

Rodvien, Emma (PUC)

From: Caroline David <cdavid246@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 9:23 AM
To: Rodvien, Emma (PUC)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] : Sea 3 LPG Expansion needs full review

Dear EFSB,

My name is Caroline from Providence and I am submitting comments in favor of requiring a full review of the Sea 3 proposed Liquified Propane Gas expansion.

I am calling on EFSB to do the following:

1. The Energy Facility Siting Board must determine that the Sea 3 Providence expansion is an “alteration to a major energy facility” and require a full application and review by the Board
2. The EFSB must have the full review include cumulative health and safety impacts

This project, as an expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure in a heavily overburdened, BIPOC community, without robust public engagement no less, requires this.

First, state law requires a full application and approval from the EFSB if the expansion is an “alteration” to the existing facility. According to Rhode Island General Law § 42-98-3(b), an “alteration” is “a significant modification to a major energy facility, which, as determined by the board, will result in a significant impact on the environment, or the public health, safety, and welfare.” Sea 3 denies it requires a full review but their application is self-contradictory. How can a facility that does not constitute an alteration of “an existing energy facility” be necessary “to meet the future demand for LPG in the region”?

Second, because the proposed expansion of this facility may result in a significant increase in diesel emissions within the Port area, which is already overburdened with polluting industrial activities and truck traffic, the potential growth in operations necessarily encourages and supports more use of fossil fuels. This is inconsistent with Rhode Island’s long-term climate change goals and binding emissions reductions as well as Providence’s Climate Justice Plan.

Third, because the proposal raises public safety concerns – it must be fully vetted by the EFSB before it is approved.

I urge the EFSB to require a full review of this fossil fuel expansion and to recognize the horrendous and disproportionate environmental impacts on the local communities by greenlighting this project.

Thank you,

Caroline David

Rodvien, Emma (PUC)

From: Charlotte Nash <charlotte.nash303@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 23, 2021 1:33 PM
To: Rodvien, Emma (PUC)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] : Sea 3 LPG Expansion needs full review

Dear EFSB,

My name is Charlotte Nash from Providence, RI and I am submitting comments in favor of requiring a full review of the Sea 3 proposed Liquified Propane Gas expansion.

I am calling on EFSB to do the following:

1. The Energy Facility Siting Board must determine that the Sea 3 Providence expansion is an “alteration to a major energy facility” and require a full application and review by the Board
2. The EFSB must have the full review include cumulative health and safety impacts

This project, as an expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure in a heavily overburdened, BIPOC community, without robust public engagement no less, requires this.

First, state law requires a full application and approval from the EFSB if the expansion is an “alteration” to the existing facility. According to Rhode Island General Law § 42-98-3(b), an “alteration” is “a significant modification to a major energy facility, which, as determined by the board, will result in a significant impact on the environment, or the public health, safety, and welfare.” Sea 3 denies it requires a full review but their application is self-contradictory. How can a facility that does not constitute an alteration of “an existing energy facility” be necessary “to meet the future demand for LPG in the region”?

Second, because the proposed expansion of this facility may result in a significant increase in diesel emissions within the Port area, which is already overburdened with polluting industrial activities and truck traffic, the potential growth in operations necessarily encourages and supports more use of fossil fuels. This is inconsistent with Rhode Island’s long-term climate change goals and binding emissions reductions as well as Providence’s Climate Justice Plan.

Third, because the proposal raises public safety concerns – it must be fully vetted by the EFSB before it is approved.

I urge the EFSB to require a full review of this fossil fuel expansion and to recognize the horrendous and disproportionate environmental impacts on the local communities by greenlighting this project.

Thank you,

Charlotte Nash

Rodvien, Emma (PUC)

From: Elise Arsenault <elise.arsenault@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 7:44 PM
To: Rodvien, Emma (PUC)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] : C3

Dear EFSB,

My name is Elise Arsenault from Rumford and I am submitting comments in favor of requiring a full review of the Sea 3 proposed Liquified Propane Gas expansion.

I am calling on EFSB to do the following:

1. The Energy Facility Siting Board must determine that the Sea 3 Providence expansion is an “alteration to a major energy facility” and require a full application and review by the Board
2. The EFSB must extend the public comment period at least another 2 months
3. The EFSB must have the full review include cumulative health and safety impacts

This project, as an expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure in a heavily overburdened, BIPOC community, without robust public engagement no less, requires this.

First, state law requires a full application and approval from the EFSB if the expansion is an “alteration” to the existing facility. According to Rhode Island General Law § 42-98-3(b), an “alteration” is “a significant modification to a major energy facility, which, as determined by the board, will result in a significant impact on the environment, or the public health, safety, and welfare.” Sea 3 denies it requires a full review but their application is self-contradictory. How can a facility that does not constitute an alteration of “an existing energy facility” be necessary “to meet the future demand for LPG in the region”?

Second, because the proposed expansion of this facility may result in a significant increase in diesel emissions within the Port area, which is already overburdened with polluting industrial activities and truck traffic, the potential growth in operations necessarily encourages and supports more use of fossil fuels. This is inconsistent with Rhode Island’s long-term climate change goals and binding emissions reductions as well as Providence’s Climate Justice Plan.

Third, because the proposal raises public safety concerns – it must be fully vetted by the EFSB before it is approved.

I urge the EFSB to require a full review of this fossil fuel expansion and to recognize the horrendous and disproportionate environmental impacts on the local communities by greenlighting this project.

Thank you,

Elise Arsenault

Elise Arsenault
Actress, Coach + Founder of The Global Actor

www.elisearsenault.com [elisearsenault.com]
www.treecave.com [treecave.com]

Rodvien, Emma (PUC)

From: Emily Grady <etfgrady@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2021 4:15 PM
To: Rodvien, Emma (PUC)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] : Sea 3 LPG Expansion needs full review

Dear EFSB,

My name is Emily Grady from Cranston and I am submitting comments in favor of requiring a full review of the Sea 3 proposed Liquified Propane Gas expansion.

I am calling on EFSB to do the following:

1. The Energy Facility Siting Board must determine that the Sea 3 Providence expansion is an “alteration to a major energy facility” and require a full application and review by the Board
2. The EFSB must have the full review include cumulative health and safety impacts

This project, as an expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure in a heavily overburdened, BIPOC community, without robust public engagement no less, requires this.

First, state law requires a full application and approval from the EFSB if the expansion is an “alteration” to the existing facility. According to Rhode Island General Law § 42-98-3(b), an “alteration” is “a significant modification to a major energy facility, which, as determined by the board, will result in a significant impact on the environment, or the public health, safety, and welfare.” Sea 3 denies it requires a full review but their application is self-contradictory. How can a facility that does not constitute an alteration of “an existing energy facility” be necessary “to meet the future demand for LPG in the region”?

Second, because the proposed expansion of this facility may result in a significant increase in diesel emissions within the Port area, which is already overburdened with polluting industrial activities and truck traffic, the potential growth in operations necessarily encourages and supports more use of fossil fuels. This is inconsistent with Rhode Island’s long-term climate change goals and binding emissions reductions as well as Providence’s Climate Justice Plan.

Third, because the proposal raises public safety concerns – it must be fully vetted by the EFSB before it is approved.

I urge the EFSB to require a full review of this fossil fuel expansion and to recognize the horrendous and disproportionate environmental impacts on the local communities by greenlighting this project.

Thank you,

Emily Grady

② 1st, state law requires a full application and approval from the EFSB if the expansion is an "alteration" to the existing facility. Sec 3 denies that they need a full review but how can they not constitute an alteration if it will be necessary "to meet the future demand for LPG in the region?"

2nd, the expansion may result in a significant increase in diesel emissions in the Port Area. This is inconsistent with RI's long term climate change goals and binding emissions reductions as well as Providence's Climate Justice Plan.

3rd, because the proposal raises public safety concerns it must be fully vetted by the EFSB before it is approved.

I urge the EFSB to require a full review because of the environmental justice impacts this expansion would have on the local community. Thank you, Emma

① Dear EFSB,

My name is Emma Verbeke and I am a student at Brown University. I am submitting comments in favor of requiring a full review of the Sec 3 proposed Liquefied Propane Gas extension.

I am calling on EFSB to do the following:

1. Determine that the Sec 3 Providence expansion is an "alteration to a major energy facility" and require a full application and review by the Board
2. Have the full review include cumulative health and safety impacts

Thank you for extending the public comment period. This project, as an expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure in a heavily overburdened, BIPOC community, requires this. ↑

Rodvien, Emma (PUC)

From: Gregory Greco <gregoryrgreco@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 7:45 PM
To: Rodvien, Emma (PUC)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] : C-3

Dear EFSB,

My name is Gregory Greco from East Providence and I am submitting comments in favor of requiring a full review of the Sea 3 proposed Liquified Propane Gas expansion.

I am calling on EFSB to do the following:

1. The Energy Facility Siting Board must determine that the Sea 3 Providence expansion is an “alteration to a major energy facility” and require a full application and review by the Board
2. The EFSB must extend the public comment period at least another 2 months
3. The EFSB must have the full review include cumulative health and safety impacts

This project, as an expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure in a heavily overburdened, BIPOC community, without robust public engagement no less, requires this.

First, state law requires a full application and approval from the EFSB if the expansion is an “alteration” to the existing facility. According to Rhode Island General Law § 42-98-3(b), an “alteration” is “a significant modification to a major energy facility, which, as determined by the board, will result in a significant impact on the environment, or the public health, safety, and welfare.” Sea 3 denies it requires a full review but their application is self-contradictory. How can a facility that does not constitute an alteration of “an existing energy facility” be necessary “to meet the future demand for LPG in the region”?

Second, because the proposed expansion of this facility may result in a significant increase in diesel emissions within the Port area, which is already overburdened with polluting industrial activities and truck traffic, the potential growth in operations necessarily encourages and supports more use of fossil fuels. This is inconsistent with Rhode Island’s long-term climate change goals and binding emissions reductions as well as Providence’s Climate Justice Plan.

Third, because the proposal raises public safety concerns – it must be fully vetted by the EFSB before it is approved.

I urge the EFSB to require a full review of this fossil fuel expansion and to recognize the horrendous and disproportionate environmental impacts on the local communities by greenlighting this project.

Thank you,

Gregory Greco

Rodvien, Emma (PUC)

From: Jackie Goldman <jegoldman93@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 12:40 PM
To: Rodvien, Emma (PUC)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] : Reject the expansion of fossil fuels in Providence

Hello,

My name is Jackie Goldman and I am a citizen of Providence and I am writing to the RI Energy and Facilities Siting Board to ask them to reject the expansion of Sea's 3's facility.

I walk and bike around this city every day. There are days when I wake up and the sky is clear and the air smells clean, and others when the city smells like gas. Over the past few years, this has become more common.

The Port of Providence already houses so massive polluters that have made South Providence in particular a dangerous place to live. Public health research has shown that time and time again, expanding propane gas storage sites has led to bad health outcomes for citizens including decreased heart and lung function, declines in mental health and physical risks to people who gestitate as well as the fetuses they carry.

Expanding the propane storage by 540,000 more gallons will have disastrous consequences for the people of Providence. I urge you not to support this.

Sincerely,
Jackie Goldman (they/them)

203-913-2589
9 Samoset Avenue
Providence, RI 02908

Rodvien, Emma (PUC)

From: Judy Ouellette <cinnamonbear132@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 8:30 PM
To: Rodvien, Emma (PUC)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] : Sea 3 LPG Expansion needs full review

Dear EFSB,

My name is Judy Ouellette from East Providence and I am submitting comments in favor of requiring a full review of the Sea 3 proposed Liquified Propane Gas expansion.

I am calling on EFSB to do the following:

1. The Energy Facility Siting Board must determine that the Sea 3 Providence expansion is an “alteration to a major energy facility” and require a full application and review by the Board
2. The EFSB must have the full review include cumulative health and safety impacts

This project, as an expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure in a heavily overburdened, BIPOC community, without robust public engagement no less, requires this.

First, state law requires a full application and approval from the EFSB if the expansion is an “alteration” to the existing facility. According to Rhode Island General Law § 42-98-3(b), an “alteration” is “a significant modification to a major energy facility, which, as determined by the board, will result in a significant impact on the environment, or the public health, safety, and welfare.” Sea 3 denies it requires a full review but their application is self-contradictory. How can a facility that does not constitute an alteration of “an existing energy facility” be necessary “to meet the future demand for LPG in the region”?

Second, because the proposed expansion of this facility may result in a significant increase in diesel emissions within the Port area, which is already overburdened with polluting industrial activities and truck traffic, the potential growth in operations necessarily encourages and supports more use of fossil fuels. This is inconsistent with Rhode Island’s long-term climate change goals and binding emissions reductions as well as Providence’s Climate Justice Plan.

Third, because the proposal raises public safety concerns – it must be fully vetted by the EFSB before it is approved.

I urge the EFSB to require a full review of this fossil fuel expansion and to recognize the horrendous and disproportionate environmental impacts on the local communities by greenlighting this project.

Thank you,

Judy Ouellette

Rodvien, Emma (PUC)

From: Matt Brown <mattabrownri@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2021 3:02 PM
To: Rodvien, Emma (PUC)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] : Comment on Sea-3 proposed expansion

To the Energy Facility Siting Board:

The continued development and expansion of dangerous polluting industries in the Port of Providence in the face of opposition from Black and brown community members is a textbook case of environmental racism. For years, polluting industry has resisted regulations and the necessary permitting to operate in the Port. Sea 3's request to bypass an EFSB review is a continuation of the reckless and profit-hungry behavior of polluting industry in our state. I am calling on the EFSB to conduct a full review of Sea 3's proposed fossil fuel expansion including a cumulative health impact study.

There is no denying that the City of Providence and our state government have allowed the Port of Providence, Washington Park, and the South Side of Providence – a predominantly Black and brown community – to become a sacrifice zone. 11 of Providence's 13 facilities listed in the EPA's Toxic Release Inventory are located in this small portion of the city.^[1] A 12th is located just up the street in the Jewelry District. As a result, Washington Park has the highest asthma rates in the state.^[2] Families are struggling to breathe, and kids miss school with asthma attacks. The air, the soil, and the water are all poisoned because of the polluting industries in the Port. Expanding a fossil fuel facility in the context of these conditions is reprehensible. Allowing such an expansion without even conducting a review of the cumulative health impacts would be a demonstration of disregard for the lives of Rhode Islanders.

Beyond the crisis in the Port is a climate crisis facing Rhode Island. According to the International Energy Agency, all fossil fuel infrastructure development must stop today if we are to reach zero carbon by 2050 – a requirement that the state of Rhode Island has codified.^[3] The expansion of Sea 3 or any other fossil fuel facility poses a threat to Rhode Islanders. Sea 3's claims that this project is necessary to meet fossil fuel demand in our state is inconsistent with Providence's Climate Justice Plan, with the state's decarbonization requirements, and with the reality of the climate crisis. It is time to stop letting out-of-state, multi-billion-dollar investment firms trample over Rhode Islanders. Fast-tracking Sea 3's expansion would be another step towards condemning Rhode Islanders to climate disaster.

I urge the EFSB to carefully consider where they are placing its values. Every Rhode Islander deserves breathable air and drinkable water. Those needs cannot be a cost of doing business. The EFSB must use its power to fully review this proposed expansion of fossil fuels in our state.

Sincerely,

Matt Brown

^[1] <https://www.epa.gov/toxics-release-inventory-tri-program> [epa.gov]

^[2] <https://health.ri.gov/publications/databooks/2014AsthmaClaims.pdf>

^[3] <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/18/business/climate-change-report.html> [nytimes.com]

Rodvien, Emma (PUC)

From: Hendrikse Liu, Maxime <maxime_hendrikse_liu@brown.edu>
Sent: Saturday, May 22, 2021 2:37 PM
To: Rodvien, Emma (PUC)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] : Review the Sea 3 LPG expansion!

Dear Energy Facilities Siting Board,

My name is Maxime Hendrikse Liu from Providence and I would like to submit comments in strong support of requiring a full review of Sea 3's proposed Liquid Propane Gas expansion.

As defined by Rhode Island General Law 42-98-3(b), the EFSB must define the Sea 3 expansion in Providence as an "alteration to a major energy facility" and therefore, by state law, must require a full application and review process by the Board. This review process must include cumulative health and safety impacts.

This is particularly important due to the fact that the environmental and public health impacts of the proposed expansion will have the largest negative impact on BIPOC communities in the Port area, which already is plagued with emissions from industrial activities and heavy truck traffic. This proposed expansion is a serious climate justice issue, and as it increases public safety concerns, it therefore must be fully vetted by the EFSB before ever being approved.

Finally, this proposed expansion will cause an increase in consumption of fossil fuels, which clashes with Rhode Island's commitments to addressing climate change and reducing emissions.

I urge the Energy Facilities Siting Board to require a full review of this proposed fossil fuel expansion and to recognize the proposal's disproportionate and unjust environmental impacts on our local communities.

Thank you,
-Maxime Hendrikse Liu

Rodvien, Emma (PUC)

From: Opeyemi Olagunju <opeyemi_olagunju@brown.edu>
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2021 6:05 PM
To: Rodvien, Emma (PUC)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] : Sea 3 LPG Expansion needs full review

Dear EFSB,

My name is Opeyemi Olagunju from Pawtucket, RI and I am submitting comments in favor of requiring a full review of the Sea 3 proposed Liquified Propane Gas expansion.

I am calling on EFSB to do the following:

1. The Energy Facility Siting Board must determine that the Sea 3 Providence expansion is an “alteration to a major energy facility” and require a full application and review by the Board
2. The EFSB must have the full review include cumulative health and safety impacts

This project, as an expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure in a heavily overburdened, BIPOC community, without robust public engagement no less, requires this.

First, state law requires a full application and approval from the EFSB if the expansion is an “alteration” to the existing facility. According to Rhode Island General Law § 42-98-3(b), an “alteration” is “a significant modification to a major energy facility, which, as determined by the board, will result in a significant impact on the environment, or the public health, safety, and welfare.” Sea 3 denies it requires a full review but their application is self-contradictory. How can a facility that does not constitute an alteration of “an existing energy facility” be necessary “to meet the future demand for LPG in the region”?

Second, because the proposed expansion of this facility may result in a significant increase in diesel emissions within the Port area, which is already overburdened with polluting industrial activities and truck traffic, the potential growth in operations necessarily encourages and supports more use of fossil fuels. This is inconsistent with Rhode Island’s long-term climate change goals and binding emissions reductions as well as Providence’s Climate Justice Plan.

Third, because the proposal raises public safety concerns – it must be fully vetted by the EFSB before it is approved.

I urge the EFSB to require a full review of this fossil fuel expansion and to recognize the horrendous and disproportionate environmental impacts on the local communities by greenlighting this project.

Thank you,
Opeyemi

Rodvien, Emma (PUC)

From: Zubair Merchant <zubairmerchantri@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2021 7:43 PM
To: Rodvien, Emma (PUC)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] : Sea 3

Dear EFSB,

My name is Zubair Merchant from Providence and I am submitting comments in favor of requiring a full review of the Sea 3 proposed Liquified Propane Gas expansion.

I am calling on EFSB to do the following:

1. The Energy Facility Siting Board must determine that the Sea 3 Providence expansion is an “alteration to a major energy facility” and require a full application and review by the Board
2. The EFSB must extend the public comment period at least another 2 months
3. The EFSB must have the full review include cumulative health and safety impacts

This project, as an expansion of fossil fuel infrastructure in a heavily overburdened, BIPOC community, without robust public engagement no less, requires this.

First, state law requires a full application and approval from the EFSB if the expansion is an “alteration” to the existing facility. According to Rhode Island General Law § 42-98-3(b), an “alteration” is “a significant modification to a major energy facility, which, as determined by the board, will result in a significant impact on the environment, or the public health, safety, and welfare.” Sea 3 denies it requires a full review but their application is self-contradictory. How can a facility that does not constitute an alteration of “an existing energy facility” be necessary “to meet the future demand for LPG in the region”?

Second, because the proposed expansion of this facility may result in a significant increase in diesel emissions within the Port area, which is already overburdened with polluting industrial activities and truck traffic, the potential growth in operations necessarily encourages and supports more use of fossil fuels. This is inconsistent with Rhode Island’s long-term climate change goals and binding emissions reductions as well as Providence’s Climate Justice Plan.

Third, because the proposal raises public safety concerns – it must be fully vetted by the EFSB before it is approved.

I urge the EFSB to require a full review of this fossil fuel expansion and to recognize the horrendous and disproportionate environmental impacts on the local communities by greenlighting this project.

Thank you,
Zubair merchant