Alliance for a Living Ocean • Amagansett-Springs Aquifer Protection • American Littoral Society
Capital District Against Fracking • Catskill Citizens for Safe Energy
Citizens for Oceanfront Preservation • City of Binghamton Residents Against Fracking
Clean Ocean Action • Coastal Research and Education Society of Long Island
Concerned Citizens of Montauk • Delaware Riverkeeper Network • Edison Wetlands Association
Fisherman's Conservation Association • Food & Water Watch • Hackensack Riverkeeper, Inc.
Jamaica Bay Ecowatchers • Natural Resources Protective Association
New Jersey Council of Diving Clubs • New Jersey Environmental Federation
New Jersey Friends of Clearwater • North and Central Merrick Civic Association • NY/NJ Baykeeper
Paddleout.org • Quiet Skies Coalition • Raritan RIVERKEEPER • Religious On Water
Save Barnegat Bay • Sierra Club Long Island Group • Sierra Club New Jersey
South Shore Audubon Society • St. Mary's Environmental Committee • Staten Island Tuna Club
Surfer's Environmental Alliance • Surfrider Foundation • The Northwest Alliance • Water Equality
WATERSPIRIT

The Honorable Andrew M. Cuomo Governor of New York State NYS State Capitol Building Albany, NY 12224

May 1, 2013

RE: Offshore Liquefied Natural Gas Facilities and Imports/Exports

Dear Governor Cuomo;

We write today to commend you for removing support for offshore liquefied natural gas (LNG) facilities, and the export of LNG therefrom, from your NYS2100 report. The issue of offshore LNG ports is timely; Liberty LNG has submitted an application to construct one such facility in the NY/NJ Bight, just south of Jones Beach, New York, with only a handful of permanent jobs created. Given the threat LNG facilities pose to the economic and environmental wellbeing of the people of the State of New York, we ask you to oppose this project.

The proposed Liberty Natural Gas 'Port Ambrose' project was originally sited in New Jersey waters, and was vetoed in 2011 by New Jersey Governor Chris Christie utilizing his authority under the Deepwater Port Act (33 U.S.C. § 1508(b)(1)). The Governor characterized the port as presenting "unacceptable risks to [New Jersey's] residents, natural resources, economy, and security." He further warned that the "project would create a heightened risk ... including potential accidents or sabotage disrupting commerce in the Port of New York and New Jersey." Allowing more threats and risks in the region is unacceptable given the density of the greater New York City region, risks already associated with commerce, significant environmental concerns, and the fact that the Coast Guard and the Department of Homeland Security are already overburdened.

After being excluded from New Jersey waters, Liberty LNG is now submitting another application for an LNG port which is virtually the same as the plan rejected by New Jersey; the only real difference is that this time the facility would be in New York State waters. Siting the project closer to New York does nothing to ameliorate the risks identified by Governor Christie. As now proposed, Port Ambrose would be located in the middle of robust fishing grounds, shipping lanes leading to the Port of New York and New Jersey, and migratory routes of endangered species, U.S. Coast Guard training grounds, and a proposed offshore wind area. The noise pollution, risk of water contamination and the inevitable air contamination would undermine the progress New York has made in recent years in improving the quality of its coastal ecosystem.

In light of SuperStorm Sandy, there is an additional reason to oppose this project - the application for Liberty LNG does not appear to even consider the threat of reasonably foreseeable future storms.

The real potential for environmental accidents, sabotage, and commerce disruption (both during normal operation of the port and in the event of an emergency) poses a long-term threat to New York State's economy.

The Energy Information Administration (EIA) predicts that the U.S. will soon become a net exporter of natural gas, so there would seem to be little need for an import facility such as Port Ambrose. Yet, despite a regime shift in the natural gas market away from imports, Liberty LNG is still insisting that this import facility is in the public interest. It is not. Over the last few years, global natural gas costs have risen dramatically; in some places, LNG costs upwards of six times more than in the United States. Increased reliance on more fossil fuels, let alone fossil fuels the region will need to pay more for in order to compete with an expensive global market, is not in the public's interest.

In recent months, applications to construct LNG import terminals across North America have been withdrawn and/or switched to proposals for export terminals. The EIA and Department of Energy project that exports will increase energy costs for consumers, businesses, and industries across the nation, and that a significant amount of exported natural gas would come from *additional* shale gas production. A shift to exports increases the level of community and environmental harm that this port could facilitate. Based on this shift of natural gas markets to exports, Congress recently amended the Deepwater Port Act to allow exports from offshore LNG ports like Liberty (P.L. 112-213 § 312) (exports had previously only been allowed from onshore terminals). While Port Ambrose is described as an import terminal, federal law would allow Liberty to switch to exports after simply obtaining "approval in writing" from the Secretary of Transportation. For this reason, due consideration of the Port Ambrose project should take into account all the impacts of building an export facility, because there may not be an opportunity to do so in the future. These impacts include not just those associated with the construction and operation of a massive liquefaction plant, but all of the "upstream" impacts associated with extraction for exportation.

If constructed, Port Ambrose would be the region's first LNG port. Other proposals have either been withdrawn by their sponsor, or rejected by New York as incompatible with the state's coastal zone policies. It is our conviction that this proposal should also be withdrawn or rejected. Late last year, before SuperStorm Sandy hit, this port applied for a Deepwater Port Act license with the Maritime Administration – in the six months since then, there has been no public process, no public review, and no public engagement. This energy facility would threaten our coastal economy, our security, and our environment. It has already been soundly rejected by the State of New Jersey. We ask that the State of New York make a similarly strong statement by rejecting this unwanted and unnecessary industrial project.

Representatives of the groups listed below are available, at your convenience, to meet on this proposal and on LNG issues in general. We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Cindy Zipf Executive Director Clean Ocean Action

Christopher Huch Jr.
Executive Director
Alliance for a Living Ocean

Alexander Peters
President
Amagansett-Springs Aquifer Protection

Tim Dillingham
Executive Director
American Littoral Society

Siobhan Burke

Capital District Against Fracking

Bruce Ferguson

Catskill Citizens for Safe Energy

Joyce Grant

Citizens for Oceanfront Preservation

Isaac Silberman-Gorn

City of Binghamton Residents Against Fracking

Arthur H. Kopelman, Ph. D.

President

Coastal Research and Education Society of

Long Island

Tom Mahedy

Concerned Citizen of COA

Jeremy Samuelson Executive Director

Concerned Citizens of Montauk

Maya K. van Rossum the Delaware Riverkeeper

Delaware Riverkeeper Network

Robert Spiegel Executive Director

Edison Wetlands Association

John Malizia Vice President

Fisherman's Conservation Association

Alex Beauchamp

Northeast Region Director Food & Water Watch

Captain Bill Sheehan

Riverkeeper and Executive Director **Hackensack Riverkeeper**, **Inc.**

Dan Mundy Sr. President

Jamaica Bay Ecowatchers

Raymond Ellmer

Concerned Civic Leader Long Beach, New York

Ida Sanoff

Executive Director

Natural Resources Protective Association

Glenn A. Arthur

Chairman

New Jersey Council of Diving Clubs

Amy Goldsmith

State Director

New Jersey Environmental Federation

Ed Dlugosz

President

New Jersey Friends of Clearwater

Claudia Borecky

President

North and Central Merrick Civic Association

T. James Matthews

Chair

The Northwest Alliance

Deborah A. Mans

Baykeeper & Executive Director

NY/NJ Baykeeper

Scott Thompson

Paddleout.org

Kathleen Cunningham

Chairwoman

Quiet Skies Coalition

Bill Schultz

Raritan RIVERKEEPER

Joan Carey, ssj

Member

Religious On Water

Karen Orlando

Concerned Citizen

Rockaway, New York

Joe Nerone Concerned Citizen Rockaway, New York

Britta Forsberg Wenzel Executive Director Save Barnegat Bay

Ann I. Aurelio Vice Chair

Sierra Club Long Island Group

Jeff Tittel Director

Sierra Club New Jersey

Jim Brown President

South Shore Audubon Society

Marie Savoia

St. Mary's Environmental Committee

CC: New York Congressional Delegation New Jersey Governor Chris Christie John Malizia Director

Staten Island Tuna Club

Richard Lee Executive Director

Surfer's Environmental Alliance

John Weber

Mid-Atlantic Regional Manager

Surfrider Foundation

Daniel Morrissey Water Equality

Suzanne Golas, csjp

Director

WATERSPIRIT



PO Box 001
Trenton, NJ 08625-0001

CHRIS CHRISTIE Governor

February 8, 2011

Mr. David T. Matsuda Maritime Administrator Maritime Administration US Department of Transportation Southeast Federal Center 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE W22-318 Washington, DC 20590

Re: Application of Liberty Natural Gas for the LNG Deepwater Port Offshore of Monmouth County, New Jersey Docket Number USCG -2010-0993

Dear Mr. Matsuda:

On September 28, 2010, Liberty Natural Gas, LLC (Liberty) submitted an application to the U.S. Maritime Administration (MARAD) under the Deepwater Port Act (Act) to construct, own and operate a deepwater port. This deepwater port would be located approximately 16 miles off the coast of New Jersey to receive vessels transporting liquid natural gas (LNG) for regasification. As proposed, approximately 44.4 miles of offshore pipeline would be needed to transport natural gas from the port to the shore in Perth Amboy, New Jersey. On November 15, 2010, a copy of Liberty's license application was provided to New Jersey.

Under the Act, any coastal State that would be directly connected by pipeline to a proposed deepwater port shall be designated as an "adjacent coastal State." 33 U.S.C. § 1508(a)(1). New Jersey is such a State, as Liberty has proposed to transport natural gas to the shoreline of New Jersey. The Act prohibits MARAD from issuing a license without the approval of the Governor of each adjacent coastal State. 33 U.S.C. § 1508(b)(1). Accordingly, under my authority as Governor of the State of New Jersey, I hereby disapprove the issuance of a license to Liberty. This project would present unacceptable and substantial risks to the State's residents, natural resources, economy and security.

The proposed deepwater port and offshore pipeline lie east of thriving coastal communities that are home to many residents of the State as well as precious plant, fish, animal and avian species. This coastal area also supports recreational and commercial fishing, shellfisheries and tourism industries that are vital to the State. Marine waters in the proposed project area function as a critical migration corridor for both federally endangered marine

mammals and sea turtles. The proposed 44.4 mile long offshore pipeline and port structures will affect almost 6,000 acres of seafloor, adversely impacting seafloor habitat, aquatic life, and prime fishing grounds. The discharge of wastewater, regasification effluent, and stormwater would also harm our marine waters and the species that depend on a healthy environment. The environmental impacts could threaten the recent ocean water quality improvements the State has worked hard to achieve.

New Jersey has invested much time, energy and resources into encouraging renewable energy, a commitment that has made the State a national leader. This project could stifle investment in renewable energy technologies by increasing our reliance on foreign sources, which would undermine progress made by New Jersey and this nation to promote sustainable energy.

Finally, the Liberty project would also present significant security risks to our State through increased demands on the U.S. Coast Guard and our State Homeland Security personnel and first responders. The Liberty project would create a heightened risk in a densely developed region, including potential accidents or sabotage disrupting commerce in the Port of New York and New Jersey.

For all of these reasons, I hereby disapprove of the issuance of a license to Liberty to construct, own and operate a deepwater LNG port off the coast of New Jersey.

Chris Chr Governor