INDIVIDUALS

IND01 – Luis Vazquez Garcia on behalf of Salinas Municipality Mayor, Honorable Karilyn Bonilla Colon

20140811-5001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 8/8/2014 6:24:58 PM

Luis A Vazquez, Caguas, PR.
Dear members of the Federal Energy Regulatory C omission:

I am Luis Vázquez García, attorney at law, writing on behalf of Salinas Municipality Mayor, Honorable Karilyn Bonilla Colón.

IND01-01 The Aguirre Ofshore Gas Port project (AOGP) is proposed to be constructed at approximately 3.5 miles from the shore of Aguirre neighborhood, located approximately six miles east from the urban zone of Salinas Municipality.
Also at Aguirre neighborhood is located the PREPA power plant known as Central Aguirre, which is proposed to be converted to use natural gas.

The people of the Aguirre Neighborhood is definitely affected directly not only by the proposed project but also by the Central Aguirre since its construction during the mid seventies.

The public hearing for the project are schedule to be conducted on september 10 2014 at La Marina, located at Playa neighborhood at Salinas Municipality. La Playa neighborhood is located 2 miles south from the urban zone of Salinas. La Marina hotel and restaurant is located near the shore in a place with difficult access and minimum parking facilities.

In representation of Salinas Mayor, Honorable Karilyn Bonilla Colón, we are respectfully asking for a change of the public hearing location to guarantee the maximum participation of Aguirre residents, the ones that are more affected by the proposed project. The Municpality of Salinas owns a community center at Aguirre with enough capacity for this type of public hearing. On the alternate the Mayor suggest the use of the meeting room of the Salinas Legislature building, located at the urban zone. Also you may consider having two public hearings one the already schedule at La Playa and the other at Aguirre or the urban zone. Two public hearings will definitely guarantee the maximum participation of Salinas Municipality residents.

We all hope that you will accept the propose change for the purity of the process being held and to guarantee the participation via an accesible location near the site of the proposed project. Also a new location will facilitate the partcipation of residents of nearby communities like Las Mareas, Coquí, and San Felipe, without harm to La Playa residents.

Cordially:

--
Lic. Luis Vázquez García
vazquezgarcialuis@gmail.com
787-509-3457

IND01-01 Comment noted. A free shuttle to the public comment meeting was provided. The shuttle was advertised in the community and there were two planned pick up stops. Additionally, the Puerto Rico Permits Management Office held an additional meeting in the community on September 15, 2014.

IND02 – Kathleen de Onis

20140811-5014 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 8/10/2014 2:27:36 PM

Kathleen de Onis, Bloomington, IN.
Dear FERC:

I am writing to express my concern with the proposed Aguirre Off-shore LNG gasport. Having just reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement, I wanted to share the following items with you and hope that you'll
IND02-01 consider these comments in your review of this project. I disagree strongly with the continuance of this project given the environmental impacts associated with it, which will not only contribute to environmental degradation but will also cause risks to human health and livelihoods.

IND02-02 1. Reliance on LNG is reliance on another fossil fuel that will aggravate Puerto Rico's current energy dependence. LNG is not "clean" or "inexpensive." When considering greenhouse gas emissions, methane releases are 20 times greater than carbon dioxide. Methane, as you know, is released during fracking operations before the gas is liquefied. Escape of methane is also risky when taking the super chilled fluid and converting it back into a gas. Numerous explosions have occurred in the US from natural gas reliance. This is a dangerous fossil fuel to be using. When special cameras are used, the smokestacks at natural gas plants can be seen emitting methane. I assume many of the members of FERC have seen Gasland and Gasland II. There are a host of other planetary and human health concerns associated with LNG, which are well-documented in numerous academic studies. Since Puerto Rico and other parts of the Caribbean are disproportionately vulnerable to global climate disruption, especially sea-level rise, flooding, and extreme temperatures, this project-which will aggravate anthropogenic climate change-should be abandoned immediately.

IND02-03 2. The fishers in the area have and continue to voice their concerns and dislike of the project. Coral reefs are in jeopardy, and dedicating the area to an industrial shipping function will be disastrous for the fish and the fishers and their families who rely on this environment for their livelihoods. Furthermore, the number of endangered species in the area that will encounter greater risks with this project is alarming. When I attended the public hearing in Ponce, Puerto Rico this summer, it was clear that the fishers' concerns weren't really being heard. I ask that before this project move forward that the alternative sites proposed for this project be reviewed more seriously. I read the EIS's rationale for rejecting the alternatives; however, given the tremendous impact the current project's trajectory will have on the environment and fishers, a more thorough review and rationale is necessary. Currently, it reads as a superficial assessment.

IND02-04 3. The EIS says the construction of the project would temporarily impact the ocean floor. Typically in environmental contexts, any kind of temporary effects lead to long-term, irreversible impacts. Further, leaks and spills are possible. The surrounding area of the gasport is already disproportionately impacted by environmental degradation caused by the thermoelectric and the coal plants. It is immoral to impact the community of Aguirre and Guayama with practices that will further risk harming

IND02-01 Comment noted.

IND02-02 See the response to comment CO01-05.

IND02-03 In accordance with CEQ regulations, we determined that the proposed site was feasible and would not result in a significant environmental impact. To make this determination, we considered Aguirre LLC's mitigation plans, agency comments received, and our recommendations within this EIS. Based on our analysis of the proposed site and the alternative sites, we found no compelling reason to review additional alternative sites.

IND02-04 Comment noted. We updated section 3.2 with a more detailed discussion of the alternative energies available to meet the Project objective. Also see the response to comment CO2-32.

IND02 – Kathleen de Onis (cont'd)

20140811-5014 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 8/10/2014 2:27:36 PM

IND02-04 (cont'd) their health. This is an environmental injustice. This year marks the 20th anniversary of the signing of the Environmental Justice executive order by President Clinton. As you know, this order calls attention to the disproportionate impacts experienced by the poor and communities of color. An appropriate way to celebrate the passage of the environmental justice order would be to reassess the current trajectory of the project, consider the alternative options proposed, and ultimately abandon this project and help the citizens of Puerto Rico invest in renewable energies. The area has tremendous solar power potential. The solar potential of the sun is not waning, nor will it disappear. The story is very different in the case of natural gas. It is a fossil fuel, subject to the spikes and variations in supply and demand. Puerto Rico is in the midst of an energy crisis. LNG will only fuel the precarity and uncertainty experienced and disproportionately shouldered by Puerto Ricans. Pages ES8-9 of the EIS explain that alternative energies would not help meet the needs driving this project. More explanation is needed. This reference is very vague, brief, and leaves the reader wondering what alternative energies were explored and how seriously they were considered. There is continued discussion of renewables later in the EIS, but it mostly suggests that wind, solar, and hydroelectric aren't as consistently reliable as natural gas. This assertion is inaccurate, particularly if someone considers implementing a combination of these alternative energy sources.

Should you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact me. I appreciate your consideration of these comments and hope that you will offer a just alternative to the Aguirre and Guayama communities.

Sincerely,

Kathleen de Onis

IND03 – Jimmy H. Vazquez

PART 3 OF 3
ORIGINAL

August 19, 2014.

REF: CP13-193-000

PF12-4-000

Chairman Cheryl A. LaFleur
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426.

FILED
SECRETARY OF THE
COMMISSION
2014 AUG 25 A 9:31
FEDERAL ENERGY
REGULATORY COMMISSION

Dear: Chairman LaFleur:

Enclosed you will find, Joint Puerto Rico Senate Resolution regarding sysmic Activity in the area of the proposed LNG terminal. On the EIS was mention that the study could not be located. The complete study is online but only available in Spanish, will need to be translated (included in this packet). The geologist incharge of this project was Dr. Lillian Soto Cordero (lillianprsn.uprm.edu.) Red Sismica de Puerto Rico.com); the sysmic activity in the area is very shallow (5.6km to 17.5km) with magnitudes of (2.3 to 3.0) and due to the shallow depth they are felt thru out the area quite strong. Our last quake was on August 12, 2014. Only 4.6 with a depth of 73km center was about 100km from San Juan. It shook the entire Island. However the IGPR site in Guayama did not register anything, even when the public at large felt the event in the area.

IND03 – Jimmy H. Vazquez (cont'd)

IND03-01 Please note; AEE requested additional funding from the Senate President to properly evaluate the area of Aguirre Power Plant, Due to Safety Consern. Preliminary studies concluded that due to lack of equipment and funding there is no way to create any site specific models. EIS does not address this site specific situation and only addresses the quake history of Puerto Rico. Setting aside all political presures; The idea to grant a permit for a LNG terminal knowing that there has been a significant increase of sismic activity in the immidiate area, 200% from 1986 to 2005 and the likelyhood of a major event is unknown with the available tehnology, Should triger a big red flag and would set a new standards for the agency.

IND03-02 Also including the Federal; Jobos Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve Management Plan " Final " (2010-2015) ; Reasearch shows a different picture of Jobos Bay from the studies that were presented to the agency by the applicants. The Management Plan, shows that the area has many needs that could be integral part of any mitigation requirements ; if this project is allowed.

EIS section 5.1.6- found 23 federal listed species threatened or endagered; plus 10 species proposed, considering that Jobos bay is a small body of water and the LNG terminal will have a daily continious effect on the Marine Santuary; beacause

2

IND03-01 Subsequent to a comment from the U.S. Geological Survey on the draft EIS, we contacted the Bureau of Reclamation concerning additional fault studies completed in the Project area, which were prepared to evaluate the seismic hazards on dams in southern Puerto Rico. PREPA provided these studies to the Commission, and they are available in our eLibrary system. In reviewing these additional studies, we are recommending in section 4.1.3.1 that the Seismic Hazard Analysis Report be revised to include both the Great Southern Puerto Rico Fault Zone and Salinas Faults, which would be consistent with the location and seismic characterization of these faults provided in the May 2014 Bureau of Reclamation reports. If the Project is approved by the Commission, it is expected that the condition would be required as part of the Project authorization.

IND03-02 See the response to comment AG02-27.

IND03 – Jimmy H. Vazquez (cont'd)

IND03-02 (cont'd) the adverse effect will not be only on the construction period, will also have a crewboat running back and forth to the terminal (this should be restricted to day transist only; proposed obsever would be useless in night time transist or any nightime operations for all practical purposed), then maintanace schedule, operation of the terminal will be a ongoing harrasment of ecosystem as a whole. If we follow Section 7 of ESA , there is no way to be in compliance with the spirit of the law.

If this project location was in Florida,California or any State would not stand a chance of approval. Most likely would end in front of a Federal Judge and with so many loose end would be send back to the drawing board.

IND03-03 Note: In the last 12 months AEE finantial problems have taken a turn for the worst, facing several federal law suites, was not able to pay its line of credit, took reserved funds to pay bills, taking 250millions from construction funds to pay operating expenses, have not met dead line with bond holders and still have not been able to settle with the Labor Force. All this information is in all the newspapers. The big question is, Who will be acountable to follow the FERC guidelines during this project, will Exelerated take over the finantial burden to

3

IND03-03 Comment noted. The financial status of the applicant is beyond the scope of this EIS.

IND03 – Jimmy H. Vazquez (cont'd)

IND03-03 (cont'd) stay in compliance under FERC guidelines. Has the agency ever given approval for a project while one of the applicants is on a technical bankrucy.

Sincerely:

Capt. Jimmy H. Vazquez

Former Senior Advisor;

Senator Olga A. Mendez, NYS Senate.

4

IND03 – Jimmy H. Vazquez (cont'd)

The attachments to this letter are too voluminous to include in this EIS. They are available for viewing on the FERC website at http://www.ferc.gov. Using the "eLibrary" link, select "General Search" from the eLibrary menu, enter the selected date range and "Docket No." excluding the last three digits (i.e., CP13-193), and follow the instructions. For assistance please contact FERC Online Support at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or toll free at 1-866-208-3676, or for TTY, contact 202-502-8659. The Category/Accession number for this submittal is 20140825-0027.

IND04 – Jimmy H. Vazquez-Aran

20140908-5170 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/8/2014 3:20:22 PM

Jimmy H Vazquez-Aran, Carolina, PR.
September 09, 2014.

REF: CP13-193-000

PF12-4-000
Chairman Cheryl A. LaFleur
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426.

Dear: Chairman LaFleur:

IND04-01 Enclosed you will find additional information that should be consider prior to the issuance of EIS.
1-Jobos bay Estuarine Profile (June 2008)
2-NERRS- Sec 5.3.2 Biodiversity and Productivity
"In the 1970 and early 1980's studies were conducted in Jobos Bay in connection with the proposed construction of a nuclear powered generating plant. Because of the existence of a fault line under the site, the project was switched to fossil fuel, and evolved into what is now the Aguirre Power Plant Complex."
3- USGS diagram showing the fault in Jobos Bay.
4- Puerto Rico Senate Resolution presented by Senate President Rivera Schatz.
5- Seismic study conducted (2008); shows that no site specific model can be generated with the available technology; but shows increase seismic activity.
6- JBEP- Climate, Weather, and Waves (page 20); Shows site specific winds in the Bay. The spill cone and disaster area should include this information; the actual cone would be different from the EIS (page- 4-18); thus resulting in a bigger potential for Human Lost in case of a major disaster.
7- JBEP- Marine Currents in Jobos Bay. (Page 24) this diagram shows that the LNG ships, daily water discharge of 46millions gallons laden with copper with a minimal sea current and just over a foot of tidal change, will kill the ecosystem, the cumulative copper contamination will affect the sea grass and up the food chain of the Marine Reserve.
8- JBEP- Sediment Quality of Jobos Bay. (Section 5.3.4; page 72)
"Toxic compounds may be accumulating in the Bay's sediments. Re-suspension of sediments from barge traffic, oil spills, and thermal and chemical discharges may be resulting in cumulative impacts on the ecology of the Bay bottom. A complete assessment of the different biotic and abiotic components of the Bay is necessary in order to properly address the impacts of land use changes. Assessment of metals such as lead, cadmium, copper, mercury, selenium, arsenic, chromium, silver and iron."
9- JBEP- EPA June 26, 1997- (pages 67-69) (Consent Order)
"Identify the effects of stressors including salinity, freshwater input, hurricanes, and thermoelectric combustion fumes, mechanical disturbance of submerged substrates, coral reefs sedimentation and toxic compounds on mangrove productivity"
10- JBEP- Appendix A thru D (pages 80- 91) List of the bulk of marine life within the Jobos Bay reserve, a full impact study has not been

IND04-01 Comment noted. We have considered these comments and incorporated the applicable information in the final EIS.

IND04 – Jimmy H. Vazquez-Aran (cont'd)

20140908-5170 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/8/2014 3:20:22 PM

IND04-01 (cont'd) conducted and the consequences of the lost marine life in relationship with the Threatened and endanger spices in the reserve. (There are five (5) Critical Habitat as per EIS 4.6.3 page 4-95)

11- LNG Tanker Liability is limited by U.S. Law

FERC should consider as part of the mitigation process for the applicants to have a suitable security bond to cover for any damages during construction or while operating this facility; that are brought upon the "Jobos Bay Marine Reserve"

IND04-02 12- Safety: Escort Tugs

FiFi Class# 1 " " Is the lowest category, and the minimum requirements include two monitors, one to two pumps and water pumping capacity of 10,569 gpm".

Information provided to the Commission (20140502-4005 FERC PDF page 20); available Tug Boats in the area, not a single one meets the minimum requirements for LNG Escort Service, under FiFi class# 1.

As to the Horsepower ratio Vs Deadweight Tons of the FSRU and LNG ships: Industry Standard is 5% of the Tanker Deadweight tonnage (HB#2347), the proposed FSRU has 82,500 DWT, and minimum Horsepower needed for a tugboat is 4,125hp or two tug combination Out the three tugs mention on the report one has only 3,800hp (can only be used as an assist tug boat). The other two 4,500 and 4,300hp; in case of an emergency or inclement weather will be operating at the top end of their naval design.

Do not see any requirements for a Standby Tug or Pilot while the LNG ship is transferring product to the FSRU. This operational period will be the weakest link for an Emergency. Without a standby Tug or Pilot the response time could be up to 2 hours and the LNG, FSRU would be on their own dealing with the emergency.

IND04-03 13- FERC should withhold for period of six months on granting the EIS; allow AEE to restructure itself and show viable financial stability, to take on this project and to be able to have the necessary funding to operate under Federal Laws.

Just yesterday AEE appointed Ms. Lisa Donahue as Chief Restructuring Officer, my personal hope is that she will be able to save AEE. The idea of FERC issuing an EIS to an applicant, who is on a financial limoo status, is a very slippery slope and will set a New Precedent for the Agency.

Sincerely;

Capt

IND04-02 The USCG, in developing its Water Suitability Assessment, noted that additional tugs would be required. Aguirre LLC would be responsible for obtaining the required equipment as well as staff trained to use the equipment.

IND04-03 Comment noted. The financial status of the applicant is beyond the scope of this EIS.

IND05 – Victor Gonzalez

September 9, 2014

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426
efiling@ferc.gov

Project Docket Number CP13-193-000

My name is Victor Gonzalez.

I have two comments:

IND05-01 **A. SENDOUT CAPACITY IS INCORRECT**

1.1 PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED
According to Aguirre LLC, the purpose of the Project is to provide LNG storage capacity and sustained deliverability of natural gas directly to the Aguirre Plant, which would facilitate PREPA's conversion of the Aguirre Plant from fuel oil only to a dual-fuel generation facility, capable of burning diesel and natural gas for the combined cycle units and fuel oil and natural gas for the thermoelectric plant. The Project would have a storage capacity of 197,400 cubic yards (yd3) (150,000 cubic meters [m3]) and sendout capacity of 50 million standard cubic feet per day (MMscf/d) to the Aguirre Plant. (Page 1-3 of EIS)

Is the above statement regarding sendout capacity correct? This sendout capacity is a tenth of the sendout capacity of a floating storage and regasification unit, FSRU; and 40% of the energy (Btu) that the Aguirre Power Complex burned in 2013. This sendout capacity will only run 150MW of the current generating capacity.

B. IMPACTS ON CORAL REEFS CAN BE REDUCED THROUGH SMARTER ALTERNATIVES

IND05-02 Environmental regulatory agencies have expressed concern over impact on protected coral species, specifically in the area of the *Boca del Infierno* pass. See page ES-5 of the Draft EIS. However, NOAA's Coral Reef Conservation Program emphasizes that:

Climate change impacts have been identified as one of the greatest global threats to coral reef ecosystems. As temperature rises, mass bleaching and infectious disease outbreaks are likely to become more frequent. Additionally, carbon dioxide (CO2) absorbed into the ocean from the atmosphere has already begun to reduce calcification rates in reef-building and reef-associated organisms by altering sea water chemistry through decreases in pH (ocean acidification). In the long term, failure to address carbon emissions and the resultant impacts of rising temperatures and ocean acidification could make many other management efforts futile."

The Aguirre Offshore GasPort Project will not reduce CO2e emissions enough. When discussing GHG Emission Impacts, the proponent argues that the Project's "potential GHG emissions are very small in comparison to other existing emission sources".[1] This is not the case.

[1] EPA Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program data shows that the Aguirre Power Complex generates 890 kg of CO2e per MWh generated. Aguirre emissions accounted for 18.5% of CO2e emissions in 2012. The EPA FLIGHT website

IND05-01 The sentence was corrected to reflect the Project's sendout capacity of 500 million standard cubic feet per day.

IND05-02 There are no thresholds of significance criteria established by the EQB or EPA for Project GHG emissions. There is no legal precedent to make a damage claim for stationary source or Project GHG emissions causing local climate change impacts. Climate change is caused by global impacts and effects. However, the GHG emissions from the Project and the effects of climate change are properly discussed in sections 4.10.1 and 4.12.2.3 of the final EIS, which include the most recent information from the U.S. Global Change Research Program. Section 4.12.2.2 further discloses the GHG emissions from the Project combined with the Aguirre Plant operations.

There are two ways to reduce CO2e emissions when burning fossil fuels. One is burning fossil fuels that generate less CO2e, and the other one is burning it in plants with a low heat rate. A modern flex-fuel combined cycle plant has a low heat rate, it can use different fuels, and it can throttle down to 50% with a minimal increase on its heat rate. Furthermore, it can be turned on and off on short notice.

In comparison, the Aguirre Power Complex plants have an extremely high heat rate, cannot be throttled up and down, and cannot be turned on and off. Their large size requires more spinning and stand-by reserves. They do provide the same frequency support as the modern flex-fuel combined cycle plants.

IND05-03 The alternative that should be considered is constructing six new combined cycle flex-fuel plants of 150MW nameplate capacity each instead of continuing operating the Aguirre Power Complex plants. This is a better alternative because:

- More energy will be generated with less fuel.
- Fewer emissions of CO2e will occur.
- More renewable energy[2] could be added to the grid.

IND05-04 A case in point is what is currently happening at PREPA's Costa Sur Plant in Guayanilla. Taking advantage of part of the unused sendout capacity of the EcoElectrica LNG import terminal, PREPA imported in 2013 fifteen LNG ships[3] while EcoElectrica only imported 12. The combined sendout capacity used was 66% of the available capacity.[4] Had the Costa Sur facility been as efficient as EcoElectrica, it could have produced 1.5 times more energy with the same amount of natural gas it burned, thereby greatly reducing CO2e emissions. The EcoElectrica LNG import terminal could handle 12 additional ships by using its remaining idle sendout capacity.

Of the available sendout capacity of the EcoElectrica LNG import terminal, only 30% is needed to power Ecoeletrica's 507MW combined cycle plant, and only 8% will be used by the permitted EcoElectrica new LNG truck[5] loading facility. The remaining sendout capacity could power 900MW of new combined cycle flex-fuels plants capable of generating 7,000,000 MWh of electricity or 51% of

reports CO2e metric tons not GHG. Why does the DRAFT EIS claim that the 18,540,844 tons in EPA's report are GHG mass and then convert it into 50,419,338 metric tons of CO2e when the EPA report number is already in tons of CO2e? The 12 reporting power plants accounted for 92% of all reported emissions. (EPA)

[2] In Puerto Rico every MWh of renewable energy avoids 800 kilograms of CO2e. EPA's nationwide estimate is 690 kilograms of CO2e per MWh. (EPA) Siemens *Renewable Energy Integration Study* concluded that "the mandated 12% penetration also can be achieved with two new combined cycle plants (2 x 334 MW) that can ramp very fast and are flexible with the capacity of cycling every day." (PREPA SIEMENS 2014)

[3] The Guayanilla terminal is permitted for 60 LNG vessels and 130 billion scf/year. In 2013, the average load per ship was 1.8 billion scf. The permitted sendout capacity of the EcoElectrica LNG import terminal is on average 356 MMscf/d (130,000MMscf/year divided by 365 days). The CICAAE report indicates that the daily MMscf send out rate at the LNG import terminal is 279 MMscf/d of which EcoEltrica uses from 82 to 93 MMscf per day, allowing for a terminal delivery of 186MMscf/d for Costa Sur. (FERC, PREPA, CICAAE Report)

[4] In 2013, EcoElectrica imported 26,341,701 Mscf, an average sendout rate of 72.1 MMscf/d, and Costa Sur imported 30,366,031 Mscf, an average sendout rate of 83.1 MMscf/d. (Office of Fossil Energy, DOE)

[5] FERC (CP13-516-000) recently approved EcoElectrica LNG truck loading terminal, which would be capable of loading twenty four (24) 12,000 gallon LNG trailers per day. The truck terminal can deliver 480 tons of LNG per day or 23.376 MMscf/d (50% of the Aguirre Offshore GasPort Project stated sendout rate). This is sufficient gas to run a 100MW modern combined cycle plant. (FERC)

IND05-03 Comment noted. The commentor suggests an analysis that is beyond the scope of this EIS.

IND05-04 The commentor points to the apparent efficiency of the EcoEléctrica Plant. The research conducted on alternatives notes the challenge of getting the natural gas from EcoEléctrica to the Aguirre Plant. Construction of a pipeline would be required, which has little support from the government of Puerto Rico or the general public, and it could not be installed in time to meet the EPA's mandatory Mercury and Air Toxics Standards and other Project objectives. A trucking alternative was researched and determined not to be viable due to the dense residential community roads that would need to be traversed and the number of trucks (times per day) to deliver the required volumes of natural gas.

IND05 – Victor Gonzalez (cont'd)

IND05-04 (cont'd) PREPA's current generation[6]. New combined cycle flex-fuels plants would emit less CO2e per MWh than even the EcoElectrica plant, Puerto Rico's lowest CO2e per MWh[7] facility.

IND05-05 With this in mind, the Aguirre Offshore GasPort Project cannot be considered a smart investment. The Project's dock will cost close to $400,000,000 once the cost of the Gas Pre-Heating System and the Gas Filtration and Metering System are added to the cost of the contract. Leasing a FSRU for 10 years will cost in excess of $600,000,000. A one-billion dollar investment will be needed. That same billion dollar could pay for six brand new 150 MW combined cycle plants capable of generating as much energy as the Aguirre Power Complex and Costa Sur Plants generated in 2013 and doing it more efficiently and with less negative impact on air quality.[8]

The combined reduction of CO2e from burning LNG on the new combined cycle plants, and the opportunity such plants provide to safely and economically integrate 1,000 MW of renewable energy, would eliminate 4,500,000 tons of CO2e emissions. This would be a greater benefit to the coral reefs at the *Boca Del Infierno* pass than any proposed mitigation.

PREPA can meet its MATS requirement by switching from its steam plants to its diesel plants while the new flex-fuel combined cycle plants are built; and by facilitating renewable energy projects.

Ultimately, the numbers speak for themselves. For the same investment as the Aguirre Offshore GasPort Project, Puerto Rico could get six modern flex fuel combined cycle plants utilizing the existing EcoElectrica LNG import terminal[9] infrastructure that would burn less fuel, pollute less, lower CO2e emissions, and yet produce more energy and more opportunity for Puerto Rico's booming renewable energy market.

If built, the Aguirre Offshore GasPort Project will be a missed opportunity to usher in truly efficient power plants, integrate more renewable energy to the grid, and reduce CO2e emissions. Once more it seems that we are embarking on an expensive and futile mismanagement of our energy and environmental needs.

Victor Gonzalez,
PO Box 363794
San Juan, PR 00936-3794
Vlgb2429@gmail.com

[6] In 2013, the combined generation of Costa Sur Steam, Aguirre Steam, and Aguirre Combined Cycle plants (2,312 MW of nameplate capacity) was 7,655,783 MWh. (PREPA)
[7] EcoElectrica emissions of CO2e per MWh generated were 490 kilograms, Aguirre's were 890 kilograms, AES's were 1,008 kilograms, and the average of all plants including EcoElectrica were 790 kilograms of CO2e per MWh generated. (EPA)
[8] Based on EcoElectrica emissions of 490 kilograms per MWh, new plants burning natural gas unloaded at the EcoElectrica LNG import terminal would generate less than 3,400,000 metric tons of CO2e. In 2012, the Aguirre Complex and Costa Sur combined CO2e emissions were 6,547,810 metric tons. New plants would also allow the safe integration of 1,000 MW of solar and wind facilities, bringing renewable energy generation to 2,000,000 MWh, or 15% of PREPA's current fossil fuel generation. The 2,000,000 MWh generated would avoid 1,580,000 metric tons of CO2e. (EPA)
[9] Currently the premium that PREPA has to pay for the gas imported via the EcoElectrica LNG import terminal makes the use of the idle capacity of that federally and locally permitted infrastructure more costly than need be. There are ways around that issue besides building the Aguirre Offshore GasPort Project.

IND05-05 Comment noted. While the analysis of the cost and effectiveness of the Project is appreciated, the facilities under the jurisdiction of PREPA, namely the Aguirre Power Complex, are not under the FERC's jurisdiction and are beyond the scope of this EIS.

IND05 – Victor Gonzalez (cont'd)

The attachments to this letter are too voluminous to include in this EIS. They are available for viewing on the FERC website at http://www.ferc.gov. Using the "eLibrary" link, select "General Search" from the eLibrary menu, enter the selected date range and "Docket No." excluding the last three digits (i.e., CP13-193), and follow the instructions. For assistance please contact FERC Online Support at FERCOnlineSupport@ferc.gov or toll free at 1-866-208-3676, or for TTY, contact 202-502-8659. The Category/Accession number for this submittal is 20140909-5021.

IND06 – Mithriel MacKay

20140910-5148 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/10/2014 2:38:09 PM

FERC issues draft Environmental Impact Statement on Aguirre Offshore GasPort, LLC's Aguirre Offshore GasPort Project (Docket No. CP13-193-000)
Issued August 7, 2014

IND06-01 The EIS for the off shore Gas Port proposed by "Aguirre Offshore GasPort, LLC (Aguirre LLC), a wholly owned subsidiary of Excelerate Energy, LP", has not included the most recent research and accounted for the gap in research necessary to make determinations regarding impact to marine mammals in the area of construction and future ship traffic. There are several errors to the EIS referring to marine mammals in the project area.

There is a limited amount of research that has been conducted off Puerto Rico to determine the abundance, movement, and habitat use in the waters surrounding Puerto Rico. This gap in knowledge leaves the potential for this construction to harm marine mammals, including endangered humpback whales (Megaptera novaeangliae). I have been conducting research on humpback whales beginning January 2011 and continuing each winter through April 2014 (and will continue annually during the winter occupation). My research includes collecting opportunistic data for marine fauna and citizen science in the form of photographs of whales, dolphins, manatee, and sea turtles. Here is a summary of my data (with publications forth coming within the next 12 months as part of PhD dissertation work and will be submitted to peer review journals);

1. Humpback whales are found seasonally and predictably in the waters surrounding Puerto Rico between (at a minimum) January 1 and May 1 each winter.
2. The waters around Puerto Rico are being used as a nursery area and for reproductive behaviors near shore and off shore.
3. IND06-02 There are preliminary indications the waters off the south coast are being used as a transect between the northern habitats and the Lesser Antilles each winter. Table 4.5.3-1, page 4-48 does not list humpback whales in the project area. This is incorrect and needs to be rectified. A survey of the project area is incomplete. The company conducted their single study when humpback whales completed their migration north, at the end of the season. There is not a single study that has been done in that area, aside from the sparse data I have collected off the south coast indicating that whales are using the near shore area. Citizen science indicates that several species of dolphin and whales are in the project area seasonally and year round.
4. Humpback whales competitive breeding groups are spotted in the waters off Puerto Rico each winter. It is unknown if this area is being repopulated as the species continues to recover from whaling or if the area serves another purpose.
5. IND06-03 Humpback whales singers are occupying the waters off Puerto Rico each winter. These are males seeking breeding opportunities. Using a bubble curtain may help to avoid masking vocalizations of marine mammals during construction and should be recommended as one inexpensive measure.
6. IND06-04 There are many species of marine mammals in the waters off Puerto Rico including killer whales, spotted dolphins, spinner dolphins, rough toothed dolphins, bottle nose dolphins, striped dolphins, Risso's dolphins, and sperm whales (MacKay 2010-2014 unpublished data). The abundance and habitat is unknown. Preliminary data suggests they are resident off the west and south coasts. Page 4-49 state that the dolphin species inhabiting similar waters to the project area are unlikely to be found is incorrect. Atlantic spotted dolphins, Risso's , spinners, and striped dolphins have been spotted by my team off the west coast frequently and off the south coast opportunistically. Killer whales are returning to the area off the

IND06-01 See response to comment AG02-24.

IND06-02 Table 4.5.3-1 lists the non-ESA-listed marine mammals potentially occurring in the Project area. The humpback whale is an ESA-listed species so it was not included in the non-ESA-listed species table. Rather, the humpback whale was included in table 4.6-1 (Threatened and Endangered Species Potentially Occurring in the Project Area).

IND06-03 See the response to comment AG05-04.

IND06-04 Section 4.5.3.1 has been updated to include the preliminary data summarizing the presence of these species near the Project area. Also see response to comment AG02-27.

IND06 – Mithriel MacKay (cont'd)

IND06-04 (cont'd) south coast for at least the past 4 seasons and local fishermen have been producing video and photos to document these events. It is imperative that surveys be conducted to determine the abundance and location of resident dolphins and the assumption that they are not in the project area be discarded in recognition of a paucity of data rather than supported by science. The citation available currently is "Mignucci 1998". This is the last publication assessing the data available at that time (and not collected by the author, rather collected previously by other projects) and is need of current information. My data will be published shortly, however; I am available to provide the information in the form of the filed local and federal reports or in direct contact with OES, NMFS, and other agencies with an interest in this project. Relying on a citation over 16 years old based on data older preceding the publication does not provide sufficient information to make an assessment of impact in the project area.

IND06-05 7. Short finned pilot whales are present in the waters off the west coast (MacKay 201-2014 unpublished data). It is unknown if they are present off the south coat. This gap in data needs to be corrected before impact can be assessed.

8. Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab led by Pat Halpin at Duke University is in the process of building cetacean density models for US waters in the Gulf of Mexico, western Atlantic, and Caribbean for the NOAA CetSound project and for the US Navy, which they will utilize in EIS preparation. (Please note that although the Navy is a funder of part of this project, the work is being conducted independently by us with the results being subject to peer review, just like any other research.) This group has contacted me and will be incorporating my data into models. This information is relevant to the construction of an LNG station off the south coast of Puerto Rico to determine the impact of cetaceans impacted by human activity.

Please refer to NMFS permit number 15682 and DRNA permit 2011-EPE-20 more detailed reports.

IND06-06 Table 4-1 of the EIS lists Humpback whales as "not likely to adversely affect" and I dispute this finding based on the information listed below. It is also important to note that dolphin species, including

IND06-07 seasonal (Killer whales) and resident dolphins (at least 5 known species) are not listed for consideration of impact in the summary in this document (Table 4-6-3 page 4-95 and page D32) and are resident in the proposed area for construction and activity. The impact to humpback whales should be "likely to be

IND06-06 (cont'd) adversely affected' and dolphins species as "unknown or likely to be adversely affected". The proposed off shore project is in the direct path of migrating, singing, and resting humpback whales (unpublished data, Mackay 2011-2014).

IND06-08 I am concerned as the construction and ship traffic has the potential to harass marine mammals in an area where the impact cannot be measured until research is funded and conducted to determine the potential for harm to several species. My research can support the need to mitigate the effects of a project of this magnitude. The first includes disrupting vocalizations of humpbacks singing to work out breeding dynamics. Whales are known to change their behavior in response to anthropogenic noise, including ship traffic. Secondly; Mothers with neonates will be traveling off shore in the area of this project and the potential to interrupt nursing or change the migration route may have significant effects on the population by increasing the risk of mortality or morbidity events.

IND06-09 The EIS states on page 4-92, "Impacts on protected marine mammals, sea turtles, and fish in the offshore environment resulting from operation of the Project are expected to be permanent but minor. These animals are highly mobile and would be able to avoid areas of noise that would cause them discomfort or harm." There are two problems with this statement. First, mothers with neonates migrating back to feeding grounds need to conserve energy and avoid predators. Changing the migration route to avoid noise requires expending more energy and has the potential to place them in areas where they are

IND06-05 The 2010–2015 Jobos Bay Management Plan was used as a resource for both the draft and final EISs and is referenced in section 4 as "(DNER, 2010)."

IND06-06 Based on our evaluation, we do not anticipate Project activities would likely adversely affect humpback whales. We will continue to conduct required Section 7 consultations related to impacts on all ESA species.

IND06-07 Section 4.5 discusses killer whales and resident dolphins. Table 4.6.3-1 only discusses ESA-listed species.

IND06-08 Sections 4.5.3.3 and 4.6.2 have been updated to include the potential impacts of increased vessel traffic on humpback whales and other marine mammals. Also see response to comment AG02-27.

IND06-09 Sections 4.5.3.3 and 4.6.2 have been updated to include potential noise impacts on humpback whales.

IND06 – Mithriel MacKay (cont'd)

20140910-5148 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/10/2014 2:38:09 PM

IND06-09 (cont'd) more vulnerable to killer whales. This change is migration route has the potential for high impact and harassment for these animals. Second; my preliminary data suggests humpback whale singers are selecting areas with very specific geographical features. Masking singing has the potential to disrupt breeding activity of whales, including the propagation of vocalizations important to humpback whale life history. Shipping traffic will place humpback whales on a collision course with large vessels. Mitigation, such as implementing measures to avoid ship strikes, is mentioned in the EIS as not being necessary, except for manatee. This is incorrect when the proximity to shore for humpback whales is taken under consideration.

IND06-10 Page 4-82 states, "No whales were observed during the marine mammal surveys conducted by Aguirre LLC for the Project (Tetra Tech, 2013d). However, the surveys only occurred in late April through early May, which is a limited window for observing these wide-ranging and highly mobile animals." Humpback whales are found off the south coast of Puerto Rico between January 1 and May 1 predictably, every winter. Peak season is roughly the middle of February to the middle of March, although this flexes between years. The window of observations excluded the peak period that whales are occupying these waters. The survey method was not mentioned in this report, but because the whales are highly mobile, aerial surveys are the only reliable means for an abundance estimate from the south coast of Puerto Rico. There is not a suitable viewing platform from land of a sufficient altitude to determine occupancy and abundance along the south coast of Puerto Rico (Mackay 2010-2014 unpublished data).

I strongly suggest, based on my research and the most current scientific publications, that the EIS include the following:

IND06-11
1. Abundance surveys of marine mammals in the area and determine the risk to local marine mammals must commence before permitting and construction. Baseline studies of marine mammals along the entire south, east, and west coasts year round, continuing after the project begins, and during operations in the future to determine the impact to local seasonal and year round marine mammals occupying the waters impacted by this project.

IND06-12
2. Placement of hydrophones mounted to the bottom along the west, south, and east coasts of Puerto Rico to determine the impact to humpback whale singers and marine mammals using sound to communicate and forage. In particular, to determine the potential for masking songs and vocalizations critical to whales and dolphins. The noise levels indicated on page 4-53 of the draft EIS are in range of marine mammal hearing and production, including dolphins and whales in the project area. The near shore ledge off Puerto Rico's south coast is consistent with the bathymetry related to males' vocalizations (singing) and may be critical habitat. A study needs to be conducted to determine if humpbacks are using this area for breeding behaviors related to singing.
3. Recommendation for mitigation guidelines, including protected species/marine mammal observers to assure operations follow a protocol in line with current practices to protect marine mammals when they enter an area surrounding the proposed project. This addresses a necessary correction to reflect that whales and dolphins will be impacted.
4. Recommendations that address the possibility of ship strikes of marine mammals, with particular emphasis on humpback whales. Page 4-91 states that the impact is expected to be low for whales, however, without any research to support this finding that assessment cannot be accurately determined. I am suggesting the impact is likely to be high as the distance from shore that humpback whales, especially mothers with neonates, occupy around Puerto Rico is consistent with the location of the project and the shipping traffic is set up to be on a collision course with whales (Mackay 2010-2014 unpublished data).
5. Recommendation that any construction be avoided during the winter between January 1 and April 30 when humpbacks are both in residence and migrating through the project area or until

IND06-10 Comment noted. We will continue to consult with NMFS to determine the appropriate mitigation for any impacts on marine mammal species.

IND06-11 Comment noted. We will continue to consult with NMFS to determine the appropriate mitigation for any impacts on marine mammal species.

IND06-12 We are recommending certain mitigation measures in section 4.5.3.3 to minimize the Project's impacts on marine mammals during construction and operation.

IND06 – Mithriel MacKay (cont'd)

20140910-5148 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/10/2014 2:38:09 PM

IND06-12 (cont'd) research can determine the route humpback whales are taking to the Lesser Antilles, areas where mothers are giving birth and neonates are resting/nursing, and the singers (males seeking breeding opportunities) are using this area.

IND06-13 6. Manatees are known to move to man-made structures off shore where warm water is a byproduct. The potential to become dependent on this resource has long term implications on the impact of the manatee in the area. Although there may appear to be an immediate benefit, warm water offal may lure manatee to areas with ship traffic. It appears that has been considered in the EIS. What has not been considered is the impact to endangered manatee if the project should be discontinued after creating a dependence on this resource for warm water. I suggest the EIS should consider the long term impact on manatee by requiring the warm water offal be dispersed in a manner that will make it unavailable to manatee and decrease the chance for dependency on man-made structures. Alternatively, if the warm water offal is discontinued, a plan should be incorporated to wean manatee or provide an alternative source.

IND06-14 7. The companies investing in the project should have an interest in ongoing marine mammal research as long as the plant is under construction and in operation. Funding for ongoing research should be mandated as part of the permitting process to assess the impact (or lack of) to marine mammal species in the project area and areas affected by the ship traffic and anthropogenic noise.

8. Construction should take place in the months when humpback whales are not using this near shore area to migrate to the Lesser Antilles, often with very small neonates. There are many measures that may be taken to avoid ship strikes when traffic begins, including very slow speeds, visual monitoring, and a coordinated communication network to warn vessel operators when marine mammals are in the area of ship traffic. Please refer to the Boston Harbor right whale mitigation efforts for a positive role model for addressing ship traffic.

It is important to note that stating there will not be an impact to marine mammals because we do not of marine mammals in the area is not sufficient for an EIS. This statement can only be valuable when there are systematic, scientific data to support that conclusion. A precedent for stating that marine mammals are not impacted where there were no studies can be found by looking to the area off Southern California where the US Navy is conducting exercises. Naval exercises preceding knowledge of the impact to marine mammals resulted in the death of bottlenose dolphins and may have changed the behaviors of other marine mammals (lawsuits filed in 2005 and 2206, and recently in 2014). A determination was made that there is a need for scientific studies to be conducted (and now underway) to determine if marine mammals were at risk in the area. The result of those studies indicate that there are many species of marine mammals in the area off Southern California where the Navy assumed no marine mammals would be at risk, simply because "nobody looked". The laws, regulations, and guidelines set forth by the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act must be considered for this proposed project. This LNG project appears to be approaching a similar determination in a similar manner.

If I can be of further assistance in providing information, including a summary of data, please contact me at Mithriel@Marine-Eco.org.

Mithriel MacKay PhD Candidate
Marine Mammal Behavioral Ecology Group (Dr. Bernd Würsig Lab)
Texas A&M University at Galveston

and

IND06-13 Section 4.6 has been revised to reflect Aguirre LLC's currently proposed action. As noted in section 4.6, the FERC will submit a BA to the FWS and NMFS outlining impacts on the Antillean manatee and all other ESA-listed species once the final pipeline design or route is determined.

IND06-14 Comment noted. Aguirre LLC will consult with NMFS to determine the need for appropriate surveys or mitigation related to potential Project impacts on marine mammal species.

IND06 – Mithriel MacKay (cont'd)

20140910-5148 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/10/2014 2:38:09 PM

Director of Research and Education
Marine and Coastal Ecology Research Center
Pipe Creek, Texas and (Field Station) San German, Puerto Rico, USA

IND07 – Alfredo Mendez

20140923-5009(29797029).txt

IND07-01 Alfredo Mendez, San Juan Puerto Rico, PR.
I am 1 of the owners of a part of Cayos de Barca we see a platform to close from my Island and also we need to understand the project and how will be affected

IND07-02 Also corales marine life plus Mangrows affected Quality of the water

IND07-03 Also warnings and safe ecosistema

IND07-04 How we can talk about the project and with who before this is approved

Page 1

IND07-01 Comment noted. We conducted further research to determine the accuracy of the landowner information for the cays. As needed, these landowners were added to our environmental mailing list.

IND07-02 Section 4.0 of the EIS addresses potential water quality changes as a result of the Project and reviews how these changes may affect corals and other marine life, including mangroves.

IND07-03 Comment noted.

IND07-04 Submitting comments on the record is an effective form of communicating with the Commission about this Project.

IND08 – Jacqueline Rosado

Comment_Jacqueline Rosado_Individual_General Opposition_092214.txt

Jacqueline Rosado, Ocean park, PR.
https://ferconline.ferc.gov/QuickComment.aspx

RE: Aguirre Offshore Gasport
IND08-01 How could this project even be recommended? There is serious erosion happening in Puerto Rico. We need alternative clean energy put into place on this island. The impact this project would have on the environment is serious. Have we not learned anything? I am just in awe at the stupidity, negligence, and uncaring for the world that the brainchild of this project possesses!
No! This project should not move forward!
Thank you,
Jacqueline Rosado

IND08-01 Comment noted. Section 3.2 of the EIS was updated to evaluate alternative energy sources (e.g., solar, wind); however, these alternatives were eliminated from further evaluation because they could not meet the objectives of the Project.

IND09 – Noelle Mendez

20140924-5069(29802339).txt

Noelle Mendez, Guaynabo, PR.
Government

FERC issues draft Environmental Impact Statement on Aguirre Offshore GasPort, LLC's Aguirre Offshore GasPort Project (Docket No. CP13-193-000)
Issued August 7, 2014

IND09-01 I am the owner of part of the Cayos De Barca Island and I would like to know the Impact in the area for this Project. As a private citizen, owner of three Cayos La Barca Cay I have never been informed nor contacted about this project. I found out by the press.

Where can I call or ask more information. I do not have the expertise to interpret the information you provide. Also, the time to look for advice is to short, since we found out by the press.
This is a very important place for me and my family.
Thanks, Noelle Mendez

IND09-01 Aguirre LLC has held multiple community informational meetings ("open houses") for the Project, and the FERC has held multiple scoping and public comment meetings. Newspaper ads and local flyers were posted to inform people about the Project, and periodic postcards or newsletters (brochures) have been sent by the FERC to the communities and its leaders during this review period. In addition, federal and state agencies have been engaged in Project review and comment since 2012. Also see the responses to comments IND07-01 and IND07-04.

IND10 – Walter M. Ruiz

WALTER M. RUIZ, mayaguez, PR.
WALTER M RUIZ, Ph. D
CONSULTING ENGINEER

Tel.787-612-1938
email:wmrgroup@yahoo.com

Suite 206, Condominio Profesional
72 W. Mendez Vigo St, Box 3213
Mayagüez, P.R. 00680

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE. Room 1A
Washington, DC, 20426

Re: Aguirre Offshore Gasport Project
Project Docket Number CP13-193-000

Dear Mrs. Bose:

We have revised your draft Environmental Impact Statement published for the referenced project and would like to make the following comments:

IND10-01 1- During the last three years we have reviewed all correspondence generated by FERC and Aguirre Offshore Gasport, LLC (Aguirre LLC) during the development of this document and can attest to the thoroughness of the evaluation, analysis and extensive state of the art technologies and design criteria that have been implemented in the development of this project. We recognize the environmentally sensitive issues associated with the project. All environmental issues are being addressed during the development stages, and must be complied with, both during the construction and operation of the facilities.

2- You conclude that construction and operation of the Project would result in limited adverse environmental impact that would mostly occur during the construction.

3- You have also concluded that approval of the Project would have moderate adverse environmental impact, but these impacts would be reduced to less-than significant levels if mitigation measures are implemented. You have specified 65 mitigation measures that Aguirre LLC should implement to further reduce the environmental impact that would otherwise result from the construction and operation of the Project, and have recommended that these mitigation measures be attached as condition to any authorization issued by the Commission.

Having address all environmental issues brought forward during the development of the EIS, and once compliance with all regulatory requirements are met we strongly request that FERC exercise all its resources to expedite the issuance of the corresponding approval and construction permit in order for Aguirre LLC be able to start and complete the construction and initial operation of these facilities in the shortest possible time.

The operation of Aguirre LLC represents, in the short term, the only alternative available to the people of Puerto Rico, that can produce some reduction in our energy cost, by operating Aguirre Plant with natural gas. At the same time, the use of natural gas will allow the Aguirre Plant to meet the requirements of the EPA's Mercury and Air Toxic standard rule

For Puerto Rico time is of an essence. Oil prices continue to represent a Sword of Democles on our throat. Any spike in oil costs caused by the political unrest in the middle east would send our energy costs by the roof. Puerto Rico is in the middle of an economic depression caused to a great extent by high energy cost caused by our high dependency on

IND10-01 Comment noted.

IND10 – Walter M. Ruiz (cont'd)

oil for energy generation. Average energy costs ranging $0.27/kwh during the last four years have crippled our economy. Business and industries are continuously closing, thirty to forty thousand residents are immigrating to the mainland, looking for better living condition each year, Living condition are deteriorating daily, resources are not available to satisfy public service facilities. Government is essentially bankrupt, continuously increasing taxes on the people and remaining businesses. All this destruction has been caused to a grate extent by the high costs of energy in the island. Cumulative co-lateral damage is essentially irreversible. A loose, loose proposition.
The operation of the Aguirre Offshore facilities represents a light at the end of the tunnel, for the economy of PR. Not only will it bring about a partial reduction in the energy cost with the use of natural gas in the Aguirre Plant (2 to 3 cents/KWH), but it will provide PREPA with the necessary storage and re-gasification facilities needed to complete the conversion of all PREPA facilities to natural gas. The infrastructure necessary to convey the NG from Aguirre to the north coast plants would be the remaining piece of the puzzle to achieve not only this goal, but to bring into compliance North Coast plants with the requirements of the EPA's Mercury and Air Toxic standard rule
The present or next government in the island must urgently address this issue in the near future. Only then, will Puerto Rico be able to keep up with the rest of the world, achieve energy cost competitiveness worldwide, (EC<$0.15/kwh), that will allow us to retain and create new jobs, industries and business, jump start our economy, that will lead us in the reconstruction of our devastated economy.

Expediting the approval of this critical project is in the best interest of all concerned.

Respectfully Submitted

Walter M. Ruiz Ph. D.

IND11 – Fernando Gomez

20140929-5199 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/29/2014 1:34:16 PM

Fernando Gomez, Dorado, PR.
Included are comments on the above reference for your consideration:

Section 4.9.1 Archival Research

IND11-01 No mention (or references are included) of baseline studies in this area which were conducted prior to construction of the Aguirre Central (PREPA Thermoelectric Plant) during the 1960s - early 70s which could be of value.

I remember seeing sections of an environmental study conducted as part of the requirements when the Aguirre thermoelectric plant was being constructed in the early 1970s. One of the findings was that an anomalous concentration of mercury was found in bottom sediments near the cays (near Cayos de Barca ?) and upon further investigation remnants of a shipwreck from the colonial period were found. Among the debris were lead flasks possibly used to transport mercury. This was brought to my attention by a colleague at the time because I was involved in a study at Guayanilla Bay and baseline concentrations of mercury also seemed to be high.

IND11-02 Section 3.5 Major Pipeline Route Alternatives
Subsection Pipeline Installation Methods

Page 3-20

It states that "On June 23, 2014 PHMSA determined that the pipeline would be an interstate pipeline facility regulated by PHMSA under 49CFR192". This would require burial of the pipeline. Aguirre LLC has stated it intends to file a variance request for depth of burial --- in order to proceed with plans of installing the pipeline above the seabed. It is also stated that ". DOT regulations state a subsea pipeline will have a minimum of 3 ft (1 m) cover" and that to achieve 3 ft cover the trench depth would be 5 ft and a top of trench width of 40 ft (12 m) based on 3:1 side-slopes".

If pipeline burial is required, more detailed studies would be necessary to determine the possible impact of trenching the seabed on the underlying fresh - saline ground water which has been inferred in USGS studies to extend beneath Jobos Bay and some distance offshore from the major part of the Jobos Bay National Esturarine Research Reserve (JBNERR). Trenching could result in "dewatering" the aquifer by reducing the thickness of confining sediment deposits or by completely breaching the confining beds. This would exacerbate the effects of groundwater withdrawals inland of the JBNERR.

IND11-03 USGS publications which should be considered and not listed in the References are:

IND11-01 See section 4.2 for a discussion on existing contaminants in Jobos Bay. In 2008, NOAA collected samples and conducted a baseline assessment of the ecological resources of Jobos Bay (Whitall, et al.), the results of which are included in multiple locations of the EIS.

IND11-02 Aguirre LLC revised its pipeline installation method and design to comply with U.S. Department of Transportation pipeline regulations. As such, we have updated our analysis to include the sedimentation impacts associated with the proposed burial method of hand jetting.

IND11-03 See response to comment IND03-01.

IND11 – Fernando Gomez (cont'd)

20140929-5199 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/29/2014 1:34:16 PM

IND11-03 (cont'd) Bennett, G.D., 1976, Electrical analog simulation of the aquifers along the south coast of Puerto Rico:USGS Open File Rept 76-4 and , Kuniansky, E.L. and,

Rodriguez, J.M., 2010, Effects of changes in irrigation practices and aquifer development on groundwater discharge to the JBNERR near Salinas, Puerto Rico: USGS Scientific Inv. Rept 2010-5022.

IND11-04 Section 4.3.3 Ground Water Resources
4.3.1 Regional Characteristics

This section is relatively vague. The Jobos Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve (JBNERR) lies within the area and it's uniqueness should be discussed in more detail. Among these, is the importance of groundwater flow within the JBNERR to sustain the inshore and offshore habitats.

IND11-04 Section 4.3.3.1 was updated to include additional discussion of regional groundwater characteristics.

IND12 – Miriam Gallardo

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

AGUIRRE OFFSHORE GASPORT PROJECT (DOCKET NO. CP13-193-000)

Comments can be: (1) left with a FERC representative; (2) mailed to the addresses below or (3) electronically filed[1].

Please send two copies referenced to Docket No. CP13-193-000 to the addresses below.

For Official Filing (send 1 **copies**):	Another copy (send **1 copy**):
Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 888 First Street, NE, Room 1A Washington, DC 20426	Gas Branch 4, PJ-11.3 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission 888 First Street , NE Washington, DC 20426

COMMENTS: (PLEASE PRINT) [*attach an additional sheet if necessary*]

IND12-01 I object the proposed Aguirre offshore GasPort Project because this area is where we have the biggest amount of manatees in Puerto Rico. Around 500 manatees travel in this area daily. this number was provided by the Jobos Bay Reserve this past Sunday, Sept. 7 2014 on the celebration of the Manatee Day. How are you going to deal with this amount of manatees everyday? What about the gas tube? Are they going to jump over it? What's going to happen to them? They are unique and should be protected, not destroyed

Commentor's Name and Mailing Address (***Please Print***)

Miriam Gallardo
urb. San Antonio
Calle G #163
Arroyo, Puerto Rico 00714
gallardo.miriam@yahoo.com

[1] **The Commission encourages electronic filing of comments.** See 18 Code of Federal Regulations 385.2001(a)(1)(iii) and the instructions on the Commission's Internet website at http://www.ferc.gov under the link to "Documents and Filings" and "eFiling." eFiling is a file attachment process and requires that you prepare your submission in the same manner as you would if filing on paper, and save it to a file on your hard drive. New eFiling users must first create an account by clicking on "Sign up" or "eRegister." You will be asked to select the type of filing you are making. This filing is considered a "Comment on Filing." In addition, there is a "Quick Comment" option available, which is an easy method for interested persons to submit text only comments on a project. The Quick-Comment User Guide can be viewed at http://www.ferc.gov/docs-filing/efiling/quick-comment-guide.pdf. Quick Comment does not require a FERC eRegistration account; however, you will be asked to provide a valid email address. All comments submitted under either eFiling or the Quick Comment option are placed in the public record for the specified docket or project number(s).

IND12-01 Section 4.6 contains information regarding the presence of manatees and mitigation methods that would be employed to minimize risk to the species. See also the responses to comments AG02-27 and AG05-04.

PUBLIC MEETINGS

PM01 – Public Meeting in Guayama, Puerto Rico

****

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE

PROPOSED AGUIRRE OFFSHORE GASPORT PROJECT

PUBLIC MEETING,

****

held on Tuesday, September 9th, 2014, at the Club de

Leones Conference Center, Avenida los Veteranos,

Guayama, Puerto Rico, starting at 4:20 p.m.

IN GUAYAMA, PUERTO RICO

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9TH, 2014

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

MS. JOHNSON: Good evening, everyone. So sorry for the delay. It's about 4:20. We are going to start in about a minute. We have translating service for anyone who needs translation from English to Spanish or Spanish to English. We also have a court reporting service. This is a joint public hearing between the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Oficina de Gerencia de Permisos. So on behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Puerto Rico Oficina de Gerencia de Permisos, I would like to welcome you all to this meeting tonight. Let the record show that the public comments meeting for the Aguirre Offshore Gasport Project began at 4:19, on September 9th, 2014. Just a couple of room announcements: Apparently the water is not running in the building right now so the restrooms are closed for the moment. And if everyone can kind of lower or turn off your cell phones so we can all hear the speakers, that would be most appreciated.

My name is Gertrude Johnson. I am an environmental project manager with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC. At the table with me tonight is Andrya Torres Pérez, who is a chemical engineer with the Pipeline Certificates Division at FERC. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, U.S. Coast Guard, the Puerto Rico Office of Permits Management, the Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board, the Puerto Rico Planning Board, the Puerto Rico Department of Natural and Environmental Resources, the Puerto Rico Department of Health cooperated in the preparation of this document, and I would like to thank them for their continued assistance with the environmental impact statement, or EIS review process.

Jared Brandell, Elizabeth Dolezal and Steve Holden are at this sign-in table in the back of the room. They are with NRG, LLC, and third-party contractors to FERC, assisting in preparing the EIS for the proposed action. Daniel Laffoon, who is not here yet, is also an environmental project manager with FERC, and he should be here soon as well. Here is the Puerto Rico Oficina de Gerencia de Permisos represented by.

MS. ROSAS: Loyda Rosas Negron.

MS. JOHNSON: And they will begin their Reading of the notes of intent and begin the public hearing for their process.

MR. RIVERA: Can you hear me now? Good afternoon to everyone here, from the Office of Management and Permits, and welcome to the hearing in relation to case 2014-287982-REA-461. In the provisions, we are going to read the public notice, which is in Spanish, and it reads as follows: "Public investigative hearing notice of the environmental document for the Aguirre Offshore Gasport Project. The Office of Management and Permits publishes the following notice on the public hearing pursuant to Article 4(b)3 of Law 4.16 from September 22nd, 2004, as amended, also known as Law About Environmental Public Policy, along with Law 161 from December 1, 2009, as amended, known as the Law for Reforming the Permit Process of Puerto Rico, and according to Rule 123 in the Regulations Evaluation and Processing of Environmental documents of the Environmental Quality Board, here on forward known as RETDA. The Permits Office invites neighbors, general public and government entities to attend the public hearing and participate in it, for the purpose of submitting its comments or information which can be considered for the evaluation of the environmental document prepared for the construction of an offshore terminal for liquid natural gas.

The project: Towards the southern part of Aguirre in the Municipality of Salinas. The project is proposed with the idea of receiving liquid gas for generating cleaner power in Aguirre, in the Municipality of Salinas. The public hearing requested by OGPe will be held on September 9, 2014, at 4:00 in the afternoon, at Club de Leones, Veteranos Avenue, Guayama, 787-864-1925; and the date September 10, 2014, at 4:00 in the afternoon, at the Salinas Marina, PR771, La Playa Ward, Salinas, Puerto Rico, 787-824-3185. Also, it's going to be held September , 2014, at 5:00 in the afternoon, in Aguirre Clubhouse, Road 705, Kilometer 3, Aguirre, Puerto Rico, telephone number 787-853-4052. The purpose of the public hearing is to research, investigate and gather information that can result useful in determining how the environmental impact statement is adequate for the proposed project, which is pursuant, but not limited to, the following rules of RETDA: Chapter 4 Rule 112, Chapter 6, 115 and Chapter Rule 133, and the other provisions of RETDA or applicable law. We invite neighbors of the project, landowners within the jurisdiction, government agencies and the general public to attend and participate in said meetings. It's obligatory that the proponent of the project and the landowner assist to the public hearing. If not, the request will be dismissed. We announce that the parties may appear with legal counsel, but are not obligated to do so, including corporations and partnerships.

The examining officer presiding the hearing cannot cancel it once scheduled, unless it is requested in writing, with no less than five days prior to holding this hearing, stating the reasons for suspending it or postponing it, together with a money order or manager's check for 50 dollars in name of the Secretary of the Department of Treasury. The request for suspension should be done before OGPe. The petitioner shall notify the intervening parties within the five days stated, and the suspension is not motivated for non-compliance of a legal requirement, the petitioner will pay the cost for the suspension and inform it through a press announcement, and copy of said document will be available in the webpage of the OGPe and the Electric Power Authority, and also there will be a hard copy at the local city hall of the Municipality of Salinas, in the Municipality of Guayama. The announcement was signed in San Juan, Puerto Rico, today, August 8, 2014, signed by Architect Alberto Lastra Power, OGPe's executive director. The examining panel for OGPe will be myself, Attorney Felix Rivera; and Attorney Loyda Rosas.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. For those who need translating services, we have an interpreter tonight for Spanish translation, who also has headphones that one can wear for translation. If you need the headphones, they are over with the translating service.

(Whereupon, Ms. Torres makes the same announcement in Spanish.)

MS. JOHNSON: On August 7th, 2014, we mailed about 350 CD copies of the draft Environmental Impact Statement in English and Spanish, and almost 200 hard copies of the draft Environmental Impact Statement in English and Spanish to those individuals in our environmental mailing list, government agencies, local libraries and newspapers. If you did not receive a copy of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, then you are not on our mailing list. Please provide us with your address at the table in the back of the room, after the meeting.

This is a project being proposed by Excelarate Energy, LP or Aguirre Offshore Gasport, LLC, in cooperation with the Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority. Aguirre, LLC filed this application under Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, to construct facilities, develop and operate an offshore birthing platform, an offshore liquefied natural gas import terminal or offshore gasport, and a subsea pipeline about 4.1 mile, or 6.6 kilometers in length, connecting the offshore terminal to PREPA's Aguirre Power Generation Complex in Salinas, Puerto Rico.

The purpose of this meeting is to get your comments on this draft Environmental Impact Statement. We are in the midst of a 45-comment period on the draft EIS. The comment period ends on September 29, 2014. All comments that we receive within the comment period will be addressed in the final Environmental Impact Statement.

We have a speaker sign-up sheet at the back of the room, and I will call individuals up to speak one at a time. After those people have had their opportunity to comment, I will ask if anyone else would like to speak. We take your environmental comments very seriously. We give equal weight to your comments whether you decide to speak tonight, mail your comments in or submit them electronically to our FERC website, as we revise the draft EIS. Also, at the back of the table there are sheets that you can use to write your comments if you would not like to speak tonight, or mail your comments in, or submit them electronically. You can write out your comments tonight and provide them to us as comments on the draft EIS. Specific instructions on how to file written or electronic comments are contained in the first couple pages of the draft EIS. If you have any questions about that you can ask me after the meeting. I'll be glad to help you the best I can. The more specific the comments we receive from you, the better we can address your concerns. General comments such as, "I do not like the project," are not as helpful as specific comments. Our job over the next couple of months is to revise our environmental analysis based on the types of comments that we receive.

If you received a copy of the draft EIS, you automatically receive a copy of the final. You do not need to sign up again on our mailing list. Once we finish the final EIS and mail it out, we will forward that on to the five presidentially appointed commissioners at the FERC. The commissioners will consider our environmental analysis, along with non-environmental issues, such as engineering, markets and rates, in order to determine whether or not to authorize the project. Thus, the EIS itself is just one tool in the process. It is not the decision-making document. Like I said, this is your chance to make your comments on the draft EIS tonight. You will notice that the meeting is being transcribed by a court reporting service on my left, your right, to make sure that all of the information gathered here tonight is on the public record. To ensure your comments are addressed in the final EIS, please come to the podium that's at the center of the room, speak into the microphone, state and spell your name, as well as any agency or group that you are representing; that way your comments will be accurate for the record. If you have questions about the environmental review process, I can answer those. If you have very specific questions on the facilities proposed by Excelerate, Aguirre, LLC or PREPA's facilities here tonight, they can discuss these questions with you after their presentation or after the meeting.

Do we have a speaker's list? Anyone signed up to speak tonight?

MR. RIVERA: As part of the proceedings of OGPe, the regular procedure is as follows. We are going to make the presentation. Since this is in Puerto Rico it's going to be done in Spanish. Once that is done, we open the forum so that everybody present can make their comments. Also, you can submit those in writing to the permits office so that they can take those into consideration for the environmental consideration.

We are going to be opening a small forum at this time in case anybody wants to express something before PREPA's presentation starts. This is just a short period of time we are providing, so that anybody who can't wait until the complete presentation by PREPA is done, then you can do so now. We want to clarify that PREPA's presentation will be somewhat long. So, again, the proceedings will be recorded. And, I repeat, does anybody want to express themselves before PREPA begins its presentation?

Having been no show of hands, we will pass the microphone to FERC.

MS. JOHNSON: We'll let PREPA make their presentation now. We'll allow them to make their presentation in full, and then, if there are questions, we can ask them at the end of their presentation.

MS. SANCHEZ: Good afternoon. My name is Ivelisse Sanchez. I work at the office of the director of the Environmental Protection Office of PREPA. I'm going to proceed to now read our presentation. This is the presentation for the offshore port of Aguirre. The legal basis was already read by the examiners, so we can continue forward. Also, the cooperating agencies were mentioned by FERC. And today's agenda is an introduction that includes the background of the project, the purpose and need for the project, a description of the project, an analysis of the various alternatives and a description of the environment and potential impacts and possible mitigation measures. This is the background of what the process has been

to arrive where we are now. On December 29, 2011, was the pre-application with FERC. On January 1st, 2012, the approval from FERC was received. On February 28, FERC notified its intention to prepare the EIS and hold meetings that include both agencies and the general public. On April 17, 2013, the application was filed with FERC to develop and construct and operate port under the National Gas Act.

The purpose of this project is to provide the storage capacity and constant delivery of natural gas, plus conversion of Aguirre units, so that these units have the capacity to use two fuels. Diesel and natural gas at Ciclo, and at the thermo electric plant it is Bunker C and natural gas; but the intention being to maximize the use of natural gas. Storage capacity of the project is of 150,000 cubic meters, and the pumping capacity will be up to 500 million standard cubic feet per day. The need for this project basically is to comply with the standard requirements of air toxics and mercury, known as MAT, which is pursuant to recent EPA regulations. To contribute in the stabilizing of prices, contribute to the diversification of energy sources and reduce the use of fuel. It has other marginal benefits, such as reducing the traffic of fuel barges in the Jobos Bay, and this reduces the potential spills of fuel and also any impact on the endangered species in the bay, and minimizes potential accidents with recreational crafts. This is a brief description of the project. The proposed project consists of the construction and operation of a liquefied natural gas offshore port and subsea piping. Here we have an illustration of the location of the platform or offshore port. And this line that we see here is the proposed line that will connect from the platform to the Aguirre power plant. Here are the details. It is located about 3000 miles from the southern coast of Puerto Rico. The diameter of the pipe is about 18 inches, and it has a concrete cover that increases the diameter to a total of 24 inches, and the longitude or length of the pipe is 4.1 miles. This is a description of the sketch of the platform or of the offshore port. And the ship you see here, which is the one that is marked to the north, the one that is facing the power plant more, is the ship that is known as the FSIU: floating storage and re-gasification unit or the floating unit for storage and re-gasification. And will be here pretty much permanently. And this is where the gas would come from, through the pipe to the power plant. And this is the liquefied gas transporter that comes as necessary to reload. And here is the analysis of the alternatives; and this is to show how we arrived at this proposed project. The criteria used in analyzing the alternatives had to be technically and economically feasible project, as well as practical. It had to comply with the objectives of the project, which we already mentioned.

The alternative of no-action, which by regulation has to be considered, has the following impacts: The proposed facilities would not be built under this no-action alternative. No additional impacts would be produced, other than the ones that already exist. In terms of the environment, the objectives of the project would not be fulfilled. It would eliminate this possibility of having a new natural gas source, and Aguirre would continue to burn fuel from oil. We would not decrease the issue of environmental contaminants and Aguirre would not comply with the MAT standards. In addition, the exposition to the neighboring communities will be exposed to the contaminants, and this would require a weekly delivery of fuels by barges within the Jobos way, which is what is being done up to now. And other alternatives, among those, another system. For example, at EcoElectrica, to build new facilities, re-gasification facilities, with the capacity to store liquefied natural gas to connect up to Aguirre, which would add another 30 acres of impact. You would have to try to avoid as much as we can, the neighboring which is complex. The installation of underground piping, which would require additional construction, and the impact would be greater than that of the proposed project. Also, we had considered other projects, piping, like the southern pipeline in 2008 and Via Verde in 2009, which were dismissed. Another alternative would be the installation, construction and operation of a land port. And two different lots were considered on land, and also two piers on the coast. These were industrial facilities. And we considered the Chevron Phillips premises and the AS Puerto Rico facilities, which is a plant that produces energy by burning coal. Here (indicating to slides) we have the lots that were evaluated. This is the Chevron Phillips facilities and the AES facilities. One of the lots that we evaluated could have been considered or was considered, land facilities in both of these facilities, and piers here that are on the coast. Other land facilities that were considered, which is what is shown on the next slide -- I already mentioned this -- would be another land facility, but this time at the Aguirre plant. Could you go back to the map, please? That would be a facility on land, but this facility --

go forward again -- would require 31 "cuerdas" which did not exist next to the power plant. For the barge to be able to arrive empty, a facility with deep water access, and, also, another disadvantage is that it would be close to a neighborhood and would require of the construction of a wharf up here. The land facility for the construction of piers does not offer an additional impact in comparison with the proposed project. Another alternative -- And this is considering an offshore port. What we are going to look at now is which were the potential locations where this could be placed. The ones we evaluated ended up with the turned over piping, to Aguirre. They all have the required depth and the length, and the distance from communities vary depending on the location of the site. The construction techniques that were considered is the direct installation versus the opening of channels. And all the alternatives in Boca del Infierno would have great environmental impacts or similar impacts in comparison with the other locations of the offshore port and its piping. On this illustration we can see the four different places, which are these small orange squares. These were the four that were originally considered, and these would be their corresponding routes of the piping that was considered. Initially, we selected site one, which is this one here (indicating), but when the geotechnical studies of the sea floor were made, then we had to decide to move it to a closer area. And we selected this area because of the geotechnical conditions of that sea floor. And here (indicating), what we have is that the project has proposed -- which is equivalent to this also considering alternative routes that were studied because of petitions made from these agencies. The studies are made of all those routes, and the "bentonic" studies also, to compare them. On this table, which we won't read in its entirety, but what it does is it compares the four proposed sides; it describes its length, the depth of the area, the sea resources that there are at each site, the distance to the different communities in the four points, and the condition of the sea floor. Next.

Once this site was selected as the proper location for the platform, we also studied various alternatives for the rooting of the pipes; and compared in terms of the number of terms in the pipes, which is more of an operational and technical aspect, the altering of sea vegetation and coral. None provided an environmental advantage over the other that would be of any significance. So the favorite or preferred alternative with the location of the platform and the root of the piping, as we have mentioned, three miles from the coast to this point (indicating), with a longitude or length of piping of 4.1 miles to the north, through Boca de Infierno and Jobos Bay, all the way to the Aguirre plant. What we have here is the surface area of the project detailed in the various components of the project, at the operational moment as well as during the construction phase to give us the total impact of soil in the area that will be impacted. Here (indicating) is the proposed construction program schedule for the platform. It will entail nine months installation of surface. Eight months under sea piping, for a total duration of 12 months. Now we are going to talk about the environment and potential impact. The measures to avoid or minimize impacts, several were taken, first to prevent, second to minimize impact, and then we will look at impacts that cannot be avoided or minimized. And then what is done is you mitigate or compensate, make up for. Two criteria or parameters considered. We considered the alternatives for the selection of the location of the platform and the piping, as we saw before. We selected a reasonably shorter route between the terminal and Aguirre plant, avoiding mangrove areas and sensitive habitats. Avoiding having to cross the navigation channel already in existence, any cable work also, of PREPA, and the project within PREPA premises on land to avoid private properties. And the measures to minimize or avoid impact, continuing on that topic. Construction methods. As I mentioned, we have already discussed somewhat.

We selected the method of having to install the pipes so that the environmental impact would be less. It's divided into three construction areas, and it leaves a lesser print. It would float above the coral area, and it would later submerge by its own weight to install it in its place. It has less impact than digging trenches, since the digging of trenches could create excessive turbidity due to the displacement of sediment. And the less impact that the directional excavation that could create a situation of excessive sludge and fragments in the bay. Now we are going to see the natural measures and what would be the possible impact and mitigation. In terms of natural resources, we'll have a minimum impact. The risks affecting the operation could be a seismic movement and liquefaction and tsunamis and effects of waves. All this has been considered in the design. Well, this is the way that you mitigate it, considering all the possibilities within

the design, so that the sign incorporates these risks. When it's designed you obtain a project that has the capacity of resisting it. And FERC already provided, in their engineering phase, detailed actualizations of the waves in the sea, such as the FERC recommends in the EIS draft, and also the structure designs of the columns and the specifications, used together with the acquisition of equipment, and the quality control measures that we used for the construction. The final design should be analyzed and approved by FERC. And inspectors should be there, once in the construction phase, to observe that process and present inspection reports. Another resource that could have impact could be sediments and swells -- in soils and sediments. The impact during construction, it could be the very re-suspension of sediments of the sea bed, which, what will be, is that the sides will be lifted with the same movement of the water. They could impact an area that's very extensive surrounding it. A sediment transport model will be made to decide the risk and impact, to determine that. In the column area there's going to be a study, since there will be more construction and that will be up to 100 feet. And the pipes will be up to some ten feet. So the mitigation would be, the sediment transport model will be made to confirm that there will not be suspended in the columns, and then ten feet from the pipes. According to the results of this model, then the mitigation models will be designed if they are necessary.

Another resource that could be impacted would be the hydrology resources. That's water, right? So one of the possible impacts is the generating sediments and possible re-suspension in the water columns, and we already saw that in the past slide. Another impact to the water resources would be that, once constructed, a hydrostatic test has to be done to see that everything has been welded correctly and safe. That will be done all throughout the length of the pipes. Some 0,000 gallons of seawater. And they consult with the National Fish and Wildlife Service to prevent any accidental taking of organisms. After the hydrostatic test will be done -- it's just that you pressurize it -- there's going to be discharge through a six foot diffuser underneath the surface. The water does not come in contact with chemical substances during this process. Another possible impact to the hydrology resources is of leaks and spills, such as fuel and lubricants in the platform areas and the FSRU. This can happen, again, through the construction, also during the operation. The construction contractor and port operators are obligated to comply with the laws and regulations, which include having a prevention controlled plan for leaks during the operation and construction of the project before beginning with the construction, and one for the installations once the operation has begun. To see the impact on several resources, "bentonic" studies were done, which are -- these are the ones that talk about the quality -- right? -- of the life on that sea bed. So we proceed with the preparation of maps of reefs that are in risk of being extinct, and also alternative routes. We saw that previously. Regarding the floor resources, the possible impact of the project, it takes into consideration that 30 percent of the bay is covered by seaweeds and the other 20 percent is microalgae. So in terms of mitigation, we developed a mitigation and overseeing plan for this life-form according with other agencies, and FERC required a draft with the comments of the related agencies before concluding the period for the comments of the draft EIS.

Continuing with the wildlife resources, the construction of the pipeline and the offshore terminal can have some impacts in the habitats on sea life. So here you have quantified what the impact would be temporarily and the permanent impact in terms of area, of microalgae, coral reefs or of habitat of bland sea bed. So the possible impacts for short-term habitat is for manatees, sea turtles, reef fish, sharks, corals and invertebrates. The possible impact for the hydrostatic test, we already saw. There is going to be water that is going to be taken from the bay or the Mar Caribe. We've already done that. We've been consulting also for smaller life. So there also could be some impacts in the colonies of corals within the footprint of the pipeline. There'll be mitigation with Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Natural Resources of Puerto Rico, according to the requirements of Engineering Corps. The relocalization of these colonies is recommended. So those colonies that were impacted will be removed from the impact area and will be replanted in a nearby area. There may be indirect impact caused by the shadow caused by the offshore terminal area, which may degrade the seaweed and microalgae area that feeds, or the species. There is also the process of consulting with the related agencies to determine what would be the adequate mitigating measures. But all these mitigating measures will be ready and approved through all the agencies before beginning the construction of the project.

Continuing for the resources for wildlife, there's a possible acoustic or sound impact which will be determined -- a sound model will be determined before finishing the public comments period. It must include a study of the possible impact on birds during their nesting, and also during the rest. The possible areas of mitigation, because the column positioning is -- during the hours of day, there's no impact considered for these populations. It's really for the wildlife, the impact that is being considered. There also is a possible impact of wildlife due to lighting. During the construction this impact will be temporary, and during the operation of the FSRU and the platform, the possible impact is permanent. Due to this, there is going to be safety lights and navigation lights, warning lights for the FAA. And also a lighting plan will be developed before the construction, minimizing the possible impact. For this technology there's types of lighthouses and different things that minimize the type of impact due to lighting. Regarding the species that are threatened and in risk of being extinct, there's 23 that are in the list. Ten of these species are proposed to be included in the list. There is a possible impact, that depending on the type of species, then it will vary. There's nine species on which there wouldn't be any effect due to the distance between the primary habitat and the area of the project. There's 14 species in which there's a possible non-adverse impact, which would depend on the characteristics of their behavior, the requirements of habitat, construction operation and mitigation measures being proposed. So there's possible adverse impacts for ten species.

Continuing with these species that are threatened or in risk of being extinct, the impact during construction -- these species have already been identified, which would be Antilles manatee and there's nine species of coral reefs that are proposed to be included in the list of species that are being threatened or in danger of being extinct. Regarding mitigation regarding these two types of organisms, then there's going to be the mammal "observators" trained and in place throughout all the ships that participate in the construction. There is going to be an exclusion zone of 0.3 miles around the column areas. And there will be barriers to avoid that any mammals come in, in case they come in to the exclusion area, then the construction operation will stop to cause noise until the mammal comes out of the area. The species that are threatened and in danger of being extinct -- to continue with the impact they may suffer. The impact of the operation, the operation of the FSRU and the LNG require extracting water from the bay, therefore the coral larvae, there could be situations that they could be dragged during those extractions and there could be loss of those organisms. The impact is permanent but it's going to be moderate. The mitigation for this, in the consultation process with the regulating agencies, which is the step we are in right now, to develop the adequate mitigation measures. The mitigation measures will be prepared before beginning construction. Regarding the use of the soils and recreational resources, construction -- during the period of construction, the use of the soil will be altered, recreation and visual resources. There will be a temporary increase in the traffic of construction ships, and the recreational navigation and fishing would be affected, although temporarily. Mitigation for this is that construction be done through stages to avoid absolute interruption of activities in the area.

Regarding the impact of the operation, the existing visual resources will be permanently altered, and also navigation, fishing and other sea uses close to the sea installation. There's a map here where you can identify the different recreational and tourist activities within the area. And the different areas where fishing is held are also identified. Regarding the current uses and the recreational uses, a mitigation program will be proposed that will study the mechanisms for mitigation for fishing. FERC required that no construction begin until a determination for consistency with the management program for coastal zones and the planning board is determined. Regarding socio economical impacts, we believe that there will be minor impacts, localized and temporary. Through consultations with commercial fishing in Salinas and Guayama, it was established that part of the area of the project there is artisanal fishing occurring. So 140 jobs will be created during construction, which will last about 12 months.

Regarding possible cultural resources, in the land portion there will be work within previously impacted lots and under industrial operation, which is the part of PREPA for 40 years, which is Aguirre. The Historical Conservation Office has said that there is no clinical study that needs to be done because they've

been previously impacted. In terms of the sea portion, the endorsement of the Puerto Rico Cultural Institute was received, and also from the Office of Historical Preservation of Puerto Rico on the dated indicated. Regarding the air quality, the impact during the construction, it's believed that there will be emissions from construction equipment with temporary impact. We don't expect that they cause deviations from the normal applicable air quality provisions during operations. They include the equipments of the FSRU, of the terminal platform, besides what already the power plant emits. Considering both installations, we believe that there will be a reduction in atmospheric emissions. And the restrictions would be incorporated to the operations and the use of technology for the reduction of emissions in the FSRU to limit the contaminating emissions as established in the construction permit regarding the source of emission in the Aguirre complex. In changing fuel in Aguirre and using preferably natural gas, some 800 tons annually will be reduced of nitrous oxide and 5816 annual tons of sulfur dioxide. And also complying with the objective of the project, which is in compliance with the MATS regulation, that would improve the local regional air quality, and there will be a reduction of up to 30 percent of particulate matter.

Regarding the resource of air, there also could be an impact of the noise. In the construction, I believe there will be an "exceedence" of the limits of night noise from the Environmental Quality Board in two zones. But a work plan will be established where the work period will be limited, so that we don't see that impact. There will also be a noise reduction plan for construction in which noise levels in land will be monitored in the areas of the pipe construction, and the measures will be adjusted in case we exceed those levels. Also, environmental noise impacts and sub-marine noise impact has to be determined through those studies. During the operation, the noise would be below the current levels from environmental noise in each one of the sensitive areas/zones. This is regarding the platform. The studies will present, 60 days after the operation begins, so that we can show what the noise levels will be in or within the criteria for noises in the sensible areas that are closed. The mitigation for this section, then, will be from the point of view of the land portion of the pipes and the power plant, and that has been done already through the creation of some specifications that allow for acquiring equipment for lower generation noise.

From point of view of safety of the project, we determined the terminal was designed with sufficient protection levels. Mitigation of potential incidents which could impact the safety of the public is carried out. Navigation routes, in terms of safety and security, the U.S. Coast Guard determined that the navigation route is adequate for the type and frequency of traffic. The project would not a significant increase in risk of public safety, based on the engineering design, the letter from the Coast Guard and regulation requirements. In conclusion, after analyzing the information obtained, this concluded the construction operation of the proposed project would generate limited adverse environmental impact, mainly during the construction phase. The environmental impacts will be reduced to levels less than significant if the mitigation measures that have been proposed are applied. In addition, we have to obtain all the permits and authorizations, before beginning the construction, of all the agencies with jurisdiction. We have to implement construction, restoration and mitigation plans to mitigate or to replace those resources that we cannot avoid the impact. FERC will complete the compliance process of Section 7; that's in species in danger of being extinct, and Section 6 of the Historical Conservation Act. Also, there's going to be an environmental inspection program that will be implemented to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures required by FERC as conditions of the permit. The project is an acceptable action from an environmental point of view. That's where we conclude our presentation.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. Like I said, this is your chance to make your comments on the draft EIS. The meeting is being transcribed by a court reporter to make sure that all the information is gathered here tonight on the record. To make sure your comments are addressed in the final EIS, please come to the podium. I have a speaker's list. We'll start with the speaker's list first, for all who have signed up on the sheet. There are about seven or eight. And then after the speaker's list, if anyone else wishes to speak, then we can start with more speakers. Please, when you come to the podium, please say your name, spell your name and any agency or group that you are representing. Also, we'll have a time for questions for PREPA. So the first speaker that we have on the list is Captain Jimmy Vazquez.

PM01 – Public Meeting in Guayama, Puerto Rico (cont'd)

MR. RIVERA: For purposes of the proceedings, as the federal agency said, we are going to begin with the list of the people who signed up. Once we finish with the list we'll open the floor for anybody present who would like to express themselves regarding the proposal, okay? And for OGPe there is no time limitation.

PM01-01 CAPTAIN VAZQUEZ: Good afternoon, members of the committee and people who are here present. I gave Ms. Fernandez from FERC a packet of information -- factual information -- of my presentation. I point out to you Jobos Bay history and profile of June 2008. I want to point out, in years, biodiversity and productivity, and I quote. "In the 1970's and early 80's, studies were conducted in Jobos Bay, in connection with a proposed construction of a nuclear power generating plant. Because of the proposed construction of the nuclear plant -- excuse me -- Because of the existence of a full line under the site, the project was switched to fossil fuel and evolved into what is now Aguirre Power Plant Complex. Enclosure 3 shows a U.S. geological survey, a diagram that shows the fault line through Jobos Bay. That should bring a little red flag, as anybody that is aware of the LNG industry, the potential disaster of one of those ships equals one of the bombs that was thrown into Hiroshima. And you are going to have two of them, one of them 24/7, seven days a week, and it's actually three miles off shore. I haven't looked into FERC. I haven't seen a single LNG terminal that is that close to shore. Usually we are looking 10-12 miles off shore. Enclosure 4 is a Puerto Rico Senate resolution that was presented by then president of the Senate Rivera Schatz, and it was a joint resolution of both parties which addresses the seismic activity in the area. I was able to find the study -- and I gave it to Ms. Fernandez, and you also have the Senate resolution there -- which shows that the area in question, which is this area here (indicating), is actively -- at present it's active, but there's not enough monitoring sensors or the technology available to make a site specific study of this area.

What we have is a preliminary report that was conducted. They brought equipment, the measure of the seismic activity, and it's right there in black and white. It says that you cannot have a site-specific study of this area. So the LNG terminal which is being proposed will be lacking the site-specific study of the geology of the area. When we talk about climate and weather, on page 20 of that study that I gave you, it has site-specific information of the winds in Jobos Bay. The spill cone and this disaster area -- This information should be included in the spill zone and the disaster area, because the actual diagram that you have, it shows winds, mostly from the east, and that's not -- I guess in a different information from the actual site specific studies of the bay. And we created a cone -- a danger cone of a different area more towards shore. So the potential for human loss in case of a major disaster would be greater. The currents in Jobos Bay is on page

PM01-02 24. This diagram shows that an LNG ship, with a daily water discharge of 46 million gallons laden with copper, with a minimum sea current and just over a foot of tidal change, will kill the ecosystem. The cumulative copper contamination will affect the sea grass and the food chain in the marine reserve. Even though, even though the last report that was provided to the Commission, the amount of copper is within the guidelines -- because this is an estuary and the amount of current is very minimal -- the accumulative copper into the water in a period of 5-10 years will have what we have between the Mississippi River and Sabine Pass, Texas, known as "The Dead Zone". Talking about sediments and quality of Jobos Bay. There is, in that same study, "Toxic compounds may be accumulating in the bay in the bay's sediment. Re-suspension of the sediment from barge traffic, oil spill, thermal and chemical discharges may be resulting in community impacts on the ecology of the bay bottom." A complete assessment of the different biotic and abiotic components of the bay is necessary in order to properly address the impacts on land use changes. A system of metals such as lead, cadmium, copper, mercury, selenium, arsenic, chromium, silver and iron. This is the same requirement as to the consent order from the EPA.

I don't know if the members are aware of that order. There is an EPA consent order of June 26, 97, page 67 to 69. And I quote, "Identify these stressors, including salinity, freshwater input, hurricane, thermoelectric combustion fumes, mechanical disturbance of submerged substrate, coral reefs, sedimentation, toxic compound on the mangrove productivity." As you know, the reserve starts with the mangroves. They are the filters. They're where everything starts, all the different types of life forms. And the loss of those mangrove areas are critical to the endangered species that lie within the bay. I have included appendix A to D, which is 25 pages. It's a list of the bulk of the marine life within Jobos Bay Reserve. A

PM01-01 Section 4.1.3.1 has been updated to require a revised Seismic Hazard Analysis Report that includes both the Great Southern Puerto Rico Fault Zone and Salinas Faults, which would be consistent with the location and seismic characterization of these faults provided in the May 2014 Bureau of Reclamation reports, which were prepared to evaluate the seismic hazards on dams in southern Puerto Rico. If the Project is approved by the Commission, it is expected that the Commission will adopt the recommendation as a required action.

Also see the response to CO01-19.

PM01-02 Sections 4.5 and 4.6 have been updated to discuss sedimentation impacts from construction on seagrass and coral habitats. In addition, we are recommending that Aguirre LLC finalize its Benthic Resources Mitigation Plan in consultation with the FWS, NMFS, DNER, and other appropriate agencies. Aguirre LLC has also committed to having MMOs on all construction vessels during construction to minimize impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles. Finally, we are recommending in section 4.5.3.3 that Aguirre LLC coordinate with the NMFS, FWS, and DNER to develop an MMO training and response protocol plan for the construction and operation phases of the Project. We believe that Aguirre LLC's commitment and our recommendations would minimize impacts on marine species.

PM01-02 (cont'd) full impact study has not been conducted, and the consequences of the loss of marine life in relationship with the threatened and endangered species in the reserve. There are five critical habitats as per the EIS 4.6.3, in page 495. The one thing that hasn't been spoken about here -- and this is not an environmental

PM01-03 issue -- is the LNG tanker liability and the U.S. law. The first you consider as part of the mitigation process for the applicants: To have a suitable security bond to cover for any damages during the construction or while operating this facility that are brought upon Jobos Bay Marine Reserve. I want to expand a little bit on this. If there was going to be a disaster, the owner of the LNG, of the tankers, would only be liable for the ship and the cargo. So you have two -- basically two Hiroshima bombs over there, three miles offshore. They go off. From Patillas to Ponce there is nothing left. Liability of the owners of those ships, you can only charge them -- it's whatever cargo is left, that went up in smoke and whatever the value of the ship is. So the last incident that FERC was involved on was in Africa. That was -- what? Over 600 people killed, tolls of billions of dollars in loss, and the owners were not responsible for anything. So there is something here that you guys should think about. The proximity of those two ships, if something happens, then we won't have have an Aguirre. Because if they go off, one of them, "la TermoEléctrica se va." Because they are so close to each other that we would actually lose half of the generating power of the island on one incident. So think about that. Safety.

The escort tugs that are required to bring those ships in, is a FIFA Class I. It's the lowest category, and the minimum requirements include two monitors, one or two pumps and water pumping capacity of 10,569 gallons per minute. The information that was provided by the U.S. Coast Guard to the Commission -- and it's FERC .pdf page 20 -- The available tugboat in the area, not a single one of them, meet the requirement for an LNG escort service tug under FIFA I. And that includes the tugboats that are presently operating in EcoEléctrica. "No están en" compliance, whatsoever. Industry standards. As to the horsepower ratio versus dead weight tons of the FRU and the LNG ships, the industry standard is five percent of the tanker dead weight tonnage. The proposed FRU has an 82,500 dead weight tonnage. The minimum horsepower needed for a tugboat to be a qualified escort tug is 4125 horsepower or you could have a two tug combination. Two out of the three tugs mentioned on the report, one only has 3800 hundred and can only be used as an assist tug. The other two: 4500 and 4300 horsepower, in a case of an emergency or in inclement weather, would be operating at the top end of their naval design. As a captain, as a 16-year -- 16 years as a captain and 10 years in the Coast Guard myself -- and I consider myself a good captain -- I would have a hell of a time trying to get one of those ships away from the other one that is burning, with one of these tugboats. If one of the engines fails I won't be able to get it done. In the case of a tropical storm, if the wind increases to knots or 30 miles an hour, steady wind against the ship, pinching them against the pier, I won't be able to get that boat out of there. There is not a captain that will be able to get that boat out of there. I recommend that the Commission really thinks about the following: having a standby tugboat. Especially when the LNG tanker comes in, and you got your FRU, your transferring product, that's the time where you are going to have an accident. I would recommend -- and I humbly request that you guys think about this -- having the pilot and a standby tugboat until the transferring is done and the LNG is gone. The LNG ship comes in, tugboat takes off to Ponce, the pilot gets in the car, something happens. It would be at least a minimum of two hours, of two hours, before you could get a tugboat to try to help one of those two ships. So the only thing that will be there, firefighting capabilities or the ability of them to lift -- you know, one of them leave the dock because the other one is on fire, it would be completely compromised. So please think about that one.

When it comes to training, I spoke to Angel, which is the vice-president of PAL Association on the south side of Puerto Rico, about two months ago. He was not aware that they were going to be required to take a simulator training and a whole bunch of different things that FERC and the captain of the port has recommended for them to go to training. You may want to think about letting them know, because they don't have no idea. Who is going to pay for that training? The last time I went into Texas A & M training it cost me 15,000 dollars, and the type of training that is recommended, that is specific to the LNG ships. So they are going to have to make a simulator on the training. And I would say, right now that would be in the neighborhood of 30-35,000 dollars. So when it comes to firefighting, even the union of the local

PM01-03 Section 4.11.8 of the final EIS contains a recommendation for Aguirre LLC to develop an Emergency Response Plan in coordination with the USCG and local responders. The Emergency Response Plan would include a Cost-Sharing Plan to address the cost of ensuring the security and emergency management of the LNG facility and the LNG vessels while in transit and unloading at the berth. The FSRU firefighting capability is described in section 4.11.5.1, and regulatory requirements for LNG carriers are described in section 4.11.7.1.

The USCG, in developing its Water Suitability Assessment, noted that additional tugs would be required. Aguirre LLC would be responsible for obtaining the required equipment as well as staff trained to use the equipment.

PM01-03 (cont'd) power company has been screaming for training for their people. I really hope that you guys really stress the personal training at the offshore plant, on the terminal, and in the actual Aguirre Power Plant because now she's going to be running gas. Is the equipment in Aguirre explosion-proof? Or the light fixtures, have the people been given proper training with the conversion? Do they have proper equipment to address a situation? They just lost three employees in San Juan, basic entry procedures that were not followed. So that's... Another thing is the union, in this last weather storm that we had, because they were on strike they didn't respond to emergencies. Are they going to do the same with the LNG terminal? Those are questions that you need to ask somebody. On the last part -- so I won't take too much time.

Communications. Communications here are going to be kind of difficult. You got a foreign ship. What kind of a crew? Is it going to be a Korean crew and then we have a "supervisor en español"? Are we going to have English as a common language? That should be addressed. And the last one is a baseline study. A baseline study is -- myself, as a captain, have done all this project from A to Z, from doing the trench, laying the pipe, ROVs, the whole thing I've done it; I've been there many times. I suggest two things: Number 1, get an ROV; survey with video; GPS position the entire length of the pipeline so you know what your endangered species are, which ones need to move. When you are laying the pipe, ROV right behind the pipe taking video, recording the positions every hundred feet. Make sure that if you are going to use -- the idea of using concrete, that presents a lot of problems. Because how -- are you going to use any anodes for the corrosion? In this type of environment, a pipeline that has a 40-year service life will probably last . And if you encase the pipe on cement and the saltwater gets into through the cement into the pipeline, corrosion is going to go rampant. Anybody that owns a boat here knows that these things, here you have to replace them every six months; because they are gone, and your propellers are gone. So the environment here versus the Gulf of Mexico or the Gulf of Alaska is completely different when it comes to electrolysis. So bear in mind. I know that a U.S. transportation -- the U.S. Department of Transportation, in Highway 101 from Oregon to San Diego, every single bridge, the rebars are rotten and they are trying to fix that massive problem they have over there. So those are a few things I want you to take a look at. As to the financial situation of the applicants, my recommendation is that FERC withhold this permit for six months to allow Ms. Lisa Donahue to do her magic and I hope -- personally hope that she saves our power company. But I can't see that or I can't fathom FERC to issue a permit to an applicant which is in a financial limbo. This is a very slippery slope and will set a new agency precedent. And thank you for your time. And from the stuff I read on the -- we read every single page, a little bit at a time. Thank you for the excellent job you guys have done. Also, remember there is no infrastructure here for any emergency. So, basically, here we will just have to shut down the pipeline and wait six months for a jack to come up and pull the pipeline. In the entire island I don't think there's more than five marine certified welders, because there's no -- any dry docks here anymore. So the ability of having commercial divers and certified welders to do a patch repair is none. You would have to bring them from the States. Thank you very much.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you, Captain Vazquez, for your comments. The next speaker is Wilma Deliz Velez. You don't have to speak in English to make your comments. Of course, if you want to speak in Spanish to make your comments that is just fine. Thank you.

MS. DELIZ: For the record, I will be speaking in Spanish. From now on I will be completely in Spanish. For the record, my name is Wilma Deliz. I am the coordinator of the Energy Dialogue Table of Puerto Rico. I am going to read. "Dear Architect Lastra Power, Good afternoon. The Energy Dialogue Table of Puerto Rico, the 'table' is a non-profit organization, non-government organization. It was founded in July 2008. Among its members we have Association of Bayamonenses Pro-Recycling and Healthy Environment [ABRASO], the community group I represent at the table; Association of Consultants and Contractors of Renewable Energy of Puerto Rico [ACOLE]; Industrials Association of Puerto Rico [AIPR]; the Electric Power Authority [PREPA]; the Architects and Landscapers Association of Puerto Rico; Chemists Association of Puerto Rico; Church Counsels of Puerto Rico [CEPR]; Consorcio Alianza Energética de Puerto Rico [KAPR]; Tropical Institute of Energy Environmental Societies from the Mayaguez campus of the University of Puerto Rico; Coop League of Puerto Rico, Misión Industrial; the Energy Public Office of

Puerto Rico; The Puerto Rico Energy Center [PREC]; the Puerto Rico Society for Planning; Interamerican University of Puerto Rico, Bayamon Campus; U.S. Green Building Council [USGBS] Caribbean Chapter. Now my colleague.

MR. MILLER: Good afternoon, my name is John Miller. Within the dialogue table I represent the Energy Consortium of Puerto Rico [CAEPR].I am addressing now the permit's office that the next hearing they have a table so that people can sit and do their exposition. Because there could be people with some limitations, and the handicaps, that they can't be standing up.

(Mr. Rivera speaks without using the microphone and cannot be heard by the interpreter.)

MR. MILLER: We're going to remain here. We are talking about in order that this situation is corrected in the next public hearing.

MR. RIVERA: And we want to thank you for the recommendation. I'm sorry that I was talking outside the microphone. There is a microphone. We thank you for the recommendation. We'll take it into consideration. It's a detail that skipped our mind. It's admitted. There's people that really do need the table to put the equipment on or to be able to talk. So we accept your recommendation. Any persons present that cannot be standing out to do their location, they can certainly take the microphone and sit at these (indicating) chairs to be able to talk. So thank you very much and we really accept your recommendation.

PM01-04 MR. MILLER: Our constitution is the memorandum for understanding. From here on, we are going to refer to it as the ME of November 10. The ME contains the following whereas' regarding the fundamental principles that we support, that we sustain, to frame the transformation -- the energy transformation which everybody is claiming and is required for the sustainability of Puerto Rico. First whereas. The table has as an objective to reach agreements, fundamental agreements between representatives and users the electric system of Puerto Rico. Second whereas. The table has identified the common objective that our electric system becomes a vital instrument for a vision of Puerto Rico that is proper, fair, democratic, sustainable and happy, as it was defined in our vision -- our broadened vision. And that is why it's imperative to reach a transformation of said system with a strategic plan that will make reference to the strategic plan to promote the sustainability of the electrical system of Puerto Rico of the table dated November 2009, and which we quote on the page which you can get that plan, which allows to overcome the exclusive visions for short-term and sector interest. Next whereas. The goal is for our electric system to become one that is robust, efficient, sustainable and innovative, financially stable and which contributes significantly to the sustainability of Puerto Rico long term. As you can see, the word "sustainable" repeats itself constantly. Next whereas. It is imperative to discontinue the current pattern of energy consumption on which the sales projections are based for PREPA, and which can be reduced 25 percent, mainly avoiding the inadequate use of energy per capita for 2030. Serious strategies of conservation and energy efficiency at all levels of the electric system, which consist of generation, transmission, distribution and us consumers. Next whereas. The Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority must make up a new business model, which should include the development of new sources of income, such as generation of energy through cleaner and renewable sources, and the expansion of its fiber optic network. We refer there the document of Dr. Efrain Muriel Carrillo from December 2012, titled "New PREPA Energy for the Puerto Rico Society of the st Century," and we quote the pages where you can get that document. And alternatives for a new financial structure for PREPA, the table, part 1 of October 2012, and part 2 of April 13. We didn't have to wait for Ms. Lisa to arrive to do this. We already had it done.

The next whereas. It is our goal that Puerto Rico is able to produce 30 percent of our electrical power using its renewable resources, by the year 2030. We make reference to the study carried out by Drs. Colucci, O'Neill and Dr. Irizarry. That study was done with federal funds and was published in November 2008. It's titled "Achievable Renewable Energy Targets [ARET] for Puerto Rico's Renewable Energy Portfolio, Final Report". These three people that conducted this study were signatories of the ME, the memorandum of understanding, initially. We are going to quote a segment of its report which is of utmost importance. And we are going to quote it in English because the study was written in English. "Approximately 65

PM01-04 Comment noted. The energy policy in Puerto Rico and practices by PREPA are outside of the scope of this environmental analysis. However, our EIS reiterates the comment that one of the Project's objectives is to contribute to energy price stabilization in the region. Also see the responses to comments CO07-02 through CO07-10

PM01-04 (cont'd) percent of residential roofs can provide the total electric energy [not power], that is generated in Puerto Rico, as shown in Figure 1.1: Residential applications." The next whereas. It is necessary to review the public policy of energy subsidies in Puerto Rico so the corrections of PREPA are effective, such as it is being done now. We were here talking about it here last week. The senate furnished its public hearings on the subject. We have to recognize that all those subsidies, all of them without exception, is an overwhelming way of imposing hidden taxes for the people of Puerto Rico. And the people of Puerto Rico can't find out that taxes are being imposed on them and the cost of those subsidies is approximately 1.5 cents per kilowatt hour, the effect. Next whereas. We need to create, develop and establish decisional procedures that are efficient, transparent, inclusive and participative in PREPA, so that the consumers have access to all information and relevant details that will allow them to reach these goals. And the last whereas. The table has identified that the use of natural gas maybe can help reduce energy costs for the inhabitants of Puerto Rico in a short term. Our ME, with its principles and fundamental criteria, allows the members of the table to act in such a way that this is our common north .In the meeting held on August 29, 2014, every member present at the table decided unanimously to use the principles and criteria that are fundamental of the ME, and this is strategic plan, part 1 and part 2 in the aforementioned report, and a new AE and ELARET to evaluate and react for all proposals for projects on energy. And this is an energy project, so, therefore, all those parameters are applied in order to evaluate it. The table understands that that says that the LNG Aguirre offshore terminal project could -- and I stress the word "could" -- align itself with the principles and fundamental criteria of its ME strategic plan, part 1 and part 2 of the aforementioned report, and a new AE and ELARET that we have adopted. However, in order for this project to really help energy sustainability in Puerto Rico, and to avoid this project from having the problems that past efforts have had of PREPA to transport natural gas, the table presents the following recommendations: Act 57 from May 2007, orders the Authority to provide mechanisms for citizen participation in each one of its regions. And establish a continuing program for education for its employees and all its clients, that encourages conservation and energy efficiency.

In order to ensure this project to tend to the claims of social and environmental justice in Salinas and the region, the table suggests that PREPA use the project to establish a pilot program for participation and citizen education in the region of Ponce, one of the seven regions of PREPA. This using as a basis, and beginning with the community concerns of this project of the offshore terminal, PREPA can start giving space and tending to the concerns related to the project and to the power plant of Aguirre. Regarding the cost of this, Act 57 establishes that the Authority can establish collaboration agreements with other public entities, civic entities, non-governmental agencies and other institutions that are interested in facilitating the coordination that will reduce the cost of education programs and the mechanisms to allow and encourage the citizen participation. We shouldn't be afraid of being open and transparent, specifically PREPA, which manages the electric infrastructure of all of us in Puerto Rico, because it's a public agency. Act 57 of May 27, 2014, says that the Authority has the duty to provide electric energy in a reliable manner and contributing to the sustainable future of the Puerto Rico, maximizing the benefits and minimizing the social impact, environmental impacts and financial impacts it could have. We talk about minimizing social and environmental impacts; therefore, the mitigation that is established in this project should not necessarily be what is required by law, rather the best mitigation possible, which really minimizes social, financial and environmental impacts at reasonable costs. What is "reasonable in cost" is debatable. Therefore, the importance that the Authority be transparent and shares with people affected the alternatives -- and I stress the word "alternatives" -- and reach agreements -- and I stress the word "agreements." Which, even if they are not ideal for one party, are acceptable to the parties, specifically for those that are potentially effective. In turn, the savings that come from natural gas should be used not only to reduce the cost of electric service to clients, it's fundamental to use part of those savings to update the infrastructure of PREPA so that it can more renewable energy could be integrated. That is a way in which the use of natural gas can be a tool in a transition for a better use of renewable energy. Part of the savings should be used to alleviate the financial pressures that PREPA faces. This process of this offshore terminal and the use of natural gas in Aguirre

PM01-04 (cont'd) presents itself as an important opportunity for finances that are related to the management of our electric infrastructure can be straightened.

Lastly, it's important to point out that the documentation regarding the project is complex and voluminous. The 600 pages were made available in the beginning of August 2014. The table does not have the time or the resources in order to make a detailed evaluation of the technical information contained in the EIS. That is why it is more important that the project is presented to the citizens in an understandable fashion and that the spaces for citizen participation isn't the minimum required by law, such as public hearings. PREPA should not waste an opportunity to open itself to the citizens and build together a better energy future for Puerto Rico. Now, we are going to tell you in "rice and beans" what is our conclusion which could make this work. The table evaluated the EIS, the caption, in light of its vision, mission, objectives, principles and values, strategic plan in order to promote sustainability of the electrical system in Puerto Rico, part 1 and part 2 of the aforementioned report, a new AE and ELARET and ME.

The table concludes that the project would produce less emissions and environmental contamination, and it will reduce the negative impact to the health of our people, and it will allow compliance with the mercury toxic max standards of the EPA, and, thus, million dollar fines would be avoided. They would support the project conditioned on achieving and signing an agreement between PREPA, Accelerate Energy, and citizen organizations of the region which include the following elements: To present an acceptable plan which will minimize environmental impact and the surrounding sea environment. Number 2, to present a plan to preserve the natural preserve of the Jobos Bay and the ecosystem of its inter-sea and tropical environment, and to ensure minimum intervention in the activities of the bay. Next, to conduct environmental studies with the National Institute of Energy and Island Sustainability [INESI], of the University of Puerto Rico, and local environmental groups, in order to assure the project will have minimum impact on the bay. I want to really go into this, what INESI is. INESI is the recent creation of the University of Puerto Rico with its 11 campuses. And there, we have available all the resources that Puerto Rico could have in order to create a sustainable Puerto Rico in the energy field and those resources, which will be available through the campuses. The dialogue table will be the central entity coordinating those resources. And last, stipulate fines for incompliance of the agreement. We respectfully submit our comments today. Thank you and good afternoon.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you very much, Ms. Deliz and Mr. Miller. The next speaker is Humberto Martin.

MR. RIVERA: When we make comments -- we want to clarify for everybody present, that if you have any written comments you can send them to us at the permit office so that they are filed in the records of the office. I'm sorry I didn't announce this before. But, please, any written comment you can send to us at the permit office.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, good afternoon to the panel and everybody present. My name is Humberto Martin Martinez. We are going to be presenting in Spanish, but before we begin with our presentation, I would like to present our FASE coordinator. I represent FASE on this occasion. Attorney Diego Ledee Bazan, so that he can talk to you a bit about our history.

MR. LEDEE: Good afternoon. Very briefly, as my friend said, my name is Diego Ledee Bazan. I have been an attorney for some years now in the Guayama region, with offices on 26 Calimano Street South. At present I coordinate FASE. This organization was constituted back in April 2009, and its postulated are to defend the rights of workers, the defense of our culture, the defense of the environment and public education, among other postulates. We have been observing very closely, and we continue to do so in our
PM01-05 continuous sessions as well as our radio program, this project that is intended for this region. In the past we have been firm "opposers" of this public nuisance of the AES coal plant, and now in recent years criminal deposit of this coal plant. And we give this introduction because, as we said, we are going to be in constant sessions, paying close attention to what happens with this project. FASE is not a political partisan organization. It groups together various sectors: unemployed individuals, fellow teachers, fellow members of different political parties, so that with one simple document we have been carrying out work, and we

PM01-05 The generation and consumption of the electricity supplied by PREPA to Puerto Rico is outside of the scope of this EIS. Further, as described in section 1.1 of the EIS, Aguirre LLC developed the Project in response to customers' demands and then filed an application with the FERC for authorization to construct and operate the proposed facilities. The EIS is limited to assessing the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project. Although the EIS does consider whether alternative actions might meet the Project's stated purpose (including meeting customers' demands), the EIS does not consider or reach a conclusion on whether there is a need for the proposed Project. Section 1502.13 of CEQ regulations implementing NEPA requires that an EIS "briefly specify the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the proposed action." In other words, the EIS states the purpose of and need for a proposed project in order to define the range of alternative actions that the agency can legitimately consider. The determination of whether there is a "need" for the proposed facilities for the purpose of issuing an authorization under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act will be made in the subsequent Commission Order granting or denying Aguirre LLC's request for authorization and is based on a determination of whether the Project is in the public interest, and includes balancing the benefits of the Project against any adverse impacts.

PM01-05 (cont'd) intend to continue to do so in upcoming years. Thank you very much. I'll leave you with fellow member Humberto Martinez.

MR. MARTINEZ: Again, good afternoon. The obvious question here is very simple. It's a matter of trust. It's a matter of knowing how, if you exclude the community where this project is going to be carried out -- a community that can't stand any more contamination -- in the decision-process -- you now come up with this idea of a project that you've already decided to build. And the community never participated in the decision. And that's what we are going to see in this document. I'll tell you right now. We oppose this; we don't think it's necessary, and we think it's going to cause us more problems than what it intends to resolve. I'm going to read to you what FASE determined regarding this project. It was written on September 7, 2014. "Statement. Draft of the Environmental Impact Statement for the LGN gasport in Aguirre". FASE and we proceed to discuss the justification of the project. And it says, "To combat the lack of understanding blamed on us, the members of the communities, we should start by explaining, based on our understanding, the real reasons behind this project and the reasons claimed by the proponents to carry out the gasification project of PREPA's Aguirre plant.

We advise whoever wants to be advised that this represents another step, in our interpretation, toward the complete privatization of PREPA. And whoever supports such privatization -- I've heard many people say that -- you should think of how much one of those little poles close to your house, or primary line or secondary line is going to cost you. Or a transformer. Especially you people who live in remote places that are now served behind the electrical energy of our system. In a corporation that does not generate any profits and therefore it's supposed to be cheaper. So let's just suppose a scenario where you privatize at the cost that you now pay, which is quite high already, you have to add the profit of the private owner. And the main problem, I continue, and from our standpoint, is the great lack of trust of the people in their political representatives and public officials, together with the acts of corruption, we deem are the main reasons for the situation that our country is in right now. So how can we trust that this project is going to be an exception? Let us take as an example some of the most important projects that have been carried out recently in Puerto Rico. The Urban Train, the cost of which was estimated at several hundreds of millions of dollars, and ended up costing more than two thousand million dollars. As far as its operating losses, they are estimated in several dozen millions of dollars. There are some who allege, or I read in the newspapers recently, that it was 84 million per year. The Coliseum, its cost was estimated at around 60 million dollars; however, its final cost was 300 million dollars. Its rental fees and continuous maintenance is much higher than expected. We can add to that this failed project of Luis Fortuño, to expect on an island that is surrounded by water on all sides. I think it's a fixation for us from the south to have the tank in Peñuelas and bring it throughout the whole central mountains to the Cataño plant, which appears to be inoperable. We see that this project, it's nothing new.

In past projects, such as the coal plant, the terrible AES plant in Guayama, the thermo-electrical gas terminal of PREPA in Guayanilla, added to other less important projects, such as the solar plate yard; the windmills in Santa Isabel used on farming lands considered to be some of the best in the world, to generate energy with wind, have had exactly the same purpose as this project that you are all proposing here: To reduce contamination, diversify energy sources and save us consumers money. However, although some of the projects have been established for more than 12 years now, none have been able to prevent the disastrous situation that PREPA is in now, as well as the government of Puerto Rico. And under those circumstances, we wonder what would be the actual result of this new threat in a community that cannot withstand any more. Corruption, corruption, corruption, impunity, impunity, impunity, incompetence, incompetence, incompetence, incompetence. Those are the real reasons for our delicate situation, yet no action has been taken in that direction. How can we trust a project that does not have in any of its stations a community supervisor, overseer? A project that has not deserved any concern or curiosity on the part of officials, starting with the mayor of Guayama who has said nothing about this project. And the legislators even less, and they are the ones who supposedly represent us. We will not limit our discussion of this matter to the mere construction of the project and the Jobos Bay. As taxpayers, members of the community where the

PM01-05 (cont'd) construction is intended to be carried out, we will express our doubts and rejection of this project, covering much more than the draft statement that we have before us. We will start with the reasons for performing the project. We will quote the document. Those are the reasons attributed to the construction of this project.

Number 1: To contribute to the diversification of energy sources, thus reducing the use of fuels, such as is set forth in the corporate plan of PREPA of 2014-2015; to allow the Aguirre plant to make mercury and air toxins requirements of EPA met; to reduce the traffic of fuel barges in the Jobos Bay, thus reducing the possibility of any fuel spills and potential encounters with endangered species and reducing the traffic of recreational craft; contribute to the stabilization of prices, which is not currently the situation. And we'll discuss the first one quickly: To diversify resources of energy. In this regard alleged by the government, we have the following comments. Once the economic and contamination questions have been overcome, we don't see how the amount that is burnt represents diversification. It's as if a furniture factory alleged that if they diversified its business by changing the wooded use to make its furniture, and use compressed cardboard instead or some synthetic fabric, this, understanding that we should not place all our eggs in our basket and stabilize prices. That's not just diversification. As we said, what we will see is diversification of the businesses of the people who live off a corporation that does not generate profits for itself and has to generate it for others. And the diversification of sources of collections for politicians for their campaigns, and also of the officials that are supposed to be guaranteeing our wellbeing, to help themselves to public funds. One of the most recent events, the so-called scandal of the petroleum or oil cartel, where in exchange for a juicy amount of money, an employee chose who to give the contract for sale of bunker fuel to PREPA.

Two. The former president of the government's agency was plundering the agency's money in expensive stays in New York hotels, granting significant bonuses to the former director of the agency, Miguel Cordero, for having directed or led the entity to an overwhelming bankruptcy. Which makes us wonder if the process carried out to choose Aguirre Offshore GasPort, LLC or Aguirre, LLC was correct, just and transparent. Because we did not participate in that decision. The allegation of the method to generate energy as reliable. The allegation is that the method -- I'm sorry. I got a little lost there. Yes. However, the recommendations made, including those by the United States president Bill Clinton regarding the use of solar plates on roofs of houses, the use of fiber optics in PREPA has been recommended broadly by many people. And the construction of a hydroelectric plant offshore, using strong undercurrents to produce energy, have not been taken into consideration. The allegation is that the method to generate solar energy is not reliable. Contradictorily, it has been established -- we have established two solar plate yards in Salinas and Guayama, which are subject to the loss of 15 percent of transmission through the network, according to PREPA itself, which is what is lost in transmission. How can we talk about efficiency of a system that does not -- without even having established a pilot plan. In relation to that diversification of fiber optics, as far as we know the agency has said nothing. We know of many countries that have decided to use these renewable energy resources with good results. We believe that in the near future this alternative will represent the primary source of energy for the important sector in Puerto Rico, whether it'd be through the installation of solar plates or the purchase of items provided, that these systems use for their operation, many of which already exist on the market. We also expect that if PREPA does not take a step forward in this initiative, it will lose a great opportunity to be the first on an emergent market and will lose a great deal of its business. Given the agency's incapacity with the knowledge and expertise in this matter to find logical and more friendly alternatives, the people will find their own opportunities.

We will make reference to the old saying that necessity is the mother of invention. To comply with the clean air regulations, this second reason, for now, will take us through what the agency claims, and other entities, that the burning of natural gas produces less contamination than the burning of bunkers. This, without considering that the complete cycle begins with the extraction and/or production of this raw material, and how the contamination generated in the extraction of this natural gas, called "fracking", effects various communities in the United States. We urge you to watch Gasland and Gasland 2, the documentaries, and the movie entitled Promise Land, in which Matt Damon stars, so that we can understand the effects of fracking on the land, animals and people, and the struggles of the people in the States against this method.

PM01-05 (cont'd) One final comment in this regard is that we certainly do not understand how the EPA intends to fine PREPA for its emission when it's allowed the establishment of AES. And the obvious question here is whether EPA did any study or analysis of the conglomerate of all the emissions produced in the area to corroborate whether they exceed the allowed exposure limits, if in the end it's not the purpose of the agency to protect the environment and people from excessive contamination. So what is to say that if the conglomerate of the agencies that we have here -- We live in an area that is very contaminated. I think it's the first or second most contaminated area in all of Puerto Rico, with the highest rate of cancer in Puerto Rico. Just so that's clear for everybody. If the EPA has done a study to see how this added effect to existing contamination by land or air, the one already generated by AES, or if it just submitted themselves to issuing the permits. The reason that I can think of is that AES -- it's not AES's fault for the emissions that already exist. I'm sure, if they don't have to pay for that error, then let the taxpayers pay for it, the ones who have to breathe all these contaminants and the ones who have the least money to pay for all this.

With regard to reducing the cost of producing energy, in this regard there is no doubt that the cost of natural gas is cheaper than bunker fuel. It does entail a reduction in the general cost of energy. But nobody can guarantee to us that this will represent a reduction on our power bills. Let's take a certain. That in Puerto Rico today, the demand for electrical energy is only 2900 kilowatt hours. These is a constant reduction in all the private sectors, residential commercial and industrial. On the other hand, as PREPA itself has said, as little as 1900 kilowatt hours are produced by alternative sources. AES produces 454 at its plant by burning coal, and the 14 that it produces at the solar plate yard, that it has the farm, it has right by its plant. The eco-electric plant is designed to produce 407 megawatts. The southern plant produced 960 megawatts, which represents close to 67 percent of the total demand for energy, two thirds. Periodically two thirds are generated by alternative sources that are not oil burning. So we don't see what the problem is or why our power costs have not been reduced already. That's in theory, but a lot has been "controverted" regarding this matter. Let's give it the benefit of the doubt, and let's say that after deducting about 15 percent that is lost in transmission, eco-generating plants, AES, EcoElectric produce 65 percent of efficiency for which they were designed, and that the Costa Azul plant of PREPA produces a bit less than 50 percent of the energy after its conversion to natural gas, still, at least one third of the energy produced in the country -- at least one third of the energy produced in the country must be around 30 percent of the demand. Yet on our bills we have three different line items instead of the traditional two item lines. So for the charges for consumption of energy and the unexplainable item of fuel adjustment, they added this other item for purchase of fuel. And instead, our bills have not gone down. On the contrary, it's gone up. And it's expected to continue increasing.

Lastly, we've left outside of this equation the increase in the price of natural gas that depends on supply and demand, future regulations it's headed on. I want to take this opportunity to say this. On my way from Gurabo, I was listening on WKAQ station on the radio, on Luis Francisco Ojeda's radio show, I heard Professor Arturo Masol talk. And he was mentioning, regarding the EcoElectrica plant in Peñuelas, how this plant, this company has tripled the price of liquefied natural gas for PREPA. And so the question is whether this was done through another oil cartel. It used to be the petroleum/oil cartel, now it's the gas cartel which has represented triple costs, three times as high, and has brought the cost of production to the same level as the bunker fuel, still using natural gas. So this is just for you all to have that on your schedule and consider it. So what will happen with this situation that we have here? We continue with the last -- with the document -- with the situation of PREPA and the energy crisis.

Since nothing has been said and the document does not address this matter, we will mention it for the record. It's currently estimated that PREPA has 1 billion in debt, and in accounts receivable it's expected to be about 1.5 billion, but nobody knows this information for sure. What is important is that just months ago they didn't have money to buy fuel. And given that situation, this agency's credit has been degraded. And this entails a considerable increment in the price of purchasing liquid fuel in terms of financing loans for that. One of the reason for this lack of liquidity is the subsidies that the government grants to various sectors: hotels, industry, churches, disadvantaged sectors of society among others, and also for government

PM01-05 (cont'd) agencies, hotels, hospitals, some of which are accounts that will never be collected. And we have to ask ourselves what were the 9 billion invested in, when that's paid for by the consumers who do not receive the benefit, as if this represented a problem for PREPA. But it's actually us, who pay our monthly power bills, who are paying for this. Who made the decision to collect or not collect, to cut or not cut somebody's service for lack of payment? How much does it cost PREPA in attorney fees to file collection actions and all the accounts that are declared losses, uncollectable? The amount of time PREPA waits to charge for sold energy. So if it continues to postpone corrections on this, and in the way this transferred to the EcoElectrica or AES, or will they transfer it to Aguirre, LLC or its suppliers? If we consider the item of payroll expenses of PREPA, according to information published by the agency, this represents about 13 percent of its expenses. So last year 350.4 million dollars were spent in fiscal year 2012-2013, of the total expenses of the agency. Of the close to 8000 employees of the agency, about 2000 or 25 percent are managerial employees. That is to say, a ratio of one managerial employee for every three union employees.

However, in 2001, the number of employees in the agency was 9,457 employees. The total payroll expense for managerial versus union employees, the ratio was 40 to 60 percent. If we look at the average basic salary of the managerial employees in PREPA, it's about 40,000 yearly. In the meantime, the basic salary of managerial employees is about 60,000 annually, which exceeds by a lot the salaries received by employees in the pharmaceutical sector, which are some of the best paid industry employees in Puerto Rico and the world. It's important to point out that, according to the statements of the director of PREPA, Juan Alicea, to El Vocero newspaper at the beginning of the year, January 3rd, 2014, he stated that even if 90 percent of the employees of PREPA were terminated, the economy of reduction in personnel -- savings in personnel of the agency, it would not be sufficient to reduce our power bills. Yet the government, in complicity will all the media of the country, have irresponsibly wanted to blame the high cost of electricity to employees of PREPA, specifically members of the UTIER union, a message that has caused great discontent among the unions of the country. In relation to the managerial employees, the treatment has not been the same, although they receive significantly higher salaries than that of union employees. But this attempt to discredit employees has not been sufficient. We most remember the most recent event of vandalism in one of the towers, which happened just a week ago. There, a petty thief attempted to steal the metal of the tower, and the federal authorities blamed sabotage by a member of the union, alleged that it had been done by a member of the Union. As it happened in recent years in an explosion that happened at Palo Seco plant of PREPA in Cataño, involves the so-called press of the country. It ran to publish this news, but then did not make any efforts to clarify the results of the investigation, which release the members of the UTIER from any responsibility.

We conclude that, although the production of energy by alternative sources -- let's adjudicate it at 30 percent -- and even terminating 90 percent of PREPA's employees, we still would not be able to reduce the cost of our power bills. The problem that PREPA has is different. For example, corruption, mismanagement. We have to remember that at the beginning of the century, the generation of electricity in Puerto Rico was in private hands. Lack of trust in agencies, this is without a doubt one of the main problems of our country. Agencies that are in charge of overseeing and monitoring the companies that can potentially harm the health and the environment of our country, the EPA, the Environmental Quality Board failed crassly in their essential duty to protect the environment and to make sure that projects and new construction projects are carried out in strict compliance with construction regulations so that the residents in the area are not harmed. As an example, the Environmental Quality Board approved the construction of the coal burning plant, AES, towards the mid-nineties. Although the panel hired by the agency itself recommended, that did not go through with the project. And one of the problems in the recommendations was how we were going to dispose of all the bottom ash that is accumulated. They are very close to the coast, where this project is intended to be built, which has been spread all over the place without following, without protecting, without monitoring contamination of groundwater such as RECRA and EPA recommend. Yet no demands for mitigation have been made by the Agency.

PM01-05 (cont'd) On its part, EPA, in complicity with the former, has allowed the community itself, where the discussed pipeline is intended to be built, being bombarded and contaminated by land and air, by the dangerous AES. The EPA allowed this coal burning plant for more than ten years, when it just has started its operations, to dispose of its industrial waste in the bay and the Las Mareas mangrove, until finally they fined them in March 2011, with a laughable fine of 170 thousand dollars. That money went to the agencies; not one cent went to compensate the communities, not even one warning to all of us who eat fish from the area or sea life from the area. So it's unknown if they were asked to mitigate or repair the damage they caused because of the contamination. More so, we don't know if they repaired the deficiency and if they've stopped that practice.

Recently, those two agencies have allowed the use of a landfill in the Municipality of Peñuelas, where they allow the deposit of the coal ash without following the recommendations of the EPA. It's worth to point out that one of the owners of the landfill is the millionaire politician Roberto Prats Palerm, whom we know very well in this county. Further on, on September 2nd, 2014, the president of the Environmental Quality Board, Laura Velez Velez, approved through a resolution, the 14-20(d), disposal of coal ash in the landfills in Puerto Rico. And here we have to point out that not long ago, precisely the EPA ordered the closing of half of the 32 landfills in Puerto Rico because they were in non-compliance. That the remaining 16, there are nine that don't comply. Their lifespan is being exhausted, and now they are going to add those thousands of tons to be deposited in those landfills without taking the precautions. So we really don't understand. Regarding the Environmental Planning Board, the atrocities allowed by this agency are unending. We just state the proliferation of residential projects that are unending in the area of Salinas. These have been filled with tons of ash that have been eroded to bodies of water, ending up in the Salinas Bay, and this harming Playa Playita and all communities that are nearby, who have acquired homes in those areas. In relation to that, many farms and lots have been filled with those ashes without complying with the laws or regulations of the EPA for disposal of those ashes. This includes a farm that AES owns in Guayama. It is our opinion and conviction that this conversion of the power plant in Aguirre to gas is imposed by the relation of the United States, through its agencies, to promote the sale of its new product, its new toy: natural gas. And not even to talk about the legislators, mayors and other officers: Caroline Bonilla Colon, mayor of Salinas; Eduardo Cintron Suarez, mayor of Guayama; Miguel Pereira Castillo; Senator Luis R. Ortiz Lugo "Edelmito", representative; Angel M. Rodriguez Otero. All the aforementioned were elected to protect all of us. Although this project will be built in lands of the respective municipalities or represented districts, they cannot be found. They haven't taken initiative to write down the concerns of their constituents of this new threat. We don't even know that they have any advisor within all their political flunkies for this issue. Maybe they don't have any questions in the matter? That would be incredible, but I wouldn't doubt it. It seems none of them has asked the question: How does the establishment of highly contaminating industries in this sector affect contamination, some already in existence: TAPI Puerto Rico, Inc.; Baxter; IPR; Pioneer; Monsanto; PREPA's Thermoelectric and others that have disappeared, such as, Phillips, Puerto Rico Corps; Smith Klein Beecham; SKV and Fibers. Specifically, Fibers and Phillips caused damage in the sector. The first contaminated the land on La Marea with benzene and other carcinogenic material, and the third one contaminated four of the five wells with volatile chemicals and asbestos. So it was put under the superfund of the EPA. This program has a very complex cleaning system of areas, especially occupied by industries that have abandoned the area. In the case of TAPI Puerto Rico, that is right there next to us, according to the list of the EPA, this company contaminated the underground waters with a chemical called isopropyl ether or IPE. Not even one mayor has made any claim for damages or requested the cleaning of the area by the companies that occupy these areas.

Neither have they asked how the projects affect tourism, fishermen and other users of the bay. They also don't know the condition, deterioration of the Jobos Bay, which represents its best and most important resource. They are more interested with Guayama Vive el Encanto and the Salinas Culinary Fest, the patron saint festival divided in a day per month. We can only make reference to the legacy of the governor of Puerto Rico of the Spanish colonial era Miguel de la Torre Ipando, who said the phrase, "A people that are entertained do not conspire. Give them a bottle, give them the cards, give them the dance." They are

PM01-05 (cont'd) unaware of their own region's socioeconomic statistics, like the unemployment rate from Santa Isabel to Patillas, which reaches 33 percent, a poverty index that is over 50 percent and illiteracy that is close to 35 percent. The region is highest in cancer incidence and respiratory illnesses in Puerto Rico and the second region with the highest contamination in the country. They also don't know the demographic information, as the lowest birthrate and a significant reduction in the population after the 2010 census, which now exceeds the reduction of all the decades of the 2000.We only have two questions to ask. In hands of who are we and for how much have we been sold for this project? Our conclusion, we don't have any trust in this project or any other, its proposals, the government agencies or the politicians. It's been proven completely that the others, most of them respond to empty private interests, and others have seen that -- have been so far away from this reality. So therefore we do not consider them capable to make wise decisions and convenient decisions, and to be vigilant in the welfare of the people, as is their constitutional duty. We are still recovering from the 60 million dollars of the super pipeline from the south of Anibal Acevedo Vila, and the 100 million dollars from the stupid action from Luis Fortuño; he paid to his friends. No result has occurred; nobody has gone to jail for it. So questions for the project: What was the bid process? Because this project doesn't begin with the EIS.

As the project states, it covers socio economical needs of the area; we are being affected socioeconomically and environmentally, and in personal terms, affecting our health. What were the requirements? How many companies bid for the project? What were the companies? When was the bid announcement published on behalf of the government of Puerto Rico? What was the criteria? Who does the project belong to? To PREPA or to Aguirre Offshore? Has any government representative benefited financially, any advisor, any lobbyist, from the awarding of that contract? That's a question could be offensive but it's a very legitimate question before all these things that we're seeing, all this bad management. And who else will have the ownership of the facilities to be constructed? I'm sorry. I jumped a line. Has Aguirre, LLC or any affiliate been responsible in the warranting of those benefits? Who will keep the ownership of the waters and the land where the facilities will be built? Who will keep the ownership of the facilities that will be built? If Excelerate, Aguirre, LLC or any subsidiary, in order to gain will gain income through rental fees for land use and waterways? Will there be any explicit or implicit expropriation or evictions from land belonging to the people of Puerto Rico? If there will be explicit or implicit expropriation of private lands. How will this transfer of title of the Puerto Rican waters where this project is being built conflict with the Water Act of 1866?All the waters in Puerto Rico are public, but they are going to be used for a specific purpose and benefit a third party which isn't the people of Puerto Rico or the government. So who do the waters belong to where the project will be built? To Puerto Rico or the United States? How long will the contract be with Aguirre, LLC, a subsidiary or its main company? Does the contract allow for the facilities or the easements and/or lands to be transferred? Is there any penalty or monetary fine to the government of Puerto Rico, in case the contract finishes before the end of the lease? Because if AES fails in this attempt, and the evaluation the fishermen did -- fish ratings, the evaluating agency of that type of company, it was triple B. This was a questionable credit because the communities accepted. But the penalty if they had to leave, for the people of Puerto Rico, is 850 million dollars. So in this case, is the arrangement similar? How much will the penalty be? Who will compensate the fishermen that will have additional costs in order to subsist due to the construction and operation of the project? Who will compensate the damages related to the prohibition of the use of the waters now available for navigation and the enjoyment of these? Has an analysis of the devaluation of the properties of the communities close to the project? Who will compensate to the landowners due to the loss of value? Have any valuations of the properties have been done to make sure that the project will not affect their value? Have any supplementary regulations to the federal agency regulations on the part of local agencies in order to penalize or fine people who come close to the station, ships, pipeline? Will additional exclusion zones be established in addition to those established by the U.S. Coast Guard? And here we are referring to the Department of Natural Resources, if the Puerto Rican government, through its agencies, will make additional regulation, supplementing that which we already know is established by federal regulations the U.S. Coast Guard manages. If so, which will those areas be? In case of intoxication through any gas leak, who will be charged the cost of the medical damages and to

PM01-05 (cont'd) repair and remove the pipeline? Because now we've heard in the project that no excavation or trenches will be done in order to avoid the movement of funds and that the water column is contaminated. But once the pipeline is there and is in the ground, you have to repair it. I have not seen this study in the EIS, that impact.

If definite, the path through Boca del Infierno will be prohibited for small vessels, as the summary states and within the EIS, because it's not the same thing; it's not the same cost for the fishermen. They use daily -- the detour they have to take is considerable. They have to add approximately an additional hour to their route. So that's more time in the water, more fuel. It's harder physically and it deteriorates their vessels more. Who is going to compensate them for that, if that's been analyzed? I haven't finished. If there is any risk for explosion in case any vessels passes close by, or by a gas leak. Meaning, if there is any gas leak and I got with my boat through it, is there any risk for explosion? How will gas leaks be detected? Is there any monitoring to detect them? Will there be any alarm system to know that it's leaking or not? Will there be any alarm to notify the people in the sector to evacuate the area in case there is a gas leak? How much interaction will there be between the ships and the pipeline? That is practically like a belt, where these ships are to one side, at least the one we live or have boats in Guayama. So we have to pass every time. So to give you an example, this summer I went out some 20-25 times, and I went through the area where the pipeline is intended to be placed all 20 to 25 times. Because we use the keys that go through Boca de Infierno. So just me, I had some interaction -- I would have had some interaction with that pipeline if it existed there, because I would go over it. Will the anchoring of ships be allowed to pipelines? For example, is there is any boat that anchors there to fish, will it be allowed, that somebody anchor to the pipe? With this we end our presentation. We appreciate the patience of the people present. And good afternoon.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. And next is Ms. Ruth Santiago. Not to limit the amount of comments of the length of the comments, but just to note that we have the room until 8:00 o'clock tonight, and we've gone through three speakers.

PM01-06 MS. SANTIAGO: Good afternoon to all of you. I don't know if it would be possible for me to stand over here so as not to turn my back to the public because I find that somewhat disrespectful. Maybe like this so I won't turn my back to anybody. My name is Ruth: R-u-t-h, Santiago: S-a-n-t-i-a-g-o, and I'm a legal advisor of the Environmental Dialogue Community, Incorporated, which is comprised of members who are residents of Salinas and Guayama, mainly, those two municipalities. And we have preliminary comments regarding the draft environmental impact statement for offshore gasport in Aguirre, which would be a mile south of Barca Key, and which would also be a floating for regasification of 4.1 miles through the middle of Jobos Bay through the Aguirre complex. These are two plants: Thermo-Electric and Combined Cycle, and it's the largest power plant in Puerto Rico, and also the one that emits most contaminants into the air in Puerto Rico. Dialogue, Incorporated is part of the initiative of Eco-Development of Bahia Jobos, Incorporated, which is an umbrella organization that groups together various community organizations and groups, particularly in Salinas, Guayama, but also Arroyo, Caguas and particularly, also, fishermen groups, associations. Some of the representatives of the groups of fishermen are here present this evening, because we do work jointly with them, but they will be making their own statements also. Dialogue, the organization, does environmental education projects such as environmental contamination, which makes a lot of use of the resting area reserve of the Jobos Bay and the keys and surrounding areas. Also, Dialogue works a lot with environmental justice projects, such as the matter of the multiple forms of contamination of the AES coal plant, which you've already heard about. But we do have many things to say about that also. Also, Dialogue worked for a long time in what was the environmental contractor efforts of PREPA -- the Aguirre plant or complex I should call it, rather. And I would like to begin by making some procedural comments, you know, in procedural matters.

It's been two and a half years. In fact, the first meeting that we attended was held here, working, looking at documents, trying to understand, making suggestions. And more formally, a year ago, the sustainability table was established, and there we sat side by side with -- in addition to representatives of Dialogue and BAJO Fishermen's Association, also PREPA, the governor's mansion/Fortaleza, agencies, the Municipality

PM01-06 Comments noted.

Specific requests under the Freedom of Information Act must be filed in accordance with 18 CFR 388.108.

Section 4.10.1 of the EIS discusses potential air emissions during construction and operation of the Project. Section 3.2 evaluates energy alternatives; however, renewable energy sources such as solar were determined to be developed in insufficient quantity to replace the Project at this time. Also see the responses to comments AG06-16, CO02-03 through CO02-05, CO02-08, IND02-04, and IND08-01.

PM01-06 (cont'd) of Salinas. We've consulted, during these conversations, experts. It's been a very intense process, particularly in this last year. We found that access to information that has been provided by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has been good. The access that we have to the information is good. All the information available on their webpage is very impressive. The information is provided quite quickly and efficiently. Also, this information has had to do with PREPA, also; it's provided us information. And also the Department of Natural and Environmental Resources has given us some information. In relation to Excelerate, we have been able to obtain some information. We have requested two particular studies that have not been provided to us, the Forestal study of 2013, and the Golder study of 2013-B; that has not been provided by them either. We would -- If Excelerate is unable to produce this, we would like this participation today to be considered under the FOIA Act, a request for the provision of those studies. Because we are working with some experts, collaborators of the committee of many years, such as Dr. Aurelia Mercado, oceanographer of the University of Puerto Rico Mayaguez Campus, who need these studies/surveys, to give us independent opinions, you see, so that we can do our work to provide the information to the coastal communities around Jobos Bay.

We also have a process with the U.S. Coast Guard. We are trying to approach them about some information we would like to provide and for them to explain to us certain things that are not clear at all with regard to this project, and we are still waiting for them to tell us. You know, if you could at all encourage them to provide that to us, we would really appreciate it. The committees that we are working with would really appreciate it. Now, we believe this is a joint procedure. In relation to that -- I have the air conditioning right on me. In relation to this process as a joint one, we are concerned because it's been almost a year now since September 24th, 2013. We went some letters to OGPe, the planning board, the Environmental Quality Board and other agencies, but those mainly. And they have not replied in any way. And we have the letters if you want to see them. We would like them to provide us information. At the time maybe they didn't have anything in their files, but anticipating that they would have something in their files, that they provide us the information so that we could be in the position to, you know, comment and work and inform the public. But despite the follow-up that has been given to this matter with the EQB and the Permit Office, we've received no reply, no transparency, no access to information, nothing. It's quite difficult to understand. Therefore, with regard to the joint nature of this process, we are not in a position to comment anything about what could be in OGPe's file. We know the environmental impact statement, the draft that's been proposed will be used. But we believe there must be, also, comments from the agencies involved in the administrative process of this agency. In terms of comments per se about the project, we are going to start with air quality and impacts on the basin area of the Jobos Bay.

Our area is classified as not being subject to classification. In our basin we have -- One of the things we wanted to ask the EQB is why is it listed as unclassifiable, what are the findings, what are the results that would allow us to know what the basic situation that we are before right now. We have some idea. The emissions of AES is the main private source of air contaminants in Puerto Rico. That's right here in our basin. And we know that an analysis a couple of years ago of the inventory of toxic emissions operated by EPA, and we found that AES plant is number 6 on a list of close to 500 plants nationwide in the United States. It's listed as number 6 in terms of the leading emitter of contaminants: hydrochloric acid, nickel, selenium, lead. This was a report published by the Environmental Integration Project. So this is a situation that is of great concern. And in terms of the project that we are considering here today, the complex, it's indicated that the conversion of the Aguirre complex would reduce -- to the bringing of natural gas, would reduce emissions of particle material of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen, carbon monoxide and sulfuric acid. Now, this is in relation to the existing plant, the existing complex of Aguirre. But there is a very particular situation that, in fact, in the draft of the Environmental Impact Statement, several times FERC employees comment that it's unusual the way that the air emissions are being analyzed in this project, and air contaminants are being analyzed in this project. And that is that the emissions of the plant, we believe that they would be reduced, the ones of the Aguirre plant, but the contaminants that would be generated by the project per se would increase because it's something that does not exist. So when you look at anything new, you have new contaminants, new emissions. So we believe that we have to perform a clearer, more

PM01-06 (cont'd) accessible analysis of how it is that the new contaminants or new emissions of that floating offshore port of regasification, and the rotors that have come to bring that natural gas are going to be dealt with, how this is going to be dealt with and how this is going to impact the environment.

Because we know this entails increases and also entails very technical exclusions under the Clean Air Act. Because in this project, on the one hand, many times it's argued that the Aguirre complex and the offshore regasification port are just one entity, you see. But for other things, to exempt them from emission standards, then they treat them separately. Because they established then that the offshore port is something that floats, something that is not permanent, you see. And I'm trying to explain this, but it's very difficult to understand, and I think it's something that warrants a lot more attention and efforts so that it's accessible to people. For example, they say, "Excluded are the boilers of the offshore port and the visiting loaders that bring the natural gas. They exclude the emission of the tanks and the emissions of the engines." This, although on the offshore port, as in these loaders that come to supply them with natural gas; so although these loaders, they will be in the offshore port 3 days out of the year. They also exclude also from the support barges -- their emissions are excluded. They also exclude, I think it's like four tugboats; I think it's, like, a fleet. Some of them are 155 feet. And I think it would be four tugboats for each barge that brings -- that supplies natural gas. And, therefore, there is no clear evaluation of all the emissions and all the contaminants that are going to be generated. And we believe the National Environmental Policy Act of Puerto Rico required that the environmental impact document analyze, disclose, present, discuss, analyze all of these impacts that are significant, you see. And also the federal executive order on environmental justice requires the analysis of these impacts, particularly because it's established here that there can be no doubt that Aguirre, Salinas, Guayama have the elements of environmental justice communities. So it's a disproportionate discharge of sources of contamination, and at the same time marginalization of communities in conditions that are very much below even Puerto Rico in general, despite our very difficult situation in other parts of Puerto Rico.

Construction of the project obviously will generate emissions also. And what we see is that besides these emissions that are not being computed, are not being discussed clearly and are not being regulated, we have increases in emissions of CO2 equivalent because methanol is the main component of natural gas, and is a greenhouse gas, a very powerful one, comparable to CO2. And also the emission of volatile organic compounds which we believe must be mitigated. And we have a letter to read to you regarding this. The School of Medicine of Mount Sinai Hospital, the unit specialized in pediatric environmental health, has issued to us an opinion in relation to some futures of the emission of the project. I won't read them all to you because we can provide them to you later in the comments, but basically, this group of doctors indicated the following: "That with the Aguirre Offshore GasPort Project, the types of DOCs or volatile organic compounds which will be emitted, include chemicals such as formaldehyde" -- and I'm sorry if I pronounce some of these wrong -- "benzene, toluene, hexane and styrene. Many of these DOCs have both short terms and long term effects. This includes the irritation of eyes, nose, throat, skin, headaches, nausea, dizziness, fatigue, shortness of breath and worsening of respiratory conditions such as asthma." "Long term effects which might result from these chemicals are: higher risk for certain types of cancer and other kidney diseases including kidney failure. And then the effects of health will depend on the amount of time the person is exposed." And several comments are made. And they recommend mitigation to prevent the effects of these contaminants. The accumulative impacts of the AAS project and other industries, the Salinas, Guayama landfills, impact the quality because landfills also emit methanol. They impact our environment by gasification of the ocean. We haven't seen in the draft of the environmental impact statement -- it's not mentioned how these air contaminants also contaminate water; and that's the famous acidification of oceans. So we believe that we need to discuss or have some information presented in this regard, and also mitigation. It is stated in the draft statement that since AES operated a photovoltaic plant of 24 megavolts, that this could be some sort of "mitigator" in this case, but that plant has been operating for some time now and there has been no reduction whatsoever in its emission of AES and much less the Aguirre complex, you see, on the contrary.

PM01 – Public Meeting in Guayama, Puerto Rico (cont'd)

PM01-06 (cont'd) You've seen, those of you that are from the area, that the solar power farm in Salinas; it's already under construction and it starts operating soon. It has a capacity of, I think it's 16 megavolts. There is no plan for reduction, on this basis or anything, to reduce AES's or Aguirre complex's emissions. So the fact that those photovoltaic plants for us is that they take away agricultural land that could always be very productive. And in the case of the Aguirre complex, it is expected to increase, for example, the combined cycle of 8 percent of its annual capacity factor, which at present it's 35 percent, and AG1 and AG2 to 55 percent, which is an increase in its operation. As we have stated before, that we believe that the alternative would be -- and it is established in the EIS that if the project is done, that it should be done as a project of the use of natural gas and be transitory, so that we open for solar energy in the roofs, particularly of public buildings, but also private, parking lots, homes, closed landfills. Closed landfills have a double benefit because they seal the landfill so that you don't have a lot of water and you don't generate a lot of leaks in terms of garbage. And also a lot of other contaminated areas that can be used for the solar panel projects versus what is being used right now. We understand that in the EIS draft, the alternative of compressed natural gas should be discussed. The use of compressed natural gas is an existing technology, which could be a viable alternative and we understand it should be included. And regarding air issues, we still have an analysis missing of the winds in the area. We have information that, possibly, that was being presented was wrong, and that 68 percent of the time the winds blow east to southeast, in other words, sea to land.

PM01-07 The climate change analysis in the EIS draft, we didn't see that it considered the higher frequency in tropical storms and hurricanes in the project area, which is something that's related to climate change, and it doesn't discuss adequately the impact of CO2 equivalents, which the project has, and its accumulative effect in the Jobos Bay and the sea. The Jobos Bay we already know, because of the Aldarondo study and others, that there are a lot of heavy metals that have accumulated in the national reserve, specifically in the sea life tissue, there's higher levels of mercury and arsenic. There's what they call the PAS, that I'm not going to try and say the whole name, but this comes from a tire fire that some of you may remember, where many -- and I think that that's a product of the unfulfilled combustion of the tires. And obviously the results of the Aguirre complex have contributed to this situation in the Jobos Bay. The negative effects of these substances that I mentioned, in addition to copper, selenium in the fish, the contamination of agricultural sources, of developed areas, of the Salinas landfill, of the material that's been taken out of the agricultural complex and the wastewater, makes the whole accumulative effect in the Jobos Bay to be significant. And it's been documented that there's a plume of nitrate contamination in the Salinas aquifer, which is coming down. We know that the aquifer of Salinas supplies all the drinking water to the municipality, part of it to Guayama, all of it to Santa Isabel, also. And that plume keeps going down in the aquifer and spreads in the aquifer. And, also, the aquifer supplies water to the bay and to the keys. So that's why in the keys you have vegetation that's not saltwater vegetation, because the aquifer comes out through there. So there is a higher impact to the bay than what is being stated in the draft of the EIS. The exuviations of the Salinas landfill has selenium and DOCs, but they are not being documented, meaning that it's going to be difficult to have record of it. Because BFI, Allied Waste and the Environmental Quality Board moved the monitor wells when they started detecting the contaminants, and we are going to submit that information with the written comments. And, as was mentioned here, AES was discharging wastewater with coal ash. And it was -- a compliance order was issued for many years, which we have the number here. It's CW02-2012-3100.

PM01-08 The studies commissioned by EPA to the University of Vanderbilt state that metals and toxins in the Agremax coal ashes. That was a study, EPA600R724.Dr. Braulio Jimenez has documented also the amount of mercury and arsenic emissions that are deposited from AES in the sea. And last, as a contaminant to water and the surrounding bay, we have the thermal discharge of the Aguirre complex, which discharges waters that reach 106 Fahrenheit, and that together with the thermal discharge of the project or hot water for the project, have, again, a cumulative effect, which states that although these two sources are not going to find each other, there is evidence that in the areas where you have the keys and where the proposed project is supposed to be, there's a flow of water that comes in through these spaces in between the keys, towards the bay. And regarding the 316 study of the Federal Water Regulation, we found that there is a lot of dragging, of impact to the larvae and the fish eggs because they are brought from those that come from

PM01-07 There are no thresholds of significance criteria established by the EQB or EPA for Project GHG emissions. There is no legal precedent to make a damage claim for stationary source or Project GHG emissions causing local climate change impacts. Climate change is caused by global impacts and effects.

However, the discussion of GHG and climate change in the Cumulative Impacts section of the EIS (see section 4.12.2.3) has been updated with the 2014 report findings of the U.S. Global Change Research Program (U.S. National Climate Assessment, June 2014).

Also see the responses to comments AG06-30, CO01-05, and CO02-03.

PM01-08 Due to revised construction methods, subsea surface currents are not anticipated to be significantly affected by the presence of the pipeline. Therefore, no significant impacts on coral larvae and ichthyoplankton are anticipated. Pipeline burial would ensure that the subsea and surface currents are not altered. In addition, we are recommending in section 4.5.3.3 that Aguirre LLC develop a lighting plan that identifies specific measures to minimize or avoid impacts associated with the Project's operational nighttime lighting on avian species, fish species, marine mammals, various life stages of sea turtles, and people on the shoreline.

Also see the responses to comments AG02-10, AG02-18, AG02-28, AG02-30, and CO02-16.

PM01-08 (cont'd) the outside, from the area where the project would be located. And they reach the thermal discharge existing, of the complex. And that's why study 316 proves that there's a lot of sea life that is being impacted with that discharge. So there is a relation between the two discharges of accumulated impact. We need that with the fisheries or what's referred to as fish of commercial value. It's been underestimated, the accumulative impact that the project would have with the already existing causes. So the project would bring on its own impact, the dragging of larvae and fish eggs because the project requires a lot of water; 56 million gallons of water daily just for the floating unit of regasification, and up to 302 million -- not daily, 302 million for the loaders that are there, usually for three days. Every eight days they would come for three days, the larger ones. And that would cause a lot of dragging of the larvae and fish eggs, and bio-elimination by using copper.

Also, the pipe that's proposed to be put on the seabed, after its installation -- obviously a lot of sedimentation is lifted during its construction, which is fatal for coral in particular and other sea life. But after its installation, it's also been stated that it could continue causing sedimentation and turbidity in the water, depending on how much it goes into the sea bed. Because it's been said that it can be on top of the sea bed, and that it will, little by little, go into the seabed. But that also makes a sedimentation turbidity. And also, the thermal discharges can reach, when these floaters of liquid gas and natural gas, when they discharge the hot water, that discharge can reach into the sea bed also, and continue raising sedimentation and ruining the fisheries. And it can be dispersed over some meters, so the recommendation from FERC is very much accepted, from the employees of FERC that are doing this job, that are producing this draft, which hasn't reached the Commission as such, that studies are made on the sediment to see how extensive that harm -- that damage can be to the fisheries. We believe that it's been shown that the sediments are contamination with past DDT, arsenic, copper, nickel. And in addition to that, if the discharge waters are also going to have copper, then you have to see the cumulative effect of those discharges and the copper that's in the sediment. The studies that were done on the plankton, the sea life in the bay and in the Caribbean Sea have certain data limitations. It underestimates by far how many fish eggs are going to be dragged in. And just for the coral larvae. That was just in the one day of sampling.

Also, the temperature that the thermal discharge is allowed is based on a project which is called Northeast Gateway, which is in the north of the Atlantic. And we believe that we could question how applicable that data would be with a project in a location so far, with such different conditions that could be applied here. Obviously, we've mentioned a lot that the proposed pipeline would create a barrier for conch and other sea life, such as sea cucumbers and -- well, that's been mentioned a lot about the project, that that would be difficult to overcome. It's been said here now in the draft of the EIS. I've seen for the first time that the conch could go under the pipeline, because since the sea bed is not totally level, that they could go underneath. We understand that there is a need for empirical studies to show that, because if not it's like an experiment, which could have devastating consequences. Also, the route of the loaders should be chosen, not like the Coast Guard has stated, that no route has been established as such. It should be one that's chosen, from south to north, and does not go laterally from east to west because of the platform. That's where the fishermen have all their artisan fishery, and this could be devastating for all of that. Also, it's been mentioned the lights of the project would go into the fluorescent bay; could be different types of lights: security, navigation, compliance with the FAA. But those lights have the effect of attracting smaller organisms that attract fish, and others that are exposed to copper, to the chemicals of the thermal water. There's studies that show that the fish that come into these zones, the thermal waters, can be sterilized, right? So you have to consider all that accumulative impact and also consider that corals -- although you are talking about replanting them, not all corals are capable of being adapted to a new environment, and it takes a lot time. Certainly, some will not recover. So this is a question for the fisheries that leads us to what is environmental justice. And we said that this area, specifically Salinas and Guayama, has a disproportionate contamination burden. And the executive or the environmental justice principles require that there's a fair treatment to the communities and the people to be impacted by projects.

PM01-09 The draft contains certain amount of data on the situation of environmental justice. It does talk about unemployment being the highest, that the poverty is highest, that there's a very critical situation. But it doesn't analyze how it would be impacted, how these communities are going to be impacted by the sea impact. In that sense, Dr. Garcia Quijano has documented a lot. The way in which many families of Aguirre, Salinas, Guayama depend for their subsistence, meaning to feed themselves in the first place, and some, as fishermen, that do exchanges or they sell smaller quantities, artisan fishermen. How they use the sea resource in a very impressive way. And there is no analysis in the draft EIS of that fair treatment or the executive order for that impact. We've already seen that these fishers would have an impact because of the project, and what corresponds, then, is to do that analysis. But you know that in the coastal communities of Jobos Bay, Salinas, it's not -- they do not only relate to the resources to fish. There's also tourist activity, specifically tourists and people that come from other parts of Puerto Rico, the Metropolitan area, et cetera, that come. And the residents of the communities provide certain services: transportation, sea transportation, vessel repairs, vessel storing, preparing food, all of that. Incredibly, we don't see any reference to this socio-economical link regarding the activities that depend on the sea in the draft of the EIS. Therefore, the impact isn't discussed that would have had these activities if the project is done, and maybe tourist don't see like that's attractive, "another industrial facility" in the middle of the keys. They keys are what attract, they are the respective beaches of Salinas and Guayama.

It was said that here in the affected areas there's six fisheries, right? Now, it hasn't been said that in Jobos Bay there's some areas that you can't fish because they are part of the reserve; they are a protected area. That, accumulated with all the situation that we've mentioned that's accumulative, leaves a limited space, which if the platform just south of the keys, for fishing. So the project would be in one of those areas. There is a slide that indicates -- the proponent here supposedly -- allegedly interviewed ten fishermen. What we found asking about the situation, that yes, apparently ten persons were interviewed, and not all of them were fishermen. And one of them, who isn't a fisherman, prepared some circles in the map that are not of the fishing areas. Because with 10 people, which not all of them were fishermen, you are not going to have all the areas anyway. But where I'm going, is that fishing areas were limited in a way that is not representative to the reality. The platforms at the south of the keys between Salinas and Guayama are the fishing areas of local fishermen. We wanted to show a recent newspaper article that states that the fishermen in Puerto Rico are artisanal. They don't have very large ships or very sophisticated equipment. They can't go very far. But on occasions they have been -- it's gone awry and they have ended up in Colombia and places like that. The newspaper article is "He lives to tell the tale" from June 20, 2004. And although it's in the southwest, this is what happens every certain... And it's not a type of situation that we can ignore. There is a very specific situation with the EIS draft in the description of the keys to justify the route the project. The problem is that there is a very big mistake. It says that Cabo Morrillo is a main attraction for residents and tourists. That, really, I had to consult it with fishermen, local fishermen. Because all my life they've said that Morrillo is just rocks, and we've confirmed it from one side and the other. Morrillo is not a tourism area, a visitor's area. And so the disqualification of an alternative route because it's close to Morrillo, there's no basis for that.

Also, if it's because of the use of the keys, the Barca Key, which is just in the north of the proposed plant's location, the floating regasification plant, it's also a key used for tourism. It's what is known as the Guayama Beach; because that's the peculiarity of this area, that coastal zones -- more than anything else, the keys are the beaches of this area. It's not like in other places where there are these long beaches on solid ground. Also, the pipeline would go close to Caribe Key, which has a small dock, has trails, an observation tower and other facilities which belong to the reserve, and receive mostly educational tourism, scientific. It's the area where every year you do the environmental living, which is the main activity for the Environmental Dialogue Committee, and it's been confirmed that for every dollar that you invest in national parks, you get a benefit of 1.67.So all these other activities and services provided by the fishermen and the restaurants, an analysis has to be done of environmental justice regarding all that financial link and how it would affect the project, that activity, the main sources of income. And another example says that the nautical club of Guayama has an amount of spaces for vessels or ships. What happens is that you have

PM01-09 We updated section 4.8.5 to provide a more detailed analysis of the potential socioeconomic impacts and mitigation measures associated with the Project. In addition, we updated section 4.7.4 to clarify that the amount of recreational and commercial fishing provided is a sample and may not list all water-dependent activities within Jobos Bay.

PM01-09 (cont'd) to go beyond that. That's like that, but the nautical club has double the membership than the spaces it has. I don't know if you've seen that on weekends they bring their boats through land. Not all of them leave them there. The same thing with the marina at Salinas. Yes, these are spaces that are numbered spaces, but if tomorrow -- Let's do that exercise. Let's look outside the bay and you'll see that you also have sailboats that are anchored. And talking about sailboats, if the Coast Guard says that in Boca del Infierno the depth -- which is a very shallow area, and with the pipeline going above two feet -- because you have reefs there, the pipeline isn't going to go into the land. That would be a restriction for sailboats automatically.

PM01-10 And sailboats also, just as the Coast Guard says, you have to use extreme caution in laying the pipe. So if the pipe is going to be through the middle of Jobos Bay, anybody coming out of the marina, that club, has to go through it. And many of those coming out of Las Mareas or Mosquito, Chuchin, San Felipe, all that, that's all in the middle of it, that specific route. So in summary, it would be that the project could have significant impact in the sustainability and health of coastal communities. And there's a great discrepancy in the official documents in the job creation that the project would create in construction phase. We know that in its operation phase, it's pretty clear that it would be 15 jobs and that 10 percent of those jobs would be for local people, that is to say 1.5 jobs in its operation. No, in its construction, it is said in the EIS draft that it would be 350 jobs. While in the location consultation, I've just been told by my fellow colleagues here that it would be 140 jobs. Besides that, there is a detail that in the contract, I think it's a charter party, it states that if PREPA wanted to hire personnel from the United States to work in those ships, it would have to pay on top of it, because apparently they want to hire people -- foreigners and pay them at the rate that they pay them. So for a citizen, like a Puerto Rican, for example, there's not much incentive to hire them if that contractual provision is there. Regarding security of the project, Dr. Aurelio Mercado, as I indicated, is collaborating. He is an oceanographer and an expert in wave analysis, storms, tsunamis and hurricanes. He prepares maps for such events in Puerto Rico, and he is collaborating. He is interested in being provided this information of the studies mentioned so that we have some collaboration in information to go a little bit more in-depth in terms of security. The documents mention that this is an area -- two things are stated: moderate seismic activity. Moderately high and then it says that it's high, and that it has the potential of liquation, this soil. So another aspect is that a recent case of the Swiss Matthews ship running around in the Langa Maria Key close to Guayanilla -- we have a lot of key; it's not just one. So that specific incident which was in 2009, which was in Guayanilla, is of great concern.

PM01-11 The capacity to fight fires has been questioned; who is going to pay that. So there's things that haven't been deciphered, haven't been solved. In terms of species that are threatened or that in risk of extinction, we know that Jobos Bay has the three essential elements for the attraction and that are important for manatees, which are shallow protected waters, no salt water and the seaweed. And I think that it's very clear that this area is the second highest populated by manatees in all of Puerto Rico. And it's important to notice that all the sightings of the manatees and sea turtles were in Boca del Infierno, the route that's been proposed. All of them were there. All the proponent's, that's where they say mainly these species that are threatened or in danger of being extinct. We also believe that there should be committee participation and mitigation plans, observation of sea life. Fishermen can see a manatee or a sea turtle so quickly, more so -- they've told us that if you want to go, for example, to Morriño Keys, they are willing for you to see it. It's not just like it's in the document. And they have this experience that could be in line with the mitigations. We believe that there are several studies that haven't been done. This turtle study is very limited. It wasn't done for other organisms as dwarf sea horses. The coral setting was very limited for the plankton. And I have some miscellaneous issues, which are that there are some maps that are wrong, that the current from the north equator is not the south of Barca Key. It's 100 miles from here, and that's wrong in the map. There's no such thing as Salinas River; it's called Nigua. And that the restoration list should be updated. Those are my comments. Thank you very much.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Ms. Santiago. The next speaker is Miguel Ortiz.

PM01-10 We have recommended that Aguirre LLC provide a construction access plan to address concerns regarding recreational users of the bay during construction. In addition, Aguirre LLC has, in a sworn affidavit, stated its employment plans. Regarding issues of seismic activity, FERC has requested additional information from Aguirre LLC. Also, all of the information filed by Aguirre LLC can be accessed by the public through our eLibrary system.

PM01-11 The FSRU firefighting capability is described in section 4.11.5.1, and regulatory requirements for LNG carriers are described in section 4.11.7.1. Information about the manatee and sea turtle and the Project's potential impact on the manatee is provided in section 4.6.1. In addition, we have recommended MMOs be used during construction to minimize impacts on these species.

MR. ORTIZ: It's cold here. Good evening to all of you. My name is Miguel A. Ortiz Serrano. I am the chair of the Fishermen's Village in Guayama, treasurer of the Federation of Commercial Fishermen in Puerto Rico and part of the fishing advisory board at the Department of Natural Resources. I was born and raised in the area of Pozuelo. As you see here, we are fenced by this project, and I am a commercial fisherman. I have 17 to fishermen in the fishermen's association. We have been working with this project for over two years now, because since the first public comment meeting here was held I was here also. And from then, we have been following up in all its parts. And the conversations that we have held among us groups of fishermen in the area -- and you know Guayama includes Branderi, Las Mareas, Barrance, Pozuelo, Puente de Jobos, Miramar, Santa Ana and Puerto de Jobos -- Jobo's Puente and Puerto and Pozuelo, including El Mosquito and El Chunchin. And you can see we are fenced in. And the only exit we have is Boca de Infierno. So anyway, we would have to go over the pipe. And in addition to that, this area of Boca de Infierno is a fishing area, not as it is indicated in the book. This whole area, including the whole edge of Pozuelo, if you go around it, all that way to Boca de Infierno, including the keys, that whole area is a fishing area.

PM01-12 In fact, it's an area where conch are raised, where the keys are. And here, in the middle of Boca de Infierno, is where we fish conch -- the ones that are ready to be fished, because the ones that you see are usually younger. And in this area (indicating) are the bigger ones, where the guys dive and fish them. Even the guys from Salinas fish in that area. I had made a comment before at the previous meeting, where -- Remember, this is prohibited. So as I was saying, in this area here (indicating) is where conch are fished. And located here (indicating), the Jobos port is on the other side here, and we'd have to go through this whole area (indicating) to be able to go out to Boca de Infierno. So you see, we would have to go over the pipe. So I ask you, what guarantee does this company have building this pipe in this direction? What guarantee would there be in an event that a ship has to come in and they would not notice and run into that pipe? This is something that's possible and can happen, because ships can come at 1:00, 2:00, 3:00 a.m., 4:00 a.m., and at least we go out in the evening, in the afternoon, and we come back in the early morning hours. And the same thing can happen with other ships, and we've seen that there. And the other thing is that this over here (indicating) is the Nautico, and higher up is the Guarida del Cocrodilo. And us who are here (indicating), between all of us, approximately there are 200 to 300 water crafts that are always going through Jobos Bay. That's in addition to those who come from the north: Bayamon, Caguas, Cayey, who bring their water crafts to navigate, to go to Isla de Barco for purposes of internal tourism. Our concern is, have you studied how much impact will this have directly on tourism? Because at least now, at this time Guayama and Salinas are trying to develop internal tourism. With the situation there with the government, and we are trying to develop these areas: Cayo Barco, and as Ruth said, Caribe and the area of Dos Palmas, this whole area there. We use it for internal tourism. I think that if I see a pipe that's going to go through an area where I'm going to go enjoy myself with my family, exposing it to a potential accident, I'd rather not go. So this will have a direct negative impact on tourism in the area of Guayama and Salinas.

PM01-13 Although this project will be built in the area of Salinas, we will also be affected in the same manner because we are in here (indicating), you see. And as I was telling you, this whole area is a fishing area. We fish all kinds of fish here. This whole area is dedicated to fishing. And we're not sure either -- we also made these comments at the meeting -- how safe is it for us to fish next to that pipe or go over it? And nobody has been able to answer that question, because we don't know if after the pipe is built, after it's installed there, how restricted the pipe will be. So that we can feel at ease that we can fish in the area and we can go over the pipe. It's been said here that conch can go over the pipe, but this is somewhat contradictory, because several times we've commented this, and it just so happens that the conch can go below the pipe as long as it's high, elevated. But then they've said the contrary, because they said that as they install it on the platform, with time it will sink. So I just don't understand, you see.In fact, this pipe will not completely sink. And that's the problem we are having with the fishing situation. And, again, I repeat, we believe that there are problems in our area of Guayama due to contamination, and we want to do everything possible to collaborate and be as simple as can be. So that if anything comes to be manufactured in the area of Guayama and Salinas, it will not continue to harm the health of the residents of the communities in the area. So those

PM01-12 Aguirre LLC revised its construction method to include pipeline burial. The revised method would result in fewer impacts on species such as the Queen conch. The existing vessel traffic through the Boca del Infierno pass would not change due to the presence of the pipeline because we are recommending that the pipeline be constructed either by HDD through the pass or be rerouted, primarily to avoid impacts on coral resources in this area. Further, we are recommending in section 4.7.7 that Aguirre LLC develop a construction access plan to minimize the impacts on the community during construction of the facilities. Section 4.8.5 also discusses concerns regarding tourism (and also visual impacts) and references the most current economic indicators related to tourism from the U.S. Census Bureau. We added additional detail to the final EIS to expand on the potential impacts of the offshore terminal on tourism.

PM01-13 See response to comment AG08-06.

PM01-13 (cont'd) are the comments that I have. And I think that later, the Federation, before the end of the month, will be sending you a written statement, which is the one that we will be sending regarding this project. Thank you to all.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you, sir. The next speaker is Angel Febles.

PM01-14 MR. FEBLES: Good evening to all of you. Angel Febles: A-n-g-e-l, Febles: F-e-b-l-e-s. I belong to this area of Jobos. I'm a sports fisherman because they have not granted me any other license, but, well, anyways. So this area of Guayama has been punished for the benefit of others since way before I was born. Phillips was a great business. When they left, that was left contaminated. Now we have the famous coal plant that supposedly has everything already. But they contaminate us. And who benefits from this? The Metropolitan Area, all those people. And they have jobs. They have jobs over there, although difficult, but they have jobs. And this fishing area, there are people here who still fish with rowboats. And they leave here to go to Salinas to make a living. So you have not talked about those people. And there's a number of unregistered fishermen, because they have not been able to get a license. But there's a large number of fishermen who have not been granted this. And they have not been taken into account either, because to get a fisherman's license here you have to be a magician. There are several "guarderias" here. The one I know, at least, has 70 boats permanently. It can go up to 100 when people come down. Miguel has another, fishing has another. That's besides the people who come -- We've run into people who come all the way from Venezuela in sailboats. They go through here (indicating), go around, spend a couple of days there and go out again. And this here is what these people make a living with. And you can see the depths here, that fishermen on bigger boats have to wait for a wave to be able to go over that area because it's not very deep. Some months it's deep but other months it can be as shallow as six feet. And you are going to be using up to two feet, so nobody will be able to navigate through there. If I were from a different area and I would see this ugly thing there that contaminates -- because it contaminates, people.

It contaminated, whether a lot or a little. So just the potential of anything happening there, I would not go. And, see, there is more risk over here (indicating) than over here (indicating). I went to a conference a week ago, and the fire department was there, and the fireman who was there, you know, an official of rank, he said that in 15 minutes, if something happens, a cloud or some kind of a leak, they'd be there standing by, ready to sprinkle it with chemicals. Look, they are not even able to extinguish fires in the countryside, and they are right by them. All these things have not been measured. We are going to experience the same thing that the States experienced with the last war. All these chemicals, look, all these people want to put all these chemicals on us and nobody actually did a study to see if these chemicals actually existed. And when they went over there to fight with these people, they never found the famous chemicals. And that's what's happening here. Everything that you are doing is beautiful. But how many of you people have gone to these areas on boat, you people present? None of you have seen how beautiful this is. How many of you have stood there on one of the piers just to look at the sunset, watch the manatees? I wish you could see how people from the Metropolitan Area, when you say, "Oh, there's a manatee there," they all run to go see that beautiful animal. Dolphins. We have dolphins here, too, and sharks. Because it's a mating area. And we can show you pictures that are on the networks and videos that the guys have. And this whole study was done from a place over there in San Juan; they got all these things, gathered all these things; they read that; they placed it the way that served their best interest and that was the end of it. But nobody actually went to this ward, this neighborhood, to see how poor it is, to see how these people have to go hustle to make a couple of bucks. It's not easy. I know a couple who have shipwrecked here and they've only made it back to the coast by an act of God. And I can get those people for you. A study is one thing and reality is another.

And we can see that this is a reality in this pipe. You say 24 inches once it's done. And you know that here PREPA has a pipe this wide (indicating), that when the fishermen are going to throw the anchors, when they take their anchors back out, they actually pull that cable up with their anchor. And they used to say that that would never happen, that it could not happen, and it happens all the time. People who go there who are not from the area, they throw their anchor in. When they are going to lift up their anchor they say,

PM01-14 Sections 4.7.5 and 4.8.3 address that the number of fishers in the area are estimates and may vary based upon who is providing the count of total fishers. In addition, the construction method has been revised and the pipeline will be buried or covered with concrete mats and, therefore, concerns about inadvertent anchor strikes should be adequately mitigated. In addition, section 3 provides information and analysis on a wide range of alternatives that were considered for the Project.

PM01-14 (cont'd) "Oh, what is this? Oh, it's the PREPA cable." So imagine when that pipe is there. When a boat, out of bad luck -- like it happened with one of mine -- sinks and hits that pipe. I didn't want it to sink, but it sank and hit the pipe. If it's a reality -- in the States it's required to be installed out more; why is it going to be installed in more? We are human beings and it should be installed as it's done in any other country so we are subject to less contamination. Look, when barges come in, they come in through here (indicating), and that's all ruined already. It's all messed up or ruined, because whenever they go through, they lift up everything at the bottom of the sea. These people are going to take millions. And wherever you can make this shorter you'll save money. That's logical. So among all the millions, you can probably install this pipe over there (indicating) and take it out some more so that these people can fish at ease and make a living, just as any of you make a living. The only thing is that they earn a lot less and they have to go through a little more trouble.

Look, here, when those tugboats start coming in, which we've already seen, they're going to go in wherever they want to go in, and hook up here or over there. They don't care. They don't care about these people. They'll just go in wherever they feel like it and let them deal with it. You're going to have to establish a path or demand under penalty of fine, because if there are no fines they won't do it. You have to go through this route to comply, otherwise the quickest way is the way that they are going to choose. In the border, also, you have to -- the people from AES, the coal plant, they have their established routes already, so that we can avoid and make sure that these people can continue to make a living. You mentioned that you are going to be mitigating. From what this lady read, we are going to mitigate. But what are we going to mitigate? You don't have anything in place. "No, once we build and we break up things, we'll see how we mitigate as we go along." Look, put it in the book already. These people didn't do this today. They've done this in other countries and they know what they are going to damage. So, look, add mitigation already. You've already done it in other countries. Don't wait until you start breaking things, demolishing things, to then decide how you are going to mitigate. Because that's what you always say; that's what they always say. But I won't be there. Foolish they are to say that, "Oh, look, I just ruined your coal but I'll just put it over there." I won't be there. There's no repair. This can't be repaired. It's something that just can't be repaired. And these guys fish lobsters, everything, and they've been doing it their whole life. And they risk their lives. They can take you around the bay and then take you out to sea. You'll see the difference. And any of them will lend you their boat or go on a job with them to fish so you can see what it's like. Don't do this from an office.

From an office everything looks beautiful. The fishing areas, like the fishing areas that you established there, and we're all laughing at. Now, please go there. There's an association there of fishermen for this. Because I'll tell you, I won't go out. I won't go out to sea. I only fish there. That's not true. They can never fish there. If I'm one of the ten I wouldn't go out to sea, and the one who's rowing doesn't go out to sea either. But the others, they do because they have to support their families and they have to go fishing out to sea. So how many miles away from this -- they can't practically fish there. For a mile they can't fish there, so you have to go further to catch fish. More gasoline, more time, more risk. To earn what? The same thing. Because they aren't going to find more fish. This should be better planned and with more people from here, the people who really know. Because the people who build this, they leave. The insurance, if they have it, let them risk it. If something happens here and there's no insurance -- I mean, look, we have the Cataño plant that blew up and it was only one container. My parents-in-law live there. How much did it take them to see how they were going to bring water to put out that fire? They had to even install pipes to bring it from the ocean. And supposedly there was a plan. In the event of an accident, you know, it was going to be immediately fixed. But we've already seen it happen. How long did it take them? How much damage was caused to these poor people's homes? And don't think they fixed them up for them. You can go and see for yourselves. Even the Municipality didn't do anything. Maybe windows, but for many people they didn't repair anything.

So imagine if this blows up. The way things are now, where everybody wants to take something from the States, with a boat there it will blow up. And you tell me you're going to have a bunch of security, safety,

lights, all this, but if I find the pipe four feet down... For vandalism there's no price, that's priceless. I put a little hole in it, put a little bit of explosive in there and blow up everybody. Look, I'm 5 foot 6 inches tall, and this is (indicating) how deep the pipe will be in certain areas, in good areas where the tide is high. See, this is what these people have not measured. Everything in books looks great, and you can even make it to the moon with the book. And if you use the internet it's even quicker. But it's not the reality, what we see in the books. Because when we start seeing the people that have been -- the things that have been omitted, you start thinking, "My God, how can they omit this?" Eighteen fishermen only between Salinas and Jobos is what the book says. And that's not the reality, it's just that they don't have a license. I hope you think about all these things. Go to the field. Don't rely on everything that is written. I used to be a teacher, and, you know, you can't trust everything you read. Go to the field. That's why there are millions. Go there, measure, take measurements. Do your studies there in the field. Because we should take from that money all the studies that were not done. One from Malaysia, from another place. But from here, no. And so when the failures start then the excuses will start. They are going to come up with all these excuses, "Oh, no," you see. You believed that they had done this study but they hadn't. How could you believe that? And this is not only for the benefit of the Metropolitan Area with the electricity. This has to benefit my son, my children, my great-grandchildren, because the same that has already happened with the other things that have been placed here is going to happen with this project, that once they leave, they just leave everything there abandoned. Otherwise, go for it. Go look at these areas they have already worked on with these supposed miraculous projects. And I'm not opposed to this because they say it's going to benefit everybody, but for the people who are here, the locals, there is no benefit whatsoever. I wish you all a good night.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. The next is Mayra Rangel Diaz. No? Okay. Eugenio Vives, next one. Is here? He left. Next person, Santiago Rodriguez Almodovar. He's not here either. Next, Joel Melendez.

PM01-15 MR. MELENDEZ: This is Joel Melendez. I'm doing this personally. I don't represent any specific organization. But I have certain concerns about the document, specifically in mitigation areas. When we talk about the hydraulic resources, in several cases it's mentioned that the recommendations to prepare mitigation documents or studies. We've seen that during these comments, and PREPA mentioned that mitigation documents will be previous -- before beginning the works. And you say that these documents should be ready before the public discussion area ends. In Puerto Rico we have problems with mitigation. As marine biologist, as planner, as ten years as a consultant, what is seen is that we mitigate and then we forget where we mitigated. When you mitigate in document, you should have a part where it discusses an evaluation process to analyze that the mitigation was accurate and if it gave good results. That doesn't occur.

So in other words, if we establish that we mitigate sea grass, number one: That we've already done it, that the Department of Natural Resources did it, that there were no results on many occasions and we lost the mitigated areas and new ones were done in the marinas. And then we didn't do anything. So the question is, the mitigating document, will it establish what we are we going to do if the mitigation is not successful? When we work with planting coral reefs -- that there's three groups right now -- after we put a new species in the list and there's monies to mitigate, now everybody is an expert doing it. But the people that work with NOAA, like Sea Venture, people who work with groups like Hector Rivera, who works with Natural Resources, there a only a few of them. And we know that when we create a coral farm with the pieces we will have, and we plant them, if we don't carry out the correct protocols they die.How are we going to measure the effect of those coral reefs? Where are those farms going to be? Where are the mitigation areas going to be? Are those areas going to be close to the hot water plumes? That coral, how are the diseases of the zones going to be measured? Are they going to be there or in another location? Are the areas going to isolated or not? When are we going to see the mitigating plans? Because I have to say, the document, for those of us that work with coral reefs, the area or the analysis that was carried out and the benthic map that was made was a very good job. Looking at it that way, I have to admit that it was a very good job. Now, if we start off on the right foot, why are we going with the left foot? Because what is missing from

PM01-15 The FERC continues to maintain oversight of projects during both construction and operation. Through the FERC filing process, the applicant attests under oath that all information provided is true and accurate. The proposed environmental mitigation measures for the Project are included throughout the EIS. Provided that the Commission adopts the recommendations as required actions in any authorization for the Project, our conclusions as to the level of impact on the resources are valid. Part of FERC's permitting process requires that an applicant address such mandatory conditions during all phases of construction and operation. Also see the responses to comments AG02-10 through AG02-17 and CO02-42.

PM01-15 (cont'd) this document is the mitigation plans. I would like to see them. Because although the Department of Natural Resources establishes what they want, there's some protocols already in effect that we know work. Those people who are going to work with mitigation say "we need those protocols from the proponent," through bid or opening, that they are going to then present or what the protocol is going to be. And, then, depending on the cost, the cheaper one that they are going to choose. So how is that going to work? Because this is going to be subcontracted. So who are we going to subcontract? Are we going to measure the expertise? Are we going to measure the associated costs or are we going to get the cheaper one? And then, what are we going to do?

PM01-16 Now, in terms of saying that we are talking about the use of soil and recreational resources, very good. We have maps. We use -- the maps are very beautiful. I've been working for ten years in geographical information systems. I represented the firms that sell the equipment in Puerto Rico and I sold a lot of the equipment to government. But the problem we have is that we don't use the data to make it public. We have the maps, but there's no coordinates on the maps. It's necessary for the document to have a coordinate table in which any person -- in my case right now, that I'm in the university, that if I want, through the software that you are also using, observe, to verify, or in a ship -- in the case of marine biology -- to place in a GPS the coordinates, run in through the zone, do a photo transect or that the community decide to examine the area and wants to go exactly through the area. Because if we go into a discussion, and the persons want to see and establish or do a transect or they want to do the same study or conduct parallel studies, it has to be done in the same place. I mean, if we go into legal terms -- you're all attorneys -- it's bottles and oranges. We are not comparing the same thing. So where is the coordinate table that shows me where the pipe is going to be laid? If I'm a citizen and I want to visit the area now and do a photo transect of the area, and later on I want to do the same thing, I don't have it. Do you follow? So these are specific elements that are important. That we also need to have a map where you have the area that surrounds -- buffering zone around the area, because people don't see. Because if there is no buffer that states what's the distance between 450 meters, they don't visualize it. They don't know what's happening and the effect. Because as the gentleman talked about, a possible explosion of the area and compared Hiroshima -- I don't know. I am not an expert on explosives. But if that's one of the concerns the community has, then it should be looked at in terms of preparing, because we have done those studies before, and to prepare with the geographical information systems. If we know the amount of fuel you have there and we know the expansive wave, you can easily do a map with the rings, and establish up to where the wave could reach. And that's something that has been done, which has been done in similar jobs with Emergency Management. And we do have the technology and we have the instruments to do so. If it's a concern of the community, why are we not tending to it?

PM01-17 In addition to that, in terms of construction, it's been mentioned on several occasions that we have areas where we have to close in moments of construction. We are talking about project management. Then, I would have to tend to the concern of the community, preparing maps, dates and so on, the situation of what would be the possible zones that will be closed during the project phases, the different periods. That's fair. And going into my personal opinion of an organization, Ecotonuei (phonetic), that we are representing today, I have to go to social mitigation. You mention that we are going to close. The fishermen in Puerto Rico, unfortunately, we do bullying to them on a lot of topics. We accuse them of being the responsible ones of the conditions of sea resources, that they kill everything. We accuse them that they destroy everything, and they are the bad guys in the movie. But in these specific times that we have to tend to these circumstances, and we talk about having to close, the fisherman has to pay for water. PREPA is going to bill for his electricity, and they are going to cut power off for that project if he doesn't pay that month. Aqueducts will do the same. We can take it for granted: "If you don't pay for this month the service will be cut off." So if we are saying, and the document is saying that the fellow colleagues from the Department of Natural Resources that are here, they are willing to educate people in terms of the monitoring of mammals, why don't to pay these fishermen who are already in the area, instead of paying these experts that were certified just the other day? They are certified because I see that they are certified with the

PM01-16 The locational coordinates for this Project, provided by Aguirre LLC, are available on our eLibrary system.

PM01-17 See the response to comment AG05-21.

certificate to look at mammals. And you charge for that. I want to go into that. But that's just brand new; I hadn't seen that before.

PM01-18 But if this is a social project to include the community, why don't you hire the fishermen in the months that they are going to close, that they are not going to be paid? They can do part of the monitoring and they get paid. Because we could have alternatives such as, the months that you are going to close and they don't have any type of income, then PREPA don't charge them for power or PRASA don't charge them for water. That the government pay them. Because when the movie came here, Pirates of the Caribbean, in which part of our work was affected, since we couldn't dive in the area that was being filmed, we were paid 75 dollars a day to each person that works in diving for not going out to dive. Because they were using the Palomino Key and Palominito, and there couldn't be a ship there so that the ship wouldn't be in the movie. So we could have options where if the fishermen can't go out to fish and visit its fishing areas, then "I'll pay him for the day that he can't fish." That's an alternative. Would it be cost-effective for the project? That I don't know. But those are the alternatives that we are talking about, social mitigation, financial mitigation. In my terms as a planner, I'm scared of the fact that I'm told, "No, but so little time." Let's talk about data. I like to about data. Now, in Puerto Nuevo, manatee observers were hired for three months. They worked for six months. Why? Because when we have a manatee in the water and we are doing a job, the person says, "there's a manatee." We can't work. So that means that if PREPA's plan is for one year, and if the manatee was there for five days without moving, for five days you didn't work.

PM01-19 For the people that are there that isn't a problem because they are getting paid for the five days, but the fisherman didn't go out for five days, for five days wasn't paid. And if there are other operations it's the same thing. So it's a very comfortable stance. "No, we are going to work. We are going to close for a short time. We will finish quickly." But the truth is another. So what are we going to do? I think that we are beginning certain part of the documents that I don't agree, others that I like. I think there's a progress in terms of what we've done in terms of the work in the field. I know part of the people who worked in the project that went into the water. I know that a good job was done there. But we do have to be aware that we can't promise things that we are not going to fulfill. The mitigation documents are important. In each mitigation document there has to be an area to measure the mitigation, if it was done or not, and if you could achieve the objectives that you wanted. And if not, you have to ask yourself what are you going to do. Is there money to do again what didn't work or there's no money to do that? We talk about certain areas we don't know the quality of the sediment, of course, not because we didn't do it. So we talk about knowing -- the fish in this area, we did a sampling. And the other routes, did we do it? If I'm measuring alternative A, B, C -- at least I was taught in the graduate planning school that I had to follow the same factors and the other alternatives in order to evaluate them. Now, my question is: Was that done? I'm not clear. So it's something that you have to evaluate. The project is going to happen. This is a project that the government wants. It's a project different agencies want. The Department of Natural Resources likes it. Everybody likes it.

PM01-20 Now, let's put out feet in the boat. We are already there; we're going to do it. I mean, I haven't seen any meeting like this in Puerto Rico since -- I'm almost 40 years old. I can't believe it, I'm almost 40. I haven't seen a meeting where the project hasn't occurred. So let's be responsible. We are talking about mitigation plans. Let's do the mitigation plans. Why? Because at the end of the day, our experience has always been that -- as the project says -- that this pipe and these installation will never been abandoned, well, they will be abandoned. Sooner or later. All these places were abandoned. We have to be prepared, in terms of the government, because it's like our large reservoirs: they are there, but those walls, sooner or later, will fall. Because they do have this infrastructure, they do have a lifespan. So what will we do when they collapse? Imagine Carraizo, all that dam break, and we have this huge flooding, different places. I'm sorry to be sarcastic, but on occasions it hurts me that in the sense that in terms of planning -- in our country we talk a lot about planning, but planning is not only before the project, it's not only during the project. It's after the project. That we have to look at this project long-term, 20, 30 years later, and determine what are we going to be doing. With an infrastructure you have to do maintenance, some pipes that you have to lay. We have

PM01-18 See the response to comment AG10-04 to AG10-07.

PM01-19 Comment noted.

PM01-20 See the response to comment AG05-08. We have made recommendations throughout the EIS regarding the preparation of mitigation plans for the environmental resources potentially impacted in Puerto Rico.

PM01-20 (cont'd) to see, do we have funds for this when these pipes, at some point you have to change them, that there's money today and continue mitigating, because that's what we do, we continue mitigating. Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Señor Melendez, you asked about the mitigation plans that we recommended before the end of the comment period. They are not available now because it's not the end of the comment period. But September 29th is their deadline for providing that mitigation plan.

MR. MELENDEZ: Yes, but it's not real, that's what I'm referring to. Because on September 29th the mitigation plans are going to be ready, and the ones that are in charge of the project on September 29 -- before September 29 we are going to have the mitigation plans in our hands? Because they have to be ready according -- you correct me if I'm wrong. They have to be ready before the 29th so that we can examine them. So that means that those plans, the protocols are already done. And they are about to be done to give them to us, right? Or not? That's my question. Because they have to be ready before this phase -- public comments. It's the 29th? I don't have a date. I have doubts about the date.

MS. JOHNSON: No, the mitigation plan, they can provide it September 29th, the end of the comment period. The end of the comment period doesn't mean that you cannot provide comments. You could still provide comments. They will be on the FERC website. You will be able to read them, evaluate them, comment on them if you wish.

MR. MELENDEZ: What happens if those plans are not provided on the 29th and it's after that?

MS. JOHNSON: We don't move forward.

MR. MELENDEZ: You don't move forward. Okay, perfect.

MS. JOHNSON: We don't go anywhere. All of the conditions that we recommended that they provide before the end of the comment period, we need them before the end of the comment period to move forward. Otherwise, we don't go anywhere.

MR. MELENDEZ: Thank you very much.

MS. JOHNSON: The next one is Victor Gonzalez. He's not here. And the last one here is Alex Cruz.

PM01-21 MR. CRUZ: Good evening. You haven't seen a more beautiful thing that to go through Jobos Bay at seven in the morning. Honestly, if you haven't, it's something -- it's impressive going by Jobos Bay at seven in the morning. I learned to ski in Salinas when you could. And now today I see my children kayak through the keys. The premiere LNG in 2000, in June, I delivered it. I was a pilot on board, and it's been like to 30 LNGs in my pocket. I'm the pilot of the Guayanilla Bay, Ponce, Tayaboa, Jobos, Las Mareas and Yabucoa. Today, if we look at the reality of Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico pays 28 cent kilowatts. Hawaii pays 40-something. In the weekend I was in St. Thomas and they pay it at 54. And they are doing a program to change the electricity to propane gas. When we were brought the Excelerate project to bring in the natural gas ships to Puerto Rico, specifically to Aguirre Bay, Excelerate brought in a vanguard project in which we were going to be trained, when the time comes. Why? Because when the time comes you have to have the dock prepared, the type of ship, how to maneuver, to know how to dock, to know how to get to the dock. Because it's not just knowing how to get from north to south, southwest. Sincerely, there's things that are much more complex.

The equipment to bring the ship, we do have it. We do have the tugboats, the latest model. But what happens is that today you have to combine it with the project of EcoElectrica. In EcoElectrica we've been doing since 2000. We've never had any problem. The only problem was of the Matthew, which had no pilot on board. We took the preventive measures; we took it much more outside so the pilot was on board. And, honestly, we've had one of the best safety records of the nation. Today, we have within our holster one of the best experiences to work with LNG in the hemisphere. Why? Because in the United States, prior to us, they had the Boston plant and there was another one. Outside of Puerto Rico you had the one in Trinidad. In order for us to begin in Guayanilla we trained in Trinidad. We came to Guayanilla, we began. And we've had an exclusive experience that's been a very high yield and high security. Knock on wood

PM01-21 Comment noted.

PM01-21 (cont'd) because tomorrow anything can happen. We have the responsibility of bringing in the natural gas ship to Aguirre -- it's not in Aguirre, it's outside -- in a safe manner, where nothing happens in the community or the environment. Now, if we are going to look from oranges and oranges, numbers and numbers, what's happening? PREPA has not bought fuel oil, so it hasn't brought in the vessel that comes every four days to Aguirre, if you look at it. Previously, every four days you would have a barge coming in through Jobos, through Ratones, through the lower part of the channel, because the lower part of the channel is just before the plant. And what would happen? PREPA asks us to bring in boats. There's been five boats with diesel in the last months, inside the bay, through the estuary, to the plant. What's safer? To have maneuvers outside or have maneuvers within the estuary? That when, honestly, God forbid, if an accident happens, you really are going to have a natural disaster in the atmosphere and everything that has to do with the estuary in the Aguirre Bay. This project is done in a very diligent manner. The professionals in the industry have been brought in from Puerto Rico -- not foreign -- which we can do. We've done it in Guayanilla and in other places in the southern coast, and in other places. You can be sure that it's done in a safe manner, satisfactory manner, with a minimum impact to the environment and to the community. Than you and good evening.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. I want to respond a bit to Sr. Ortiz and Febles. The depth of the pipeline, to clarify. But if anyone has been following the record in the FERC docket CP13-193, recently, FERC met with the Department of Transportation Pipeline Safety of Hazardous Materials Administration on the safety of the pipeline, the depth of the pipeline within the bay, whether the proposed action or whether to bury the pipeline. That was on August 22nd.Subsequent to that meeting, DOTPSHMA had additional questions for Excelerate or Aguirre to answer about the proposed pipeline construction method, whether to just lay it on the sea floor, whether it was necessary to bury. So for the record, there is some -- there will be some analysis made, required by Excelerate or Aguirre, by the U.S. Department of Transportation, on whether it meets DOT safety standards and whether it doesn't meet it. Excelerate or Aguirre will be required to meet the depth of burial, whether it's subsea or whether it's underground for the pipeline. That is yet to be determined; that is under review for now. I just wanted to clarify while we are here. It's been in the record that there've been some communication with DOT, FERC and Excelerate, but while we are here in the meeting, that is currently under review. That is the end of our speaker's list. Is anyone else willing or would like to comment tonight? Okay.

I'll go ahead and close our formal part of the meeting. Anyone wishing to keep up with the official activity associated with Aguirre Offshore GasPort Project was use the FERC website at www.ferc.gov. Within our website there is an e-library link where you can type in the docket number for this project: CP13-193. You can use e-library to gain access to everything that is on the public record for this project, including all of the public filings by Aguirre, other federal and state agencies and other landowners or interested parties. Representatives from PREPA and Aguirre or Excelerate Energy can stay after for a little way to answer any additional questions that anyone might have. If you'd like immediate copies of the transcript, please see the court reporter. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Puerto Rico Office of Permits Management, the Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board, the Puerto Rico Planning Board, the Puerto Rico Department of Natural and Environmental Resources and the Puerto Rico Department of Health, I would like to thank all of you for coming here and sitting tonight. Let the record show that the comment meeting concluded at 8:32. Any further closing by OGPe?

MR. RIVERA: We want to thank you all for having appeared here this evening. And we wanted to ask Ruth Santiago to please stay after the hearing so that we can look at the documents, to see if we conform to the rule and for the proper procedures to be followed for applications. And we are going -- the Permits Office is going to hold three of these hearings, one tomorrow and another on September 15th. So we hereby declare this meeting concluded.

(Whereupon, the proceedings conclude at 8:34 p.m.)

PUBLIC MEETINGS (cont'd)

PM02 – Public Meeting in Salinas, Puerto Rico

****

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE

PROPOSED AGUIRRE OFFSHORE GASPORT PROJECT

PUBLIC MEETING,

****

Wednesday, September 10, 2014, at

The Salinas Harbor, Playas Ward,

Salinas, Puerto Rico, starting at 4:17 p.m.

IN SALINAS, PUERTO RICO

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10TH, 2014

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

MS. JOHNSON: Good afternoon. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Puerto Rico Permits Management Office, I would like to welcome you all this evening to the meeting. Let the record show that the public comment meeting for the Aguirre GasPort Project began at 4:17 p.m., on September 10, 2014. My name is Gertrude Johnson and I'm the environmental project manager with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC. At the table with me tonight is Andrya Torres Pérez, who is a chemical engineer at FERC, in the Division of Pipelines Certificates. Danny Laffoon, at the end of the table, is also an environmental project manager with FERC as well. The U.S. Environmental Agency, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Office of General Permits, Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board, Puerto Rico Planning Board, the Department of Natural and Environmental Resources, and the Department of Health cooperated in the preparation of The Environmental Impact Statement for this project. I would like to thank them for their continued assistance with the Environmental Impact Statement. Jared Brandell, Elizabeth Dolezal, and Steve Holden are at the back room, at the sign-up table. They are with NRG LLC, and a third party contractor for FERC in assisting us for the preparation of the Environmental Impact Statement. This public comment meeting is a joint meeting between FERC and the OGPe, which is represented by Felix Rivera Torres and Loyda Rosas Negrón.

MS. ROSAS: Good afternoon to all. My name is Loyda Rosas Negrón. Present with me is Attorney Félix Rivera Torres. Today's public hearing is held jointly with FERC. We will proceed to read the Notice of Public Hearing, published in a newspaper of general circulation: "The OGPe notifies the following Notice of Public Hearing, according to Article 4-B3 of Law 416 of September 22, 2004 as amended, also known as National Environmental Policy Act, just as with Law 161 of December 1, 2009 as amended, also known as Law to Reform the Permit Process of Puerto Rico, in conformity with Rule 123 for the Evaluation and Processing of Environmental Documents of the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA. "OGPe invites the public, neighbors and representatives of all government agencies to attend the public hearings and participate, for the purposes of submitting their comments and information to be considered by the environmental document prepared for the construction of a maritime terminal delivering liquefied natural gas to the south of the Aguirre Power Plant Complex, in the municipality of Salinas. The Project intends to generate cleaner and cheaper energy in Aguirre.

"The first public hearing petitioned by OGPe was held yesterday, September 9, at the Lion's Club, Los Veteranos Avenue in Guayama. Today, September 10, 2014 is held at the Salinas' Harbor, Playas Ward in Salinas. The case is Docket Number 2014-287-982-REA-22-461. "The purpose of this hearing is an investigative one, and it intends to gather useful information in the Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Project. This environmental document will be evaluated in light of but without limiting itself to the following rules from (unintelligible) Chapter 4, Rule 112; Chapter 6, Rule 115; Chapter 11, Rule 123; just as any other disposition from (unintelligible) or any other applicable law. "Neighbors, owners of any property within the territorial limits of the Project, government agencies, and the public at large are welcomed to attend and participate in these hearings. "It is mandatory that the proponent, owner of the property or his/her authorized representative, attend the public hearings. Otherwise, his/her complaint will be filed into docket. It is advised that the proponents may come assisted by their legal representatives but are not obliged to do so. This includes corporations and associations. "The official examiner of these hearings may not suspend them once announced, unless it is petitioned in writing,

explaining the reasons to justify the suspension or rescheduling. This petition must be put in writing and sent five days in advance to the date of the hearing and be accompanied by a manager's check for the amount of $50 to the name of the Secretary of the Treasury Department. "The petition for the suspension or postponement of the hearing must be solicited before the OGPe. The petitioner will give copies to the other interested parties in the processes within the mandatory five days. If the suspension is not prompted by lack of compliance to any legal requirement, the applicant will have to pay for the costs which entail that suspension and publish the new notice in the press. "An electronic copy of that document is available and open to read in OGPe's and PREPA's websites. Those interested may obtain a photocopy at the municipalities of Salinas and Guayama, and at the Permits Regulations Office. "Signed in San Juan, Puerto Rico, on August 8, 2014."

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. So, on August 7, 2014 we mailed out about 350 CD copies of the draft EIS, in English and Spanish, and almost 200 copies of the hard-copy of the draft EIS, in English and Spanish as well, to all of those individuals in our environmental mailing list, government agencies, local libraries, and newspapers. If you did not receive a copy of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, then, you are not on our mailing list. Please, provide us with your address, if you would like a copy of the final Environmental Impact Statement, at the table at the back of the room. This is a project being proposed by Aguirre Offshore GasPort LLC, in cooperation with the Puerto Rico Power Authority, or PREPA. Aguirre LLC filed this application under Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, to develop, construct and operate an offshore platform, an offshore liquefied natural gas import terminal or offshore gas port, and a subsea pipeline of about 4.1 miles or 6.6 kilometers in length, connecting the offshore terminal to PREPA's Aguirre Power Generation Complex, in Salinas, Puerto Rico.

The purpose of this meeting is to get your comments on this draft EIS. We are in the middle of a 45 days comment period in the draft EIS. The comment period ends on September 29, 2014. All comments that we receive within the comment period will be addressed in the final EIS. That is to say we have to end the comment period on a specific date. That's not to say that if you provide us with comments after September 29 that we won't consider your comments. We consider all comments that are provided to us and address them, whether they are in the EIS or thereafter. We have a speaker's sign-up sheet at the back of the room, and I'll call individuals to speak one at a time. After those speakers have had the opportunity to comment, I will ask anyone else who would like to speak. We take your comments very seriously. We give equal weight to your comments, whether they are spoken here tonight, whether you mail your comments and/or submit them electronically through our FERC website, as we revise the draft EIS. Specific instructions on how to file written or electronic comments are contained in the first couple of pages of the draft EIS. If you have any questions about that, you can ask me or anyone else here representing FERC, after the meeting. I'll be glad to help, or anyone else, as best as we can. The more specific the comments we receive from you the better we can address them in the final EIS. General comments such as "I don't like the Project" are not as helpful as specific comments. Our job over the next couple of months is to revise our environmental analysis in the final EIS, based on the types of comments that we receive. If you received the draft EIS, you'll automatically receive the final EIS. You don't need to sign up again on another mailing list. Once we finish the final EIS and mail it out, we will forward that onto five presidentially appointed commissioners at FERC. The commissioners will consider our environmental analysis, along with non-environmental issues, such as engineering, markets and rates, in order to determine whether or not to authorize the Project. Thus, the EIS is only one in the process. It is not the decision making document. Like I said, this is your chance to make your comments on the draft EIS, today. If you have any questions about the environmental process, I can answer those. If you have very specific questions regarding the Project facilities by PREPA or Excelerate or Aguirre, they are here tonight and can answer your questions as well, during the meeting or after the meeting. You'll notice that this meeting is being transcribed by a court reporting service to make sure that all of the information that we receive tonight is on the public record. To ensure that comments are addressed in the final EIS, please, come to the podium to my left, which is your right, speak into the microphone, and state and spell your name; that way, your comments will be accurate for the record.

MS. ROSAS: Prior to the presentation that will be made by the assigned functionary we will give the opportunity to those who wish to make a comment prior to the presentation. They can do so. If someone has to leave before the end of the meeting, they can leave acknowledgement of their comments. Also, there's going to be a period after the presentation to receive your comments, once you receive that information. Is there any individual who wishes to comment at this point or introduce himself/herself at this point? (Whereupon, the mayor of the municipality of Salinas stands up.)

MS. ROSAS: Please, come forward. (The mayor gives some documents to the Panel.)

MS. BONILLA: Good afternoon to all. I'm Karilyn Bonilla Colón, mayor of the municipality of Salinas, addressing the members of the Energy Regulatory Commission in regards to the Aguirre Offshore GasPort Project. Before we start our presentation, we would like to welcome to our municipality the members of the Commission and those officials accompanying it. Likewise, we welcome the officials from the Permits Regulation Office. To all the citizens of Salinas here today, we are grateful for your interest in the Project and for your commitment to the progress of our town. We invite you to share your thoughts on the matter, in a firm but respectful manner. I would like to clarify that our comments are directed to the members of the FERC. These comments have to do with the adequacy and the environmental impact of the Project. This project, known for its intended conversion to natural gas at Aguirre, will be a gas facility located four miles away from Aguirre. Its key objective is to comply with the new federal regulation of reducing contamination issued by energy producing plants. In addition, it intends to diversify the sources of producing energy, help to alleviate the cost of that energy, and work toward a greater integration of the source of renewable energy in the immediate future. These objectives are important for Puerto Rico and for the town of Salinas, who wants to achieve these goals and improve the quality of life for our citizens. In the past few months, our municipality has participated in what we have denominated the "Technical Panel" of the Project. As part of this panel, members of the Environmental Commission, officials from the Electric Power Authority, and a representative from the Governor's Office have actively participated.

PM02-01 At the table, technical information about the Project has been discussed. Just as well, it has been thoroughly discussed the environmental impact that this project may generate. Many have joined these discussions: fishermen, government officials, particularly those from the Department of Natural Resources and the Environmental Quality Board. Moreover, the Technical Panel gave information to the residents of the area through carrying out various community meetings in the Aguirre, Marcas, Coquí, and Playa sectors. The task carried out by the Technical Panel has certainly resulted in that the residents of Salinas have better knowledge regarding the importance of the Project and its impact to the environment and Salinas' economic development. This is the first time in the history of Salinas, and possibly Puerto Rico, that this type of exchange has transpired in the initial stages of a project of this scope. As representative of Salinas' residents, I thank the effort of all the participants, especially the officials from the Electric Power Authority and the members of the Environmental Dialogue Committee. The cutting edge of the economic development of this project of the municipality of Salinas is tourism. A key element of our tourism is to have direct access to the sea line and the existence of the keys near the coast. It is important to point out that Salinas' coast line doesn't have an adequate beach for people to swim. Our beaches are in these keys, visited by hundreds of tourists every week, so they can enjoy crystal clear waters with pleasant temperatures.

PM02-02 The evaluation of a project such as this one is an excellent opportunity to study the current-day conditions of our tourist areas, their potential, and the way they have to be developed. We respectfully request to the members of the Commission that they expand their study in terms of noise impact and the present day tourist activity and that they take into consideration that the public policy of our administration includes making the most of tourism in our keys. These studies should also take into consideration that recreational navigation passes by the proposed platform and that Cayo Barca, the closest to said platform, is visited by hundreds of tourists. It is our position that the research studies to be done must consider Cayo Barca as a zone susceptible to noise. We further request a study of the impact of noise on the

PM02-01 Section 4.8.5 of the EIS provides a discussion of tourism and visual impacts, and references the most current tourism economic indicators from the U.S. Census Bureau. We have revised the text to provide a more detailed analysis of the potential impacts of the offshore terminal on tourism, including the issues raised by the Mayor of Salinas.

PM02-02 We have recommended environmental conditions for Commission consideration to address mitigation measures for seagrass, coral, entrainment, lighting, and construction noise. In addition, the EIS has been revised where appropriate to further develop our analysis of the impacts.

PM02-02 (cont'd) fishing activity, which almost always starts at early morning hours, when the sun hasn't risen. This impact evaluation on the fishing activity is critical to the margin of the exclusion area, the nearest point to the platform, which is where the fishermen are able to anchor their boats. A deeper analysis of this project's impact on the maritime life, coral reefs and seaweeds should be made, as well as a study that establish the levels of any contaminating emissions and other effects that are scientific and technical in nature.

PM02-03 We consider that is of the utmost importance to insist that the Aguirre Generating Plant, built during the '70s, has had a negative social and economic impact on our municipality. We request that the Commission evaluate the socio-economic impact of the terminal, being an addition to other cumulative negative impacts suffered for four decades. Certainly, this project is an opportunity to make justice for Salinas and begin to mitigate the negative impact that the Aguirre Generating Plant has had on us. We hope that with this proposed project of natural gas renovation well make possible for Aguirre to have greater lifetime and be able to operate at least 35 years more. We respectfully request this Commission to consider the aforementioned cumulative impacts for Salinas and recommend mitigation measures that would guarantee the quality of life of our residents. I am confident that the renowned scientific community and the members of the Environmental Dialogue Committee who participate in the Commission will cover more effectively than I such aspects. In the same way, I trust our expert fishermen who know the zone like the palm of their hands will participate in the process and express before you their doubts and concerns regarding the Project. Again, we appreciate the courtesy you have had in allowing us to have the first turn and the opportunity to express ourselves before you in regards of such important project for Salinas and Puerto Rico. Have a good afternoon.

MS. ROSAS: Anyone else who wishes to make a statement prior to the presentation? If not, then, we can begin with the presentation.

MS. SÁNCHEZ: Good afternoon. My name is Ivelisse Sánchez. I work at the Office for the Planning and Environmental Protection of the Electric Energy Authority. I will proceed to read the presentation we have prepared. This is a presentation on the offshore liquefied terminal for the Aguirre Offshore GasPort. The legal basis was already read as part of the presentation that FERC did. So, we can proceed. FERC already stated what the cooperating agencies in the process were. Our presentation will show to you our agenda, and we'll consider the history, the purpose and need, and the description of the Project. It will also include an analysis of various alternatives, the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures. Regarding the Project's background, on December 21, 2011, it was petitioned to FERC the possibility to implement the pre-application process. On January 1, 2012, FERC approved that pre-application. On February 28, 2012, FERC notified the intention of preparing an environmental impact statement. For that, it requested comments and had some meetings with several agencies and the general public. On April 17, 2013, the application is presented to FERC to build and operate a terminal of the GasPort, under Article 3 of the Federal Natural Gas Act. The purpose of the Project is to provide storage capacity and a constant delivery of natural gas and its conversion in Aguirre, so that they have the capacity of using two types of fuels. In the case of the combined cycle, it would be diesel and natural gas. In the case of the thermoelectric, it would be Bunker-C and natural gas, although we foresee the maximization of natural gas.

The capacity for storage is of some 150 thousand cubic meters, and the pumping capacity is of some 500 million standard cubic feet per day. This project is necessary in order to comply with the requirements of the new mercury and toxic air standards, known as MATS, promulgated by the EPA, hence its importance. It will also contribute in stabilizing the prices and in the diversification of energy sources, because it reduces the use of fuel, according to PREPA's strategic plan. The Project also provides other benefits, such as the reduction of barge traffic for fuel in the Jobos Bay, which in turn reduces the potential for spills and possible encounters with endangered species. Now we will give you a brief description of the Project. The Project proposes the construction and operation of an offshore port of a liquefied natural gas import terminal and a submarine pipeline. This includes a docking platform, which

PM02-03 See the response to comment AG09-03.

will be located three miles from the southern coast of Puerto Rico, and an undersea pipeline, which will go from that platform to Aguirre. This pipeline will have a diameter of 18 inches, with a covering of cement of an additional 3 inches, for a total diameter of 24 inches and a length of 4.1 miles. This is an image of the Project's platform. (Ms. Sánchez asks for the pointer and approaches the screen.)

MS. SÁNCHEZ: Here, on the screen, you can see an image of two ships, once the port is built. This ship would be the one closer to the coast, the FSRU: a floating unit for storage and regasification. This ship will be there in an almost permanent fashion. The other ship, which would be closer to the south, is a barge for natural gas, which would bring the cargo every time necessary. Now we'll go into the alternatives analysis, so you can know what the criteria and the alternatives evaluated were. One of the criteria is that the Project would be technically and economically feasible and practical. Also, it should present a significant environmental advantage, as well as the compliance with the Project's proposed objectives, as we mentioned before. Specifically, it provides the opportunity to comply with the new MATS regulations. One of the alternatives evaluated was the alternative of no action, meaning not executing any project. Under this alternative, none of the facilities proposed will be built. There would be no additional environmental impact, and we would not comply with the objectives of the Project. This new source of supplying natural gas would not exist. Aguirre will continue burning fuel from oil and it will not comply with the new objectives of diversifying the sources of energy. Thus, the atmospheric contaminating emissions would not be reduced, which means Aguirre's noncompliance with MATS new regulations.

This will prolong the community's exposure to emissions coming from diesel and Bunker-C, and will require a weekly continuing supply of fuel through barges inside the bay, which presents the possibility of fuel leaks. Another of the alternatives evaluated was using other systems, in order to bring gas to the power plant, for example: building a new facility of regasification, with the capacity to store liquefied natural gas in EcoEléctrica, and building a new pipeline to connect the facility of EcoEléctrica from Guayanilla to the Aguirre Power Plant. This means adding some additional 30 acres of impacted areas. This alternative would make it difficult to avoid affecting nearby communities. Installing a land pipeline would generate an additional industrial development, and the impact would be of a larger scale than with the proposed project. In fact, there were two previous proposals for pipeline projects. One was the Southern Gas Line, in 2008, and the Vía Verde, in 2009. Neither was done. Another of the alternatives was the installation, construction and operation of two land terminals: one for the storage and regasification on land, or two terminals next to the docks that are in the boundaries of the coast. The current situation of Las Mareas Bay was considered, where two industrial installations are located: Chevron Phillips, a chemical installation, and AES Puerto Rico, which generates power by burning coal. On the screen, we see the images of the premises of the aforementioned industrial installations. (Indicating in the screen) The green area shows the facilities of Chevron Phillips, and the purple area shows the facilities of the AES Power Plant. This alternative would entail building a pipeline coming from those installations, (indicating in the screen) the one in orange, up to the Aguirre Power Plant, (indicating in the screen) the one within the yellow line.

The facilities considered in Las Mareas Bay would be located six miles to the east of the Aguirre Power Plant. This is an industrial zone with enough land to develop, but it requires the construction of storage tanks, the bay must be widened, and they would have to build a new terminal on land or in the adjoining coastal area. This requires digging, in order to build a new channel with a minimum of 45 feet and a pipeline that long, up to the Aguirre Power Plant. This will entail a greater impact than the one of the proposed project. Another of the alternatives considered was the construction of a terminal within the Aguirre Power Plant. This requires building storage tanks and gasification equipment. In order to build it, some 31 acres or "cuerdas" are needed. These 31 "cuerdas" do not exist right next to the power plant. For this reason, intricate maneuvering is necessary to access deep waters, and it requires dragging and building a new pier. All these will be closer to the community. The land installation of that pier does not provide any significant environmental advantage, as is the case of Aguirre. Another alternative was

building an offshore terminal, for which four alternative areas were evaluated, with different routes from the terminal to Aguirre. The four areas had the required depth. The length of the pipeline and the distance from the communities would vary, depending on the location of those areas that were evaluated. Different construction techniques were evaluated: direct construction versus opening of trenches and channels for the pipelines.

All the pipelines that avoid Boca del Infierno would have similar or greater environmental impact. In these images you can see the locations of the different areas evaluated for the terminals, which are the oranges squares (indicating in the screen), marked as One, Two, Three, and Four, as well as the different routes for the pipeline. Also, in this illustration you can see alternate routes for the pipeline that were evaluated by request of some of the regulating agencies. (Indicating in the screen) In this table we do a summary of the findings of the different criteria we evaluated in Locations One, Two, Three, and Four, meaning the areas evaluated for the platform, where the length of the pipeline is discussed. It varies according to the location, the depth in feet, the maritime resources that could be affected, the distance from the communities, and the conditions of the seafloor. From all this analysis, the area for the offshore terminal was selected. (Indicating in the screen) It's here, in the green square. From that location to the platform, we evaluate different routes for the pipeline, trying to minimize as much as possible the impact on ecological resources of the bay. The selected alternative is the one seen in this image (indicating in the screen), which is the proposed project. Its platform is three miles from the southern coast of Puerto Rico, and the undersea pipeline of 4.1 miles in the Caribbean Sea, which goes from the platform to the north through Boca del Infierno and Jobos Bay, until reaching Aguirre Power Plant. This is a summary of what would be the impact on the area of the Project, and it's itemized in the different components and different stages. Some of the impact during the construction will be temporary and other impacts will be permanent, which is where the facilities will be located.

The proposed construction, so far, we foresee that it would take some 12 months, 9 months for the maritime infrastructure, 8 months for the installations going over that infrastructure, and 4 months to install the undersea pipeline. Now we'll go the description of the environmental impact and the mitigation measures proposed. The alternatives for the selection of the location of the offshore terminal and the route of the pipeline are the criteria that were evaluated to minimize or to avoid any impact. It was also considered that the route was reasonably shorter from the terminal to Aguirre. We tried to avoid mangrove areas and sensitive areas, avoid crossing the existing navigational channel, avoid crossing the existing PREPA's discharge pipeline, and we tried that the Project stay within the grounds of PREPA, to avoid impact on private property. In addition to that, it was considered the appropriate construction methods. We propose and select the method of putting on the pipeline, pushing and pulling. There are three areas of construction, which leaves a lesser print during the construction phase. This method is that the pipeline will float over the reef area, and later it would go down by its own weight to install it in its place. This will have less impact than digging trenches, which can create excessive turbidity. It will also have less impact than any direct excavation, which would allow leaks of sludge and fragments within the bay. Now, these are the resources that could be impacted.

We will begin with the geological resources. The geological resources, it has been determined that will have a minimum impact. The risks that could affect during the operation could be a seismic movement, liquefaction episodes, wind, the effects of the waves, and tsunamis. The mitigations are considered within the design. When the final designs are done, we'll consider these risks and incorporate measures, so that the project has the capacity to withstand some of these risks. FERC will be provided, during the detailed engineering phase, with an update of the analysis of the waves and high seas, details of the offshore terminal platforms and the design specifications of the columns, used together with the acquisition of equipment and the quality control procedures that will be used for the design and construction. The final design will be analyzed and approved by FERC, and there will be inspectors to observe the construction and file the inspection reports. Another resource that could have an impact is soils and sediments. The impact during the construction phase --it would be possible that when the soils

are impacted, there could be re-suspension of sediments that could occur from the seafloor. This is a very thin sludge that could travel hundreds of yards. A sediment transport model will be created to determine if there is such impact. Once the model for sediment transportation is done, which we expect to confirm that there's no impact, it will be presented to FERC. So, they will have that information, and from there, if any mitigation is required, then it will be designed to attend to that situation. The hydrology resources or water resources -- during the construction phase as we already saw, there could be a displacement of sediment and possible re-suspension. We already discussed how that impact will be attended.

The hydrostatic test will be done throughout the whole pipeline and some 250 thousand gallons of seawater will be used, and also a screen will be used. Its size will be determined in consultation with the National Fish and Wildlife Service, in order to prevent any accidental taking of organisms. Also, there's going to be a discharge pipeline with a six foot diffuser underneath the surface, in order to avoid altering the seafloor and create more re-suspension of sediments. The water will not come in contact with chemical substances during this process. Another possible impact to hydrology resources are spills and leaks, such as fuel and lubricants in the platform areas and the FSRU, during the construction process. The contractors and the port operation personnel are obligated to comply with the laws and regulations, and a prevention plan to control spills during the operation and before the construction will be presented. To determine the ecological and wildlife resources, thorough benthonic studies were done, based on benthonic characterization, preparation of maps of reefs in risk of being extinct, and additional alternative studies for routes. Regarding the flora resources it has been determined that 30 percent of the seafloor is covered by seaweeds and 20 percent by microalgae. In order to mitigate any possible impact to this resource, mitigation and surveillance plan for these seaweeds will be developed in accordance with the Corps of Engineers and other agencies.

FERC required a draft with the comments of the agencies before concluding the period for the comments of the draft EIS. Regarding the wildlife, the construction of the pipeline and the offshore terminal can have some impact in the habitats of the sea fauna. We saw that it could impact seaweed and microalgae, but it could also impact coral reefs and habitats of bland sea-life. Possible short-term impact on habitats for manatees, sea-turtles, reef fish, sharks, corals and invertebrates may occur. We call them "short-term" because it would be what's related to the construction phase. But there's also a possible impact by hydrostatic tests, which we already saw what the mitigation measures would be. Also, there are some possible direct impacts on the colonies of coral habitat within the footprint of the pipeline. A mitigation plan is being developed in consultation with the National Fish and Wildlife Service, the Department of Natural Resources of Puerto Rico, and according to the requirements of the Corps of Engineers. The relocation of these colonies is suggested and is also considered that there could be other indirect impacts, caused by the shadow created on the area under the offshore terminal. This could degrade the seaweed and microalgae area that feed other species. Regarding this, there's also the process of consultation with the related agencies to determine the adequate mitigation measures.

In terms of the possible noise impact on wildlife, an acoustic impact model will be done before the public comment phase ends. It will include a study of the acoustic impact on birds during their rest and nesting period. Possible mitigating measures for this may be to put in the columns in the sea-bed during the day, since this area is four miles from the nearest population and no acoustic impact is expected on those nearby coastal communities. Another possible impact on wildlife may be on the illumination. It's considered that there's going to be some temporary impact during the construction period, and during the operation of the FSRU and the platform there's a possible permanent impact due to the safety lights, navigation lights, warning lights. It's proposed a lighting plan prior to construction, so that the possible impact is minimized. Regarding the impact on threatened species and species at risk of being extinct, there's 23 species in the list. From these, ten are proposed species to have possible impact. And according to the studies, there's nine species on which there would be no effect, because the distance from their primary habitat and the area of the Project is sufficiently large. There's a possible non-adverse impact on 14 species, depending on their behavioral characteristics. You have to evaluate their habitat

requirements, the construction procedures and operations, and the proposed mitigation measures. Later it was determined that there could be a possible adverse impact on the species.

The impact during construction would be over the antillean manatee and nine types of coral reefs, which will be included in threatened species or those in danger of extinction. To mitigate the dangers of these species, we'll have trained mammal observers, placed on all of those vessels that participate during the construction. There'll be an exclusion zone of 0.3 miles around the column areas. There will be no entry to void those mammals from coming in. But, in case they do come in, the observers will alert those dealing with the construction, so they stop the activity that causes the noise, until that mammal leaves that area. In terms of impact in the coral areas, during the operational phase we might observe a loss of larvae, because they might be dragged by the intake of sea water both by the FSRU and the barges. It will basically have moderate impact. In terms of mitigation to this potential impact, we are now in the process of making consultations with regulatory agencies to develop adequate mitigation measures. Those mitigation measures will be prepared prior to initiating constructions. Those that have been requested by FERC prior to concluding the comment period will be completed by then. In terms of the use of the recreational resources and soil, during the construction phase the use of soil will be altered. There will be a temporary increase of traffic barges during construction, which might affect recreational navigation and fishing. Mitigation will be carried out in the construction by stages, in order to avoid absolute interruption of activities within the area.

During the operational phase, visual resources on the platform will be impacted, and there will be impact to navigation, fishing and other activities on the areas close to the maritime facility. (Indicating in the screen) In this graph we are able to see part of what's been registered from research studies on recreational activities and tourism activities in the areas where they were reported and observed. (Indicating in the screen) On the right one, you see the assigned areas which have been identified, through consultation with fishermen, as fishing areas. In order to avoid and compensate that impact, we're studying mitigation means for fishing activities. FERC requested not to initiate construction until obtaining a determination for consistency, given by the Planning Board. In terms of the potential social and economic impact, there would be minor impact, and it will be localized and temporary. Through consultation with commercial fishermen in Salinas and Guayama, it was established that in parts of the area of the Project there is an existing artisanal fishing occurring. Around 140 jobs will be created during the construction phase, which will last around 12 months. In terms of cultural resources, in the land portion of the Project, which are the pipeline in the area and the conversion of these units, the area has been previously impacted, and it's been under industrial operation for more than 40 years and belongs to PREPA. The Historic Conservation State Office said it was unnecessary to do archeological studies in the industrial area. In terms of the maritime portion, the endorsement from the Puerto Rican Cultural Institute and from the State Office of Historical Preservation was obtained.

In terms of air quality, the impact during the construction phase will be caused by emissions from the construction equipment, which is only temporary in nature. There will be no deviation to air quality standards. The impact during operations will be caused by the use of equipment in the FSRU and the terminal platform. It will prompt a reduction of atmospheric emissions. This will be attained by incorporating restrictions to the operations and the use of technology of reduction of emissions in the FSRU, in order to avoid contaminating emissions, as established in the construction permit in the Aguirre complex. The Project will reduce emissions from the Aguirre Plant of around 800 tons of nitrogen oxide and around 5816 tons of sulfur dioxide per year. This will comply with the objectives of the Project and with MATS, will improve the quality of air both locally and regionally, and will attain a reduction of up to 30 percent of particular matter. In terms of noise during the construction phase, it's acknowledged that the limits of night noise issued by the Environmental Quality Board will be exceeded in two sensible areas. The mitigation plan for this is to restrict the number of work hours, implement a noise reduction plan in the pipeline construction site, and adjust measures in case of exceeding noise levels.

Determining impact to environmental and submarine noises --during the operation phase, noise will be below the current levels of environmental noise for each one of these sensible areas. In terms of that condition, there will be a noise study no later than 60 days after initiating operations, to corroborate that the levels of noise are at or below those critical levels for those areas that are sensible. In terms of the pipeline section at the Central, the equipment acquired will have specifications for the generation of very low noise levels. In terms of security, the terminal is designed with sufficient levels of protection. The potential impact on public safety will be mitigated by establishing an adequate path to be able to deal with vessel traffic, according to the U.S. Coast Guard recommendations on the frequency and type of vessel traffic. We'll also reduce significant risk to public safety based on the engineering design analysis, a letter from the U.S. Coast Guard, recommendations, and regulatory requirements. After analyzing the information obtained, it is concluded that the construction and operation of this project will generate limited adverse environmental impact, mainly during the construction phase. Environmental impact will be reduced to less than significant levels, if the proposed mitigation measures are applied. For this, and to be able to advance forward with the Project, we need to obtain all authorizations prior to initiating construction. We need to implement construction, restoration, and mitigation plans. FERC will complete the compliance process under Section 7 of the ESA and under Section 106 of the National Historical Conservation Act. In addition, we need to implement an environmental inspection program, which will guarantee compliance with all the mitigation measures required by FERC as conditions for the permit that it issues. Finally, the Project is an acceptable course of action from an environmental perspective.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. Like I said, this is your chance to make your comments on the draft Environment Impact Statement. If you have questions about the environmental review process during your comments, we can answer those. If you have specific questions about the facilities proposed by Aguirre or Excelerate or PREPA, you can ask them here, tonight, and they can answer those, now or after the meeting. As I said before, the meeting is being transcribed by a court reporter. If you would like to make comments, please, come to the podium, state and spell your name, and state any agency or association that you're representing, so your comment will be accurate for the record. We have one more person signed-up to speak. After she has spoken, if anyone else wishes to speak, they can feel free to come to the podium and present their comments. The person that we have signed-up to speak is María García.

PM02-04 MS. GARCÍA: Good afternoon. My name is María Elena García. I'm here on behalf of Reef Check Program. I have certain comments that have been drafted by Reef Check's work team. Am I limited in terms of time, or can I read the document in full? (The Panel nods.)

MS. GARCÍA: I would like to start with geological resources. It's been suggested to Aguirre LLC by the proponent agency to give updated details about the analysis of the maritime waves; the structure of the terminal, the design, and the construction of the columns sunk in the submarine floor; the seismic specifications along with the acquisition of equipment; quality control procedures; and an appointed inspector, recruited by Aguirre LLC, who could observe the construction of the Project and submit an inspection report. The community has suggested that an independent inspector, not employed by Aguirre, inspect and prepare a report separate from that of the Company. In terms of water resources, soil and sedimentation there's no studies that establish the movement of the sedimentation during the course of the construction phase. We need a model and data available to the general public, so the communities and organizations such as Reef Check can do a monitoring plan and an impact evaluation regarding sedimentation. The proponent agency suggests that Aguirre LLC do the shaping of transport before the end of the public comments period about DIA's, thus supporting its determination that the new depositing of sediments altered during the construction phase would be limited to a radius of 100 feet, or 30 meters, of the columns' bases in the anchoring platform in the high seas, within 10 feet, or 3 meters, from the centerline of the pipeline. Based on the information that would be provided by Aguirre, we will also assess the impact of construction, associated with the re-suspension of sedimentation from the ocean floor, as presented in the final DIA. It should also be noted that no studies of sediments were carried out

PM02-04 The FERC staff are reviewing the design criteria and site-specific information for seismic, wind, and wave hazards and have requested additional information from Aguirre LLC. This information must be provided to the FERC for review and approval prior to construction of the Project. In addition, see the responses to comments AG05-06 and AG07-01.

PM02-04 (cont'd) for other options or potential alternate routes. This should have been part of analysis of possible alternatives. In terms of the sedimentation, it is important to measure the sedimentation in coral reefs and sea grass to see how this could be mitigated. Lacking monitoring for sedimentation and an analysis for transporting sedimentation could bring negative effects that are way beyond the construction area, not solely where the construction is being proposed. Another issue is that the plan for control and prevention of spills should be public and subjected to comments. In addition, it should be subjected to periodic evaluations by an independent inspector, which would guarantee that the same is being carried out. We have extensive comments in terms of flora. Can we? (The Panel nods.)

MS. GARCÍA: In general, what we are concerned is that all mitigation plans would be provided in dates before the comment period ends. What we would like is that those mitigation plans, all mitigation plans, be given on a closer date, so we are able to comment about those mitigation plans.

MS. JOHNSON: May I?

MS. GARCÍA: Please.

MS. JOHNSON: As I said yesterday, the end of the comment period is --we have to set a date for the end of the comment period and for the mitigation plans we said to be submitted to us by the end of the comment period. Of course, those plans will be public, so everyone can view them and review them and make comments on them.

MS. GARCÍA: Publically?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. Your comments don't have to be --we don't exclude any comments that are submitted after September 29th. Once they file their plans, you have time to review them. Feel free to comment on them, even if it's after September 29th.

PM02-05 MS. GARCÍA: Okay. So, in terms of those mitigation plans, we would also like to add, not to be redundant, that you include within the mitigation plans the specific coordinates where such mitigation will be carried out: if it's going to be in the proposed construction area, or if it will be done somewhere else. If we don't have the exact coordinates, Reef Check cannot do an annual monitoring in regards to how this mitigation plan is being carried out. I will give you an example that everyone here knows about. When there is a construction plan, a mitigation plan is done in terms of the amount of trees removed from one place and planted somewhere else. But there is not a monitoring plan to check on those newly planted trees because no one knows where they were placed. So, the majority of those trees die due to the lack of maintenance. So, a true mitigation plan is needed, one that the public can really evaluate. We would like to specifically know where they are planning to do such mitigation and what type of mitigation should be, depending on the area that would be affected. We also have an additional comment on what was being talked about regarding having certified mammal observers. There's the possibility of training people from the community to do that, so they could become maritime mammal observers. That can be another source of income for those fishermen and members of the community who, maybe, would have to stop working during construction. People from the community can do the monitoring and be trained by the Department of Natural Resources. Neither have we observed that there is a study done in terms of what the thermal effects of the floating warehousing and regasification is going to have, and how that intake could affect the coral reef. Aguirre is also already dropping hot water, and now you add the hot water from the floating unit. DIA does not provide any studies or projections of the effect of these warm water currents and their impact.

PM02-06 In terms of the use of soils and recreational resources, they must provide coordinates so you can assess the impact of this buffer zone, which is 457 meters surrounding the facilities. There is no map in the document showing the buffer zone, so it could be evaluated by the public at large. No coordinates have been shown in terms of those alternatives, which would allowed the Committee to carry out similar studies or visits to the proposed zones, or to the zones proposed as alternatives therein. Reef Check needs these coordinates' tables in order to visit the sites and evaluate them prior to construction and

PM02-05 The draft Benthic Resources Mitigation Plan includes mitigation for impacts on coral as well as relocating corals impacted by the pipeline and offshore terminal. This Benthic Resources Mitigation Plan will assist in identifying impacts on the corals as well as mitigation measures. In addition, we have recommended in section 4.5.3.3 that, prior to construction, Aguirre LLC should coordinate with appropriate agencies to develop a detailed MMO training and response protocol plan for the construction and operation phases of the Project. The plan should provide appropriate measures to avoid and minimize potential vessel strikes of manatees and sea turtles, and should incorporate the FWS's manatee conservation measure for in-water work, where applicable.

PM02-06 As stated in section 4.11.8 of the final EIS, for emergencies that may impact the public, the USCG regulations contain requirements for notification, coordination, and cooperation with local officials, hospitals, fire departments, police departments, and other emergency response organizations. To address these types of impacts, this section of the final EIS also contains a recommendation that would require Aguirre LLC to develop an ERP in coordination with the USCG and local responders.

PM2-06 (cont'd) subsequent to it, so it can assess that mitigation plan, as I stated before. Sorry for the redundancy. Regarding the social mitigation plan, the closure of the areas for construction, areas used by fishermen, what would happen with these fishermen? Would they be allowed to continue working? They could be trained in order to work as manatee observers, as I already mentioned. Or is it planned to pay them for

PM02-07 the days that they are not allowed to go fishing? In terms of environmental justice, we believe that part of the issue regarding environmental justice is the need to have an evacuation action plan due to explosion. There is concern about a potential explosion of the floating barge and it should be addressed, so we can discard any erroneous information. The community is entitled to know the potential risks, in case there is an explosion. The proponent should present models and maps illustrating what would happen in a situation like this. That would be all. Thank you for your time.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Juan Carlos Puig.

PM02-08 MR. PUIG: Good afternoon. My name is Juan Carlos Puig. I'm a resident of the Aguirre community. I have some concerns, and one of them is similar to what was stated by the previous speaker: what emergency or evacuation plan does the company have for us? What would happen to us in case there is an accident or explosion, in case we have to evacuate the area? In an emergency fashion, I mean. I believe that it would be great to have that. The other question and concern is --if it was done, and I think so. I'm not very clear on it, whether the current operation at Aguirre --if it has some emanations of gases and other things that would cause damages in our community. How does the operation that we have

PM02-09 today compare with the one proposed? In the construction process, would there be contamination from both sources, meaning the one that's already built and in operation versus the one that's going to be built? The other concern is --well, although it doesn't have to do directly with this topic, and I don't know if this would be the time, but we wonder if this process can be implemented --for this gasification project, what plan does PREPA have to mitigate or to correct those problems, and how do they plan to face the possible fines or penalties for damaging the environment that EQB and EPA plan to impose? Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Forgive me if I don't answer every question tonight. Of course, the questions and concerns that are presented here will be --some or most require additional analysis. We will address all of the questions and concerns in the final EIS, although there is not a comment period before the final EIS. Like I said, we don't exclude any comments or any of the documents that's presented to us when a line of questioning and concern requires an additional analysis. That will be present in the final EIS, to address your concerns in a public document. The next speaker is Victor Alvarado Guzmán.

MR. ALVARADO: Good afternoon. My name is Victor Alvarado Guzmán. I am a resident of Salinas since I was three months old. I've lived practically all my life here in Salinas. Currently, I work as environmental advisor of María de Lourdes Santiago, and I am a municipal legislator here in Salinas, as well. Today I come as representative of the Eco-development Initiative of the Jobos Bay, known as IDEBAJO. I am the director of the Security and Safety Commission of the Initiative and I would like to make some preliminary comments about the EIS draft on the natural gas offshore terminal for regasification and maritime gas pipeline proposed for Aguirre, in Salinas. First, I would like to state that the IDEBAJO Organization is a nonprofit organization since 2010, and it's comprised of an alliance of citizens and community organizations concerned with social equality and with their environmental heritage and their culture. Their radius of concern is the communities located in the central and southern east areas of Puerto Rico and their hydraulics resources, the transformation of these excluded communities of the center, south east of Puerto Rico, by means of defending these communities and their environmental resources, and the development of those resources in that area. Our intention is to have a coalition of the communities in the south and eastern parts of Puerto Rico, so they can develop productively and in solidarity, be sustainable, and be socially and culturally inclusive.

The values that we promote are the environmental sustainability, cooperation, honesty, solidarity, empowerment, justice and equality, democracy, commitment, trust, generosity, freedom, and charity. Along with the Environmental Dialogue Committee, which is a Grass Roots movement instituted 18 years

PM02-07 As discussed in section 4.2.3.2, we commissioned a study to predict the suspended sediment concentrations and subsequent transport and deposition resulting from hand-jetting/suction activities during the burial of the pipeline. Based on the results of these studies, we determined that impacts on ESA species would be limited to the construction workspace as described in sections 4.5 and 4.6. Also presented in section 4.3.1.3, Aguirre LLC would implement mitigation measures in the NPDES construction stormwater discharge permit SWPPP developed for the Project to avoid or minimize water quality impacts on shore and in the bay. Also see the responses to comments AG02-01, AG06-11, AG02-29, and AG08-12 in regards to thermal discharge.

PM02-08 To address safety and evacuation plans, section 4.11.8 of the final EIS contains a recommendation for Aguirre LLC to develop an ERP in coordination with the USCG and local responders.

PM02-09 The discussion in section 4.10.1 provides all of the operating emissions from the Project (even those not applicable for certain federal and state air quality permitting requirements), including the non-FERC-jurisdictional Aguirre Plant, and describes the applicability of these emissions in the context of the federal and state regulatory requirements. Notwithstanding, the air quality impacts of the Project demonstrated by air dispersion modeling were not required under PSD regulations. However, to assess the impacts, we required Aguirre LLC to perform an OCD model of the impacts from the offshore stationary sources as well as the non-stationary sources even though federal and state regulations do not consider the non-stationary sources. In addition, we required Aguirre LLC to model the Project and the Aguirre Plant and disclose the air quality impacts; these are presented in section 4.12.2.2. The model results showed no adverse impacts. Note on commentor's suggestion that VOC and ozone be modeled: There are no stationary source modeling requirements or protocol for VOC and ozone modeling. Lastly, in the absence of EPA-defined significance criteria for ozone, these modeling results for the ozone precursor, NO_2, were presented in the EIS, demonstrating no new violations and no increases in the severity or frequency of violations of the NAAQS, which EPA established to protect human health and public welfare for criteria pollutants, including ozone.

ago and it's an intervening party in this process with FERC and it's part of this organization, we have participated for over a year together with representatives from PREPA, which should be here today, with representatives from Fortaleza, and sometimes with representatives of Salinas, to discuss the technical issues, amendments and possible mitigation of the proposed offshore terminal of natural gas and regasification, known as the Aguirre Offshore GasPort or natural gas terminal in Aguirre. In fact, in that Dialogue Table, in which we've been for over a year, IDEBAJO and Environmental Dialogue have already proposed some amendments to the Project, and it's a work that we are still continuing. I mean, it's not something that ended. We still continue the dialogue. There are some of these changes that we are proposing that, obviously, we knew beforehand that were not going to be in the EIS, but we haven't seen them in the presentation. So, we expect that, at some point, some of those changes are included. On the other hand, I want to recognize that since yesterday there has been an open process that FERC has conducted in the evaluation of this process and the access to information, which has allowed obtaining the required documents to be evaluated by the communities. Equally, we recognize the efforts that PREPA, representatives from Fortaleza and the Department of Natural Resources have performed, in order to provide their required and requested availability to meet with the communities and organizations.

PM02-10 Unfortunately, there are agencies, such as the Permits Office, Environmental Equality Board, and the Planning Board, that have not had the same willingness to communicate with the organizations and communities. Since last year we have requested information in writing and the information that these agencies could have on the natural gas project in Aguirre, and they didn't have the courtesy to answer our communications. Though they have information on the Project, we never received copies. It was requested, in the same manner, that the company Excelerate deliver document that were required. Recently, the executive director of PREPA said that the project in Aguirre, the offshore terminal, does not have any environmental impact and that everything is okay with the Project. At the Dialogue Table, it was established from the beginning that this project will indeed have an impact on the environmental resources, the sea life, and, most importantly, on the fisherman and the coastal community in the area. The declaration of environmental impact summarizes these impacts, and those that cannot be avoided have to be mitigated. In fact, FERC drafted over 60 recommendations, which shows the great impact that the Project has on the resources of the area. Obviously, one of the sectors that will be most affected is the area of the fishermen. The fishermen, I think, are going to be impacted the most, as well as the close-by coastal communities. On one hand, during the construction phase of the pipeline and the port, the daily work of the fishermen will be affected, be it because of the restrictions imposed in passing through the bay or because they will be unable to fish in specific areas. On the other hand, the platform or permanent port where the natural gas will be received, the fixed point storing and re-gasifying it, will be on top of the coral area, where there is the habitat for sea life and is a fishing area. The Project also has significant impact on the dragging of larva and fish eggs, loss or alteration of habitats, copper bio-illumination, thermal discharges and others.

PM02-11 The Study 316 of Aguirre states that fish eggs are being dragged by the equipment used by Aguirre, because they come from the keys areas where the project will be located. Also, there are serious limitations in terms of the studies of larva because there was just one day of sampling. Obviously, one day of sampling is not enough to establish a study of this coral larva. Regarding the bio-illumination with copper, yes, we say that it is good the change from the initial use of chloride to the use of copper. But it is also true that this can affect sea life, and according to PREPA this impact will increase under the cargo ship at the port. Besides the effects on the bio-accommodation to the species, last year, a group of scientists from the University of Lethbridge, in Canada, determined that the fish cannot detect the danger in the waters contaminated with copper. Their study states that the fish cannot smell the danger emissions that other fish have sent within the area that's been contaminated with cooper. For this reason, we propose monitoring and studying the species that live underneath the barge at the port, so that the levels of copper, arsenic, among others, can be measured periodically. If there's an increase in any of these levels, immediate remedial actions must be taken. The undersea gas pipeline will also affect coral reefs, areas of sea grass, and the flow of different species within the bay.

PM02-10 Sections 4.7.5 and 4.8.3 address that the number of fishers in the area are estimates and may vary based upon who is providing the count of total fishers. The draft Benthic Resources Mitigation Plan includes mitigation for impacts on coral as well as relocating corals impacted by the pipeline and offshore terminal. This Benthic Resources Mitigation Plan will assist in identifying impacts on the corals as well as mitigation measures. In addition, We have recommended in section 4.5.3.3 that, prior to construction, Aguirre LLC should coordinate with appropriate agencies to develop a detailed MMO training and response protocol plan for construction and operation phases of the Project. Finally, we have recommended that Aguirre LLC prepare a Construction Access Plan to minimize impacts on tourism in the Project area.

PM02-11 The draft Benthic Resources Mitigation Plan includes mitigation for impacts on coral as well as relocating corals impacted by the pipeline and offshore terminal. This Benthic Resources Mitigation Plan will assist in identifying impacts on the corals as well as potential mitigation measures. In addition, we have recommended in section 4.5.3.3 that, prior to construction, Aguirre LLC should coordinate with appropriate agencies to develop a detailed MMO training and response protocol plan for construction and operation phases of the Project. The plan should provide appropriate measures to avoid and minimize potential vessel strikes of manatees and sea turtles and incorporate the FWS's manatee conservation measure for in-water work, where applicable.

In regards to employment, see the response to comment CO02-51.

PM02-11 (cont'd) The issue of the conch, which was much discussed at the Dialogue Table --and the fisherman that were there may recall that, at the beginning, it was said that the conch could climb over the pipeline. The fishermen, with their sense of humor, said that they're going to be acrobatic conch, because they knew the conch cannot climb over the pipeline. Now the EIS says that they can go under it, under the pipeline. So, these would be underground conch. We believe that there must be a clear and serious solution to this problem, in terms of what the EIS states and if the effects would be less and short-termed. The accumulation of internal and external factors of the Project could have permanent effects, and if they are not attended they could be greater. In fact, in the Public Notice from the Planning Board on the requested certification of federal compatibility, Number 1259, the Planning Board states, and I quote, "The operation of the maritime installations will have a permanent impact on some 25.3 acres, 21 'cuerdas' of undersea area." Further down it insists, and, again, I quote, "The construction activities in the high sea associated to the Project and its operational phase will have direct, indirect, temporary, and permanent impacts on the sea resources in the area." This issue has been discussed broadly in the Dialogue Table, and it has been proposed to have a mitigation process with the fishermen during the construction process. IDEBAJO has proposed various mitigation projects that can be established, in order to benefit fishermen and their families. Obviously, this will also benefit the communities.

In addition, from the EIS statement itself, we can see other instances that offer windows of opportunities for the fishermen and the residents of the nearby communities. Just like the past speaker said, the mammal observers that are necessary on the barges during the construction activities could be young people or residents of the nearby coastal communities. They could be trained and certified by law, just like the EIS requests. Also, transportation to the port of the Project can be in the fishermen's boats. This is part of a mitigation agreement that could be established. In fact, we were just talking with some of the fishermen and some of their ships comply with the requirements established by the EIS. So, I believe there should not be any type of problem. Since the fishermen are going to be the most affected, they should be given the opportunity to be hired for this job of transporting those working in the platform. The issue of the fishermen is important because it is established that the construction of the Aguirre Offshore Port does not entail a significant creation of jobs or any relevant impact that can ameliorate the socio-economic conditions in the municipalities of Salinas and Guayama. Therefore, it is important to protect ecotourism, fishermen jobs, and the resources which have been developed in the area throughout the years. Just so you have an idea of Salinas' precarious situation, our municipality is alternating between the first and second place in all Puerto Rico in unemployment. Sometimes we are first in unemployment, sometimes second. From 2000 to 2010, several neighborhoods were built here in Salinas. However, the population was reduced. All these neighborhoods were built, but the population was reduced, according to the census of 2010. This is because of the lack of opportunity employment. Due to the absence of the Government's strategic plan as we face this precarious economic situation in our country, we have to promote solutions where there's active participation from the communities in the generation of sources of employment and income in their own realities.

PM02-12 This project, besides not having a significant creation of jobs or any mayor impact on the socio-economic conditions in Salinas --it is not clear what amount of jobs it will create. On Section 2.4, titled "Construction and Labor Force Program," it says, and I quote, "Aguirre LLC anticipates that it will need some 350 workers during the construction phase of 12 months, and at least 10 percent of those will be hired locally." In parentheses it says, "See Section 4.8.3.2." First, it must be said that Section 4.8.3.2 doesn't exist in the draft of the EIS. We don't know if that was a typo. Most importantly, this information of 350 workers needed during construction period is contradictory with the information offered in the Application for Consultation of Location. Item 25 of the Application clearly states that the jobs generated during the construction phase are 140. I think that I also saw that number in the presentation of Attorney Sánchez. That discrepancy has to be clarified. Nonetheless, the EIS is clear on the poor participation in the socio-economic reality, just with the construction and operation of the Project. Section 4.8.5 states, and I quote, "The construction and operation of the Project would have less impact on the existing socio-economic conditions in the area of the Project. There may be some potential

PM02-12 The number of jobs (350) to be created by the Project (as shown in section 4.8.1.2) is the same number that was provided by Aguirre LLC in the Data Response dated June 25, 2013.

PM02-12 (cont'd) impact on the population in terms of those coming to the area to work on the Project. "However, this will be localized and temporary, and will be limited to nonlocal workers and their families. It is not foreseen that the construction and operation of the Project would have an impact on rent: the workers will live on the barges, and it is expected that, once the construction in the area of the Project is finished, the population levels will be consistent to the prior levels, since the number of workers needed to operate in the installations will require only a minimum amount of local employees." In addition, one of the contracts between Excelerate and PREPA states that if workers need to have U.S. citizenship that would incur in additional costs, which leads us to belief that foreign workers would be brought in and paid under other agreements, it may even be less money. If this project is going to be good for Puerto Rico and for Salinas --it was established in the Dialogue Table, that this project must be good for Puerto Rico and Salinas. It can't be good for Puerto Rico but unfavorable for Salinas, because Salinas is tired of paying for the contamination, unemployment and all the bad projects established in the area. So, we need to come up with a different strategy for improving the situation of our people. Just like I said, we have paid the price for unemployment, contamination, and empty promises.

PM02-13 The economic development of the communities should come from the communities themselves. The Dialogue Table made the commitment to create a way in which all of us, communities, organization, the Authority and the Government can contribute in that process. I have to make specific comments on some of the aspects presented by the EIS. For example, a topic of concern is the manatees. In this draft of the EIS, Section 4.6.1.1, it says, and I quote, "The Jobos Bay has been documented as the second place with the second largest population of manatees, in the Antilles and Puerto Rico." You have to review that quote, because we have always been told that this is the area where you have the most manatees. Then, Tetra Tech, which is the company sub-contracted by Excelerate, says, and I quote, "It was observed three antillean manatees on sea grass near the Boca del Infierno channel during the sea mammals study, made by Aguirre LLC, in May 2012. It was observed one antillean manatee in high sea by the Boca del Infierno channel, during the channel mapping of Aguirre LLC, in November 2013." With this brief information, the impression is that we don't have a lot of manatees, that "in two days we saw four manatees." Other contradictory information is that in the same section it says, and I open the quote: "The Fish and Wild Services estimates that the population of antillean manatees in Puerto Rico is made up of 42 individuals." However, the director of the Conservation Center of Manatees in Puerto Rico, Antonio Mignucci, stated that in the cost of Puerto Rico, and I quote, "There are about 500 to 700 manatees." This came out recently in a newspaper article titled "The Manatee Continues Being Threatened." In the case of the keys, a very important point I have to clarify is in terms of security, because this has been talked about in the Project, and it's one of the things that in the Dialogue Table it has been talked about so often, in terms of the security of the Project.

PM02-14 This issue is the presence of people in the nearby keys. Section 4.11.7.1, pages 4-194 and 4-195, mentions the risk zones, and it states, and I quote, "A small portion of the barge keys uninhabited will be inside Zone-2 at the north of the offshore terminal of GNL. Zone-3 will encompass uninhabited zones in Cayo de Barca, Cayo Puerca, and parts of Punta Colchones to the north, and Cayo Caribe to the north-west. There would be no inhabited zones in Zones 1, 2 and 3." Even if it's true that no one lives in the said keys, that's why it states "uninhabited," it doesn't mean that there is no people on them. It has also been said before that these keys are the greatest tourist attraction Salinas has. Many people go there, especially during weekends, and, from there, they visit the different restaurants in the zone. In addition, these people are taken by the fishermen to the keys during the morning and are picked up in the afternoon. It is important that the security protocols take into consideration that in the case there's a spill or any other accident people will be in these keys, some of them without transportation. It must be clearly established what would be done in a case like this. We ask ourselves: who is going to be responsible for any possible damages? In conclusion, when we were fighting the Southern Pipeline, one of the alternatives we presented as beneficial for the Project was that the natural gas be taken directly to the power plants. Precisely, that's what we are looking at today, and that's what PREPA is proposing to do now. Of course, it doesn't mean that this is at any cost.

PM02-13 We reviewed the information provided on the Antillean manatee. Additional information is provided in the final EIS. In addition, see the responses to comments AG10-04 to AG10-07.

PM02-14 The final EIS presents additional information on potential impacts on fisherman from the proposed Project. In addition, see the responses to comments CO1-16 regarding to the safety zone, AG05-05 regarding the Construction Access Plan, and AG02-05 regarding post-construction monitoring of impacts.

PM02-14 (cont'd) Though it is necessary changing Aguirre to natural gas, it is also important that this would be a transitory process, aiming at using renewable energy sources, established in responsible places and not in agricultural areas. The problem is that it has not been established where we will move after the transitory phase. Often it is spoken publicly that this is a natural gas project, but we still have the same problem we had with the Southern Gas Pipeline and the ill called Vía Verde. That is, it was spoken that these would be transitional projects. But they wouldn't have a plan and no clear projections as to where Puerto Rico will be as a people, within the next 30, 40 years. We believe that the Project may be the beginning of a different kind of PREPA, a different route for Salinas, and the construction of a new Puerto Rico. But we cannot do this project merely to comply with federal rules. The approval or disapproval by the fishermen and coastal communities of this Project is in the hands of PREPA and the Government. Do the necessary changes so the Project can be good for Puerto Rico and good for Salinas. Thank you.

MR. RIVERA: Good afternoon. Thank you for the comments. We have heard yesterday and today about the concerns that there hasn't been enough accessibility to documents from OGPe. Last night, we had the opportunity to sustain a dialogue with Attorney Ruth Santiago, who showed us the letters submitted by the Agency. The letters are from 2013, and the case was presented on August 7, 2014. So, the Agency didn't have any type of documentation to that date. But Counsel told us that a person went to our offices requesting a copy of the record. Just like I said, we will verify today when this person went and who received him, because the record has been available since the public hearing was notified. Now, the comments received in the Agency --we have comments received from August 12 and August 20. Maybe, when the person went and asked, there were no comments there. We discussed this situation with the executive director, and he sent us a copy of the CD Agency's records to give them to Attorney Ruth Santiago, as part of our intentions to guarantee accessibility. We are going to talk to her later and give her now a copy of the CD with the documents that we have in the Agency, because the idea of this public hearing was --the OGPe itself asked her to come here today, and, then, along with FERC, have the hearing. We want to make a determination based on the comments from all parties. Counsel, I'm sorry to bring you in. I want to give you a copy of the CD. Here are the documents in the Agency, just like we discussed last night, so you can have them with you. (Whereupon, Mr. Rivera gives a CD to Ms. Santiago.)

MR. JOHNSON: The next speaker is Ángel Febles.

PM02-15 MR. FEBLES: For those who don't know me, I'm Ángel Febles. I was at the meeting yesterday, in Guayama, with the folks that are here. Part of what I heard --and sorry for being late. I thought it was at 5:00 and it's at 4:00. I was doing some tasks. The same concern that you're having, including the last thing that I heard, is exactly what we have been letting them know, both from persons who are going to work for safety and security in the islands. They are doing this project, again, at our expense. If you are Number 2 in unemployment, Guayama is Number 1. So, we are basically fighting each other, between Guayama and Salinas. There's a lot of unemployment, and the Project doesn't bring any employment for anyone. Yesterday --and I don't know if it had happened before, but we have 1.5 jobs. I don't know if you take the 0.5 or if you want to split that in the middle. I asked them to take a boat and go see the keys, because this was done using the internet, without visiting the field and with two or three studies done. Imagine. If you're telling me that there's no people in the keys, well, go take a vessel during full moon or go on a holiday Monday or on a weekend, and see how many people are there. They're packed. Imagine how much so that they close down the beach. At Barco, which is the smallest one, the boats are all around because they don't fit inside. On a Monday, if an accident happens, not many people would die: 50, 40. If an accident happens on a weekend or during full moon, then, we're talking about 1000, 2000 people. There are not 2 or 3 individuals there, not taking into account that there are a lot of fishermen there during those hours. I haven't been able to count them during those time frames, but there are people there, a lot of people. Let's assume that there's no one there, then, a lot of animals will be affected: manatees, dolphins and whatever other species that it's in extinction. Another thing that happened was that the owner of the trailers --and he has a good record because there's no reason to lie about it.

PM02-15 Section 4.8.5 discusses concerns over tourism and references the most current economic indicators related to tourism from the U.S. Census Bureau. This analysis discusses tourism and visual impacts. Additional text was added to the final EIS which discusses in further detail the potential impacts of the offshore terminal on tourism, and it addresses concerns that were raised by the Mayor of Salinas.

In addition, we are recommending that an emergency response plan be filed prior to commencing operations.

Regarding the concern over anchor strikes to the pipeline, Aguirre LLC has revised its construction method to bury its pipeline or cover it with concrete mats, thus minimizing the risk of anchor strikes.

See the response to comment CO02-51 regarding employment levels related to construction and operation of the Project.

PM02-15 (cont'd) He gave us a choice: Which was better? An accident when all the oil ships are coming in, or a high seas accident? Neither of the two is good, although there's always going to be an accident. If not, go ask folks in Texas. Over there, supposedly there has never been accident on those power plants, and one broke down. How much did that cost the United States? Millions or billions, which we don't have in case it happens here. Up to this point, it hasn't been clarified who will be responsible in case something happens. Who would be liable? The Government of Puerto Rico? We are bankrupt, imagine. Aside from that, if it happens in high seas --I brought a photograph. It could happen where you have the barge. The water would flow in completely through Boca de Infierno. Totally. You can see the photographs. We took them from a satellite. You can see the water movements. In fact, they said I had to ask permission to someone here to show you that on screen.

PM02-16 I don't know who, but just to be sure. Guayama, just like you, is attempting to raise this area up for tourism, so that there is more employment. In fact, our major has something called "Guayama: Live the enchantment." What enchantment? Guayama needs people to come in, because they are killing us. There is no enchantment. We are trying to raise this area up. Not a long while ago, we had to bring people to see that there are indeed beaches, that there's a sea and that we can offer some other things. Salinas has a greater level of attractions. We need to acknowledge that. Look at this hotel. Salinas has some additional tools to attract to have better living conditions for its people. We don't. If you get into that boat you were offered or in a car, you can see the poverty that exists, which is greater than that here. I arrived late, and I wasn't even going to come, because our consensus is that this is all set up. I protest, the other one protests, whoever. It's going to happen and it's going to go forward in the cheapest way for that company that's coming. Why? Because, if there's 250 million, and it's a fact of life that if I can only spend 50 million and keep the other 200 --all companies do that, and in Puerto Rico the same thing will happen. From those 200 million I kept, I split 25 million around, and I'm not just talking from the hip, the Project will be granted. I call out for our bay, Puerto de Jobos. May we show the first slide? This is what we're talking about (indicating in the screen). It was downloaded from Google. This is what we want to know. Aside from the photographs they have in their records, we don't even appear. They only show it to you up to here (indicating in the screen). I said, "Let me show these people what we are talking about." Next slide, please. This is our town, Jobos (indicating in the screen). This is Aguirre Central. You can see how large Aguirre is (indicating in the screen). See? This is what we're talking about. Look at those tanks here. If something blows up, you could imagine this will not exist anymore. Like I said yesterday, there was only one that blew up in Cataño. How much damage was caused? The people were never able to collect damages to their homes, because no one knew from whom to collect. They all split, left, and it's this one or him or the other one, and no one collected anything.

PM02-17 Next slide. According to what they indicate, the only local area for boats in Guayama is the Guayama Fishing Club, and there should be around 200 vessels there. (Indicating in the slide) But look, here is another storage location for boats, one of those that they have there. Our area, in contrast to yours, has around five public boat rams. Here there are not as many, hence we attract more people to take their boat to the pier than in Salinas, which means that aside from the boats that are there and that are paying to anchor there, we have hundreds of additional boats that come to those five public boat rams. But not only that, during the weekends, we have a bunch of jet skis there, sometimes 50 or 60 or 70 running around the water, and, if you haven't counted, we have. And they have created a problem. Next slide. (Indicating in the screen) Here we have another storage location. There was only one they mentioned in the study, in that Google piece that they showed, and these are the same photos that they downloaded, right? So, they didn't study beyond the immediate area, and I didn't make this up. I downloaded this today. That's why I came in late. (Indicating in the screen) See the water, how it ripples there? Next slide. Notice how there's another storage location. This one was built this week. Next slide, please. This is called Eco Mar. That was a proposal from a lady from the neighborhood. Her name is Mildred, who was able to have this done through a federal proposal, when the Popular Democratic Party was in power. When the New Progressive Party came into power, this lady rented kayaks here. These fishermen boats supposedly never existed, and this is just in this area, those fishermen boats. No one saw them.

PM02-16 The Offshore GasPort will have an emergency response plan prepared that addresses a number of the concerns raised. Additional information on the items to be included in the response plan is provided in section 4.11 of the final EIS.

PM02-17 Aguirre LLC has committed to hiring local people for many of its construction activities. In addition, there will be positions added at the Aguirre Plant to support operation of the facility, and the staff at the Aguirre Plant will be re-trained to support the new fuel source.

PM02-18 There are only three or four fishermen boats in Guayama, they said. Now, the issue is if they are licensed or not, but they earn a living. They don't get the license, but they still fish. I know one of them that has been fishing for over 30 years and is still an amateur fisherman because he doesn't have a license. So, this lady invented this, would rent kayaks and give a tour around this area. She takes the people up to Puerto de Jobos and talks about mangroves, red mangroves, and manatees, when they see manatees, and you can see manatees roaming. Sometimes you see six, eight, or ten. People say that they saw only five or four? (Indicating in the screen) This lady had this until the change of government. Then, when the New Progressive Party won, they confiscated it. They said it was illegal, and it took four, three years before they returned it. They even painted them and used them and changed their colors. They returned them in lousy conditions. This business is gone and doesn't exist. This is used by Yankees, you know. It no longer exists as a business. Why do things such as this happen? Because people come without proper studies, from other municipalities, and say, "That lady is making money." That lady helped reduced poverty in this area and would use the money to donate it to schools, to somebody who got surgery, to older people, and we continue in poverty, and we're stepping backwards. Here, no one from the Government said, "Hey, Ms. Mildred had a great idea. Let's advance her idea." Now Guayama is the enchanted city?

Next slide: another two reseeding areas which did not end up in the report. (Indicating in the screen) This one, if I'm not mistaken, is the one at the Fishing Club, that one there. There are no vessels. Oh, it's the Fishing Club; it's the Nautical Marine. You can see cars, people, which reflect often in our economy. If I put a pipeline, people are not going to be able to go there. And what's going to happen with this? That's it. If this people who are here (indicating in the slide) have to deal with a pipeline whenever they come either drunk or not drunk or however, because in this type of business a lot of people drink, they are going to start dealing with new issues: if you jump to a place where is not allowed to go through, you'll get tickets, $500 tickets. People are going to be turned-off and they'll probably come to Salinas to enjoy it, because if I have a boat here (indicating in the screen) and it's going to be so burdensome to go over a pipeline and there are all these restrictions, I might as well come to Salinas and enjoy all these little keys and islands, without having to go through all that pipeline, or around it. Then, my little corner becomes even poorer. It's been basically because of the sucking of smoke from the carbon plant, for years, and the one from PREPA, aside from Phillips and all other inventions, such as this one that they made up. Next slide. (Indicating in the screen) If you notice here, the water changes; it's different, right? Look at all the people here that would need work. They are not working. We are so huge that we have schools next to that and, having the natural resources, we don't teach them to fish. I'm sure that if they hire fishermen to teach people here how to use small fishing vessels, they will enjoy that and we'll increase the number of fishermen. But it seems that it's not good to teach them how to become fishermen, because it's better to import fish instead of fishing it ourselves. Right? Next slide. (Indicating in the screen)

PM02-19 This is Boca del Infierno, if I'm not mistaken, and if I am, let me know. This here is a little entrance area. There's a whole bunch of little islands on the side. All these are packed on weekends: men, women, children, Japanese, Americans, foreigners. They hear others talk about Jobos and Salinas and they want to check it out, because throughout the whole year we have weather conditions that allow them to travel through there. In December, is when it gets cold, but an American come here and says, "It is warm in here." We are attempting to bring people to come over. We make a music festival and we try to bring in Nuyoricans. I'm one of those that post it on the web. This is the Guayama Plaza. There's always an orchestra playing here, and they'll come down. However, when that pipeline crosses through here, all these people are just going to go somewhere else. They are not going to be willing to deal with that pipeline or the fines that come along with it. No one can assure us that when the pipeline is built, there's not something in addition to that pipeline, like "you can't touch the pipeline" or "you've got to be a thousand meters away from it." And if the police see you going next to it, you're going to have a problem. You know? Now we have the municipal officers. (Indicating in the slide) These areas here, these dark blue and light blue areas are the fishing area where most of our fishermen friends go. Those in Salinas have to go through there, and we go through here (indicating in the screen). It's the only closer

PM02-18 Additional information on the Project area has been included in section 4.8 to address the recreational and commercial uses of the area. In addition, additional information on tourism is included.

PM02-19 Additional information on the Project area has been included in section 4.8 to address the recreational and commercial uses of the area. Additional information on tourism is included.

PM02-19 (cont'd) exit point, so we can spend less in fuel, and it's closer to home. But, they are going to place a plant here. When those people go that area here --in fact, it's going to be visible from the highway. Imagine. We don't even know what's coming afterward. So, we'll have a plant that throws out smoke, whatever, hot water. Let's talk about how we know there's going to be an escape point. I think they would know, because once I was on the docks in Rangel and one of those alarms blew. I said, "Jesus Christ, what's going on?" Half an hour later, it stopped blowing. When I asked what was that all about, he said, "Oh, that's the coal plant. Maybe there was some internal emergency." But neither Rangel nor anyone I would ask knows what's going to happen if an emergency goes on. And they have been here for how long, with the same promises of jobs for our people? If there's two people working there that's a lot. If they place, for example, a barge here and something happens, this is gone, and whatever it spills, it's going to spread there. Somebody told me yesterday that there is an easier way of knowing if there's some sort of spill, and that's by seeing all the dead fish floating and, then, the people lamenting. That happened in the lakes a while back. They saw the fish floating, and then they knew. Maybe if they placed a pump to oxygenate the water, the fish would have been saved.

Next slide, please. (Indicating in the screen) Look at these water currents in Boca del Infierno. It's obvious that whatever blows up there, the currents will bring them all in to us, even if the accident is here or there. Regardless of the good faith that's behind this, there is always an accident sooner or later. There's always an accident. If the record shows there has been none so far, that's like playing on luck. Just like the saying: "The more you drive, the more you expose yourself to an accident." And if there's an accident, who's going to be liable? "No, it's the people in the barge." "No, it's so and so," and we are caught in the middle. Next is the Aguirre Plant. (Indicating in the slide) Aguirre is actually further than the plant or barge that's going to be placed here, which will be more visible to all. Next slide, please. This is our area. (Indicating in the slide) We are down here. There are no people here. It's like they said to Puerto Ricans in New York: "They're still using pampers." Why? Whoever carried out this study wasn't interested to measure what's there; he was only interested from the pipe downward. They have another exit point for that area; we do not. (Indicating in the screen) When I go to the dock area, this gentleman is coming in from the sea at 6:00 a.m. He uses no engine, because if he does he will get dizzy, he says. He basically does it by rowing, in order to sustain his family and his mother. He reaches all the way down to Salinas, rowing. He leaves at 5:00 p.m., to throw the nets. Sometime he doesn't fish anything. But it doesn't matter; those people go. Well, those people let them take care of themselves. If they can't go through because of the pipelines, they'll have to find somewhere else. Next slide. Let's do an imaginary trip: I reach Rangel. I see Tony coming out or coming in.

PM02-20 What's the next thing I see in our area, down in our little corner? People in the kayaks. Those are rented kayaks, and that money goes around. They come there solely for that, after spending a week working hard. They come to take a break with their children and see the manatees. (Indicating in the screen) Do you see them? And they see them sticking out their muzzle, and they're happy. I hope you go there and see that. Next slide. Not only people come here for that, they also come here to compete. Different than in Fajardo, which has probably the worst sea, we have the best one in here. In Fajardo either rains or you have seven, eight, nine foot waves. Here it's navigable. In that marina you have people from Naguabo, Fajardo, Trujillo, from Dorado, Gurabo, from Humacao, because there they realize that they can't navigate in those areas. And we've been growing, because the boat storage started out with five and now has a bunch more. And how have they come down? One tells the other, "Hey, look, Fajardo? Forget that. I could come here every weekend and take my vessel out." Even when the weather is bad, you can still bring your vessel. But that's going to end. Next slide. So, what else do we do there? And this is new: Jobos Bay Festival. People came up with this idea to bring people over, so they can get clients, consumers. This put us on the map, and it worked. We did a sailing boat race. It's when we saw most people there ever since they invented "Guayama: Live the enchantment." The mayor invented "Enchantment Guayama," and we invented this, and we posted it everywhere. Those very same sailing boats are the ones that will have to go over the pipeline, and since they are not going to be able to do it, well, they will go somewhere else. All our efforts to try to raise this area up, so that there's more money

PM02-20 See the response to comment CO-01-19 regarding emergencies and emergency response plans.

PM02-20 (cont'd) and better living conditions for our people, are in vain. Different than most of you --when I worked as a teacher, I was earning $3000. Now I'm retired and earn less. But those people have never seen that amount of money in a month. That's their yearly pay, and they have to thrive with that and pay electric power, water. Like a gentleman said, "They install these pipelines, but this people will still have to pay for their food, water, and electric power." Otherwise, the service is cut. Next slide. Look how beautiful this is. That's Villa Pesquera, a fishing village.

PM02-21 There were around 30 to 35 sailing boats, people from other places that come to consume. When they leave from here, they'd be talking about the tremendous sea we have here. You could navigate, reach down to Salinas. What will happen to all these effort that we've done? Next one. (Indicating in the screen) The least you can see is little toys like these (pointing at the sailing boats on the screen). That's the least you'd see there, and that has a keel, and that has basically a 3 by 4 feet, 5 feet, that little toy. With the larger ones, are even bigger. Next slide. This is another activity we carry out. Here we have people coming from Fajardo, who stayed there at least two days. Some stayed over the night, in different areas of that hotel that they have in Guayama. See how they line up? And that's the ones we picked at the last minute. It costs us a lot of work to have this people from Fajardo to come to our area, and the next one is going to happen in a couple of weeks. They are not only middle class people; these are people who are going to bring bigger ships the next time they come here to enjoy themselves. When that pipeline is here, then, we'll have to see, and this is basically announced news. We already saw what happened with Philips. There's a lot of thought but very little humanity involved here. People should be first. Next slide. This is what I see when I walk from the Rangel dock area. (Indicating in the screen) That's a beautiful house. It has a little dock next to it and calm waters. You can't even have it as calm in your own bath tub. When I leave from Rangel, most of the times this is what I find: a dolphin. If I do not see one, then, I see two or three or four. I didn't bring the video that shows how they used to harass me. You know why? Because I used to go on a jet ski, which I don't basically hit too hard, and they would play in front of it. When I showed that to my grandchildren, they just went crazy with that. You can often find this in Guayama and Salinas.

PM02-22 Next slide. Look at this photograph. There were four dolphins that day. I even got scared because they would go under me and, then, jump over me. Some Americans who were in a boat in front me threw their kids to play with the dolphins. They stopped, so the kids would play with them. That was unwise, because if that dolphin was in a bad mood, well, you know what would have happened. That's also down there, in that exit area. The ones who live there, the neighbors, do that as well. After going out, I found a dolphin or a manatee or a sea turtle. If you see a turtle, and with the manatees is the same, you see a bit of its muzzle and, then, it submerges back into the water. It's something that happens very quickly. I come to one of the islands here with my family and enjoy the water. And everybody here has done it, both natives from Salinas and from Guayama, and they enjoy themselves. My family is there and boats start arriving, sharing and spending time together, those from Corozal, Bayamón, Americans, and everybody. That's living. The rest is work. Next slide. See this jet ski? This was early in the morning. (Indicating in the screen) That is my own jet ski there. We have large ships, medium size ships, fisherman boats, everything. That's where everybody meets, in that point, whether they are fishermen or those who have never fished before. And if a fisherman has fish, then, everyone starts eating as well. They cut it down and cook it. And if I'm wrong, raise your hand. Everybody eats. It's the only location where they share with one another, whether they are from the metro area or from somewhere else, whether they have money or they're poor. Let me reaffirm, why don't you come and check this area. First come in a larger ship, and then, get into a fisherman's boat, accompanied, in case something happens, and check how it is. Next slide. This is what I see when I'm there. That's in Dos Palmas.

PM02-23 People hardly go to Dos Palmas. There's no people, no animals. Throw a little piece of bread and see what happens: if you see a hundred fish that would be the least. Take out a fishing rod and see what happens. They don't speak French, but these fish do. To catch them, you have to use a harpoon. Everybody is there, having a good time. You want to change all this happiness for a pipeline, because

PM02-21 See the response to comment CO02-19 regarding emergency response. In addition, see comment CO01-16 regarding the response procedures related to fire and explosions.

PM02-22 The presence of marine mammals is addressed in the final EIS. See the responses to comments AG10-04 to AG10-07 for further information regarding marine mammals.

PM02-23 The potential temporary and permanent impacts of the pipeline on fishing and recreation activities are addressed in sections 4.7 and 4.8.

PM02-23 (cont'd) electric power is solely for us? Well, maybe that's fine. But, then, we have to sacrifice ourselves, again, to basically help the metro area, again. Let's continue with these photographs. We are here having drinks. The only problem is --next slide. (Indicating in the screen) If I'm in this island having fun, this is what I'm going to see, and that was the plant they used as test platform, if I'm not mistaken. That's what we'll all see, that's what we're looking at, maybe pumping smoke, contaminating. What is it? A mile away? If I'm not mistaken. Somebody yesterday told us that in the U.S. there is none that is a mile away. They put them 10 or 12 miles away. But since we have to take the cheap ride in this area where

PM02-24 they find funds right away --less pipeline, less time, less everything in their favor, and we'll be paying a whole bunch of money, folks. It's not for free; it comes from your taxes, their taxes, mine, other people's taxes. There's no one there, none of us who pay taxes, to check whether they are doing it right or not, no one. They put it there, get their money, and once they're gone, then, the problems will begin. It's like buying a used car: once you buy it, you start losing oil, dripping oil and whatever. You will be having this barge over there. You can't go at less than "X" distance and can't fish there. And you, who are the poorer, the fishermen, will have to find another fishing area, because they are the ones who are going to take the millions. Why don't they find another location to place this? And it is beneficial. I agree with that. But we need to modify the way they are doing this.

PM02-25 Those people from abroad and we should benefit not make us become poorer, because the fact is they'll make us become poorer, after all the sacrifices from mayors and people to raise perspective and vision about all this. Next slide. After I had my drink, I saw this and I said, "This is a bummer. It's dark, so let me go home." I leave earlier, and others leave later at night, basically blown away. Do you see how beautiful this looks? That's what we'll lose. Next slide. As I'm going back, I saw this. They don't talk about what they see there. The sting-rays, as they start going to the sand, that's not mentioned. I can't say, "Look, you better get out of there, sting-ray. They're going to put a pipeline." Neither can I say that to a lobster or a conch. Like the man said, that's what they are selling us: that they can get on top of that

PM02-26 pipeline. Now that's not the issue. They will be excavating into the sand, and they'll have to go under the pipeline. Therefore, the bay I represent and where I'm at will have less, because those animals are not going to be able to go to the opposite side. They're going to change the habitat for these animals. But things have to be done to benefit humanity, not for money or for the politicians. (Indicating in the screen) This is a typical afternoon, the sunset. As you move around, you can see how beautiful this is. Those that see people from the coal plant, tell them that Ángel Febles would like to know where to run when the alarm goes off. These people come and it's the same thing: "What will happen? Where do I go if the alarm goes off? Where should I run to?" There is no warning. I don't even know whether there's an escape route. I wouldn't know if I'm on the boat. Who can I call? "Look. I saw a stain there on the water. Who should I call?" Those documents don't mention it.

There was a person yesterday who said that if it blows up, everything will disappear, including the electric pipeline. Citizens should be concerned about that. We need to answer that. Don't do a project first and, then, answer after it's built. Answer those questions first, seriously. And there's a rush, because everybody wants the electric power bill to go down. But do we need not drag along all these people? They have no other alternative. They can't pick up their things and say, "I'm going to sell my house and buy a condo in Old San Juan." There's one expensive home for every 70 or 80 poor houses, because they're close to the sea. The sea-salt is eating them up. That's not mentioned in there. We are not talking about helping any of these people, or giving them work. Nothing's for free. We are talking about jobs, work. There's no work in the metro area, but maybe you can have some work here. If it weren't for the Pioneer that's there, at least they give some jobs. Next slide. Look at that. That's the same little house I saw in the morning, and look how beautiful it looks in the afternoon. When we get to have that pipeline back there, maybe the landscape won't change, but there will be no vessels running through there or the fish that you could see here. You won't see any of the local fish. The fisherman would have to take their boats and see how they can basically slip out, because they are not even mentioning the penalties if you go over the pipeline. They talk about the one on the outside area, but not about spaces that we have to leave open, so we don't get close to that pipeline.

PM02-24 The visual impact of the facility on the surrounding area is addressed in section 4.7.6.

PM02-25 The current environment and impact on marine creatures is addressed in section 4.5.3. See also the response to comment AG08-06.

PM02-26 The FERC and USCG staff take seriously their responsibility to ensure the safe operation of the facility. See the response to comment CO01-19 for additional information.

PM02-26 (cont'd) Those that navigate through that area in good weather know that it's seven feet. Those with big boats know they have to wait to go over the wave, if they can, to avoid having their ships damaged. Those who have smaller boats of six or five feet have to basically lift over to avoid hitting the pipeline, if they are allowed to go through there at all. The pipeline is around 24 inches, two feet. (Unintelligible). Everything that they talk about from the pipeline through Salinas, we're happy. But the pipeline toward Puerto Jobos: Go to hell. And that's what we're protesting about. Do actual, real studies. Go to the field. Don't talk to ten fishermen. Maybe they saw someone with a rod trying to fish something and said, "Hey, there's a fisherman." The maps that they saw regarding the fishing area are not true to reality. These people's fishing area is bigger than that, and you have to go out early to come back the next day. That's without taking into account when they find the kind that say, "Oh, that guy will give me fish for three bucks a pound," after he basically risked his life. Next slide. (Showing a black slide) This is Guayama. Look at it there, now. That's what's going to be left: nothing. Do you see it there? Nothing. They'll take us into ruin for the benefit of those that are going to steal money, of politicians that are in a hurry to do this, of those that are going to come to build and leave.

They are not going to leave here any of that money, because those people in those ships have everything at killing prices for those people willing to pay them whatever they get paid in their countries. I'm not going to take that away from them, if they're trying to gain a larger profit. But don't do it at our expense, folks. They are not even going to get out of those ships or vessels to rent something from you. Maybe those that are problematic are the ones that are coming down and give us problems during that year they'll be over here. There's work, but it's not for you. It is for those that they'll bring. You have 1.5 divided into two persons. We'll have one from Salinas and one from Guayama working there. I'll ask you to take that into consideration. Don't be in a hurry. Review this. All of these people, from what I've heard, have the same concerns that we have there, in Guayama, and no one addresses that. Address that. Convince us that nothing that has happened with Phillips and those people will ever happen to us. That pipeline is supposed to last 30 years. Maybe in Korea it would last that. Here, basically, the salt residue will eat it up. And in 10 or 15 years from now, what's going to happen to that pipeline? No one says anything about it. There seems to be no long term vision. You know that here they make a building, municipal or state building, and after the first coat of paint it won't be painted until 15 years later. The money for that, they transfer it and transfer it. Then, we lose it. And if I'm lying, let me know. I worked at the Department of Education. A pencil costs $0.7. Do you know how much it costs the Department of Education? It's $1.50. That is the same thing that's occurring there. With that $1.50 that the supplier provides for the pencil --"It doesn't matter; it's not your money." Oh, yes it is. It's my neighbor's, my mom's, my dad's, what they charge me at the supermarket. If that $1.50 is divided: $0.50, $0.05 to pay the pencil and $0.50 for the guy at Education and $0.50 for the next one down the line. That's what's going to happen there. And if I'm mistaken, raise your hand and say, "Ángel Febles, you're a liar." You have seen it happen and happen again, and we'll allow it to happen again. This is a set up. It is very difficult that this could be changed. But, at least, we warned you. Good Afternoon.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank your, sir. To be clear, and maybe we didn't make it as clear in the draft EIS. I appreciate the photos of your community. I see that you have pride in your community and in the natural resources that are there. I wish the Federal Government would pay for us to sit there and see what goes on there day by day, month by month. Federal Government is not as gracious. But that's why we are here: to get your comments, more than what the company Excelerate or Aguirre or PREPA has provided to us and what we've written; to get your comments on really what your concerns are, what the real environment is there; the environmental socioeconomics that's in the project area, not just for the platform and the pipeline but the communities surrounding the area. For the benefit of those who weren't at the meeting yesterday, there were concerns by Mr. Febles. He talked about the safety of the pipeline. For anyone who is following the record, FERC and Excelerate met with the Department of Transportation over the safety of the pipeline. The Department of Transportation has jurisdiction of the pipeline, on whether or not they are considering, and they have to consider it, whether the pipeline should be on top, laying on the seafloor, as proposed by Excelerate, or whether, by their standards and their

requirements, it should buried because of the depth, of the water depth that's there. So, that is something that is not the proposed project as it is, and the proposed pipeline as it --laying on the seafloor is not something that is set in stone. That is something that is now under review, on whether they are required to bury it or not, for safety of the pipelines, safety of the facilities, and safety of the surrounding community. There were a couple of --maybe we didn't make it clear in the EIS about the amount of recreation that goes on there, the amount of fishing that goes on there. We did get photos from the NER over the Memorial Day weekend, of all the boats that were surrounding the Cayos de Barca --I think it was Cayos de Pájaros, and I don't think it was further west of there-- to see the amount of --what goes on there over the weekend, what boats are there, for us to consider in our environmental analysis. Perhaps our final EIS should elaborate more on the recreational, the subsistence, fishing, the commercial fishing that's going on there, whether it is licensed or not. The next speaker is Mayra Rangel Díaz. Mayra, the next speaker has to leave soon. I don't know whether you could wait until the following speaker.

MS. RANGEL: It's really short. It will be short.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay.

PM02-27 MS. RANGEL: I think 15 minutes. Good afternoon. My name is Mayra Rangel. I live in Puerto de Jobos ward, Lot 28, and I have in my yard a spectacular bay. Yesterday, I was at the Lion's Club and I saw many people there that had certain precautions, certain concerns on what's going to happen again with the wild life, with the ecosystem, because just like you know, when the Phillips Petroleum Company inaugurated in '66, it was the first one in damaging the bay. They closed the wetlands. The Puerto de Jobos Bays crystal clear and with yellow sand, just like what you find in Matias, Perdida, Barcas. They closed the wetlands, and when you go to Pozuelos, all the right side --the left side, I'm sorry, of Pozuelo, all that entrance is burnt. It was destroyed by Phillips Petroleum Company. Because of this, they left a barge, which damaged a vein of mercury, a vein of natural mercury. Everybody who lives in Jobos Port knows what I'm talking about. That barge is still in the area known as "Grafito." There is another barge there, also, that's a little bit sunk, not sunk completely --we are talking about 30 years ago-- at the right side also of the Guayama Marina. There is no white sand anymore; there is three feet of sludge. I was talking in Aguirre, in the activity in Aguirre, a week or so ago, and I mentioned this. I'm concerned now. Between the lizards and the black ash, we are not going to have mangroves. The lizards are eating, just like my grandmother said, the new leaves from the mangroves.

PM02-28 My home has three types of mangroves: the red mangrove, the green mangrove and the white mangrove. From the white there's not a lot because the lizards eat it all. The recommendation of the biologist is to kill them and throw them in the water. Okay? The erosion, we barely have --we have three feet of sediment, of sludge. It's a swamp. If you touch the leaves in any of the keys of the Puerto de Jobos Bay, you get coal. I have several clients that tell me: "Angie, what's happening that I find black dust on the floor of my boat?" Unfortunately, I have to tell them: "That's the coal plant." Since 1972 until 1994 --if you allow me to copy the title. In 1994, The Management Plan for the Jobos Bay National Estuary Research Reserve was done. That's where the Forest Bay was done, which is a federal bay that you have to take care of. This is 267 pages, but this study goes down to the slightest microorganism in this area. I don't know if you have knowledge of this. It has all the agencies, and their main purpose is to protect the Bay. Okay? I would like you to read it before September 29th. Please, consider that, in Guayama, we are really going to be very affected. I don't understand why there aren't more people from Guayama. I thank Counsel, but people from Salinas have an escape. We don't. Here, in this document, in '94 they made the Guayama Bay 16 at the world level. This has improved a lot for Guayama, for Jobos Bay. That's it. Please, read this research. It is very important. Okay? Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. The next speaker is Juan Rosario.

PM02-29 MR. ROSARIO: Good evening. My name is Juan Rosario. Since I'm not going to speak in English, I asked if I could speak French and they told me "no." First, how many people here in this room live close by? How many people live close by? In Salinas or close by. I'm going to talk to you even if it's a

PM02-27 The 2010–2015 Jobos Bay Management Plan was used as a resource in the draft and final EISs and is referenced in section 4 as "DNER, 2010."

PM02-28 The Jobos Bay Management Plan was used in the development of the final EIS.

PM02-29 Comment noted. Air conditions would be monitored under the terms of the air quality permit.

PM02-29 (cont'd) hearing from FERC, because we are part of the board of directors from --the governing board from PREPA. I've been there for two years. I got there with the idea of transforming PREPA, because we knew what was happening in PREPA and the way PREPA was working wasn't the best way to operate. There are things that have been happening for a long time. But what I'm going to say is my opinion. It is not the opinion of the governing board. After being in this process for about a year or so, I was there when we began to talk about the construction of the Aguirre Port. We asked the board of directors to work on this in a different manner. We dealt with the two gas pipelines that could not be built. There has been war between the communities and the Authority. That way of doing things wasn't going to lead anywhere. All the communities were fighting against PREPA, and with good reason. I know about this region. Nobody has to tell me what's going on here because those from the Dialogue and IDEBAJO know that I've been working here for over 30 years, working in these communities, with the same people. There have been a lot of very good projects and very bad projects from PREPA. So, when I was in the hearing yesterday --what I was seeing there, I don't understand. I saw that people were very mad, that they were perceiving things as unfair, injustices that have been accumulating for a long time. People were being very distrustful, although PREPA, during the last year, has embarked on a new experiment, from what I've talked to people that work there.

The Board accepted, Fortaleza accepted to do this in some other way, and these spaces were created and this Table was created. So, when I hear people saying that the information hasn't been brought in, that's not true. For about over a year, the information has been given directly to the communities and there have been meetings. That there are some people that don't know about it? Yes, that's true. But it's not because things are not being done. It's because, despite all the efforts we made for people to come, not everybody came to the meetings. They say that the fishermen were not consulted. Well, yes, they were consulted. The fishermen were brought in to the Table to talk. Nonetheless, there are a lot of things that still haven't been done. So, there are a lot of things we still need to work on. I want to state for the record that I belief this is a good project for the country, and I think is a good project for Salinas. I think this project has many benefits for Salinas, from an environmental perspective. The reduction in emissions is going to safe hundreds of lives in the next decade. All you have to do is get some literature and see that the main substances that cause death due to the emissions of plants are going to be reduced radically. They are going to be lowered greatly. Nonetheless, we have stated at the table where Victor is, where Tata is, where Nelson is, that there are some local impacts that we have to work on. They are still not completely resolved. The issue of the pipeline being a barrier or not requires some mitigation procedures that we've stated. I believe there's some agreement at the Table that the communities and the groups have to be within those procedures since the beginning. It can't be that things are designed, and, then, after they are designed and built, they bring them all designed to the community groups. That's not how it works. If the communities are not invited early within the process, "early" within reason, we can't work on it. They should be invited. Yesterday, for example --I love to look at people. I love to sit on the back and see how people react. The first visceral reaction was when they said that a Natural Resources officer was going to say when a mammal is there so they could stop the operational activities. Everyone laughed, and they reacted with the typical distrust people have toward government agencies.

That's not easy to solve. But, yesterday, some people brought the solution: "Why does it have to be an officer for Natural Resources? Why can't it be a fisherman? Why can't it be the people from the same community doing that?" That was a solution. I want to state for the record, clearly, that here it has been said that this project is going to harm fishing. If I believed that, I wouldn't favor it and wouldn't care about the other benefits. But fishing is dying all over the world without this pipeline, and it's dying in that bay without the Project. It's dying because of global conditions that are killing oceans and killing corals. This project could be an inflection point where we can begin to work on a manageable habitat again. If we can create that team work with the Committee, we can begin replanting corals and create habitats, so that the fish can move from one point to the other. I think that's possible. I think it's good and good for the community. I think that it's important that we work on it together. I think there are many things which, after a year and a half, I'm not happy about. One thing is the answer from the

PM02-30 MR. RIVERA: They have with me. Again, I'm working with the workers from PREPA in this process. So far, everything that we've worked on with them, they fulfilled. PREPA doesn't --let me tell you something. Listen to what I'm telling you. The option to this pipeline, you don't even want to see it close to you. The option to this pipeline, to meet with the federal regulations --and I didn't impose them. I don't like to be in front of a federal agency saying what should be done in my country. Everybody knows what my political ideology is. I'm clear about that. In my house: first my wife and then me, but I'm the lord of my house, not anybody else. But that's the law, and there's a federal law that imposes on us a reduction on emissions. And we can do in three different ways: either we do environmental controls, and we don't have the money for that; or we put gas, which is the other one; and the third one, you don't even want it close to you, and it's that we change the whole operation to diesel. You wouldn't want the barges to come in here with diesel, because that really is going to kill the bay. That's going to destroy it. So, is that the option? Is it the pipeline, or the windmills that produce energy? These are options, all of the options, with risks. But, from all of them, this is the one with the least risk. I'm convinced --I can be wrong, but I'm convinced that even the situation for fishing, if we work correctly, it will be better when it's put there than what it is now, because it's going to give us resources that we don't have right now to work in creating habitats. We have been losing them and dealing with the replanting of corals.

MS. JOHNSON: So we don't have anyone else on the list to speak, but if there's anyone else who would like to speak today. I can remind you: speak through the microphone and state your name. Yes? Please, use the microphone.

MR. SANTOS: It's just that I want --

MS. JOHNSON: Your name?

PM02-31 MR. SANTOS: Nelson Santos. I'm part of IDEBAJO, the initiative for the development of the Jobos Bay. It's just to bring in to Febles, to tell Febles that here we are all together: Jobos Bay, the fishermen from Jobos Bay, fishermen from Las Mareas, in Guayama, to Las Mareas, in Salinas. That's the Jobos Bay and all the fishermen: from Jobos, from Banderi, from Pozuela, from Barranca, from Mosquito, from Aguirre, from Marea, from Playita, all those fishermen fishing that area. Besides that, I agree with what you stated regarding the poverty level. But in Salinas there is a 55 percent. Guayama, being a city, has 46 percent. So, there is high poverty here. I believe that in that sense here all of us have to row to the same coast. If we don't row together, it's going to happen what historically has happened: this environmental injustice that has happened. That's all. Thank you.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. Anyone else who would like to speak tonight?

PM02-32 MR. RIVERA: It's just that I can't leave, because in a public hearing everybody talks and, normally, there is no way to clarify things that people leave without any answers. Look, 20 times have been said, and you have brought it up, that there are restrictions for the boats. There is no restriction to go over the pipeline. Obviously, you can't put an anchor from a cruise ship on it because it's going to break it. But a boat can go over it. Not only can it go over it, but the only place --and this is a product of the discussions with the group, because at the beginning we were not clear on that. The only place, which is the entrance of Boca del Infierno --that pipeline is not going to be on the ground. It's going to be on the trench. I mean, it's not going to change anything the depth of the seafloor. I'm telling you that it's like that. It's not an opinion; it's like that. They are going to put it inside. It's not going to be on top. It's not going to change anything in the depth of the area. In all the other places, you can go and fish. I wouldn't want to fish (unintelligible). But do you want me to tell you something? Everybody is going to fish there because that's going to be filled with fish due to the structure. It's like when we go to piers to fish.

MS. JOHNSON: (To Mr. Rivera) Did you have a question?

MR. RIVERA: No, no. It was only to clarify the thing about the restriction over the pipe, which is known. There is no restriction. Obviously, you cannot use a huge transatlantic to go over that place, but you can fish there. There's no problem with that.

PM02-30 Comment noted. The Aguirre Power Complex is required to meet the requirements of the EPA's Mercury and Air Toxics Standard rule. In addition, section 3.2 provides an updated review of renewable energy alternatives.

PM02-31 Comment noted.

PM02-32 Comment noted. Aguirre LLC has proposed a change in its construction methods, which includes burying the pipeline except at the 1,700-foot section that crosses the Boca del Infierno pass, where it is proposed to be laid on the surface and covered with concrete mats. However, we are recommending that the pipe be installed in this area using the HDD method or be rerouted to minimize impacts on coral resources.

MS. JOHNSON: The question about pipeline safety, the question about boat traffic over the pipeline is a very valid question. I think that question has been asked from the beginning: What are going to be the restrictions within the bay for both traffic around the pipeline and the terminal? As I mentioned, the Department of Transportation has come a bit late in the process for evaluating the depth of the pipeline, the location of the pipeline, in regards to their regulations. But we are not finished yet with our environmental analysis. This is a draft Environmental Impact Statement. We are here to get your comments, consider your comments, address your comments and, in the process of all that, find out from the Department of Transportation how this pipeline is going to be located within the bay, outside of the bay, whether it's going to be on the seafloor or whether they will be required to bury it at whatever depth is required by their regulations. So, as it is written in the EIS, that their proposed construction method is to lay it on the sea floor, it's in our draft EIS. The final EIS will most likely be something different because of the process that Excelerate has to go through with the Department of Transportation. All of the conversations that FERC has had with Excelerate are on the public record. Because of our regulations, we are not legally allowed to have conversations with the company that are not privy or not open to the public. So, therefore, I put on the record a summary of the meeting that we had in August that we talked about what the DOT's concerns were, what their list of questions were for the Company. FERC issued a letter to Excelerate, requesting additional information about the pipeline, about safety and about the requirements that DOT has for the pipeline, and what's going to happen afterward. That will unfold during this process between the draft and the final EIS. Anymore questions? Anymore comments? I didn't mention earlier that we do have at the signing table --I don't have it with me, but there are sheets where you can write. If you don't wish to speak today, there are sheets there where you can write your comments. They are the same as if you were to speak tonight.

You can write your comments and you can give them to the folks at the table. Or you can take that home, write your comments and mail them to FERC as well. Are there anymore comments or questions? If not, I'm going to go ahead and close the formal part of the meeting. As I said, anyone wishing to keep up with the official activity that goes on with FERC can go on the FERC website, www.ferc.gov. Within our website there is an e-library link. You can enter the docket number for this project: CP13-193. You can use our library to gain access to everything that's on the public record, whether it's entered by FERC, other interested parties, Excelerate, PREPA, anyone. And there are federal and states agencies. Excelerate and PREPA will be in the room to answer any additional questions after the meeting. If you would like immediate copy of the transcript, you can speak with the court reporter. On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the U.S. EPA, Army Corps Engineers, the Coast Guard, the Office of General Permits, Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board, Puerto Rico Planning Board, Department of Natural and Environmental Resources, and the Department of Health I would like to thank you all for coming here tonight. I really do appreciate your comments. I should speak better Spanish, but I don't. I am Dominican and my parents are from the Dominican Republic. To see people that love a community that's not within the States --it's enlightening to see a community so involved in their community and not only the community but with the environment that surrounds your community and that gives you your business and living. This is, I think, a great thing for Latin America, for Hispanics that are not just here but abroad, so they can see that there are people here that are involved in their living and the environment around them. Your concern about the conservation of the environment is very encouraging, to see that it's not just people in the States or Americans. This is also, you know, Hispanics that may not enjoy the thing that they have in the States. But, you know, you're living here so concerned with the environment, and that is a great thing. So, let the record show that the comment meeting ended at 7:04 p.m.

MS. ROSAS: If there are no additional comments for OGPe, we conclude this meeting today. I want to remind you that there will be a third meeting on September 15 at the Aguirre Gulf Court. Good evening. (Whereupon, the public hearing concludes at 7:04 p.m.)

APPLICANT COMMENTS
AP01 – Aguirre Offshore GasPort, LLC

20140929-5220 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/29/2014 2:20:16 PM

The Honorable Kimberly D. Bose
Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington DC 20426

Re: Aguirre Offshore GasPort, LLC, CP13-193-000
Draft Environmental Impact Statement – Aguirre LLC Review Comments

Dear Ms. Bose:

AP01-01 Aguirre LLC has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) issued on August 7, 2014 in the above-referenced docket and offers the following comments for your consideration:

1. Section 1.1 – Purpose and Need: The sendout capacity of the facility should read 500 million standard cubic feet per day (MMscf/d) instead of 50 MMscf/d.
2. Section 2.2 – Land Requirements: Figure 2.2-2 shows the location of the pipeline where it connects into the Aguirre Power Plant. Following input from the community the line has been moved south approximately 200 feet closer to the south end of the bulkhead which places the pipe more than 660 feet from the nearest residence. This new proposed route is still within the previously surveyed corridor, poses no additional impacts, and increases the distance of the pipe from nearby residences. A formal filing with FERC will be made in the near future detailing the change in route with maps provided.
3. Section 4.3 – Water Resources: Remove all reference and statements related to chlorine use, sodium hypochlorite and related effects on marine life. As per the amended NPDES permit application addendum, filed in the above-referenced docket on August 25, 2014, chlorine will not be used as the primary macrofouling growth prevention system (MGPS) biocide. An alternative copper-aluminum anode MGPS will be used in place of the sodium hypochlorite injection system. The copper aluminum anode MGPS will meet Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board water quality standards and avoid the use of chlorine as the primary biocide agent.
4. Section 4.9.2.2 – Marine Investigation: A statement is made on page 4-120 regarding the evaluative testing conducted by Aguirre LLC in March 2013 and the SHPO review of the resulting report submitted in June 2013. In correspondence dated July 2, 2013, the SHPO concurred with the report's conclusions that "none of these anomalies are historically significant and that they require no further archaeological work." A copy of this letter was filed in the above-referenced docket on July 12, 2013 as Supplemental Response to RR4 - Question 1 of June 5, 2013 Environmental Information Request.
5. Section 4.9.5 – General Impact and Mitigation, Item a.: As noted in response 2 above, the SHPO has reviewed and concurred with the conclusions of the evaluative testing report and a copy of the letter with SHPO's concurrence was filed on July 12, 2013 as Supplemental Response to RR4 - Question 1 of June 5, 2013 Environmental Information Request.

AP01-01 We updated the applicable sections of the EIS.

AP01 – Aguirre Offshore GasPort, LLC (cont'd)

20140929-5220 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 9/29/2014 2:20:16 PM

AP01-01 (cont'd)

6. Section 4.10.1.5 - Operational Emissions Impact and Mitigation: The *Project Best Management Practices* subsection on page 4-140 refers to "the use of low-NOx combusters for the engines to achieve controlled NOx levels at 10 ppm (10 mg/L), and SCR technology for the boilers to achieve controlled NOx and ammonia slip levels at 15 ppm and 10 ppm (15 and 10 mg/L) respectively." Aguirre LLC wishes to point out that there are no GasPort emission sources proposed to achieve 10 ppm NOx, nor are low-NOx combusters specifically proposed as emission control technology for any GasPort emission sources.
7. Aguirre LLC believes that the converted NOx and NH3 boiler exhaust concentrations shown in mg/L on page 4-140 are not correct. A NOx concentration of 15 ppm by volume on a dry basis (ppmvd), corrected to 3 percent O2, should convert to about 31 mg/Nm3, at normal conditions of 273K and one atmosphere. Similarly, an ammonia concentration of 10 ppmvd at 3 percent O2 should convert to about 7.6 mg/Nm3 at normal conditions of 273K and one atmosphere.
8. In Table 4.10.1-7 on page 4-141, CO2e from each main boiler on gas should be 114,648 tpy, not 114,642 tpy. SO2 emissions from each main boiler in cold startup should be 0.9 tpy, not 0.09 tpy. VOC emissions for the aux boiler (worst case) should be 0.7 tpy, not 3.8 tpy. The facility totals at the bottom of Table 4.10.1-7 are all correct however.
9. In Table 4.10.1-8 on page 4-143 and Table 4.12.2-2 on page 4-197 the support vessel and tug stack diameters (bottom 3 diameters on the table) should be 0.7 meters rather than 0.2 meters.
10. In Table 4.10.1-9 on page 4-144 the PM2.5 annual OCD predicted concentration should be 1.1 microgram per cubic meter rather than 3.8 microgram per cubic meter so the total with background should be 7.3 rather than 10.0. This correction to Resource Report 9 was filed in the above-referenced docket on November 4, 2013 as Supplemental Response to June 5, 2013 Environmental Information Request, which included the final GasPort and Power Plant cumulative modeling results.
11. Minor changes have been made to estimated emissions data presented in Table 4.12.2-1 (page 4-96) per Table 4-4 of the latest PREPA permit application amendment letter sent to EQB dated June 3, 2014. This amendment consists of very minor changes made in response to EPA and EQB comments on the application.
12. On page 4-200 Aguirre LLC believes the Table 4.12.2-4 title should read "Offshore and Coastal Dispersion Model Results for All Aguirre GasPort Project and Power Plant Sources Combined with Ambient Background for Comparison with National Ambient Air Quality Standards".
13. Section 4.10.2.4 – Construction Noise Impact and Mitigation: It is stated in this section of the DEIS that there are exceedances of the EQB noise limits at NSAs 2 and 6 during construction. As explained in the Response to RR9 - Question 11 of the June 5, 2013 Environmental Information Request, filed in the above-referenced docket on June 25, 2013, the predicted received sound levels at NSAs presented in Table 4.10.2-4 are reported as L_{max} values but the EQB noise limits are reported as 1-hour L_{10} values. If the more conservative L_{max} values were converted to L_{10} values so that they are directly comparable to the EQB noise limits; no exceedances of the daytime noise limits would occur during construction.