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,

Henry M. Kimball
38 North Glenora Road
Dundee, New York 14837
From: Robert Seeley <rds12@cornell.edu>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/11/2011 10:39 AM
Subject: 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 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,

Robert Seeley
85 Starks Rd
Newfield, New York 14867
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, Conor Boyland
From: I i <golfergirl213@yahoo.com>
To: "dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us" <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/11/2011 10:43 AM
Subject: Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas

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,

Linda Ingersoll
1982 Spencer Hill Rd.
Corning, NY 14830
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, Vera Giasi
From: "Michele Griego" <michele@pinetreefarmsinc.com>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/11/2011 2:13 PM
Subject: LPG storage on Seneca Lake

Dear Mr. Bimber,

Emailing you on behalf of Gas Free Seneca, my family and my business, Pine Tree Farms, Inc., we encourage you to think carefully your duties as a DEC officer, and that is to protect the environment and to keep it safe for all the inhabitants in this region and beyond. Our business is nearly walking distance to Cayuga Lake, but we and others support Gas Free Seneca and their reasons for not allowing this heavy industry to take place here. I personally live in Hector on Updyke Rd.

I realized that after the hearings that it is just not Liquid Propane Gas storage and railways they are looking for but also for natural gas storage in very large amounts not seen in this area ever. Is the DEC and or nearby municipalities capable of dealing with disaster situations? Explosions, spills, etc. It is a well known and established fact that horizontal fracking causes earthquakes. A four thousand foot prohibitive boundary for a
no-frack zone around the Finger Lakes does not cut it.

Furthermore, an economic impact has not been presented to the area in regards to jobs, tax relief of any kind to the residents, nor taxation on Inergy that is a worthwhile benefit for the community.

Lastly, industrialization and the current rural touristic and agricultural settings do not mix. Again we support the comments below as stated by GAS FREE SENECA and request for a QRA.

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,

Michele A. Griego -Stillions
Pine Tree Farms, Inc.
3714 Cayuga Street
Interlaken, NY 14847
607-387-3656 ph
607-532-4311 fax
From: Natalie Bartone <zeedith@hotmail.com>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/11/2011 1:45 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 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.
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,
Natalie Bartone
Dear Mr. Bimber:

Attached please find my letter detailing my concerns about this proposed project. I am a concerned citizen who has spent many hours sailing on Seneca Lake and enjoying the wineries and restaurants in the area around Watkins Glen. I would like my comments to be counted among those that are NOT in favor of this proposal.

Respectfully yours,

Linda
Linda VanDerhoof
Administrative Assistant
Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering
263F Link Hall
Syracuse NY 13244-1240
Tel: (315) 443-9096
Fax: (315) 443-9099
November 11, 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 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,

Linda VanDerhoof
From: Michael Herrick <michaeljherrick@aol.com>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/11/2011 12:01 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 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 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 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,

Michael J. Herrick
A Property owner, Tax Payer and Voter.
4385 Mickel Rd.
Burdett, NY 14818
From: Rootwork Herbals <info@rootworkherbals.com>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/11/2011 11:26 AM
Subject: 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

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
*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,

Amanda David

---
Rootwork Herbals
P.O. Box 13
Alpine, NY 14805
607.592.0196
www.rootworkherbals.com
www.rootworkherbals.wordpress.com
From: Steven Wertheim <siwertheim1@gmail.com>  
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>  
Date: 11/12/2011 10:24 AM  
Subject: Proposed Inergy LPG storage under Seneca Lake (DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085)

3255 Reading Rd.

Watkins Glen, New York 14891

November 12, 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,

I am writing to voice my strong opposition to the proposed LPG storage facility under Seneca Lake, just outside of Watkins Glen. Specifically, I have concerns about the the DEC Environmental Impact Statement and the environmental impact of this project on Seneca Lake and Schuyler County. I am concerned about the costs to the local population and our tourist industry that provides hundreds of jobs and brings many visitors to one of the most beautiful lake areas in the world.

I am concerned about having this industrial facility within a mile or two from my home (at 3255 Reading Rd) due to the negative environmental impact this facility will have on the area. Specifically, there will be noise and air pollution created by the facility itself as well as greatly increased train and truck traffic. I live just off of Route 14 which already has too much noisy and polluting truck traffic on it. With an increase in truck traffic - running 24 hours per day, I am afraid that the truck noise alone will greatly negatively impact my life. I did not move to this pristine finger lakes area to have to worry about listening to trucks going up and down a steep hill. Also, having this facility right along beautiful Seneca Lake create an eyesore to this area. And our wonderful tourists will not want to leave their industrial area to come to visit our industrial area.

I am greatly concerned about the safety of having such a big facility in this environmentally sensitive region. A catastrophic failure in any number of areas would have a long lasting impact on Seneca Lake.

I am concerned that the DEC cannot adequately monitor what is happening at this facility in light of New York State budget cuts.

I have many questions and concerns that I share with many, many others in this area:

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, 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?

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. Please feel free to contact me.

If possible, please include me in any information you plan to disseminate about this proposed project.

Sincerely,

Steven Wertheim
Pamela Paine
(607) 535-7311
(607) 592-4396
Dear Mr. Bimber,

Please review the attached letter on my views regarding the proposed LPG facility.

Thank you

Neal Johnston
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
From: Bill Wood <dunkendunk@gmail.com>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/13/2011 11:46 AM
Subject: Don't permit Inergy's LPG facility

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, Dylan Peress-Lippincott
From: "Golden Knight Inn & Suites" <goldenknightinn@htva.net>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/13/2011 8:59 AM
Subject: Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas

DEC Environmental 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 do not know why I have to have a constant heart beat in my house and 2 motel businesses at night and throughout the day from the drilling ridges they are 3 miles away and you can hear the pounding of the drilling rigs inside of the structures and even sometimes the motors? I don't know of any other businesses in the area that is adversely affecting peoples lives 24 /7. It is not will they have a major problem ever it is only when. Given the scope of the increased size is only causing it to happen sooner. Just the other day Syracuse already had a train accident with LP Gas and had to displaced 80 or so homes and businesses to make it safe for them when will it happen here?

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,

Stuart Henry
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.

https://outlook.co.chemung.ny.us/owa/?ae=Item&t=IPM.Note&id=... 11/8/2011
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:

https://outlook.co.chemung.ny.us/owa/?ae=Item&t=IPM.Note&id=... 11/8/2011
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,

[Signature]
Lynda H. Kimball
38 N. Glenora Road
Dundee, New York 14837

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,

Lynda H. Kimball
38 North Glenora Road
Dundee, New York 14837
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.

If the brine pond fails, Seneca Lake will be permanently and irreparably harmed. If the caverns fail, Seneca Lake will be permanently and irreparably harmed. In spite of the expert claims and engineering studies, either or both failures are not impossible and if either occurs, the damage will be catastrophic and permanent.

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,

[Signature]
Anne C. Hurd
P.O. Box 763
Waverly, NY 14892
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 hope you and your office will take the time for a more reasoned and more strict appraisal of the proposed LPG facility, how the understaffed DEC will monitor the activities, what and where from will be the responses to failures, the environmental impact of the brine pond, and how the little towns near the facility are going to pay for the associated degradation of our infrastructure, especially when so many more trucks start rolling around. We need more time and deeper investigation by DEC before you sign off on Inergy’s plan.

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 and Yates Counties. It is hard to see adequate benefits to the local area that can offset the likely massive costs, including potentially serious environmental 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? Methane gas bubbles up into the lake from deposits in the shale rock. When you add pressure to the layers, will not there be substantially more gas seeping into the lake and into nearby wells?

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.

Further 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,

Stephen Rose
42 North Glenora Road
Dundee, NY 14837
roselaw@laplaza.org
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,

Peter N. Campbell
From: Heide Stuebel-Horowitz
To: <dbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/14/2011 2:05 PM
Subject: Proposed Finger Lakes Liquefied Petroleum Gas Underground Storage Facility in Reading, NY Project Number: DEC Facility ID 8-4432-00085

Heide Stuebel-Horowitz
820 W King Rd
Ithaca, NY 14850

November 13, 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,

My husband and I live in Ithaca and we consider the proposed storage of LPG in Reading a regional matter. 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 proposal 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,

Heide Stuebel-Horowitz
820 W King Road, Ithaca NY 14850
From: Catherine Chadwick Baker <cathcbaker@gmail.com>
To: "David L. Bimber" <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
Date: 11/14/2011 8:57 AM
Subject: Concerns re proposed hydrofracking and lp storage in the Finger Lakes

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 long time resident and property owner on Keuka Lake, I implore of you to insure that our water supplies and lands remain safe and habitable in the manner in which we are accustomed. It is the government's fiduciary responsibility to protect us. Inergy's track record around the country thus far is questionable and I have read documentation relative to unsafe practices in their production as well as waste management. As the amount of natural gas in the Marcellus Shale area is questionable and as the underground connections of watershed areas are not totally mapped and as there are previous documented studies cautioning against drilling on or near fault lines, it seems that anything short of further study and deliberation is reckless.

I am in agreement with the points below and I thank you in advance for your consideration and attention to your responsibility upon our behalf. Hydrofracking and lp storage brine ponds and increased heavy wear and tear on our area will be detrimental and hazardous to our health and well being as studies have shown previously relative to migrant camp similarities and the influx of people into our area that are not invested in our well being.

Again, it is the government's fiduciary responsibility to protect us. Kindly recommend that further study be done and not by Inergy.

And........

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.
David Bimber - Concerns re proposed hydrofracking and lp storage

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 Chadwick Baker
12043 East Lake Road
Hammondsport, NY 14840
From: Matthew Peterson <titusgallery@yahoo.com>
To: <dlbimber@gw.dec.state.ny.us>
CC: <titusgallery@yahoo.com>
Date: 11/14/2011 8:48 PM
Subject: Gas 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 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.

The US Government Confirms link between Earthquakes and Horizontal Hydrofracking. See Oil Price.com 11/8/11.

We own a Art Gallery in Ithaca NY. Two thirds of our income is from tourists. Hydrofracking will destroy most of the tourism in the Finger Lakes. Farms and beautiful scenic views become industrial sites.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions.
Sincerely,

Matthew J. Peterson

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

Peter C. Widynski  
150 Chestnut Lane  
Watkins Glen, NY

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

Dear Mr. Bimber,

In addition to the statements made in this formal letter, please consider the other issues I have listed at the end of this letter.

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.
Additional comments:

I’ve been trying to research the safety factor regarding underground storage. And I stumble across such incidences of Land Subsidence and Karst formations which can be natural or man-made occurrences. In elementary school we are taught the earth is forever changing, every action has a reaction --- what safety factor can be calculated into the equation? It seemingly is short sited on the solution mining end! Repeated injection and removal of gas/brine will increase the cavern capacity. I am extremely perplexed by the notion that man in his infinite wisdom can conclude that he has the capability to control the forces of nature rather than working with them in his pursuit of wellbeing.

Thank you for considering my concerns and suggestions,

Peter C. Widynski