Dear Governor Cuomo;

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

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

After being excluded from New Jersey waters, Liberty LNG is now submitting another application for an LNG port which is virtually the same as the plan rejected by New Jersey; the only real difference is that this time the facility would be in New York State waters. Siting the project closer to New York does nothing to ameliorate the risks identified by Governor Christie. As now proposed, Port Ambrose would be located in the middle of robust fishing grounds, shipping lanes leading to the Port of New York and New Jersey, and migratory routes of endangered species, U.S. Coast Guard training grounds, and a proposed offshore wind area. The noise pollution, risk of water contamination and the inevitable air contamination would undermine the progress New York has made in recent years in improving the quality of its coastal ecosystem.
In light of SuperStorm Sandy, there is an additional reason to oppose this project - the application for Liberty LNG does not appear to even consider the threat of reasonably foreseeable future storms.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Cindy Zipf  
Executive Director  
Clean Ocean Action

Christopher Huch Jr.  
Executive Director  
Alliance for a Living Ocean

Alexander Peters  
President  
Amagansett-Springs Aquifer Protection

Tim Dillingham  
Executive Director  
American Littoral Society
Siobhan Burke  
**Capital District Against Fracking**

Bruce Ferguson  
**Catskill Citizens for Safe Energy**

Joyce Grant  
**Citizens for Oceanfront Preservation**

Isaac Silberman-Gorn  
**City of Binghamton Residents Against Fracking**

Arthur H. Kopelman, Ph. D.  
President  
**Coastal Research and Education Society of Long Island**

Tom Mahedy  
**Concerned Citizen of COA**

Jeremy Samuelson  
Executive Director  
**Concerned Citizens of Montauk**

Maya K. van Rossum  
the Delaware Riverkeeper  
**Delaware Riverkeeper Network**

Robert Spiegel  
Executive Director  
**Edison Wetlands Association**

John Malizia  
Vice President  
**Fisherman's Conservation Association**

Alex Beauchamp  
Northeast Region Director  
**Food & Water Watch**

Captain Bill Sheehan  
Riverkeeper and Executive Director  
**Hackensack Riverkeeper, Inc.**

Dan Mundy Sr.  
President  
**Jamaica Bay Ecowatchers**

Raymond Ellmer  
Concerned Civic Leader  
**Long Beach, New York**

Ida Sanoff  
Executive Director  
**Natural Resources Protective Association**

Glenn A. Arthur  
Chairman  
**New Jersey Council of Diving Clubs**

Amy Goldsmith  
State Director  
**New Jersey Environmental Federation**

Ed Dlugosz  
President  
**New Jersey Friends of Clearwater**

Claudia Borecky  
President  
**North and Central Merrick Civic Association**

T. James Matthews  
Chair  
**The Northwest Alliance**

Deborah A. Mans  
Baykeeper & Executive Director  
**NY/NJ Baykeeper**

Scott Thompson  
**Paddleout.org**

Kathleen Cunningham  
Chairwoman  
**Quiet Skies Coalition**

Bill Schultz  
**Raritan RIVERKEEPER**

Joan Carey, ssj  
Member  
**Religious On Water**

Karen Orlando  
Concerned Citizen  
**Rockaway, New York**
Joe Nerone  
Concerned Citizen  
Rockaway, New York

Britta Forsberg Wenzel  
Executive Director  
Save Barnegat Bay

Ann I. Aurelio  
Vice Chair  
Sierra Club Long Island Group

Jeff Tittel  
Director  
Sierra Club New Jersey

Jim Brown  
President  
South Shore Audubon Society

Marie Savoia  
St. Mary's Environmental Committee

John Malizia  
Director  
Staten Island Tuna Club

Richard Lee  
Executive Director  
Surfer's Environmental Alliance

John Weber  
Mid-Atlantic Regional Manager  
Surfrider Foundation

Daniel Morrissey  
Water Equality

Suzanne Golas, csjp  
Director  
WATERSPIRIT

CC:  New York Congressional Delegation  
     New Jersey Governor Chris Christie
February 8, 2011

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

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

Dear Mr. Matsuda:

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

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

The proposed deepwater port and offshore pipeline lie east of thriving coastal communities that are home to many residents of the State as well as precious plant, fish, animal and avian species. This coastal area also supports recreational and commercial fishing, shellfisheries and tourism industries that are vital to the State. Marine waters in the proposed project area function as a critical migration corridor for both federally endangered marine...
mammals and sea turtles. The proposed 44.4 mile long offshore pipeline and port structures will affect almost 6,000 acres of seafloor, adversely impacting seafloor habitat, aquatic life, and prime fishing grounds. The discharge of wastewater, regasification effluent, and stormwater would also harm our marine waters and the species that depend on a healthy environment. The environmental impacts could threaten the recent ocean water quality improvements the State has worked hard to achieve.

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Chris Christie
Governor