

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line and Expansion of the Bridgehampton Substation Project

Final Scope of Work

Response to Scope Comments

A. INTRODUCTION

The proposed Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line Project (the Proposed Action) is the construction of a new 69 kilovolt (kV) transmission line between the Southampton and Bridgehampton Substations. The new transmission line is needed to meet the growth in energy demand and improve system reliability on the South Fork of Long Island. The Proposed Action also includes the installation of a new transmission switching station on the currently unimproved northern portion of the parcel of property where the existing Bridgehampton distribution substation is located.

This Final Scope of Work has been prepared to respond to public comments on the LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line Project Draft Scope of Work (August 27, 2007). These comments were made at two public meetings held by LIPA. The two meetings were held on September 18, 2007 at the Southampton Inn. The first meeting commenced at 3 PM and the second meeting commenced at 7 PM. The scoping comment period was held open until October 2, 2007 to receive written and e-mail comments on the Draft Scope of Work.

Listed below are the names of individuals who commented, both orally and written, on the Draft Scope of Work. Where comments were made on the same subject by more than one person, they are summarized into a single comment. Following each comment is the name of the commenter.

B. COMMENTERS ON THE DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK

COMMENTS MADE AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS

- Town Councilwoman Nancy Graboski (Graboski)
- Town Councilman Christopher R. Nuzzi (Nuzzi)
- Marty Shea representing Supervisor Patrick Heaney (M. Shea)
- Town Councilwoman Linda Kabot (Kabot)
- Village of Southampton Mayor Mark Epley (Epley)
- Village of Southampton Trustee Nancy C. Mgann (Mgann)
- Suffolk County Legislator Jay Schneiderman (Schneiderman)
- Kate Wycoff-Holmes (Wycoff-Holmes)
- Sam Holmes (Holmes)
- Claire Watson (Watson)
- Margaret Logan (Logan)
- P. Gorman (Gorman)
- Stephen Flores (Flores)
- John Laffey (Laffey)
- Teal Squires-Vella (Squires-Vella)

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

- Gloria Rabinowitz (Rabinowitz)
- Bill Thayer (Thayer)
- Jenice Delano (Delano)
- Toni Maloney (Maloney)
- Joe Redding (Redding)
- Christine Sullivan Witker (Witker)
- Frederic S. Owen (Owen)
- Steven Abramson (Abramson)
- Bill Dalsimar (Dalsimar)
- Michael Irving (Irving)
- Suzanne Caldwell (Caldwell)
- Howard Doleh (Doleh)
- William Berkoski (Berkoski)
- Marlene Haresign (Haresign)
- Carl Nigro (Nigro)
- Anna-Marie-Garret Wellins (Wellins)
- Sandra Dunn (Dunn)
- Sherry Cohen (Cohen)
- Marilyn Kirkbright (Kirkbright)
- Tom Perez (T. Perez)
- Jean Marie Hazelton (Hazelton)
- Jeffrey Levitt (Levitt)
- John C. Higdon (Higdon)
- Thomas Shea (T. Shea)
- Anna Throne-Holst (Throne-Holst)
- Kerry Jon Macuinnie (Macuinnie)
- Jim Henry (Henry)
- John J. Bennett (Bennett)
- Dr. Ed Kush (Kush)
- Ceal Havemeyer (C. Havemeyer)

WRITTEN AND E-MAIL COMMENTS

- Celia and David Sachs, August 26, 2007 (Sachs)
- Matthew J. Brower on behalf of the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets, September 17, 2007 (NYSDOA)
- Charles J. Voorhis, CEP, AICP, Nelson, Pope, & Voorhis, LLC, September 18, 2007 (NP&V)
- Mark Epley on behalf of the Village of Southampton, September 19, 2007 (VoS)

- Judith White, September 19, 2007 (White)
- Anthony and Ann Lombardo, September 23, 2007 (The Lombardos)
- Mitchell Kriegman, September 23, 2007 (Kriegman)
- Thomas P. Shea, September 23, 2007 (T. Shea)
- Vicki Nolan, September 23, 2007 (Nolan)
- Peter and Patricia Smith, September 24, 2007 (Smith)
- Suzanne Caldwell, September 24, 2007 (Caldwell)
- Gloria Rabinowitz, September 25, 2007 (Rabinowitz)
- Jeffrey Vogel, September 25, 2007 (Vogel)
- Joan B. Zaluski, September 25, 2007, (Zaluski)
- Neil J. Heiskell, September 25, 2007 (Heiskell)
- Robin Perez, September 25, 2007 (R. Perez)
- Sandra M. Raynor, September 25, 2007 (Raynor)
- Therese Bernbach, September 25, 2007 (Bernbach)
- Tom Perez, September 25, 2007 (T. Perez)
- Steve Abramson on behalf of the Water Mill Citizens Advisory Committee, September 26, 2007 (WMCAC)
- Raymond Ford, September 26, 2007 (Ford)
- Jennifer Hartnagel on behalf of the Group for the East End, September 27, 2007 (East End)
- Anthony J. Newman, September 27, 2007 (Newman)
- Dave and Sue Birdsall, September 27, 2007 (Birdsall)
- Dr. Edward A. Kush, September 27, 2007 (Kush)
- Doreen Corwith Eckert, September 27, 2007 (Eckert)
- John S. Erwin, September 27, 2007 (Erwin)
- Judy Clifford, September 27, 2007 (Clifford)
- Marsha Kranes, September 27, 2007 (Kranes)
- Rachel Verno, September 27, 2007 (R. Verno)
- Dr. John R. and Sally B. Scranton, September 28, 2007 (Scranton)
- Frances de La Barre, September 28, 2007 (de La Barre)
- Hamilton Hoge, September 28, 2007 (Hoge)
- Helen Verno, September 28, 2007 (H. Verno)
- Jennifer and Joshua Neren, September 28, 2007 (Neren)
- Paul Griffin, September 28, 2007 (Griffin)
- Preston T. Phillips, September 28, 2007 (Phillips)
- R. Mark Keenan, Esq. on behalf of the Committee for A Green South Fork, September 28, 2007 (Green SF)
- Sherry K. Cohen, September 28, 2007 (Cohen)
- Richard Pinto, September 29, 2007 (Pinto)

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

- Gina and John Anderson, September 30, 2007 (Anderson)
- Chiara Bozzi, September 30, 2007 (Bozzi)
- Gina Farahnick, September 30, 2007 (Farahnick)
- Marlene Haresign, September 30, 2007 (Haresign)
- Charlotte Cousins, September 30, 2007 (Cousins)
- Arthur C. Muller, September 30, 2007 (A. Muller)
- Catherine Weinstock, September 30, 2007 (Weinstock)
- Elizabeth Walbroel, September 30, 2007 (Walbroel)
- Kristina Muller, September 30, 2007 (K. Muller)
- Margery Freedman, September 30, 2007 (Freedman)
- Richard Rutkowski, September 30, 2007 (Rutkowski)
- Robert and Elizabeth D. Skinner, September 30, 2007 (Skinner)
- Kevin Kispert on behalf of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, October 1, 2007 (NYSDEC)
- Jefferson V. Murphree on behalf of the Town of Southampton Town Board, October 1, 2007 (ToS)
- Charles Raben, October 1, 2007 (Raben)
- John C. Higdon, October 1, 2007 (Higdon)
- Kate and Sam Holmes, October 1, 2007 (Holmes)
- Jzytwins@aol.com, October 2, 2007 (jzytwins)
- Sarah Havemeyer, including various petitions, October 2, 2007 (S. Havemeyer)
- Audrey Stafford and Jeff Golub, October 3, 2007 (Stafford/Golub)
- Ann Lombardo, October 4, 2007 (Lombardo)
- Shelley Borkoski, October 5, 2007 (Borkoski)
- Robert Matloff, undated, (Matloff)
- Shirley H.V. Davidson, undated (Davidson)
- Stephen P. Vella, undated (Vella)
- Teal Squires-Vella, undated (Squires-Vella)

C. COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK

PROCEDURAL

Comment 1: Why didn't LIPA send the Draft Scope of Work with the notice of the public meeting? (Holmes, Hazelton)

Response: The Draft Scope of Work was sent to all potentially involved and interested agencies. The notice of the public meeting contained an internet link to the LIPA web site, where the Draft Scope of Work was available. Copies of the Draft Scope of Work were available at the public meeting.

Comment 2: LIPA did not notify the Village at the same time as all other entities including the Town, Southampton Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), and Water Mill CAC. (Epley, Hazelton, Henry)

Response: The Draft Scope of Work and notice of public meeting were mailed to all potentially involved and interested agencies at the same time.

Comment 3: Why wasn't I, as a neighbor of LIPA on Montauk Highway in Bridgehampton, notified of this project? (C. Havemeyer)

Response: Post cards with the notice of public meeting were mailed to all LIPA rate payers within 1,000 feet on either side of each of the four alternative routes.

Comment 4: The public meeting on the Draft Scope of Work is premature because the Town of Southampton Planning Board has contested LIPA's bid to be lead agency. The Town Planning Board should be the lead agency. Will the DEIS explain why it's not a conflict of interest for LIPA to be the applicant, regulatory agency, and lead agency at the same time. (Nuzzi, Schneiderman, Berkoski, Haresign, WMCAC, Green SF, Rabinowitz, T. Perez, ToS)

Response: LIPA believes that it is the correct entity to serve as the lead agency, and this public meeting, while optional, is part of the public review process mandated by the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) and its implementing regulations. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) will consider the Town of Southampton Planning Board's protest over LIPA's lead agency designation, and assertion that it is the appropriate lead agency. While the adjudication process is ongoing, LIPA is continuing the public review process under SEQRA.

Under SEQRA, it is common for state and local agencies to serve as the lead agency for projects the agency proposes to undertake. This is a long-standing, common and accepted practice and has not been found to constitute a conflict of interest.

Comment 5: LIPA hired an ex-county judge to oversee the proceedings to add the perception of official sanction. Why didn't a community panel with representatives from the community, LIPA, and the Town preside over the scoping hearing? (Nigro, Throne-Holst, Macuinnie)

Response: Judge Belfi, a retired Nassau County judge, was selected as the presiding officer because of his experience at this task. The purpose of the public meeting was to receive comments on the Draft Scope of Work in an orderly manner, and a representative panel is not an appropriate mechanism for accomplishing this purpose. A public open house to discuss the proposed project was held on August 21, 2007 where members of the public and representatives of the Town and Village of Southampton could informally discuss the project. Numerous

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

other meetings have also been held where community representatives have had an opportunity to discuss the project.

Comment 6: Why was the meeting scheduled on the same night as the primary and open school night (Squires-Vella, Frederic, Nigro, Hazelton, C. Havemeyer)

Response: The public meeting was held within the time period proscribed by the SEQRA regulations. Afternoon and evening sessions were scheduled so that people could avoid conflicts.

Comment 7: Will a full copy of the hearing transcript be made available to the public? (Rabinowitz)

Response: The hearing transcripts were posted on the LIPA Web site the week after the public meeting and are still available on the Web site.

Comment 8: There is no easy way to e-mail comments on the Draft Scope of Work. (Ford)

Response: A number of email comments were received and have been included in this document. However, comment is noted, and a dedicated email address has also been created: sobridge@lipower.org.

Comment 9: When will LIPA provide the opportunity for dialogue between it and the community, including the Town and the Village? Meetings should continuously be held throughout this process. (Maloney, Dunn, Henry, ToS)

Response: The public meeting on the Draft Scope of Work and the future public hearing on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement are formal requirements of the SEQRA process. Informal dialogue among LIPA, the Village of Southampton, the Town of Southampton, involved and interested agencies and the public have occurred and are expected to continue in the future.

Comment 10: Is there an independent oversight entity reviewing this project? (Throne-Holst)

Response: LIPA has served as lead agency in the past and has exhibited sound, objective judgment in assessing potential impacts from their projects. The EIS will be a public document and subject to outside review by members of the public, expert governmental agencies, and elected officials. This public review and these agencies are independent of LIPA.

Comment 11: Why aren't there available meeting minutes for any meetings with residents, officials, and employees of the Village and Town regarding this project? (Hazelton)

Response: Minutes of these informal meetings were not taken by LIPA and thus do not exist. To the extent documents relating to those meetings exist, they have been made available as appropriate and as required under the law.

Comment 12: The scoping document is inadequate and was drafted with the result already in mind. The SEQRA process is supposed to provide a public applicant with meaningful choices. (Bennett)

Response: The purpose of soliciting comments on the Draft Scope of Work is to address any inadequacies in the document. The Draft Scope of Work draws no conclusions about potential impacts and presents only the methodology to assess those potential impacts. A number of alternatives to the proposed project are included in the Draft Scope of Work and will be studied in the DEIS along with the proposed project.

Comment 13: According to LIPA's website, they are planning to order project material in September 2007 and hold the scoping hearing in September 2007? How could material be ordered before LIPA has heard the public speak? Does this mean that LIPA has already made up their mind? (Epley, T. Perez)

Response: Construction materials that require a long lead time to manufacture are typically ordered well before a project is approved or fully engineered and designed. The orders can be canceled with a small penalty, re-sold, stored, or used for other projects, and the fact that such orders have been placed does not mean that a result has been predetermined.

Comment 14: SEQRA requires LIPA to take a hard look at the potential adverse environmental impacts and consider those impacts when making its decision. The DEIS has to consider the social, human, environmental, aesthetic, cultural, and community scenic character for all routes. (Haresign, WMCAC, VoS, Kabot, ToS, de La Barre, Kriegman, R. Verno, Pinto)

Response: The DEIS will take a hard look at the potential adverse environmental impacts of the project along all four routes.

Comment 15: The DEIS has to address the controversy that is surrounding the project. The DEIS should explain why burying the lines would address all of the community concerns. (Haresign, WMCAC)

Response: The DEIS will address the potential environmental impacts of the project. The amount of controversy is not germane to the analysis of impacts, although the decision makers can consider controversy in their decision-making process. The potential impacts of burying the line will be assessed in the DEIS as well.

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

Comment 16: The DEIS should list all local contacts and resources utilized in the Village and Town of Southampton, and the DEIS should explain how outside people can evaluate important historic, social, and visual resources within the community. (Witker, Haresign, Hazelton)

Response: Consultations with expert agencies and persons with local knowledge will be included in the DEIS.

Comment 17: The map route numbers should be the same as listed options in the document. (Haresign, NP&V)

Response: Noted. The route designations will be consistent in the DEIS.

Comment 18: LIPA is becoming like LILCO in that they only care about their own financial well being. (T. Perez)

Response: LIPA is a not-for-profit instrumentality of New York State and makes no profit from providing electricity to its rate payers. LIPA has an obligation to make prudent financial decisions on behalf of its rate payers and seeks to provide adequate service to its customers at a reasonable cost.

Comment 19: All maps in the DEIS should include the Village of Southampton boundary. (NP&V)

Response: Noted. Where appropriate, the boundaries of the Village of Southampton will be shown.

Comment 20: The DEIS should include a section on Cumulative Impacts that discloses all currently proposed and pending projects within each of the alternative study areas and address the potential impacts of the combination of all these projects on each environmental resource addressed in the DEIS. (NP&V, WMCAC)

Response: A cumulative impact analysis will be included in the DEIS.

Comment 21: Add a chapter on Project Location that describes the alternative routes and substation and provide a related figure. Also indicate the various existing zones, districts, services area boundaries, planning areas, etc. through which the project route runs. (Voohis, ToS)

Response: Noted. The Project Description and the Alternatives chapter will include a description and figures of the routes. Boundaries of various districts and environmental conditions will be shown in the appropriate chapters in the DEIS.

Comment 22: Provide a map of all existing power lines on the East End, and indicate the pole heights and whether above ground or below ground. (NP&V)

Response: A map showing all existing transmission and distribution lines with pole heights on the East End of Long Island would be overly complicated, difficult to read, and would not add information that would explain or expand the analyses in the DEIS. Further, the Department of Homeland Security restricts distribution of this type of infrastructure information.

Comment 23: Provide a study area map for each impact chapter with appropriate information specific to the analysis in that chapter. (NP&V)

Response: Noted. In each technical chapter, study area maps will be included as appropriate.

Comment 24: In accordance with SEQRA, the DEIS must be written in language that is easily understood by the public. Highly technical material should be summarized and the details included in an appendix. Any reports or studies cited in the DEIS need to be listed in an appendix indicating where the public can review these prime sources. (WMCAC)

Response: Noted. The DEIS will be written in clear, easily understood English. The Appendices, as needed, will contain backup materials to the analyses and results in the main body of the DEIS.

Comment 25: Provide a tax map showing the location of the proposed poles and heights and materials of those poles for each alternative. (WMCAC, Farahnick, Clifford, ToS, Neren, Kriegman, R. Verno)

Response: The exact locations of each pole are not known at this time because the final design has not been completed as yet. The planned heights of the poles will be described.

Comment 26: Red lining which properties have buried lines and which have overhead lines is illegal in New York State. How will LIPA compensate for this discrimination? (Phillips, Holmes)

Response: LIPA has proposed partial undergrounding of the proposed line in certain areas. The installation of overhead utility lines is not illegal in New York State. The DEIS will determine if either overhead or underground transmission lines would have any significant adverse impacts.

Comment 27: The Environmental Assessment Form, Coastal Zone Assessment Form, and Draft Scope of Work are deficient and should be revised. (ToS)

Response: The purpose of the Environmental Assessment and Coastal Zone Assessment Forms are to highlight issues to be analyzed and the Draft Scope of Work presents the methodologies for the analyses. The DEIS will contain the analyses.

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

Comment 28: Will the DEIS address light pollution from the proposed transmission line? (Caldwell)

Response: The proposed transmission line would not include lighting fixtures and therefore an analysis of light pollution is not warranted in the DEIS.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Comment 29: Justification for burying some lines in certain areas, such as East Hampton, and not in other areas must be disclosed in accordance with New York State case law. Will the Riverhead to Jamesport EIS be made available and be referenced in this DEIS since those lines were buried? (Thayer, Bennett, WMCAC, Green SF, R. Verno)

Response: The DEIS will address the reasons for considering both overhead and underground lines for this proposed project. The Riverhead to Jamesport Environmental Assessment Form and related analysis (no EIS was prepared) is available on LIPA's website at www.lipower.org under the "About LIPA, Powering Long Island, Past Projects" tabs.

Comment 30: Why hasn't LIPA followed LILCO's previous plan to bury the lines? Southampton Town can be a model for the rest of the region and nation to bury all lines. If new overhead lines are installed, this will become a precedent for the next power lines. (Dunn, Cohen)

Response: When practicable and economically feasible, LIPA has and will continue to bury lines. Alternative methods of paying for additional costs associated with energy projects have been developed by other utilities. LIPA is a separate and distinct entity from LILCO and therefore previous plans drafted under LILCO do not apply to LIPA.

Comment 31: All LIPA's existing, replacement, and expansion projects should require burying the transmission lines, especially in storm prone areas. As a matter of policy, LIPA should bury all existing and new lines in storm prone areas. (Schneiderman, Epley, T. Perez, VoS)

Response: Burying all lines on Long Island would be expensive, and the increased cost of electricity to all rate payers would be prohibitive. Impacts from storms on overhead lines will be assessed in the DEIS.

Comment 32: Scare tactics should not be used to force a decision for project approval. People would be willing to be inconvenienced by power outages if that allows for a proper investigation of the issue. (Cohen, Henry, Borkoski, T. Perez, Scranton)

Response: The need for the proposed project is based on the best information and projections available to date. Consequences of the No-Action Alternative are

factual. Based on LIPA's past experience, the public is not willing to experience power outages.

Comment 33: LIPA has not provided justification for the new overhead line when considering safety, environmental, economic, and aesthetic impacts of the project. LIPA must provide documentation for their decision not to bury the line, such as analyses indicating that it would be technically unfeasible or inefficient, as well as unacceptably expensive. (Henry, NP&V, Cohen)

Response: Noted. The DEIS will provide the impact of the proposed project on social, environmental, and economic factors within the region. The DEIS will also present the cost to underground the line in comparison to overhead installation as the justification to not bury the entire line.

Comment 34: Will the DEIS provide the basis for the growth assumptions and subsequent expected electrical outages to ascertain that this project is needed by the summer of 2008? (Delano, NP&V)

Response: Yes. The growth projections are based on KeySpan's planning group estimates.

Comment 35: How many years will the new transmission line serve the needs of the population? When will the new Bridgehampton Substation become obsolete? Why is the substation needed and why does it have to be so big? Will LIPA disclose, in the DEIS, its long-term plan to address future electrical needs of the community beyond ten years and address what the impacts are of those plans? A long-term plan, not piecemeal projects, is warranted. To what extent will the proposed project affect the need for additional power lines on the East End? What additional transmission or generation plans are being considered? (Maloney, T. Perez, Hazelton, Henry, NP&V, WMCAC, Cousins, ToS)

Response: The DEIS will only address the impacts of the project in question. It is expected that the proposed project would provide sufficient energy for the foreseeable future. A sequential build-out plan is general utility transmission planning practice. Far-term future projects are less defined as they are dependent on future load growth and usage patterns. LIPA's long-term plan will not be analyzed in the DEIS. However, the LIPA Energy Plan 2004—2013 is available on the LIPA Web site, lipower.org.

Comment 36: Will the existing poles along the back roads remain? (Graboski)

Response: Where new overhead lines are installed, existing poles would be removed and cables located on the existing poles would be transferred to the new poles. Where underground lines are installed, existing poles would remain.

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

Comment 37: Please completely describe the work necessary, including how much clearing of land and what equipment would be installed, for the expansion of the Bridgehampton Substation. The DEIS should also explain how the substation would be screened and if the screening will be maintained. (Kabot, T. Perez)

Response: Noted. The DEIS will include a complete description of the work proposed as part of the expansion of the Bridgehampton Substation.

Comment 38: Does LIPA contemplate other uses on the Bridgehampton Substation property? (Kabot)

Response: No other uses beyond the existing distribution substation and proposed transmission substation are currently being considered at the existing Bridgehampton Substation.

Comment 39: Does LIPA want to put other uses on the poles? (Gorman)

Response: On LIPA owned poles, space is leased to other service providers, such as the telephone and cable companies. The Town has expressed interest in utilizing existing and new poles for wireless uses.

Comment 40: Will the proposed project only utilize public property or will private lands also be used? If private lands are to be used, discuss how LIPA will gain access to these properties (e.g., easements, purchases, leases, etc.). (NP&V)

Response: The DEIS will detail the necessity to use private lands, where applicable. However, it is not expected that LIPA would need to utilize private lands for this project. Further, LIPA already maintains existing easements along roadways and would therefore not need additional easements for those alternatives that would construct the new line along roadways. LIPA would need to obtain new easements for the LIRR Route Alternative and renegotiate easements for the Existing Line Alternative.

Comment 41: Present a chronology and narrative of LIPA's discussions with the various levels of government related to the considered routes, including public meetings and/or public presentations, if any, and discuss agency or public concerns. (NP&V)

Response: The Project Description Chapter will include a section of public outreach.

COST

Comment 42: How much will it cost to bury the transmission line? A cost benefit study should be included in the DEIS that compares the long-term benefits of underground cables to overhead lines including construction, maintenance and repair, prevention of environmental and visual impacts, reduced power outages,

reduced impacts on emergency services, reduced tree pruning costs, avoidance of motor vehicle collisions with poles, and improved electricity reliability. The additional cost to bury the transmission line will be worth the benefits. The cost differential between above ground and underground seems enormous and a full detailed analysis should be provided in the DEIS, including fixed versus variable cost. Costing should be provided by an independent contractor not affiliated with LIPA. The Town of Southampton spends far more on land preservation to protect views than it would cost to bury the cable. (Holmes, M. Shea, Gorman, Flores, Nuzzi, Delano, Maloney, Kirkbright, T. Perez, Bennett, Levitt, White, Henry, WMCAC, ToS, Raynor, Vella, Eckert, Neren, Erwin, Freedman, Kriegman, R. Verno, Pinto, Cohen, East End)

Response: The cost differential between overhead and underground lines will be presented in the DEIS on a system wide basis. Various studies commissioned by LIPA and other entities will be used in the analysis. The monies spent by outside entities on land preservation will not be included in the analysis.

Comment 43: LIPA's cost analysis assumed that land acquisition would be at market price compared to what could be obtained if agencies such as the Peconic Land Trust were involved in acquiring the rights for underground lines. (Henry)

Response: LIPA does not plan to acquire land for this project.

Comment 44: Why was no cost benefit analysis completed to date for this project? (Hazelton)

Response: General cost estimates for the project have been completed and shared with the Town and Village of Southampton. A full analysis will be included in the DEIS.

Comment 45: What is the cost to LIPA for sending out all of their public relations mailers? Why don't rate payers have to pay for the stamp on their bills? When a house has more than one meter, why can't the bills be combined to save stamps? (Hazelton)

Response: The cost of mailing bills to rate payers is not germane to the analyses in the DEIS.

Comment 46: What is the difference in time to repair underground lines compared to overhead lines? (M. Shea, Nuzzi)

Response: Generalized costs and time of outage to repair overhead and underground lines will be presented and discussed in the DEIS.

Comment 47: Cost to bury the line should be amortized over the line's expected life and compared to the cost of blighting the area where the line would be installed overhead. (Epley, VoS)

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

Response: The generalized overall cost of overhead and underground transmission lines will be presented and discussed in the DEIS.

Comment 48: A proposal should be given to the public on the cost to bury the line and impact of this cost on utility bills, and what is being done to offset some of these costs, including special tax or assessment districts, special rate structures based on usage, or the impact on an overall rate increase for all rate payers, or a bond issue to address these costs. Ideally, the cost to bury the whole line would be borne by LIPA, however, LIPA and other governmental officials, including the Town, should find a way to fund burying the lines. Is any Federal, State, County, or Town money being used to fund the project? (Kabot, Throne-Holst, Levitt, WMCAC, Holmes, East End)

Response: As is normal practice, the cost for the new transmission line is expected to be borne by the rate payers. The DEIS will not present the potential effect on the rate structure. No outside funding is expected to be used for the project and will not be discussed in the DEIS.

Comment 49: The Village will work with LIPA to find the money to pay for burying the lines. (Epley)

Response: LIPA is willing to continue discussion with the Village of Southampton over funding the proposed project.

Comment 50: Rate payers would pay the higher rates to bury the lines. What would be the tax cost to the affected communities if the taxpayers paid to bury the line? What would be the cost to individual taxpayers of a 10 to 20 year bond to bury the line? (Laffey, Bennett, WMCAC, Haresign, A. Muller, Eckert)

Response: LIPA has a duty to the rate payers to prudently spend money to provide high quality electric service at the lowest possible cost. LIPA is willing to continue discussions with competent governmental agencies over cost sharing.

Comment 51: The cost should be split four ways between the homeowner, LIPA, and the cable and telephone companies. (Macwuinnie, Cohen)

Response: LIPA is unable to split costs with the various agencies, but does lease space on poles to telephone and cable companies.

Comment 52: The DEIS should address why LIPA does not have the money to bury the lines and disclose what cost saving methods have been underway by LIPA including salaries of their executives and their bargaining agreements. Take the \$2 million spent annually on public relation and spend it on burying the lines. LIPA can save more money over the long-term by burying the lines. Internal budgetary

constraints are not appropriate criteria on which to determine whether to bury the line. (Cohen, Hazelton, C. Havemeyer, Green SF, Borkoski, Cohen)

Response: LIPA has a duty to the rate payers to prudently spend money to provide high quality electric service at the lowest possible cost. The DEIS will contain information regarding the overall costs of the various alternatives, based on length.

Comment 53: The DEIS should evaluate the cost of the development rights program and the current value of those rights as compared to the proposed route including 30 years of lost taxes (the length of time the program has been in effect) and the attraction to tourism from preservation. (Ford)

Response: The development rights program is separate and apart from the proposed project and will not be discussed in the DEIS.

Comment 54: How will the proposed project be paid for? Will the costs be associated with a rate increase for LIPA customers? (NP&V)

Response: The proposed project is included in money budgeted for capital projects. This money comes from the rate payers. No specific rate increase is associated with the proposed project.

LAND USE AND COMMUNITY CHARACTER

Comment 55: The land next to the Bridgehampton Substation has been preserved through the Community Preservation Fund as a working farm and hunting preserve. Will the expansion of the Bridgehampton Substation have negative impacts on that use? (Kabot, ToS)

Response: Impacts of the proposed project on existing land use adjacent to the project will be discussed in the DEIS.

Comment 56: The poles will depress property values. Therefore, an assessment of property values and the effect on the tax base should be included in the DEIS, including taxes paid to schools. If there is a loss in the tax base, will LIPA compensate the Town for the difference? (Wycoff-Holmes, Nuzzi, Schneiderman, Squires-Vella, Frederic, Abramson, T. Perez, C. Havemeyer, Henry, WMCAC, Green SF, Caldwell, ToS, Newman, Farahnick, Freedman, Kriegman, R. Verno, Pinto, Skinner, Cohen, T. Shea, Kush)

Response: Purely economic impacts of a governmental action are beyond the scope of SEQRA, which relates to the study of potential significant adverse environmental impacts. However, the DEIS will discuss, in the context of potential impacts on community character, the potential of the project to depress

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

property values in the study area in a manner that would impact community character.

Comment 57: Impacts on neighborhoods, hamlets, and the Town's economic viability should be addressed. (Nuzzi, WMCAC)

Response: Noted. This will be discussed in the DEIS.

Comment 58: A ½ mile study area is deficient to adequately assess impacts from the proposed project. (Dalsimar, H. Verno)

Response: The area within ½ mile of the proposed project has been defined as the region where the proposed project could have the greatest impact on land use and therefore is utilized as the appropriate study area. However, for those impacts that may have larger zones of impact (visual, etc.), larger areas will be used in the analysis.

Comment 59: The placement of utility poles in agricultural fields can create obstacles for farming equipment and can significantly reduce the efficiency of the farm tillage and harvest operations. Therefore, transmission lines installed above ground should be located outside field boundaries, wherever possible. When transmission line must cross farmland, all attempts should be made to locate the poles on field edges to the greatest extent practicable. (NYSDOA)

Response: Because the proposed project would install poles along corridor right-of-ways, (roadway, LIRR, and transmission), it is not expected that the proposed project would be located within field boundaries but along field edges. Thus, the project is not expected to interfere with farm operations.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND OPEN SPACE

Comment 60: LIPA should bury the lines to construct a bike and jogging path along the entire buried route and present all financial resources available to fund the bike path and create a landscaped buffer between the route and the bike path, and the roadway. LIPA should also present the positive economic impacts from the creation of such a bike path and subsequent partnership between LIPA and the community. A bike path is sorely needed. (Dalsimar, Henry, WMCAC, A. Muller, Holmes, Freedman)

Response: The easement LIPA holds for the current line does not allow bike use. The DEIS will discuss that the Town has proposed the South Fork Bikeway project and is currently soliciting bids for construction of the bikeway. The DEIS will observe that LIPA would work with the Town should the South Fork Bikeway be underway during construction of the proposed project.

Comment 61: A ½ mile study area is deficient to adequately assess community facility and open space impacts from the proposed project. (Ford)

Response: The area within ½ mile of the proposed project has been defined as the region where the proposed project could have the greatest impact on community facilities and open space and therefore is utilized as the appropriate study area. However, for those impacts that may have larger zones of impact (visual, etc.), larger areas will be used in the analysis.

Comment 62: The Draft Scope of Work doesn't address or recognize the legislative program for the purchase of development rights of agricultural land for agricultural, rural, and community preservation as well as maintenance of the area's aesthetic quality that is followed by the State, County, and Town. The DEIS must analyze the legislative history and purpose of this program and recognize the enormous amount of money spend on preservation of the agricultural and rural character of the area. (Ford, Davidson, ToS, East End)

Response: The Town's Community Preservation Fund will be discussed in the DEIS and the project's consistency with this policy will be addressed.

Comment 63: The project area is used by the community for recreation and open space enjoyment. The DEIS much address this the impact. (VoS, ToS)

Response: Noted. The DEIS will address the proposed project's impact to open space and recreation.

ZONING AND PUBLIC POLICY

Comment 64: Consistency with the Town of Southampton's Comprehensive Plan is a key element for inclusion in the DEIS. The comprehensive plan specifically recommends that the Town "coordinate with local utility companies to place utility cables underground along scenic road corridors and designate special assessment districts to fund the placement of utility cables underground." The DEIS should also describe and discuss Federal, State, and other regulations applicable to the project and how these regulations would be satisfied. (Kabot, Dalsimar, NP&V, WMCAC, ToS, H. Verno, East End)

Response: The DEIS will summarize the relevant land use policies, including the Town's Comprehensive Plan, and will address the proposed project's consistency with such policies.

Comment 65: Why was this project not included in LIPA's Energy Plan for 2004 to 2013? (Hazelton)

Response: The proposed project was identified in LIPA's Energy Plan as the South Fork 2nd 138/69 kilovolt Transformer Bank.

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

Comment 66: The DEIS should address impacts on environmentally sensitive areas including the Aquifer Protection Overlay District and the Agricultural Overlay District. (Nuzzi, ToS, East End)

Response: Noted. Potential significant adverse impacts on the Town's overlay districts will be addressed in the DEIS.

Comment 67: A ½ mile study area is deficient to adequately assess zoning and public policy impacts from the proposed project. (Ford)

Response: Because zoning is the policy that guides land use decisions, similar to the land use section, the area within ½ mile of the proposed project has been defined as the region where the proposed project could have the greatest impact on land use and zoning, and therefore is utilized as the appropriate study area. However, for those impacts that may have larger zones of impact (visual, etc.), larger areas will be used in the analysis.

Comment 68: Provide documentation supporting the conclusion that Village zoning and building regulations do not apply to this project. (NP&V, VoS)

Response: The DEIS will discuss the basis for LIPA's position that the agency, as a state public authority, is not subject to local zoning and building regulations.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Comment 69: There are historic districts in the Village of Southampton and hamlet of Bridgehampton, and the railroad plaza is historic. The DEIS needs to address the impacts to these districts. The DEIS needs to also address the proposed project impacts to sites on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places as well as disclose the proximity of these sites to the proposed project. (Logan, Irving, Haresign, Epley, NP&V, WMCAC, ToS, Eckert, Kriegman)

Response: The DEIS will provide a comprehensive analysis of the proposed projects impacts on historic resources, including districts, listed resources, and potential resources.

Comment 70: Why didn't any LIPA representatives at the Water Mill Community Meeting know that the Village was in a historic district? (Hazelton)

Response: The DEIS will assess potential significant adverse impacts from the project on the Village of Southampton historic district.

Comment 71: Local historic resources, archives, and experts need to be consulted as part of the Historic Resources analysis to be included in the DEIS. The experts should

be identified in the DEIS. The Water Mill Museum should be contacted for information on historic resources. (Haresign, Abramson, WMCAC, The Lombardos, Griffin, de La Barre)

Response: Local resources will be contacted regarding historic resources within the vicinity of the proposed line. Those resources will be identified in the DEIS.

Comment 72: The DEIS must address the proposed project's impact to colonial roads that date back to the 1600s that provide scenic and historic character to the region. The DEIS must also provide alternatives to utilizing this corridor. (WMCAC)

Response: The DEIS will address the proposed project's impact to the historic character of the area.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Comment 73: All of the roads for the Direct Route Alternative are recommended to be designated as scenic roads by the 1999 Comprehensive Plan. The Town of Southampton is currently developing an ordinance that will designate those roads as scenic. (Graboski, WMCAC, The Lombardos, Newman, A. Muller, Griffin, Kriegman, Rutkowski)

Response: The DEIS will provide a list of the scenic roadways intended for designation by the Town and address the proposed project's consistency with this designation for the identified roadways.

Comment 74: The transmission line should be all underground. The poles are large, tall, and unattractive. The poles do not belong in residential, agricultural, and open space areas. The Town is known for its natural beauty, its rural heritage, open spaces, farmland vistas, its quaint residential neighborhoods, and its exceptional quality of life. The poles would detract from the beauty of the area. The community is a tourist based economy, which needs beauty. Based on previous projects undertaken by LIPA, placing the line underground is technically and economically feasible. (Graboski, Wycoff-Holmes, M. Shea, Watson, Logan, Gorman, Flores, Laffey, Nuzzi, Schneiderman, Squires-Vella, Thayer, Mgann, Frederic, Abramson, Epley, Nigro, Wellins, Dunn, Cohen, Kirkbright, T. Perez, Levitt, Higdon, Throne-Holst, Bennett, Kush, C. Havemeyer, jzytwins, Stafford/Golub, Lombardo, S. Havemeyer, various petitions, WMCAC, VoS, Green SF, Borkoski, Haresign, Davidson, The Lombardos, Rabinowitz, Smith, ToS, Newman, A. Muller, Sachs, Cousins, Birdsall, Nolan, Anderson, K. Muller, Vogel, Phillips, Heiskell, Griffin, Raynor, Eckert, Scranton, Walbroel, Erwin, Holmes, Freedman, Kranes, Kriegman, Pinto, Rutkowski, Skinner, Caldwell, Hoge, Kush, East End)

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

Response: The DEIS will address the proposed project's consistency with surrounding land uses and community character.

Comment 75: The scenic values of the railroad corridor needs to be addressed in the DEIS as it serves as the gateway to our communities. (ToS)

Response: The DEIS will address the project's impacts to scenic resources along each of the routes.

Comment 76: Will the DEIS address how the large poles are not considered significant visual structures and how the removal of trees will change the view. The DEIS should also address the project impacts to Mill Pond. (Rabinowitz, WMCAC, Bozzi, Eckert, Kriegman, Matloff, Caldwell, East End)

Response: The DEIS will provide a complete visual analysis in accordance with New York State Department of Environmental Conservation guidelines.

Comment 77: Will the DEIS explain how the poles will be designed to physically blend with existing surroundings and how LIPA will mitigate the effects of the high poles on the aesthetic beauty and historic character of the area. (Rabinowitz, WMCAC)

Response: Should the DEIS find that the proposed project has a significant adverse impact on visual resources within the area, mitigation will be proposed to eliminate these impacts.

Comment 78: How far will the new poles be visible to the community and intrude on scenic vistas? The visual resources analysis needs to consider the impacts to the entire community and not just to the residents along the line. (Maloney, Zaluski)

Response: The study area for the visual resources impact analysis is 1 mile, or the limit of the viewshed.

Comment 79: What experts will be utilized to assess the scenic resources in the area for inclusion in the DEIS? The DEIS should describe the methodology used to assess visual resource impacts, including the simulations of the project during all seasons. (Abramson, NP&V, The Lombardos, Clifford, de La Barre, H. Verno, Erwin, Kriegman, R. Verno, Matloff, Caldwell)

Response: The proposed project's impact on scenic resources will be assessed based on the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation guidance and photosimulations of the built environment will be provided in the DEIS.

Comment 80: The Bridgehampton Substation will be an eyesore. What will be the visual impact of the substation? (T. Perez)

Response: Visual impacts from the substation will be addressed in the DEIS.

Comment 81: The Draft Scope of Work, under visual resources, does not mention the old, costly, extensive and ongoing State program to acquire and hold development rights as being of statewide significance. (Ford)

Response: There are no designated areas of statewide significance on Long Island.

Comment 82: The DEC guidance referenced in the Draft Scope of Work to be followed for the visual resource analysis is intended for internal use by NYSDEC. (VoS)

Response: While it is acknowledged that DEC Program Policy DEP-00-2 is intended for use by DEC personnel in assessing potential visual impacts, the methodology is comprehensive and can be used at the local level. Program Policy DEP-00-2 includes the requirement for analysis of potential visual impacts from locally designated sensitive receptors (e.g., parks, historic resources, and scenic areas) in addition to Federal or State designated resources. In the absence of any other defined visual impact assessment methodology, Program Policy DEP-00-2 is the most appropriate methodology to use.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Comment 83: The DEIS should address the impact to natural resources from the buried line during and after construction. The DEIS should also address project impacts, including the substation, to wildlife, including wild turkey, pheasants, turtles, and birds. (NP&V, Thayer, Dalsimar, T. Perez, Sachs, Clifford, ToS, H. Verno, Kriegman, Kush, East End)

Response: The DEIS will address the direct and indirect effects of the proposed project on wildlife habitat, migration corridors, and wildlife movements, including an assessment of the effects to turkey and ring-necked pheasant, both during construction and post-construction.

Comment 84: How many trees will be removed due to this project? The location of large trees that may interfere with the project should be discussed. In addition, how will those trees be trimmed now and in the future and to what height? How many poles will be over the tree line? Will LIPA replace trees that are accidentally destroyed? Will the DEIS identify trees of historic value? The DEIS needs to address whether the proposed project would be subject to LIPA's "Withstanding Severe Storms Policy and Program Summary" as it relates to vegetative removal. (C. Havemeyer, WMCAC, Matloff, Raben, Bernbach, K. Muller, Eckert, de La Barre, Neren, Erwin, Holmes, Freedman, Kranes, Kriegman, R. Verno, East End)

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

Response: Installation of the proposed project may require some tree removal and tree pruning for the transmission line. Trees will be removed and land cleared for the Bridgehampton Substation. The area of existing vegetation will be described and mapped in the DEIS. Areas of likely tree removal will be noted. As is current practice for the existing lines, tree trimming would also occur in the future to keep the overhead lines clear of trees. The DEIS will identify biologically notable trees.

Comment 85: What will removing and pruning of trees do to the migratory birds? The DEIS needs to disclose impacts to endangered birds that nest in the area. (Maloney, Abramson, de La Barre, Kriegman, Matloff)

Response: The DEIS will address impacts to migratory birds based on data collected in the field, as well as the Breeding Bird Atlas Project and Natural Heritage Program historic records of occurrence of birds, including endangered species.

Comment 86: Impacts on natural resources from construction and maintenance of the line and switching station should be included in the DEIS. In addition, the DEIS should disclose impacts to natural resources from service roads, staging/lay down areas, areas of temporary and permanent clearing, and the potential use of herbicides to maintain these areas, if applicable. (NYSDEC, ToS)

Response: The DEIS will present impacts to natural resources from both the construction and maintenance of the proposed project, including service roads, construction staging areas, vegetative clearing, and the potential use of herbicides.

Comment 87: The DEIS must identify potentially affected rare, threatened, or endangered species along the routes and the substation location. Surveys conducted to determine the presence of threatened and endangered plants and animals should take place at the appropriate time of the year to allow the best possible chance of observing the organism and achieving accurate identification. (NYSDEC, ToS)

Response: Natural resource surveys will identify required habitat types for threatened and endangered species noted by the Natural Heritage Program to be within the vicinity of the proposed project. Based on surveys conducted to date, no threatened and endangered species have been identified along the proposed routes.

Comment 88: Documented Eastern Tiger Salamander sites are located along all four alternative routes with the Existing Line Alternative being the least intrusive to the salamander habitat, followed by the Direct Route Alternative. All areas within 1,000 feet of the edge of disturbance for the new transmission line (including any area of excavation or clearing of vegetation) should be surveyed for the presence of vernal pools, which may provide breeding habitat for this

species. The survey of vernal pools should be conducted between March 1 and August 1 within 3 days following a significant rain event (> 1 inch). Potential tiger salamander ponds should be examined for egg masses and/or presence of adult animals during the months of February and March. The known locations should be accounted for as well as any other extant vernal pools located near the proposed line. The proposed project's edge of disturbance should be situated a minimum of 1,000 feet from the edge of any wetland or vernal pool that have been documented as providing breeding habitat for this species as well as Marbled Salamander and/or Spotted Salamander. If however, any disturbance is expected to occur within 1,000 feet of the landward edge of any wetland or surface water of any documented Eastern Tiger Salamander breeding habitat, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation requests the applicant consult with the Region 1 Bureau of Wildlife and Habitat. If the line can not be rerouted beyond 1,000 feet of known salamander breeding ponds, horizontal drilling can be used for that stretch of the line as long as there is no disturbance to the upper 2 feet of the soil horizon. (NYSDEC)

Response: Based on correspondence with the Natural Heritage Program, noted Eastern Tiger Salamander sites will be investigated. Construction activities would be coordinated with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

Comment 89: To avoid and minimize disturbance to sensitive natural resources, the proposed project, where feasible, should be located in existing disturbed areas, utility rights-of-way, and easements, provided there are no wetlands or other significant natural resources present within these areas, which would be disturbed or destroyed. (NYSDEC)

Response: The DEIS will discuss the potential significant adverse impacts from the project on sensitive resources, wetlands, and forested areas. The DEIS will note that such impacts would be avoided to the maximum extent practicable through such methods as modifying the proposed pole locations, sub-surface excavation, etc. The analysis of existing resources will guide the proposed design and will be a factor in selection of the preferred route for the transmission line and the method of construction.

Comment 90: Upland areas that are disturbed by the proposed project should be revegetated with native vegetation similar in composition to what existed prior to construction. The revegetation should include an herbaceous mix as well as woody species, including trees and shrubs. A revegetation plan that details the size, species, quantity, density, planting requirements, and other pertinent information should be provided in the DEIS. (NYSDEC)

Response: The DEIS will analyze potential significant adverse impacts on upland areas, and approaches to revegetation where appropriate.

Comment 91: Directional boring/drilling should be utilized to avoid direct disturbance to and destruction of all state-regulated wetlands. Any disturbance, including surface (clearing, grading, and excavation) and subsurface (trenching, excavation, and drilling), associated with the installation of the proposed project must be situated at least 100 feet from the boundary of any wetlands. In areas of existing culverts, placement of the transmission line above the culvert may be considered provided such placement and installation does not result in any adverse impacts to wetlands and surface waters. When horizontal direction drilling is utilized, water for drilling must be obtained solely from trucked-in sources or existing public water supplies. (NYSDEC)

Response: If the proposed project would involve construction within a NYSDEC regulated adjacent area, KeySpan would utilize its General Wetlands Permit and employ best management practices to minimize potential impacts. Further, to minimize disturbance to wetlands, directional drilling would be utilized should crossing of a wetland, stream, or culvert be necessary.

Comment 92: Appropriate erosion and sediment control must be properly installed before any construction disturbance and must be maintained for the duration of construction. If de-watering is required, the DEIS must discuss the potential impacts on the water table, wetlands, and vernal pools in close proximity to the project. If well points are to be utilized, a New York State Long Island Well Permit may be required. (NYSDEC, ToS)

Response: The DEIS will observe that the New York Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Controls would be used to design appropriate erosion control measures for the chosen alternative. Information on de-watering and effects to adjacent water resources and wetlands will be provided in the DEIS.

Comment 93: The DEIS should note the presence of any unique landforms and Critical Environmental Areas, discuss the significance of such designations, and analyze potential impacts. (NP&V, ToS)

Response: The DEIS will identify the presence of unique landforms and address and analyze Critical Environmental Areas within the project vicinity.

Comment 94: The DEIS should document the qualifications of the various personnel conducting the ecological field work, dates of the field visits, and include copies of field notes, photos, etc. in an appendix. (NP&V, Matloff, Kriegman)

Response: The Appendices, as needed, will contain backup materials to the analyses and results in the main body of the DEIS.

Comment 95: Include any Town-prepared wetland maps, studies, and other documentation or analysis, etc. (NP&V)

Response: The Natural Resources Chapter will include a discussion of the Town's wetland regulations and the applicability to the proposed project.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Comment 96: The DEIS should address the potential for the presence or use of hazardous or toxic materials in the proposed or existing equipment that would be impacted by the proposed project, including PCB containing transformers, asbestos insulation, etc. If such material may be present, provide a discussion of proposed handling, removal, and disposition procedures and associated remediation actions. Also provide a discussion of applicable Federal, State, and local regulations and procedures. (NP&V)

Response: The DEIS will address hazardous materials and discuss proposed handling and disposal of such materials.

GROUNDWATER AND SURFACE WATER RESOURCES

Comment 97: Will LIPA place conical piles through the aquifers? The DEIS needs to address groundwater contamination. (Nigro, R. Perez, H. Verno)

Response: It is not expected that the proposed project would require dewatering. Groundwater contamination will be addressed in the DEIS.

Comment 98: There are places along the route that have a high water table (5 feet), the DEIS must address how drilling poles deep into wet sub soils for stability will affect those areas with a high water table? When soils are oversaturated, what will happen to the poles? (T. Shea, T. Perez, ToS, Kranes)

Response: Noted. The DEIS will consider this issue.

Comment 99: How will the drainage under the road near the Old Seven Ponds area, which is a stream that feeds Mill Pond, be addressed in the DEIS? (T. Shea, H. Verno)

Response: At present, the water flows via a culvert. Forested wetland habitat is directly under/adjacent to the existing lines in this location. The DEIS will consider these features in assessing potential significant adverse impacts from the project.

Comment 100: If temporary access is required across agricultural fields during construction, appropriate measures should be included for the protection of soil resources. These measures include limiting construction traffic when the soil is wet and using deep subsoil shattering equipment to break up any soil compaction caused by construction. (NYSDOA, Kranes)

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

Response: Access across agricultural fields is not expected. However, the DEIS will observe that if access is needed, New York Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Controls would be used to design appropriate erosion and sediment control measures for the chosen alternative to reduce any impacts to soil resources.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Comment 101: Long Island is vulnerable to hurricanes, and therefore the DEIS needs to present a full evaluation of the impact of hurricanes on the transmission line cables and poles and emergency and public safety. The DEIS should also address the long-term effects of overhead versus underground lines due to a storm. The effects of fallen transmission line cables and poles on traffic must be evaluated in the DEIS. The above ground poles would inflict damage with wind borne debris. (Graboski, M. Shea, Laffey, Nuzzi, Schneiderman, Squires-Vella, Abramson, Kirkbright, Henry, S. Havemeyer, WMCAC, Higdon, T. Perez, ToS, K. Muller, Walbroel, Neren, Freedman, Kranes, Kriegman, Pinto, Cohen, T. Shea, Hoge, Kush)

Response: The DEIS will address emergency management in relation to the proposed project.

Comment 102: The DEIS should detail the wind speed that all new poles can withstand. The poles should be buried due to the high wind speeds and storms in the area. The new poles should be designed to withstand winds between 175 to 200 miles per hour. The DEIS should include the cost difference between providing poles to withstand a Category 3 hurricane and a Category 4 hurricane. (Frederic, Rabinowitz, Kush, White, Scranton, Holmes, Freedman, Kranes)

Response: The DEIS will detail the wind speed tolerance of the new poles. New poles installed on the South Fork, in accordance with the National Electric Safety Code must withstand 120 miles per hour. However, based on LIPA criteria, new poles on the South Fork must be able to withstand 130 mile per hour winds. The wind speed criterion for new poles was selected based on engineering judgment to withstand expected conditions on Long Island at a reasonable cost.

Comment 103: What is the difference in the number of electrical outages with overhead lines compared to underground lines? (M. Shea)

Response: Number of electrical outages with overhead versus underground lines will be discussed in the DEIS.

Comment 104: The cost of hurricane damage to community electricity and downed poles should be evaluated in the DEIS. Will the DEIS address the project's impact on

homeowner's insurance rates, policies, and deductibles? (Rabinowitz, WMCAC, T. Perez, Scranton, Scranton, Neren, Kranes, Kriegman, R. Verno, Pinto)

Response: The difference between the cost of maintenance of overhead versus underground lines will be analyzed in the DEIS, including maintenance incurred due to weather and storms events such as northeasters and hurricanes. It is not expected that new poles would affect homeowner insurance policies.

Comment 105: Will the DEIS assess what the new poles would do to the drainage patterns on the local roadways? Will the DEIS address the planned route location in a flood plain? How will the loss of trees affect flooding and runoff. (Maloney, Nigro, T. Perez, Eckert, de La Barre, H. Verno, Kranes, Kriegman, Matloff)

Response: Potential significant adverse impacts from the project on drainage patterns and floodplains as well as changes to runoff will be discussed in the DEIS.

Comment 106: Will the DEIS consider the potential for increased power demand for air conditioning due to the removal of shade trees to accommodate the proposed project? (Caldwell)

Response: Few trees are expected to be removed due to the project, and the removal would have an insignificant impact on power demand.

Comment 107: The DEIS must address ways to directly and indirectly decrease energy consumption. (Haresign, WMCAC)

Response: One of the alternatives to be analyzed is conservation as an alternate manner of meeting the electrical need.

Comment 108: The DEIS should address the level of maintenance needed to repair overhead versus underground lines. Engineers have disagreed with LIPA's position that underground lines are harder to repair. (Delano)

Response: The level of effort and cost differentials between overhead and underground lines will be presented in the DEIS on a system wide basis. Various studies commissioned by LIPA and other entities will be used in the analysis.

Comment 109: The DEIS should address the weak spots that are present when a line goes from overhead to underground. To avoid the weak spots, the line should be buried 100 percent. (Delano)

Response: The transmission line would be designed to meet the requirements of the National Electric Safety Code or LIPA's standards, whichever is more stringent.

LIPA Southampton to Bridgehampton Transmission Line

Comment 110: Existing poles are regularly struck by lightning and cause electric outages, won't the taller poles invite more hits by lightning? (Zaluski, R. Verno)

Response: Almost all poles have shield wires or lightning arrestors, and these are struck by the lightning, not the electric lines.

TRAFFIC, AIR QUALITY, AND NOISE

Comment 111: Intersections are where people stop, and more accidents occur at these intersections. Will the DEIS address potential accidents caused by the blockage of visibility from the new, wider poles as well as road safety? (Flores, Doleh, Nigro, C. Havemeyer, WMCAC, Davidson, ToS, Newman, A. Muller, Sachs, Vella, H. Verno, Kush)

Response: The DEIS will address the proposed project's potential significant adverse impact on the number of traffic accidents.

Comment 112: Will the DEIS address the speed of traffic along the roadways where the poles will be located? (Nigro)

Response: An assessment of the speed of traffic on local roadways is outside of the scope of this project, and irrelevant to the assessment of potential significant adverse impacts caused by this proposed project.

Comment 113: Will the DEIS address project impacts on air quality. (Caldwell)

Response: The DEIS will assess the potential for the proposed project to cause significant adverse impacts on air quality.

Comment 114: Will there be noise from the new transmission substation? Will the DEIS address the noise impacts from the existing poles as well as the new poles since the existing poles currently buzz when wet? (Kabot, Caldwell)

Response: The DEIS will assess the potential for the proposed project to cause significant adverse noise impacts.

Comment 115: Because trees act as a natural noise barrier, will the DEIS address the increase in traffic noise once trees are removed? (WMCAC)

Response: Few, if any trees are expected to be removed as part of this project. The removal of single trees, if necessary, would not significantly increase vehicular noise.

ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS

Comment 116: There is concern about the potential health impacts of the electromagnetic fields from the transmission lines at the lowered height of 48 feet. An explicit

explanation of these effects is needed (including impacts to humans, wildlife, farm animals, marine life, plants, and vegetables on an open air farmstand), and a cursory statement that there is no proven medical impact is not acceptable. Electromagnetic fields from buried lines should also be addressed. What scientific organization will be utilized to study this issue? (Watson, Thayer, Mgann, Redding, Abramson, Bennett, WMCAC, Higdon, R. Perez, Caldwell, ToS, Weinstock, Sachs, Raben, Bozzi, Bernbach, Anderson, K. Muller, Zaluski, Eckert, Scranton, H. Verno, Neren, Erwin, Holmes, Kranes, Kriegman, Pinto, Cohen)

Response: Electromagnetic fields from the proposed project will be addressed in the DEIS and the latest available scientific research will be cited and discussed.

Comment 117: Electromagnetic fields should also be evaluated based on the population density surrounding each of the routes under consideration. (Redding)

Response: Electromagnetic fields from the proposed project will be addressed in the DEIS and the latest available scientific research will be cited and discussed.

Comment 118: It has been documented in many studies that the rate of leukemia increases in areas where there are electrical lines, particularly, high-voltage electrical lines. Is this the legacy we're going to live the children on the East End? Will the cost benefit analysis evaluate cost of treating as well as losing the catholic school children and other children residing in the area under the lines? What is the liability? (Wellins, Hazelton, C. Havemeyer, S. Havemeyer, R. Perez, H. Verno)

Response: Impacts, including health effects, from the proposed project will be addressed in the DEIS.

Comment 119: In the scoping document, what does a "study based upon current literature" mean and what specific literature will be cited? (Bennett)

Response: The DEIS will include available literature on the topic of Electromagnetic Fields. Since this topic is consistently the subject of new literature, the latest peer-reviewed, scientifically accepted research will be included in the DEIS.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Comment 120: There is a portion of the route where minority communities live. How will the poles further devalue their properties? The DEIS needs to address this issue. (T. Shea, T. Perez, Caldwell)

Response: The DEIS will include a chapter dedicated to Environmental Justice issues in the region relative to the proposed project.

CONSTRUCTION

Comment 121: How long will the proposed project's overall construction phase last, as well as any stages within the overall process? Provide information on how the construction will proceed from multiple points along the chosen route. How long is the construction phase at each pole location? Provide input on the duration and intensity of construction activities at a typical pole location to assess potential impacts to residential and/or commercial neighbors along the chosen route. Address construction safety measures, including erosion control measures. (NP&V, Bernback, Neren, Kriegman)

Response: The construction schedule will be disclosed in the DEIS. Typical productivity for installing overhead and underground transmission lines will be discussed along with the number of workers and types of equipment.

Comment 122: Provide information on routes of construction vehicles to and from the construction site along the route, and the numbers, types, and sizes of vehicles and equipment needed, including worker parking, materials staging, and storage areas etc. Provide information on project roadway closures for back roads when Montauk Highway is closed due to an accident. Also address the construction impact on school bus routes along the Direct Route. (NP&V, Bernbach, Vella, H. Verno, Neren, Kriegman, T. Shea)

Response: While the design of the transmission line and the expansion of the substation have not been completed, typical numbers of construction vehicles and space requirements will be presented in the DEIS. The detour routes used by police for accidents vary, based on the particular circumstances of the accident. LIPA would work with local police in circumstances where the back routes need to be utilized as a detour due to an accident on Montauk Highway. The effects of construction on the roadways will be discussed in the DEIS.

Comment 123: Provide information on anticipated maintenance activities, such as frequency of maintenance crew visits, duration, types of activities that may be performed, etc. (NP&V)

Response: Maintenance activities will be discussed in the DEIS.

Comment 124: The DEIS must address noise and air quality impacts, including dust and exhaust emissions from construction. (ToS)

Response: These issues, related to construction, will be addressed in the DEIS.

Comment 125: Will there be construction runoff to Mill Pond and what impacts will that have on well water? Many residents utilize well water and not city water. (Bernbach, Squires-Vella, Eckert, H. Verno, Neren, Kranes, Kriegman)

Response: Construction runoff, and any potential significant adverse impacts from such impacts, will be addressed in the DEIS.

ALTERNATIVES

Comment 126: The DEIS needs to present more information on why the Existing Transmission Line Alternative is not viable. (Graboski, Kabot, ToS, Phillips, Holmes, Verno, T. Shea)

Response: The DEIS will present this information.

Comment 127: All alternatives should be analyzed in the same depth as the Direct Route Alternative including overhead versus underground. (Graboski, Gorman, Nuzzi, Haresign, WMCAC, VoS)

Response: All alternatives will be analyzed to the same degree in the DEIS.

Comment 128: The DEIS should examine meaningful and reasonable alternatives including an alternative that considers other ways of meeting the South Fork's electric needs, including more efficient technology at existing substations, constructing emergency generators, employing energy conservation measures including imposing surcharges on construction of extremely large homes and higher rates for wasteful use of electricity, and researching alternative energy sources as well as directly or indirectly decreasing energy consumption. (Nuzzi, Rabinowitz, Bennett, NP&V, ToS, Cohen, East End)

Response: The DEIS will consider a Demand-Side Management alternative, which includes employing energy conservation.

Comment 129: The Montauk Highway Alternative goes through the heart of the Village and therefore should be eliminated from consideration in the DEIS. (Bennett)

Response: Comment noted.

Comment 130: The LIRR Route Alternative is the most appropriate alternative for these poles. (Davidson)

Response: Comment noted

Comment 131: A new alternative should be included in the DEIS that considers burying the line within the Village of Southampton portion of the route. (NP&V)

Response: This alternative will be considered in the DEIS.

MITIGATION

Comment 132: Mitigation of negative impacts is critical. Burying the line should be analyzed as mitigation to the adverse impacts of the proposed project. (Kabot, WMCAC, VoS)

Response: The DEIS will include a section on mitigation measures should any analysis disclose significant adverse impacts from the proposed project.

OTHER CHAPTERS

Comment 133: In light of concern regarding the proposed development of a substation lot on the route, how will the Growth Inducing Chapter address this? (Cousins)

Response: The lot is owned by LIPA and has always been intended for expansion of the Bridgehampton Substation. As such, the expansion is not considered to be growth inducing. The Growth Inducing Chapter will address potential development that could occur because of the Proposed Action, and will balance inducement effects against growth serving effects, and LIPA's obligation to serve its customers. *