LNG, there has never yet been a disaster from an LNG tanker ship. But there has been disasters involving the exact kind of LNG facilities that National Grid is proposing now.	Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Helen MacDonald 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 97:24 – 98:1)	This proposed LNG facility is a racist, classless disregard of the lives of people with color.	Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).
Money McNeil 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 24:16-21)	I just wanted to echo the statement that this is environmental racism. This is put on the wrong side of the hurricane barrier which would put mostly low income communities of color at risk if something were to happen.	Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).
Money McNeil 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 24:21-24)	Also, that this will cost 100 million-dollars, and it looks like we’re going to be footing the bill.	Expression of commenter’s view.
Beth Milham 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 85:25 – 86:10)	I read in the newspaper just a day or two ago that National Grid plans to petition the Public Utilities Commission to put a surcharge on ratepayers who are -- have solar panels and thus increase the cost to people who are doing the responsible thing about the energy future. Here they are investing 100 million-dollars in an energy source of past. And what are they doing for the energy sources of the future?	Expression of commenter’s view.
Joshua Miller 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 86:24 – 88:12)	I want to address another concern that, I think, National Grid and FERC to look at as a way to improve conditions in Providence, whether or not this plant is built, and that is the LNG traffic by truck as it is currently routed through neighborhoods past where people live and work. If you were trying to access 95 South, which many of the trucks do, I think the truck traffic currently in the current facility is about 30 a day for LNG. And then there is also the collateral gasoline, oil and other chemicals that come in and out of the same area.	Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.4 (pages 5-11 and 5-12) (Traffic). Refer to Resource Report 8, Section 8.1.5 (pages 8-5 and 8-6) (Land Use Impacts and Mitigation). Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (Alternatives).

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

	<p>And, so, an improvement to accommodate current LNG traffic by truck and future LNG traffic by truck, if this is permitted, can be an improvement for the whole community.</p> <p>This is the -- I believe, there must be a concern and a consideration for is this the safest way for truck transport to go through these neighborhoods. So I hope there is an exploration on safer routes that have less of an impact to these neighborhoods, not only for the LNG that goes through those neighborhoods currently and in the future but also gasoline fuel, oil and the collateral diesel pollutions that causes they go on this route that not direct but indirect to gain access to the highway.</p>	
<p>Peter Nightingale 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 22:24 – 23:6)</p> <p>10-25-15 Filed Comments</p>	<p>EPA recently created an environmental justice website. Look up the data for Fields Point – for the Fields Point area in Providence. You will find that building a liquefaction plant in this area is an act of environmental racism in spreading that filth. The National Grid plan is a violation of the Article 1, Section 17 of the RI Constitution (the duty "to provide for the conservation of the air, land, water, plant, animal, mineral and other natural resources of the state, and to adopt all means necessary and proper by law to protect the natural environment of the people of the state.)</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p>
<p>Karen Palmer 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 50:16-20)</p>	<p>When it comes to global warming, gas is one of the things that actually is advancing global warming. We should be getting away from that and use alternative fuels like wind and solar.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view.</p>
<p>Paul 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 85:1-18)</p>	<p>Using the promise of jobs to get a plant built in an area where unemployment is an issue is unfair. These jobs that will be created during the project will be reserved for union employees, most of which do not live in this neighborhood. These jobs will be gone after the completion of the project and the five permanent jobs they will be highly specialized, and it is unlikely that community members will have a stake in the hiring process. Even if community members are chosen for these five positions, that will not solve unemployment in this neighborhood. Instead, this plant will continue to profit the corporation that has little investments in the community.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view.</p>
<p>Lisa Petrie 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 74:13 – 75:4)</p> <p>10-26-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>I think it’s essential that the environmental impact statement assess the greenhouse gas impacts of emissions from this facility and also from the increase in fracking in the Marcellus shale that the project will cause.</p> <p>In its previous assessments, FERC used wildly outdated estimates of the potency of methane. The intergovernmental panel on climate change recently found that methane was 34 times as potent as carbon dioxide over 100-year period. Not 20 times as potent, 25 times as potent as FERC believes. And, more importantly, it’s 86 times as potent over a 20-year period and more than 100 times as potent over a 10-year period.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures); and the discussion in the cover letter.</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (Alternatives).</p>
<p>Lisa Petrie</p>	<p>As others have pointed out, we need to stop investing in all fossil fuels immediately and begin massive investments in conservation and renewable</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Sections 10.1 (Alternatives) and 10.2 (Analysis of No Action Alternatives).</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

<p>10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 75:23 – 76:13)</p> <p>10-26-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>energy sources, such as solar and wind. So-called natural gas -- and, by the way, what is natural about it? It's natural in the same sense that coal and oil are natural. It's naturally occurring deep underground, but there is nothing natural about fracking, pumping millions of gallons of water laced with toxic chemicals into the ground and then bringing all that water up and having no responsible way to dispose of it and contaminating peoples' water supplies, et cetera.</p>	
<p>Juan Pichardo</p> <p>10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 89:7-10)</p>	<p>Opposed to this LNG or this facility being built and the waterfront is so close to hospitals and so close to the neighborhood.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection), Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 8, Section 8.2.2 (Existing Residences and Buildings).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 ((pages 13-102 through 104) Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Juan Pichardo</p> <p>10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 89:17 – 90:3)</p>	<p>I hope that the writeup . . . be included in the record, the writeup that has been put in place by the Providence Journal that illustrates that in the vicinity of where the proposal is being or the LNG facility is being proposed has many distributors that are depot for oil, for toxic chemicals that impact the quality of air, that impacts the quality of life here in the City of Providence and the neighboring city, which is Cranston.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p>
<p>Juan Pichardo</p> <p>10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 91:13-18 – 92:4)</p>	<p>The lack of information getting out to the community is also a significant part that, I believe that National Grid should have done a better job in circulating information and not relying on others. So with that said, yes, they could have sent it out with our bills just to get information if they really wanted to have more information.</p>	<p>NGLNG does not serve retail customers.</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7.2 (page 5-22) (examples of outreach).</p>
<p>Juan Pichardo</p> <p>10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 92:8 – 93:5)</p>	<p>Lastly, I wanted to say that just as of last year the quality of air in the neighborhood has not improved as much as we wanted it to because of all these things that are within one mile, two miles, whether it's the buses, whether it's also in the port, all the gas and oil tankers that are there, we all</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

	<p>know that it's a hazard to our health but it's also a hazard to all the homes that are around this area, including to the hospital. That is the number one hospital in Rhode Island, which is Rhode Island Hospital. That complex there has a children's hospital, the only children's hospital in the State of Rhode Island.</p> <p>To add more of these type of facilities in the area hurts the quality of life, hurts the safety of our community, hurts all the members in the district and the people that I represent, not just only my district, but also through the City of Providence and State of Rhode Island.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3 (pages 5-7 through 5-11) (Public Services).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 8, Sections 8.2 (pages 8-6 through 7) (Residential and Commercial Areas) and Section 8.3 (pages 8-8 through 9) (Public Land, Recreational and Other Designated Areas).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Ana Quezada 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 82:14-17)</p>	<p>What did you guys do to let the people in the community know about this meeting and to know what is going on about in this building?</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7.2 (page 5-22) (examples of outreach).</p>
<p>Erin Regunberg 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 66:3-10)</p>	<p>There is a constellation of toxic and dangerous factors that our families have to deal with, and we don't need National Grid piling on another concern. We don't need to be jacking up a few more percentage points of risks to add on to the already overwhelming risk factors that our kids face.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3 (pages 5-7 through 5-11) (Public Services), Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems)</p>
<p>Erin Regunberg</p>	<p>National Grid claims that this facility can withstand, I think, 500-year flooding . . . The reason that we are seeing so many extreme and dangerous weather</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 6, Sections 6.4.1, 6.4.8 and 6.4.9 (climate and weather related risks) (pages 6-4, 6-10 – 6-12).</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

<p>10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 66:11 – 67:8)</p>	<p>events is because we are destroying the planet with carbons. And even though we know that the science is very clear about the catastrophic places we are headed, if we continue plowing ahead with investments like this, 100 million-dollar investments in an archaic industry that we know that is threatening our future.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p>
<p>Steve Roberts 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 98:15-18)</p>	<p>We should look at conservation in making Providence more energy efficient before looking at increasing the supply of natural gas.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.2 (page 10-5) (Analysis of No Action Alternatives).</p>
<p>Gina Rodriguez-Drix 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 54:24 – 55:6)</p>	<p>I am deeply concerned about this project’s effects and disproportionate effects of women and children and, in particular, women of color and children of color that live right here in this neighborhood. This is unnecessary. It’s going to be on us to pay for it.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p>
<p>Gina Rodriguez-Drix 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 56:20 – 57:1)</p>	<p>National Grid, public outreach to the South Side Neighborhood Association, which doesn’t exist, to the Washington Neighborhood Association, again, which doesn’t exist, trying to act like there’s no nonprofits in south Providence or Board of Directors. I’m sitting on the board of two.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7.2 (page 5-22) (examples of outreach).</p>
<p>Julian Rodriguez-Drix 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 60:13 – 61:9)</p>	<p>There is no justification that this facility is needed. In the documents that National Grid has already submitted to FERC, the reasons that they give that this is needed is that two companies have said that they need a diversified supply. Those two companies are Narragansett Electric and Boston Gas. Those two companies happen to be subsidiaries of National Grid. So, basically, we have National Grid saying that we need this because they say that we need it. And who is going to pay for it? Of course they are going to pass it through and make us pay for it. They’re saying that it’s going to make the prices more stable. That’s also not true, because domestic prices of gas are just as subject to fluctuations as the international market is. This will not increase supply.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.1.1 (page 1-3) (Purpose and Need) and Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (page 10-1) (Alternatives) and Section 10.2 (page 10-5) (Analysis of No Action Alternatives).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p>
<p>Julian Rodriguez-Drix 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 62:20 – 63:11)</p>	<p>I want you, FERC, to look at the cumulative effects of this facility. I want you to look at the facilities that are next to here. You have the UNIVAR facility right next door, which has a 14-mile hazard radius. That includes 313 schools and over 110,000 students who are at risk of a chemical accident and a disaster. If anything were to go wrong at this LNG tank or at the liquefaction facility, that UNIVAR facility would be impacted. There has never been an accident with LNG tankers, but there have been accidents with LNG liquefaction facilities and LNG tanks like the ones that we have here already, and the ones that are being proposed.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems)</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

<p>Marti Rosenberg 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 36:3-24)</p>	<p>We understand that significant safety risks are there everyday now with trucks taking this natural gas and moving it from the highway to the facility and from the facility to the highway, and things should be done right now to make that safer. And National Grid and others may say let’s put it underground to make it safer, but that’s not safe either. There are risks. There are risks of explosions. There are risks of hurricanes like Sandy and like Joaquin, which we just dodged. And earthquakes, yes, here. There was one a couple of months ago or weeks ago. These affect neighborhoods like south Providence first, because the dangers are already here. And then . . . Warwick and east Providence can get affected, 14-mile radius around the project. That is a lot of Rhode Island.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 6, Section 6.4 (page 6-4), Section 6.4.2 (page 6-5), Section 6.4.3 (page 6-7), and Section 6.4.9 (page 6-11) (Geologic Hazards). Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (page 10-1) (Alternatives). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Marti Rosenberg 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 37:4-14)</p>	<p>So we also have the health impacts . . . of the natural gas problems that we have now in south Providence and, frankly, the highway problems that we have now. And that affects neighborhoods like south Providence, which are closer to the highway than other neighborhoods that have been mentioned.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.4 (pages 5-11 and 5-12) (Traffic). Refer to Resource Report 8, Section 8.1.5 (pages 8-5 to 8-6) (Land Use Impacts and Mitigation). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures). Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (page 10-1) (Alternatives).</p>
<p>Kate Schapiro 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 31:2-11)</p>	<p>What happens [on the south side] affects the people who live in Providence and, ultimately, the burning of that gas will affect the planet that all of us live on. I don’t want them to be at risk of a breach or a leak or an explosion or even the normal operation of a plant. I don’t want our air or water compromised.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 2, Section 2.2 (Surface Water Resources) and Section 2.3 (Wetlands). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection), Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality),</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

		<p>Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Yudiglenn Sena-Abreu 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 79:1-3 – Tr. 79:18-20)</p>	<p>This is yet another dangerous and toxic facility on top of all the other polluted facilities in the area. This facility has the potential to be extremely dangerous, and we all know that from experience. We need to stop this now.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Servio 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 71:21 – 72:3)</p>	<p>If anything goes wrong with the facility, this facility has the potential to be extremely dangerous and the people who would be most hurt by it are people of color who are already dealing with concentrated poverty, as I have already mentioned, crippling schools, substandard housing conditions and health problems.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection), Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

<p>Peter Sugrue 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 39:6-12 – Tr. 40:1-7)</p>	<p>According to the proponents of this project, the primary projected benefit is price reliability for liquified natural gas. Now, there is no mention of rate reduction. We will clearly see an initial rate increase for this 100 million-dollar project.</p> <p>We have to ask ourselves how much are these initiatives about ensuring consistent prices for consumers and how much of our investment is actually about ensuring that shale gas continues to be the dominant source of energy in our states to come?</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view.</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (page 10-1) (Alternatives).</p>
<p>Peter Sugrue 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 40:8-18)</p>	<p>But perhaps the long-term trajectory and the responsibilities of Rhode Island isn’t only what this meeting is about. Perhaps we are here tonight for the families in the surrounding neighborhoods and the schools and daycare centers and surrounding communities, which have already been subject to excessive environmental degradation and health risks. Communities that have every reason to be suspicious of more heavy industrialization.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p>
<p>Susan Walker 10-08-15 Scoping Meeting Comment (Tr. 102:19-22 – Tr. 103:9-1)</p>	<p>So why in the world do you want to store fracking chemicals on the waterfront? It seems extraordinarily risky.</p> <p>And then also -- so we are concerned about respiratory health with this facility being built here, and asthma already impacts minorities at a higher rate than non-minorities.</p>	<p>Chemicals used for natural gas production by hydraulic fracturing are not stored or used at the NGLNG site nor proposed to be stored or used at the site.</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (page 10-1) (Alternatives).</p>
<p>Katherine L .Accola 10-09-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>It is TOO DANGEROUS, TOO EXPENSIVE, and way TOO CLOSE to a large population of people and businesses.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view.</p>
<p>Karlo Berger 10-09-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>National Grid’s proposal to build a natural gas liquefaction facility in the Port of Providence . . . is a dangerous, expensive, short-sighted, and foolhardy idea.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p>
<p>Keith Catone 10-09-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>The close proximity of schools, hospitals, and countless more families and residents make the associated risks presented by the liquefaction facility far outweigh the benefits.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view.</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

<p>Keith Catone 10-09-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>The proposed facility will cause household energy costs to rise as National Grid passes on its expenses to us as consumers. We can no longer afford further (private and public) support for and growth of the fossil fuels industry in lieu of public investment in renewable and sustainable energy sources.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view.</p>
<p>Sigal Gottlieb 10-09-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>This facility is proposed in close proximity to residential areas, schools and hospitals. This makes me as a resident very uncomfortable.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), and Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Jean Ann Guliano 10-09-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>Converting fracked gas (brought in by pipeline) into Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) for export exposes our region to high risk and danger by creating a facility which would process a combustible commodity adjacent to one of the biggest oil import terminals in Southern New England and an existing chemical storage facility with a 14 mile hazard radius. In addition, all of this would be within walking distance of multiple schools, hospitals, homes, businesses, restaurants, community centers, churches, etc.</p>	<p>The proposed Project does not include an export terminal. Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 8 (Land Use, Recreation and Aesthetics). Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (page 10-1) (Alternatives). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), and Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Christopher Hasslinger 10-09-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>The explosion of a similar facility in Washington last year is an example of the type of hazards that present with the construction of this Facility.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

		Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Helen 10-09-15 Filed Comment	NOT HERE!!!	Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.5 (Alternative Sites).
Anna Highsmith 10-09-15 Filed Comment	This deal is bad for people and bad for the environment . . . this is not what Providence wants or needs.	Expression of commenter’s view.
Rebecca Kislak 10-09-15 Filed Comment	As a rate payer I do not want to pay for this expensive LNG facility. We should be investing in alternatives to fossil fuels.	Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.2 (page 10-5) (Analysis of No Action Alternatives).
Rebecca Kislak 10-09-15 Filed Comment	I am very concerned about the hazards this creates near where many people live, go to school, seek healthcare. It would increase the environmental burden on a low-income community of color that already faces a disproportionately high rate of asthma and other environmental related illnesses.	Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).
Arthur C. Kreuter III 10-09-15 Filed Comment	Building a LNG facility at the port of Providence would create a great danger to the community. The potential explosive danger more than offsets any positives that would come from constructing the LNG facility. LNG is stored and distributed under high pressure and transportation by ship is very dangerous. Facility should be built in a sparsely populated area not in the core of the city. If it ever blew up it is better to have a bunch of squirrels killed in the woods than all the kids at Hasbro Children’s Hospital. Way too great a danger to the surrounding community.	The LNG stored at the existing facility is stored under low pressure. No LNG will be stored in the proposed liquefier and the amount of LNG that will be in the proposed liquefier at any given time will be minimal. No marine transportation is proposed. Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Amanda Lazarus 10-09-15 Filed Comment	Last year there was a large unidentified explosion at an LNG facility in Washington State. Were something like that to happen in our area and at this scale, it would cause great loss of life and destruction of property. This	Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection).

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

	additional risk to our community is not worth the cost of the facility, which National Grid will just pass on to consumers in the form of higher prices.	Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Deirdre Lovecky 10-09-15 Filed Comment	Such a plant would contribute to a very dangerous situation for the surrounding city, especially since there is already a natural gas storage facility near the proposed site. Also, in the event of an explosion, the location close to residential areas, hospitals and schools would be severely damaging.	Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Deirdre Lovecky 10-09-15 Filed Comment	The cost would also be high and would be passed onto us consumers. Already the natural gas bills in RI and the rest of New England are higher than in the rest of the country.	Expression of commenter’s view.
Deirdre Lovecky 10-09-15 Filed Comment	I am concerned about environmental issues and increasing the amount of pollution in Providence.	Refer to Resource Report 2, Section 2.2 (Surface Water Resources) and Section 2.3 (Wetlands). Refer to Resource Report 3, Section 3.1 (Fisheries), Section 3.2 (Wildlife) and Section 3.3 (Vegetation). Refer to Resource Report 7, Section 7.3 (Construction and Operation Impacts). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).
Kathleen Odean 10-09-15 Filed Comment	A natural gas “liquefaction facility” in the Port of Providence, where they would convert fracked gas brought in by pipeline into Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) for export, is a dangerous idea.	The proposed Project does not include an export terminal. Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection).

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

		<p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (page 10-1) (Alternatives).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), and Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Allan Shapiro 10-09-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>The Port already has a high concentration of toxic and dangerous industrial facilities next to a low-income community of color that suffers from high rates of asthma and environmental related illnesses. The LNG production plant will be next to an existing chemical storage facility with a 14 mile hazard radius, an existing LNG storage tank, and the biggest oil import terminal in Southern New England. This is all next to a community with numerous schools, day care centers, multiple hospitals and health care centers. The LNG produced in South Providence will be exported to Massachusetts by truck. We cannot afford to have this hazard in RI.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection), Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), and Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Allan Shapiro 10-09-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>National Grid will pass the \$100 million dollar price tag onto consumers by adding the cost onto their gas bills.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view.</p>
<p>Paula Weindel 10-09-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>In no way will the addition of a "liquefaction facility" enhance life in Providence. Let’s look to the future and spend our money on alternate energy sources.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view.</p>
<p>Mikaila Arthur 10-13-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>Providence is a densely-populated urban area with a watershed we’ve all been working hard to restore and protect, and putting a facility with a high risk of combustion and/or leakage in a dense urban core with such a valuable aquatic habitat is reckless and unnecessary.</p>	<p>The proposed Project is land based and does not include any waterbody or wetland crossings.</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 2, Section 2.2 (Surface Water Resources) and Section 2.3 (Wetlands).</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

		<p>Refer to Resource Report 3, Section 3.1 (Fisheries), Section 3.2 (Wildlife) and Section 3.3 (Vegetation).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Mikaila Arthur 10-13-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>As a National Grid ratepayer, I already pay high prices for gas and electricity. I do not see any reason for National Grid to raise rates to support more construction--instead, they should continue and expand their vital support for reduced energy usage, such as subsidized energy audits and access to energy-saving technologies like LED bulbs and better insulation... if they expand such programs they may find there is no need for expanded energy-production facilities. Our country is not interested in any more dangerous, expensive carbon-burning facilities--especially where people live and environments are precious and vulnerable.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.2 (page 10-5, second paragraph about conservation) (Analysis of No Action Alternatives).</p>
<p>Donald Baier 10-13-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>The proposed Providence Fields Point liquefaction project is a high-risk LNG facility, adjacent to numerous toxic industrial facilities, located in a densely populated community, ranked over the 95th percentile on numerous environmental justice indicators including: traffic proximity and volume; proximity to chemical facilities requiring a risk management plan; proximity to facilities storing and transferring toxic and hazardous waste; and proximity to major water discharge polluters.</p> <p>...The proposed facility is next to a chemical facility that has a 14-mile hazard radius.</p> <p>...Rhode Island's only trauma and hospital complex including RI Hospital, Hasbro Children's Hospital, and Women and Infants is less than two miles away, within the potential evacuation zone of the proposed facility. Providence Community Health Center, Hasbro Medicine Pediatric Primary Care, and other medical facilities are even closer.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 2, Section 2.2 (Surface Water Resources) and Section 2.3 (Wetlands).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection), Section 5.4 (page 5-11) (Traffic), Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

		Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Donald Baier 10-13-15 Filed Comment	The proposal will increase the price of gas by adding the \$100 million cost of the facility to customer's bills.	Expression of commenter's view.
Donald Baier 10-13-15 Filed Comment	There is no need to increase the supply of LNG. The existing LNG storage tank serves RI's needs, there are three LNG import terminals already built near Boston.	Expression of commenter's view.
Sara Dorsch 10-13-15 Filed Comment	Providence is a beautiful city with a wonderful opportunity to expand its waterfront for residents and tourists alike. The idea of more storage tanks is not the best use of the land in terms of creating jobs and strengthening the economy. We should be investing in renewal sources of energy as well.	The proposed Project does not include any new storage tanks. Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.1.1 (page 1-3) (Purpose and Need).
Ben Hall 10-13-15 Filed Comment	Given the proximity to the Borden and Remington chemical storage facility and the oil import terminal, the LNG terminal would be far too dangerous. Furthermore, I do not want our city to be part of the network that increases the use of fossil fuels.	Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (Page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Sandra Jacobi 10-13-15 Filed Comment	I protest the building of a natural gas liquefaction facility in the Port of Providence, which also houses an oil storage terminal and a chemical storage facility. This site is situated in a densely populated area, dangerously close to homes, schools, hospitals and businesses. I would not trust National Grid to design and manage a potentially dangerous facility in the best interest of the community.	Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

<p>Jesse Marsden 10-13-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>This proposal is too hazardous on the local and global scale. Its construction is not necessary.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view. Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.1.1 (page 1-3) (Purpose and Need).</p>
<p>Carole Marshall 10-13-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>It is a heavily populated area and rapidly becoming more so as our town, East Providence, actively develops the coastal properties. The Port of Providence already has a high concentration of toxic and dangerous industrial facilities. The LNG production plant will be next to an existing chemical storage facility with a 14 mile hazard radius, an existing LNG storage tank, and the biggest oil import terminal in Southern New England.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 8, Sections 8.2 (Residential and Commercial Areas). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Carole Marshall 10-13-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>The site is directly adjacent to a low-income community that suffers from high rates of asthma and environmental related illnesses. It is a community with numerous schools, day care centers, and multiple hospitals and health care centers. Placing the plant in that neighborhood would demonstrate a suspicious pattern of systemic racism.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p>
<p>N. Nicholson 10-13-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>This area is right next to downtown Providence — a densely populated urban area. It is less than a half-mile from major hospitals and several schools. The proposed LNG facility would be next to a huge oil import terminal and a big chemical storage facility — a recipe for disaster. National Grid needs to invest in clean energy, not fracked gas for export. Rhode Island will gain nothing from this, but instead will be put in great danger of an industrial catastrophe because of the hazard that a LNG facility would present in this location.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (page 10-1) (Alternatives) and Section 10.2 (page 10-5) (Analysis of No Action Alternatives). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

		Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Amanda Starr 10-13-15 Filed Comment	This proposed plant would be MUCH too close to residential neighborhoods and existing and vital emergency medical facilities to be safe. It was rejected once for safety reasons	Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 8, Sections 8.2 (Residential and Commercial Areas) and Section 8.3 (Public Land, Recreation Areas). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Amy Torrence 10-13-15 Filed Comment	The Port already has a high concentration of toxic and dangerous industrial facilities next to a low-income community of color that suffers from high rates of asthma and environmental related illnesses. The LNG production plant will be next to an existing chemical storage facility with a 14 mile hazard radius, an existing LNG storage tank, and the biggest oil import terminal in Southern New England. This is all next to a frontline community of color with numerous schools, day care centers, and multiple hospitals and health care centers. This is environmental racism.	Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection), Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Amy Torrence 10-13-15 Filed Comment	National Grid will pass the \$100 million dollar price tag onto consumers by adding the cost onto their gas bills.	Expression of commenter’s view.

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

<p>Amy Torrence 10-13-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>The LNG produced in South Providence will be exported to Massachusetts by truck. The limited number of temporary jobs created during construction of the facility will be specialized positions from out of state, since construction will be managed by the multinational firm Kiewit. If \$100 million of our own money is being invested in energy, it should be invested in community owned renewable energy. We want jobs in our own communities in South Providence, that are life-sustaining and support healthy communities not toxic risks.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view.</p>
<p>James Corbin 10-15-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>The proposed location - next to an oil import terminal and near an existing chemical storage facility - has the potential for severe environmental and safety catastrophe if there were to be even a minor incident in the handling of volatile gas. This location is within walking distance of nearby schools, colleges, hospitals, and numerous homes.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Susan Feeley 10-16-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>This is not properly thought of as an industrial area--there are MANY houses within a mile of this site: a thriving neighborhood including many beautiful old houses, with families including many children. There are in fact 3 schools within a short distance. Not to mention the fact that a disaster in this neighborhood could damage the state’s biggest hospital complex. This is NOT an appropriate site for this facility.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 8, Sections 8.2 (residential and Commercial Areas) and Section 8.3 (Public Land, Recreation Areas). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>John Brett 10-20-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>No Natural Gas processing in Providence Rhode Island!</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view.</p>
<p>Joel Schapira 10-21-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to project because I think it is not good for health, safety and ecology.</p>	<p>Expression of commenter’s view.</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

<p>Darcie Dennigan 10-26-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>This terminal raises the risk of toxic chemical accidents and exposure in one of the most populated and impoverished parts of the state. The added risks to low-income, predominately minority neighborhoods is environmental racism.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection), Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Jus-tice-Socioeconomics).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island 10-26-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>There is no Justified Need for the Project (p. 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to National Grid’s own information, the existing LNG storage is only used up to 9 days each year, and is less than half of the gas used even on the coldest days with the highest demand. • The requests to increase the supply of LNG come from subsidiaries of National Grid. 	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.1.1 (page 1-3) (Purpose and Need).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Sections 10.1 (Alternatives) and 10.2 (Analysis of No Action Alternatives).</p>
<p>Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island 10-26-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>Public Participation (pp. 3-4, 22)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Grid’s public participation plan is extremely flawed. They contacted certain officials, industrial neighbors, and a handful of homeowners but ignored the residents and tenants who will be negatively impacted by the project. 	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7.2 (page 5-22) (examples of outreach).</p>
<p>Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island 10-26-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>Potential Disasters (pp. 5-11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •LNG is a dangerous substance. • The LNG facility was denied in 2005 due to safety risks. •There are numerous risks and potential disasters that need to be studied including but not limited to earthquakes, hurricanes, storm surges, industrial accidents, terrorism, fires, explosions, and chemical incidents. • The close proximity to other facilities with highly flammable and potentially explosive substances could trigger a secondary incident at a neighboring facility. 	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 6, Sections 6.4 (pages 6-4 through 12) (Geologic Hazards).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

<p>Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island 10-26-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>Environmental Racism (pp. 12-20)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed facility would be adjacent to numerous toxic industrial facilities, located in a densely populated community of color with many environmental justice concerns. According to the EPA, the neighboring community is ranked over the 95th percentile on numerous environmental justice indicators including: traffic proximity and volume; proximity to chemical facilities requiring a risk management plan; proximity to facilities storing and transferring toxic and hazardous waste; and proximity to major water discharge polluters. 	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p>
<p>Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island 10-26-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>Climate Change (pp. 21-22)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a new fossil fuel facility involving methane, a potent greenhouse gas, this facility will create emissions that contribute to climate change. The source of the methane that would be liquefied is the Spectra Energy pipeline, which carries gas produced by hydraulic fracturing (fracking) from the Marcellus Shale into New England. As a result, the emissions and climate change impacts of the fracked gas lifecycle must be taken into account, from drilling to consumption. • The liquefaction facility requires a large amount of energy and will use 15 MW of electricity to liquefy the gas. For comparison that is half of the electricity that will be produced by the Deepwater Wind project. • The area where the project is planned is at high risk from climate-related impacts and severe weather events. 	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 6, Section 6.4.1 (page 6-4), Section 6.4.8 (page 6-10), and Section 6.4.9 (page 6-11) (cli-mate and weather related risks).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.2.4 (page 9-9) (Greenhouse Gases), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures); also see the discussion in the cover letter.</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (page 10-1) (Alternatives).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p>
<p>Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island 10-26-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>Public Health (pp. 23-25)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and GIS mapping. . . show that Washington Park has largest concentration by far of chemical exposures in Providence, and also has the highest concentration of leaking underground storage tanks. • On top of the high level of children with asthma, the frontline community and asthma hot spot next to the port also has some of the highest levels in the state for Emergency Department visits or Hospitalizations due to asthma. • Rhode Island’s only trauma and hospital complex including RI Hospital, Hasbro Children’s Hospital, and Women and Infants is less than two miles away, within the potential evacuation zone of the proposed facility. Providence Community Health Center, Hasbro Medicine Pediatric Primary Care, and other medical facilities are even closer, which is an unacceptable. 	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection), Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

		Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island 10-26-15 Filed Comment	<p>Energy Economics & Economic Inequality (pp. 26-32)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal will increase the price of gas by adding the \$100 million cost of the facility to customer’s bills. It will not lead to more stable and predictable natural gas costs, as National Grid claims, because domestic natural gas prices have a history of extreme volatility. • There is no need to increase the supply of LNG. The existing LNG storage tank serves RI’s needs, there are three LNG import terminals already built near Boston, and our focus needs to be on energy conservation, weatherization, and reducing demand, not increasing supply unnecessarily. 	Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.2 (page 10-5, second paragraph about energy conservation) (Analysis of No Action Alternatives).
Environmental Justice League of Rhode Island 10-26-15 Filed Comment	<p>Solutions and Alternatives (pp. 29-32)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The immediate solution is to stop this facility from being built. •The \$100 million price tag for the proposed liquefaction facility could be better spent in ways that would address energy needs, create jobs in the economically marginalized and oppressed frontline communities next to Port, supportable renewable energy and energy efficiency, and build greater community health instead of increased toxic risk. 	Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.2 (page 10-5, second paragraph about energy conservation) (Analysis of No Action Alternatives).
Robert Malin 10-26-15 Filed Comment	I am writing to strongly oppose the LNG production facility on the Providence Waterfront, which would liquefy fracked gas from Spectra Energy’s “Algonquin” pipeline, which was permitted by FERC despite losing other illegal segmentation lawsuits that FERC lost.	Expression of comment’s view. Refer to Resource Report 10, Section 10.1 (Alternatives).
Robert Malin 10-26-15 Filed Comment	<p>This site was the epicenter of a recent earthquake. This \$100 million-dollar project would be built right next to an existing LNG storage tank, a Univar toxic chemical facility with a 14-mile hazard radius, and the biggest oil import terminal in Southern New England.</p> <p>A leak, fire, or explosion at the LNG facility could trigger a disaster at the Univar chemical plant, placing over 109,000 children in 311 schools at risk. There is no evacuation plan and if it blew up Univar it could make Providence, Cranston and Warwick uninhabitable. Some of the Univar Chemicals are as toxic as Dioxin and measured in parts per billion.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 6, Sections 6.4.2 (page 6-5 to 6-7) (seismic risk and earthquakes) and Section 6.4.3 (page 6-7 to 6-9) (faults).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

		Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).
Robert Malin 10-26-15 Filed Comment	The original stakeholders notice went out to owners and not residents only in English, in the neighborhood which is low-income and predominantly Spanish speaking. Even at the “town halls” there were no translators or signs in Spanish.	Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7.2 (page 5-22) (examples of outreach).
Robert Malin 10-26-15 Filed Comment	In a glaring instance of environmental racism, these industrial hazards are all sited in a low-income community of color which is also home to numerous schools and day care centers and several major hospitals including RI Hospital, Women and Infants, and Hasbro Children’s Hospital.	Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomic Impacts).
Rhode Island Department of Health (RIDOH) 10-26-15 Filed Comments	<p>RIDOH recommends including a Health Impact Assessment as a component of the environmental review.</p> <p>With respect to overall health security, the proposed project’s impact on the surrounding community’s ability to reduce hazard vulnerability, correct place-based inequities influencing health, increase sustainability within the local area, and improve the collective resiliency of residents should be assessed and included for review.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts and public safety impacts should be assessed at multiple levels, from close proximity (0.5, 1 and 2 mile radius from the facility), to neighborhood level and citywide level of analysis. There are a number of underlying factors (i.e., geographic, socioeconomic, and environmental) that should be included in assessments of cumulative impacts. Health protection alongside the prevention of disease should be included within this portion of the review.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection), Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), and Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
Rhode Island Department of Health (RIDOH) 10-26-15 Filed Comments	<p>Geographically, the proposed facility is in an industrial area with a concentration of facilities listed in the EPA’s Toxic Release Inventory (TRI), facilities requiring Risk Management Plans (RMP), and Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities (TSDF) that handle hazardous materials.</p> <p>Another geographic factor that is critical for analysis in the environmental review is the concentration of healthcare facilities and critical health system infrastructure within close proximity to the proposed project.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.3 (page 5-10) (Medical Services).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.2.3 (page 9-9) (Risk Program Management).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11)</p>

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

		(Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).
Rhode Island Department of Health (RIDOH) 10-26-15 Filed Comments	Given the high level of existing health burdens in areas adjacent to the proposed facility, RIDOH requests that the scope of the cumulative impact analysis include any additional impact related to air quality, emissions, and/or traffic due to construction or operation of the facility.	Refer to Resource Report 5, Sections 5.4 (page 5-11) (Traffic) and Section 5.9.2.4 (page 5-27) (Traffic-Socioeconomic Impacts). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.1 (pages 9-4 and 9-5) (Existing Air Quality and Climate Conditions), Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).
Rhode Island Department of Health (RIDOH) 10-26-15 Filed Comments	Other environmental factors that are worth considering in the scope of the review include coastal flooding, both current and future levels given projected sea level rise, as well as potential storm surge and wind impacts.	Refer to Resource Report 6, Sections 6.4.1, 6.4.8 and 6.4.9 (climate and weather related risks) (pages 6-4, 6-10 – 6-12). Refer to Resource Report 9, Section 9.1.3 (pages 9-12 through 9-15 including Tables 9.1-5, 9.1-6, 9.1-7) (Air Quality), Section 9.1.4 (page 9-16) (Cumulative Impacts), and Section 9.1.5 (page 9-17) (Construction and Operation Mitigation Measures).
Rhode Island Department of Health (RIDOH) 10-26-15 Filed Comments	The final set of topics that RIDOH requests be included in the environmental review fall under the general heading of “public safety” the combination of multiple hazardous facilities, healthcare infrastructure, and vulnerable communities requires extra care and attention.	Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan). Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems). A Facility Response Plan (“FRP”) is described in Resource Report 13, Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) and Appendix 13U.14.
Rhode Island Department of Health (RIDOH) 10-26-15 Filed Comments	RIDOH is concerned about the health impacts that would results from a worst-case scenario involving secondary impacts. Communications in disaster preparedness and response should also be taken into consideration as part of the environmental assessment and/or a broader emergency/risk management review.	Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (Operation and Maintenance). Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.3 (page 5-10) (Medical Services). Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11)

Field Point Liquefaction Project – FERC Docket No. PF15-28 – Response to Scoping Period Comments

		<p>(Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Jan Very-Creamer 10-26-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>We resent, as customers of National Grid, paying \$100 million for this potentially dangerous project which would be built next to an existing LNG storage tank, a Univar toxic chemical facility with a 14-mile hazard radius, and the biggest oil import terminal in Southern New England.</p> <p>A leak, fire, or explosion at the LNG facility could cause a disaster at the Univar chemical plant affecting 109,000 children in 311 schools and putting them at risk.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 1, Section 1.4 (page 1-14) (Operation and Maintenance).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.3.2 (pages 5-8 through 9) (Fire Protection).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 11, Section 11.1 (pages 11-2 through 11-8) (Safety Issues), Section 11.2.3.2 (pages 11-10 and 11-11) (Thermal Radiation and Flammable Exclusion Zones) and Section 11.3.1 (page 11-11) (Facility Response Plan).</p> <p>Refer to Resource Report 13, Section 13.14 (pages 13-102 through 104) (Hazard Detection System), Section 13.15 (pages 13-105 through 109) (Fire Suppression and Response Plan) and Section 13.16 (pages 13-110 through 13-111) (Hazard Control Systems).</p>
<p>Jan Very-Creamer 10-26-15 Filed Comment</p>	<p>It is obvious environmental racism that these industrial hazards are all sited in a low-income community of color involving many schools, day care centers, and several major hospitals such as Hasbro Children’s Hospital.</p>	<p>Refer to Resource Report 5, Section 5.7 (pages 5-13 through 5-22) (Environmental Justice) and Section 5.9.2.6 (page 5-28) (Environmental Justice-Socioeconomics).</p>

Document Content(s)

FPLP - PF15-28 - Scoping period comment response.PDF.....1-38