

10/01/2006

## **LNG terminal is safe for Sound**

**Coast Guard concludes safety and security concerns are manageable , A New Haven Register Editorial**

Among the objections opponents have raised to the proposed liquid natural gas terminal in Long Island Sound have been its safety, its vulnerability to terrorist attack and its presence leading to the industrialization of the Sound. A Coast Guard report directly rebuts the first two concerns and indirectly addresses the third.

While the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will decide whether the terminal is built, the probability of that happening has greatly increased with the Coast Guard report.

The Coast Guard concluded that there are "no known, credible (terrorist) threats" against the proposed floating terminal, in part based on the assessment of a subcommittee of 20 officials of federal, state and local agencies responsible for maritime security.

Because the terminal would be in open water - 10.2 miles from East Haven, 9.2 miles from New York - no population area would be threatened by a leak from the terminal.

Tankers carrying LNG to the terminal would require a security zone around them just as security zones are required for submarines based at Groton. The only risk to land from a tanker leak would be when it passed through the Race, which connects Long Island and Block Island sounds. Balanced against this potential risk is the safety record of LNG tankers. In the 45 years of LNG tanker trips, more than 33,000 voyages, there have been eight spills and no fires aboard LNG carriers.

Two or three tanker trips to the terminal each week will have little impact on congestion in the Sound. Between 4,000 and 7,000 domestic commercial vessels use the Sound each year as well as 450 vessels from foreign ports. The addition of the LNG tankers would result in less than a 1 percent increase in commercial traffic. The volume of commercial traffic - oil tankers, barges, fishing boats - undercuts opponents' suggestions that the addition of the tankers and terminal would somehow change the Sound's character.

While the Coast Guard has concluded that the terminal proposed by Broadwater Energy could operate in the Sound, it also found that more resources would be needed for the safe passage of the LNG tankers and the security of the terminal. As a profit-making enterprise, Broadwater, not taxpayers, should pay most of these costs, including those for fire-fighting tugs and security patrol boats.