these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy's economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy's economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migrand waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and
natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.
Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Jena Chapman Andres, Schuyler county resident
Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our
The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy's economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy's economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:
Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."
The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Sandra M. Larsen
From: "Mom Larsen" <llarsen@rochester.rr.com>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 10/10/2011 8:01 PM
Subject: LPG Storage in Reading NY

David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region's economy.
Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?
What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy's economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy's economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?
According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.
The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,
From: Hannah Hones <hannahhones@yahoo.com>
To: "dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us" <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 10/10/2011 7:23 PM
Subject: please re-think what your doing!

Hannah
G. Hones
2504 state route 79
Trumansburg NY, 14886

David
L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance
what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the
24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy's economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy's economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote, farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?
According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of
Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Hannah G. Hones
Dear Mr. Bimber,**

**

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.****

**

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?****

**

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?****

**

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy. ****

**

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic
aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.****

***

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area. ****

***

*Economic and safety issues:*

***

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?****

***

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?****

***

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?****

***

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?****

***

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?****

***
What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?****

* * *

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?****

* * *

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?****

* * *

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.****

* * *

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?****

* * *

*Ecological and other issues:*

* * *

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley? ****

* * *
Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?****

** **

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?****

** **

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.****

** **

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?****

** **

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.****

** **

* Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:*  
** **
Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?****

***

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.****

***

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.****

***

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.****

***

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."****

***

*The next logical step:*

***

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA. ****

***

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions.****
** Claire Fox

hopefoxmama@gmail.com

Ithaca, NY

**
From: Joshua Jespersen <joshuajespersen@gmail.com>
To: “dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us” <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 10/10/2011 3:13 PM
Subject: Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?
What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated
with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Sincerely,
Josh Jespersen
-Concerned property owner and tax payer
From: "Bonnie Prunka" <bonnieprunka@gmail.com>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 10/10/2011 9:03 AM
Subject: Gas Storage Facility

TO: David L. Bimber

Deputy Regional Permit Administrator

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

As owners of property located at 4130 Weller Road, Rock Stream, New York, 14878, we are very concerned about the above referenced facility for gas storage which will be located only a couple of miles from our home. We urge you to carefully consider the issues mentioned below and support the initiation of a Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis for this project.

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent
growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region's economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region's property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility's proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

We are most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, we assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less
populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base-on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy's economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for
upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy's economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in
its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."
The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering our concerns and suggestions,

Timothy and Bonnie Prunka
P.O. Box 490865
Watkins Glen, NY 14891
Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development
in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?
Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,
Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development
in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?
Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,
Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development...
in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?
Is Inergy's economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy's economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,
Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.
Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region's property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility's proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?
What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy's economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take
for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.
There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering our concerns and suggestions,

Kristie Snyder
Glen Robertson
642 Valley Rd.
Brooktondale, NY 14817
From: kendall carpenter <kmc14850@yahoo.com>
To: "dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us" <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 10/11/2011 11:05 AM

David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region's economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region's property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility's proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of
Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a bowl shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we
assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s proprietary claims.

The next logical step:
Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Kendall Carpenter
From: Erica Wurster <shenjoy9@yahoo.com>
To: "dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us" <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 10/11/2011 12:32 AM
Subject: Please read!

David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region's economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region's property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility's proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic?
Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume
that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately address the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical step:
Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Erica Wurster
From: "Eric Serritella" <eric@ericserritella.com>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 10/11/2011 12:04 AM
Subject: No Watkins gas storage from Julie Nathanielsz

David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region's economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region's property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility's proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will
impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base-on the lake, near the facility, and along
the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy's economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy's economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archaeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Julie S. Nathanielsz
From: "Eric Serritella" <eric@ericserritella.com>
To: <dlbimer@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 10/11/2011 12:04 AM
Subject: No gas storage in Watkins Glen

David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will
impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base-on the lake, near the facility, and along
the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy's economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy's economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Eric Serritella

Eric Serritella
528 Sebring Road
Newfield, NY 14867
607-564-7810
Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY is the latest bad idea on the energy industry’s considerable list of bad ideas for our beautiful finger lakes. Those who think otherwise are a small minority, dominated by powerful moneyed interests who stand to make trainloads more money from the project and its sister bad idea, hydrofracking. Nobody is fooling anybody here; if we let them in they’ll ruin the area’s landscape, roads, water and economy. The money will leave the area, the damage will not. The companies that control these projects do not care, and the DEC is not and will not be equipped and staffed to police them. It only takes one catastrophe to reduce all we have here to worse than nothing. Inergy and their ilk cannot truthfully promise the risk is negligible. When that happens, all we will have left is the remains of our homes and the signs saying “Entering the Finger Lakes-NO SMOKING”.

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?
Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the
trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this? How?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does
not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

**Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:**

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us? WE certainly do not.

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

**The next logical step:**

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should
choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Sincerely;

Eric Ott
4724 E Bates Rd.
Trumansburg, NY 14886
Dear Mr. Bimber:

While I understand the consideration of "frackin" by many in the area struggling to survive, the proposal of the above referenced facility based on the attached, seems just bizarre.

Please seriously consider "The next logical step:" at the close of the attached.

Very truly yours,

Leonice K. Mertz

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development.
in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?
Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

**Ecological and other issues:**

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Leonice Mertz
18 Chapel St., Apt. 209
Sherburne, NY 13460-9711
Anne Myers  
3770 Barnum Street  
Burdett, NY 14818  
October 4, 2011

David L. Bimber  
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator  
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation  
6274 East Avon-Lima Road  
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community.
I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?
How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

**Ecological and other issues:**

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?
Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Anne Myers

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community.
I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?
How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?
Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

**Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:**

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

**The next logical step:**

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Jean O. Fernandez

[Signature]
October 13, 2010
David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

I am a businessman and long time upstate New York Resident. I have enjoyed and witnessed the growing recognition that the Finger Lakes are a very special natural place within the United States. I am sure that this is not news to you.

The growing recognition that produce from our area is of the finest quality has made our farmers more successful in the past decade than anytime after the agricultural boom of the late 19th century. An agricultural renaissance is underway in the Finger Lakes region, finally.

For better or worse, this renaissance has been aided by climate change that has given us longer growing seasons and warmer summers. A recent article in the Wall Street Journal noted that climate change has in fact degraded agricultural production in southern California and the central California valleys. The journal pointed out that Cornell University agricultural research has shown that the two newest regions of fast developing agriculture and particularly grape viniculture are the Willamette Valley in Oregon and the Finger Lakes region of upstate New York. Abundant clean water and moderating temperatures make these areas ideal agricultural regions that are only going to become more important.

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of
tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Tankers carrying LPG are not allowed to come into the port of Boston Harbor. The risk to the city is too great and ships are required to off load far out to sea. Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?
While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination in an ecologically sensitive agricultural region, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

**Ecological and other issues:**

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people, currently. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian and Iroquois Nation sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Richard D. Farr
DEC Commissioner
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
625 Broadway
Albany, NY 12233-1010

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Commissioner,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community.
I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be
a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

**Ecological and other issues:**

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

*Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.*
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Jesse Beardslee
David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

October 16, 2011

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the
negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?
How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

**Ecological and other issues:**

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberate across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?
Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Dianne Hansen

I couldn’t say this better myself, but
I do want to register my extreme concern about this issue as a Seneca Lake resident...
living north of Watkins Glen on the west side. I have personally seen how traffic congest this region, especially from spring through fall. In person I witnessed the break-through of the Morton Salt brine pond located near Hinrold. The destruction to the aquifer, the devastation to people’s lakeside property and the potential for death of anyone caught up Plum Point Creek as the wall of water raced to the lake were a visible example of the future disaster that could overwhelm Southern Seneca Lake.

Also, the few permanent jobs that this venture will provide cannot possibly offset the damage to the bucolic, peaceful ambiance of one of the most beautiful places in New York State.

Please consider an independent quantitative and qualitative risk analysis!
From: Jenny McReynolds <jenny@vinegarhillhouse.com>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/3/2011 1:40 PM
Subject: Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

As a visitor and lover of the Finger Lakes region, I am opposed to the plan to turn the area surrounding the southwestern end of Seneca Lake into a Liquid Petroleum Gas Storage and Transportation Facility, as proposed by Inergy. Such a facility will threaten the health of the drinking water. It will be ugly and noisy. It will bring heavy truck and rail traffic that is dangerous and a nuisance, and overwhelming on the small highway and rail infrastructure. It will threaten the health of the lake as a habitat and as a place of recreation. It will bring risk of environmental disaster.

All of these threats have the potential to destroy all of the things that bring me to Seneca Lake – the landscape, both natural and agricultural, the lake recreation, the wineries, the peacefulness, the bucolic lifestyle and the community itself. How sad that would be, for me as a tourist and for all the people who make a life there.

I ask that you please require Inergy to pay for an independent quantitative risk assessment on their proposed LPG Storage and Transportation Facility before considering granting them the necessary permits.

Thank you for your consideration.
Best regards,

Jenny

--

Jenny McReynolds
Office Manager | Private Events Coordinator

Vinegar Hill House
72 Hudson Avenue
Brooklyn, New York 11201
*p:** 718.522.1018*
*f:** 718.228.6507*
411 North Main St.
Penn Yan, NY 14527
November 1, 2011

David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.
I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be
a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Darlene Bordwell
Thomas Efinger
112 Sackett Street
New York, NY 11231
11/3/11

David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

As a visitor and lover of the Finger Lakes region, I am opposed to the plan to turn the area surrounding the southwestern end of Seneca Lake into a Liquid Petroleum Gas Storage and Transportation Facility, as proposed by Inergy. Such a facility will threaten the health of the drinking water. It will be ugly and noisy. It will bring heavy truck and rail traffic that is dangerous and a nuisance, and overwhelming on the small highway and rail infrastructure. It will threaten the health of the lake as a habitat and as a place of recreation. It will bring risk of environmental disaster.

All of these threats have the potential to destroy all of the things that bring me to Seneca Lake—the landscape, both natural and agricultural, the lake recreation, the wineries, the peacefulness, the bucolic lifestyle and the community itself. How sad that would be, for me as a tourist and for all the people who make a life there.

I ask that you please require Inergy to pay for an independent quantitative risk assessment on their proposed LPG Storage and Transportation Facility before considering granting them the necessary permits.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Thomas Efinger

[RECEIVED]
NOV 7 2011
DEP-REGION 8
David L. Bimber  
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator  
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation  
6274 East Avon-Lima Road  
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 6-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

As visitors and lovers of the Finger Lakes region, we are opposed to the plan to turn the area surrounding the southwestern end of Seneca Lake into a Liquid Petroleum Gas Storage and Transportation Facility as proposed by Inergy. Such a facility:

...will threaten the purity and health of the drinking water,
...will turn a pleasant lakeshore into an ugly and noisy blight on the environment,
...will bring heavy truck and rail traffic, dangerously overwhelming a relatively small road and rail infrastructure,
...will threaten the health of the lake as a habitat and place of recreation, and
...will bring the risk of environmental disaster.

These threats have the potential to destroy all of the things that bring us to Seneca Lake - the landscape, both natural and agricultural, the lake recreation, the wineries, the peacefulness, the bucolic lifestyle and the community itself. How sad that would be, both for us as tourists and most especially for all the people who call this beautiful place ‘home’.

We ask that you please require Inergy to pay for an independent quantitative risk assessment on the proposed LPG Storage and Transportation Facility before any consideration of granting them the necessary permits.

Thank you for your attention to our request.

Donald A. and Audrey J. Clinton
David L. Bimber  
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator  
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation  
6274 East Avon-Lima Road  
Avon, New York 14414-9516

102 Powers Street  
11/3/11

Dear Mr. Bimber,

As a visitor and lover of the Finger Lakes region, I am opposed to the plan to turn the area surrounding the southwestern end of Seneca Lake into a Liquid Petroleum Gas Storage and Transportation Facility, as proposed by Inergy. Such a facility will threaten the health of the drinking water. It will be ugly and noisy. It will bring heavy truck and rail traffic that is dangerous and a nuisance, and overwhelming on the small highway and rail infrastructure. It will threaten the health of the lake as a habitat and as a place of recreation. It will bring risk of environmental disaster.

All of these threats have the potential to destroy all of the things that bring me to Seneca Lake – the landscape, both natural and agricultural, the lake recreation, the wineries, the peacefulness, the bucolic lifestyle and the community itself. How sad that would be, for me as a tourist and for all the people who make a life there.

I ask that you please require Inergy to pay for an independent quantitative risk assessment on their proposed LPG Storage and Transportation Facility before considering granting them the necessary permits.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Walter Sipser
Mary Hone  
5506 82nd St SW K302 
Lakewood, WA 98499  
November 3, 2011

David L. Bimber  
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator  
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation  
6274 East Avon-Lima Road  
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

As a visitor and lover of the Finger Lakes region, I am opposed to the plan to turn the area surrounding the southwestern end of Seneca Lake into a Liquid Petroleum Gas Storage and Transportation Facility, as proposed by Inergy. Such a facility will threaten the health of the drinking water. It will be ugly and noisy. It will bring heavy truck and rail traffic that is dangerous and a nuisance, and overwhelming on the small highway and rail infrastructure. It will threaten the health of the lake as a habitat and as a place of recreation. It will bring risk of environmental disaster.

All of these threats have the potential to destroy all of the things that bring me to Seneca Lake—the landscape, both natural and agricultural, the lake recreation, the wineries, the peacefulness, the bucolic lifestyle and the community itself. How sad that would be, for me as a tourist and for all the people who make a life there.

I ask that you please require Inergy to pay for an independent quantitative risk assessment on their proposed LPG Storage and Transportation Facility before considering granting them the necessary permits.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

[Signature]

Your Name
Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There
is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

*Economic and safety issues:*

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the
impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 rail cars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be an Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is
not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

* * *

*Ecological and other issues:*

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?
Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

*The next logical steps:*

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to
thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

In addition, it is imperative that a balancing test be performed to weigh both the potential growth inducing aspects of the Inergy proposal versus the impact this industry will have on the existing community character and the potentially negative economic impact it will have on the tourism, wineries, and agriculture in the region in addition to the potential negative impact on property values and hence the tax base in the region. This too should be performed by an expert chosen by the residents within the community and paid for by Inergy.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Catherine VanVleet
607-279-8311
1665 Lodi Point Road
Lodi, NY 14860
Call me a NIMBY, but this is CRAZY. Putting something like this on a lake known for its vineyards and organic farms. Why not put frackwater in our children's swimming pools? This may fly in PA, which seems content to serve as the toxic waste dump for the Northeast, but up here?? Seriously??

You can't have something like this next to an enclosed body of water. One accident and we are screwed. Even if by some miracle there are no accidents (when has that ever happened) this level of industrialization is incompatible with vineyards and tourism. What will we gain? A handful of truck driving jobs? We lose an industry that directly and indirectly employs thousands.

We do not want this. Drive around Seneca lake and see all the anti-LPG signs in the area.

While you are at it, stop by our wineries. The whites have always been terrific, but recently the reds have really come along. I shared a local Pinot with my brother, who is a connoisseur and he said it was as good as anything from California.

Sincerely,

Josh Harben, Hector, NY

David L. Bimber  
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator  
New York State  
Department of Environmental Conservation  
6274 East Avon-Lima Road  
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed  
Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY  
(DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County.
and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?
What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 rail cars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be an Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy's economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy's economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other
issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.
What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical steps:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

In addition, it is imperative that a balancing test be performed to weigh both the potential growth inducing aspects of the Inergy proposal versus the impact this industry will have on the existing community character and the potentially negative economic impact it will have on the tourism, wineries, and agriculture in the region in addition to the potential negative impact on property values and hence the tax base in the region. This too should be performed by an expert chosen by the residents within the community and paid for by Inergy.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bimber,

Thank you for taking the time to consider my attached concerns.

Thank you,
Casey L. Kendall
Keuka College
Sr. System Administrator
ckendall@keuka.edu
(315) 279-5707
Casey L. Kendall  
58 Troy Street  
Seneca Falls, New York 13148

David L. Bimber  
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator  
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation  
6274 East Avon-Lima Road  
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten
prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?
What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 rail cars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be an Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

**Ecological and other issues:**

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?
According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

**Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:**

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”
The next logical steps:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

In addition, it is imperative that a balancing test be performed to weigh both the potential growth inducing aspects of the Inergy proposal versus the impact this industry will have on the existing community character and the potentially negative economic impact it will have on the tourism, wineries, and agriculture in the region in addition to the potential negative impact on property values and hence the tax base in the region. This too should be performed by an expert chosen by the residents within the community and paid for by Inergy.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Casey L. Kendall
David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

With ~45% of all LPG storage unit accidents happening in salt caverns, which make up only 8% of all LPG storage units, the risk is too high! The storage of brine on a hillside above Seneca Lake creates a situation that has the potential to poison thousands of people who count on the lake for their drinking water through human error, heavy rains, earthquake or other uncontrollable acts of nature. If that water is polluted, their is no back up plan that could be made that is able to replace this water, which so many people depend on! The North Eastern United States has been blessed with 25% of the world's drinking water! With aquifers quickly drying up in other parts of the world, this is a natural resource that we can not afford to squander! We need to protect the water that we have for future generations and not take chances with their health and well being.

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when
tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region's economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region's property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility's proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will
any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 rail cars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be an Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?
Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a
growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical steps:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

In addition, it is imperative that a balancing test be performed to weigh both the potential growth inducing aspects of the Inergy proposal versus the impact this industry will have on the existing community character and the potentially negative economic impact it will have on the tourism, wineries, and agriculture in the region in addition to the potential negative impact on property values and hence the tax base in the region. This too should be performed by an expert chosen by the residents within the community and paid for by Inergy.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions.

Sincerely,
Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their
businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?
What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 rail cars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be an Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?
On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

**Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:**

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.
The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s "proprietary claims."

The next logical steps:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

In addition, it is imperative that a balancing test be performed to weigh both the potential growth inducing aspects of the Inergy proposal versus the impact this industry will have on the existing community character and the potentially negative economic impact it will have on the tourism, wineries, and agriculture in the region in addition to the potential negative impact on property values and hence the tax base in the region. This too should be performed by an expert chosen by the residents within the community and paid for by Inergy.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Evelyn Petit

Homer, New York
From:  Winenewyork <winenewyork@aol.com>
To:  <dbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date:  11/8/2011 1:31 PM
Subject:  REL Finger Lakes LPG underground storage facility in Reading, NY

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic?
Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 rail cars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be an Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy's economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy's economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?
Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical steps:
Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

In addition, it is imperative that a balancing test be performed to weigh both the potential growth inducing aspects of the Inergy proposal versus the impact this industry will have on the existing community character and the potentially negative economic impact it will have on the tourism, wineries, and agriculture in the region in addition to the potential negative impact on property values and hence the tax base in the region. This too should be performed by an expert chosen by the residents within the community and paid for by Inergy.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions.

Cheers,

Maryrose Savino
Bed and Breakfast owner
former Winery Tasting Room Manager for two wineries on Seneca Lake
David L. Bimber  
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator  
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation  
6274 East Avon-Lima Road  
Avon, New York 14414-9516  

November 5, 2011  

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)  

Dear Mr. Bimber,  

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.  

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?  

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?  

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.  

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community.  

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development
in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?
Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Harriet Eisman

Thank you for scheduling a 2nd hearing on Waterman Glen. We have lived in Baywood for 30 years and have watched our neighbors and friends build up the Genera Wine Trail to a thriving business, step by step. We support them.
Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.
I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be
a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

**Ecological and other issues:**

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Mary Hone
From: Ann Cain Crusade <anncc3@gmail.com>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/9/2011 12:33 PM
Subject: LP gas storage

David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There
is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region's economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region's property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility's proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

"Economic and safety issues:"

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the
impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 rail cars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be an Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy's economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy's economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is
not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote, farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

* * *

"Ecological and other issues:"

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?
Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

*The next logical steps:*

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable
to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

In addition, it is imperative that a balancing test be performed to weigh both the potential growth inducing aspects of the Inergy proposal versus the impact this industry will have on the existing community character and the potentially negative economic impact it will have on the tourism, wineries, and agriculture in the region in addition to the potential negative impact on property values and hence the tax base in the region. This too should be performed by an expert chosen by the residents within the community and paid for by Inergy.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Ann Cain Crusade, RN, MS, L.Ac
Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this...
region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region's economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region's property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility's proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility?
Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 rail cars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base-on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be an Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?
Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do
not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical steps:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

In addition, it is imperative that a balancing test be performed to weigh both the potential growth inducing aspects of the Inergy proposal versus the impact this industry will have on the existing community character and the potentially negative economic impact it will have on the tourism, wineries, and agriculture in the region in addition to the potential negative impact on property values and hence the tax base in the region. This too should be performed by an expert chosen by the residents within the community and paid for by Inergy.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Diane and Neal Melveney

4180 Robertson Road

Burdett, NY, 14818
Katherine Lieber  
6075 Sirrine Rd, Trumansburg, NY 14886  
November 7, 2011

David L. Bimber  
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator  
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation  
6274 East Avon-Lima Road  
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085) 

Dear Mr. Bimber, 

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world. 

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy. 

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.
I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be
a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Katherine Lieber
From: Bill Murphy <murphy.bill007@yahoo.com>
To: "dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us" <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/10/2011 6:35 AM
Subject: Against LPG Storage in Reading, NY

David L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State
Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

Please help. The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing businesses and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region's economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region's property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility's proposal is
already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 rail cars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?
There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be an Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is
not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."
The next logical steps:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

In addition, it is imperative that a balancing test be performed to weigh both the potential growth inducing aspects of the Inergy proposal versus the impact this industry will have on the existing community character and the potentially negative economic impact it will have on the tourism, wineries, and agriculture in the region in addition to the potential negative impact on property values and hence the tax base in the region. This too should be performed by an expert chosen by the residents within the community and paid for by Inergy.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions. We know you and your people will do the right thing and actually protect the environment, and the drinking water. Also, please no hydro-fracking!

Sincerely,

Bill Murphy
From: kirsten <kirstenfazzari@yahoo.com>
To: "dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us" <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/10/2011 8:11 PM
Subject: Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

David
L. Bimber
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when "there is no tourism in the area." Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region's economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease
property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region's property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility's proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an
earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess
the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy's planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy's Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan's Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual's property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy's "proprietary claims."

The next logical step:
Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Kirsten Fazzari
PO Box 231
Hector, NY 14841
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
6274 East Avon-Lima Road
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.
Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?
What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 rail cars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be an Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as
opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

**Ecological and other issues:**

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?
Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

**Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:**

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”
The next logical steps:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

In addition, it is imperative that a balancing test be performed to weigh both the potential growth inducing aspects of the Inergy proposal versus the impact this industry will have on the existing community character and the potentially negative economic impact it will have on the tourism, wineries, and agriculture in the region in addition to the potential negative impact on property values and hence the tax base in the region. This too should be performed by an expert chosen by the residents within the community and paid for by Inergy.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth M. Jones
4025 Chase Road
Burdett, NY 14818
(Summer Cottage)
David L. Bimber  
Deputy Regional Permit Administrator  
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation  
6274 East Avon-Lima Road  
Avon, New York 14414-9516

Re: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the
expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the
facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can't we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our
lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.

**Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:**

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

**The next logical step:**

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.
Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Your name  

[Handwritten signature]
Betty Hansen
305 7th Street
Watkins Glen, NY 14891
November 8, 2011

Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourism industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.
I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already overwhelmed and don't have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

**Economic and safety issues:**

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn't it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn't such a site be in a less populated area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and water create a "bowl" shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 railcars per day carrying thousands of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be
a Historic District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?

Is Inergy’s economic claim true that home heating costs will go down for upstate New Yorkers? If so, by how much? Where are the details? Will any lowering of local gas prices be worth the potential negative impacts and risks? The DEC should demand a more in-depth study on Inergy’s economic claims.

While there may be a need for propane/gas storage in the region, this is not the appropriate site for this facility. Why must Inergy construct this facility in a world-class tourist destination, as opposed to placing it somewhere more remote; farther away from residences, and on a flatter terrain?

Ecological and other issues:

Are you seriously considering the impact of noise (truck, rail, compressors, flares and other industrial activity) in a lake region where small sounds reverberates across and around the entire lake valley?

Since there is some evidence (Halfman, Finger Lakes Institute; Wing, et al) that points toward a higher salt content existing in Seneca Lake from permeability into the lake from salt caverns, can’t we assume that LPG and butane will seep into the lake? Are you addressing this?

On top of the aesthetic damage to a pristine hillside overlooking Seneca Lake, a brine pond on the side of a hill can spill or leak into the lake and local water sources, leaving the village and local residents without potable water. The water table is very high where the proposed brine pond is to be located. How porous or permeable is the soil beneath the brine pond? In the event of a brine leakage, how long would it take for the brine to contaminate the water table?

According to a paper submitted to US Fish and Wildlife, there is high morbidity and toxicology associated with salt water and migratory birds and waterfowl. The impact of the brine pond to our migratory birds and waterfowl, including the threatened loon, is not adequately addressed in the dSEIS. How would this facility impact the recently established Bald Eagle? What about the ecological health of nearby wetlands? The dSEIS suggests that since our wetlands are small, no impact or mitigation measures are required, but there is no reason to claim this. The dSEIS does not adequately assess the flora and fauna at the site. An independent study should be undertaken and completed over several seasons.

Gas produced from the Marcellus Shale contains some of the toxins used in its extraction. Some, if not all, of the propane, butane, and natural gas stored in the salt caverns will come from drilling in the Marcellus Shale. Toxins from the gas could also leak into our lake. The DEC has not adequately addressed this issue. Seneca Lake is a Class AA drinking water resource for over 100,000 people. Why take such a risk?

Have you adequately dealt with the impact on unexplored Seneca Indian sites? No independent archeological survey was completed. This must be done to determine whether there are any archeologically sensitive sites.
Doubts about the company Inergy and their plan:

Inergy does not have experience building a facility of this type and size from the ground up. Do we want them experimenting on us?

Inergy largely relies on the 1992 GEIS for information in their proposal. This GEIS deals with hydraulic drilling of vertical wells, NOT storage of LPG in salt mines.

What are the long term, cumulative effects of Inergy’s planned expansion? There is a disparity between what they tell us in the dSEIS compared to what they are telling investors. In the dSEIS, they do not mention expansion, although their investors are told that Inergy wants to make this the major distribution facility for the Northeastern United States. They have big hidden plans, involving many salt mines and a growing industrial facility. Once this initial permit application is approved, they will expand and increase their negative effects on our community. The DEC should investigate the full expansion plans listed in Inergy’s Initial Public Offering to investors and demand full-disclosure from Inergy.

The character of this company is questionable and needs to be fully considered. They do not have our local interests in mind. Instead they are working purely on a profit motive. Inergy was sued by the State of Michigan’s Attorney General for price gouging. They have had accidents and been fined in other areas. They have taken individual’s property through eminent domain for their own profit and expansion.

There are many issues still not addressed and disclosed in the dSEIS. This document should be a full disclosure to the DEC and the public. Demand that full disclosure be met, regardless of Inergy’s “proprietary claims.”

The next logical step:

Considering the obvious threat this project brings, it is only reasonable to have an independent Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) to thoroughly and impartially evaluate the risk and impact that this facility would have on the region. Local governments and residents should choose the people who make this risk analysis. It should be paid for by Inergy. If the project is worth the risk, the company should have nothing to fear from a QRA.

As a homeowner in the village of Watkins Glen I support the efforts and beliefs of Gas Free Seneca!

Thank you for considering these concerns and suggestions,

Betty Hansen
Dear Mr. Bimber,

The DEC Environmental Impact Statement for storage of LPG in salt mines in Reading, NY leaves many questions about the environmental, economic, and cultural impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the massive costs to our local population and our growing vital tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

This unattractive and noisy industrial facility will be visible and audible from the beautiful dock and waterfront area in Watkins Glen, developments that have brought economic prosperity to Schuyler County and local towns. It will be visible from Routes 414 and 79, as well as from the water, since the brine pond cannot be landscaped on the eastern side. What happens to our area if the tourist industry jobs dry up? Can hundreds of jobs be replaced by a few industrial jobs that may not go to local people?

Inergy claims that much of the truck traffic will occur in the winter months when “there is no tourism in the area.” Has the DEC studied the recent growth of tourism in the area over the wintertime? Does Inergy realize that propane delivery begins in August and continues through autumn months in this region, when tourism is at its peak?

Compatible businesses and industry have postponed plans to develop or are selling before their businesses are impacted by the Inergy facility. There is a need to preserve existing business and promote industry that can coexist and enhance what we already have in this region, not frighten prospective growth away. The Inergy facility with its associated noise, traffic, and few jobs does not offer enough positives to balance out the negative impact on the region’s economy.

Homeowners are selling and delaying remodeling plans while prospective buyers are looking elsewhere because they fear that investing in an area where a gas storage and transport facility is located will decrease property values. In turn, this will have a negative fiscal impact on the region’s property tax base. As you can see, Inergy facility’s proposal is already having a negative impact, and if approved will continue to negatively impact the character of our community. A balancing test should be conducted to compare the growth inducing aspects of this project to the negative economic aspects that this facility will impose on our wine, agriculture and tourism industry.

I am most concerned that with the massive budget cuts at the DEC, you do not have the expertise or trained personnel to watch over this facility despite your positive intentions. You are already
overwhelmed and don’t have adequate staff to handle other proposed gas industry development in our
state. The result will be an out-of-state company doing as they please with the environment of our area.

Economic and safety issues:

Who is responsible for maintaining the roads that will have increasing amounts of heavy truck
traffic? Who will pay for this? Local taxpayers, I assume. How will the already congested main streets
of Watkins Glen deal with added traffic and pollution?

Since catastrophic failures of salt cavern hydrocarbon storage happen more often than failures with other
types of hydrocarbon storage, are our small local fire departments expected to deal with catastrophic
failure at this facility? Who will pay for training and equipment needed? Is our small local hospital
equipped to handle an industrial catastrophe? Isn’t it foolish to put such a facility near a highly populated
town that would have to be evacuated in a major failure? Shouldn’t such a site be in a less populated
area?

What are the risks of building this facility on a steep hillside versus a flat location? The lake shores and
water create a “bowl” shape. In the event of an accidental release, and since LPG is heavier than air, what
are the risks if a vapor fog forms and sinks over the lake? What will the impact be in this scenario, and is
there an evacuation plan in place?

What are the risks associated with hydrocarbon storage next to a compressed air storage facility? Will
any fires or explosions that ignite at the gas storage facility be magnified if they come into contact with
the compressed air stored nearby?

What impact will the volatile organic compounds produced by the diesel trucks have on our crops and
agriculture? Will these trucks or any portion of the Inergy proposal, including pipeline, impact Grade A
farmland?

What kind of security measures have been established for the 24-32 rail cars per day carrying thousands
of gallons of highly explosive LPG traveling over miles of track near residences and also over a bridge
across our beautiful Watkins Glen Gorge? The Route 329 Bridge that the trains plan to use is in poor
condition and is unsafe for transport of explosive material. Have security measures been established for
the pipelines or off-site aspects of the project?

There are fault lines on the Western shore of Seneca Lake. In light of the recent seismic activity felt in
Watkins Glen, what would be the impact of an earthquake involving those fault lines and the gas stored
within the caverns so close by? How adequately have these fault lines been studied? The application to
store spent nuclear rods in these caverns was denied due to these fault lines. Why then is storing LPG in
these same caverns being considered?

How will this facility affect local property values and the tax base—on the lake, near the facility, and
along the roads leading to the facility? How will added traffic and industrial activity affect tourist
businesses in the area? Franklin Street, the main street in Watkins Glen, has applied to be an Historic
District. How can added LPG truck traffic coexist with a historic site designation? How much more
traffic can the retail shops and homes on Franklin Street withstand?