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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

On May 29, 2015, ITC Lake Erie Connector, LLC (ITC Lake Erie or Applicant) applied to the United States (U.S.) Department of Energy (DOE) for a Presidential permit in accordance with Executive Order (EO) 10485, as amended by EO 12038, and the regulations at 10 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §205.320 et seq. (2000), “Application for Presidential Permit Authorizing the Construction, Connection, Operation, and Maintenance of Facilities for Transmission of Electric Energy at International Boundaries.” The DOE Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability (OE) is responsible for reviewing Presidential permit applications and determining whether to grant a permit for electrical transmission facilities that cross the United States' international border. If DOE issues a Presidential permit to ITC Lake Erie (OE Docket Number PP-412), it would authorize ITC Lake Erie to construct, operate, maintain, and connect the United States’ portion of the proposed Lake Erie Connector Project (LEC Project or Project) where the Project crosses the United States-Canada border.

The proposed LEC Project consists of an approximate 72-mile long, 1,000-megawatt (MW), +/-320-kilovolt (kV), high-voltage direct current (HVDC) electric power transmission system that originates in Haldimand County, Ontario, Canada and terminates in Erie County, Pennsylvania, United States. The proposed LEC Project would cross the United States-Canadian border in Lake Erie as a submerged cable and extend approximately 35 miles underwater through Lake Erie and emerge onshore in Erie County, Pennsylvania on private property west of Erie Bluffs Park. The proposed Project would run approximately 7 miles underground to a proposed +/- 320-kV new direct current (DC) to 345 kV alternating current (AC) HVDC converter station (Erie Converter Station) in Conneaut Township, Erie County, Pennsylvania. Approximately 2,153 feet of 345 kV AC underground transmission cables would run between the proposed new Erie Converter Station and the nearby Penelec Erie West Substation. The proposed Project would terminate at the existing Penelec Erie West Substation and interconnect with the transmission system operated by PJM Interconnection, LLC, (PJM), a Regional Transmission Operator (RTO).

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, and in considering an application for a Presidential permit, the DOE must take into account potential environmental impacts of the proposed transmission line and associated facilities before making a final decision. The DOE is using the NEPA process to involve federal, state, and local agencies; tribal governments; and the public in the environmental review of the proposed LEC Project. This document constitutes the Final Environmental Assessment (EA) Comment Response Document for the LEC EA. The Draft EA and all other documents associated with the EA are available on the LEC Project website at www.lakeerieconnectorea.com.

1.2 HISTORY OF OUTREACH AND PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS

The DOE provided a 30-day public review period starting June 3, 2016 and ending on July 5, 2016, for the Draft EA. The public review period was initiated through publication of a Notice of Availability (NOA) in the Erie Times-News on June 3, 2016 (Attachment 1), which has distribution along the proposed transmission line. The NOA was sent to interested parties, including federal, state, and local officials; regulatory agency representatives; stakeholder organizations; and private individuals in the vicinity of the proposed transmission line.

The DOE received written comment letters and emails from private citizens, citizen groups and government agencies. A copy of the comment letters received are included in Attachment 2 and are also available on the LEC Project website at www.lakeerieconnectorea.com.
1.3 COOPERATING AGENCIES

The DOE invited several federal and state agencies to participate as cooperating agencies in preparing this EA because of their special expertise or jurisdiction by law (40 CFR 1501.6). The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), New England District, agreed to be a cooperating agency for the proposed LEC Project EA on March 9, 2016. The DOE has the authority to issue the Presidential permit for the international border crossing, and the USACE issues Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 and Section 10 permits. No other agencies or Native American tribes made a request to participate as cooperating agencies.

2 AGENCY AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EA

A variety of issues and concerns were raised during the public review period. The DOE considered all comments in preparing the Final EA. This section lists the commenters and summarizes the comment documents received during the public comment process. Commenters on the Draft EA included one state agency and several individuals. ITC Lake Erie provided revisions to the Project route that are consistent with other federal and state applications filed by ITC Lake Erie. Table 1 provides a list of those persons and/or agencies who provided comments during the Draft EA comment period. The DOE responded to those comments that are within the scope of and relevant to the analysis within this EA.

Table 1. Draft Environmental Assessment Commenters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commenter Name</th>
<th>Commenter Agency or Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Ryan</td>
<td>Fisheries, Biologist, Pennsylvania Fish &amp; Boat Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Lavery</td>
<td>Private Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lavery</td>
<td>Private Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome Skrypzak</td>
<td>SONS of Lake Erie Fishing Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conneaut Township Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania Fish &amp; Boat Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Gail Prunty</td>
<td>Private Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. James Jordano</td>
<td>Private Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dave Marino</td>
<td>Private Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Bartosek</td>
<td>Private Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petition Letter to USACE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaleen Marino</td>
<td>Private Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kately Almeter</td>
<td>Private Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Mihalak</td>
<td>Private Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signed Petition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lora Z. Lattanzi</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 summarizes the comments submitted during the Draft EA public comment period into major representative issues and concerns, organized by general topic. All comments received are presented in their entirety in Attachment 3 of this Comment Response Document. Table 3 identifies the substantive revisions that were made from the Draft EA to the Final EA as a result of these comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Purpose and Need for the Action**              | *General.* Commenter stated that ITC was sold to a Canadian power company (Fortis) and that Fortis sold 19.9% to a Singapore company (GIC). With this change, the Commenter feels that this is not in the best interest of the United States.  
*General.* Commenter disappointed that he did not receive a letter for the public notice.  
*Public Meeting.* Due to the many concerns, property owners are seeking a public meeting. Would like non-biased engineers and individuals to discuss the Project.  
*Environmental Impact Studies.* Commenter concerned that land owners have not had access to environmental impact studies conducted by ITC Lake Erie for this Project.  
*Project Route.* Was this route selected because it is: the least environmental impact or most affordable?  
*General.* Thirteen property owners state that there was no concern for health, safety, welfare, responsibility for damage or compensation by any entity to these property owners.                                                                                                                                 |
| **Proposed Action and Alternatives**             | *General.* Because ITC was sold to a foreign country, the Commenter is concerned that the United States will continue to be dependent on energy supplied by a foreign county. Commenter suggested using an American company to save American jobs, and give “the American power companies a chance to meet emissions” standards.  
*Alternative Route.* Commenter suggested that another route be selected because of concerns about Project effects on health, noise, well water, property devaluation, quality of life, and wildlife.  
*Alternative Route.* Commenter suggested using the Penelec route…. “it is shorter and would be less costly”.  
*Environmental Impact Statement.* Commenter asked if an environmental impact statement (EIS) was prepared for this Project.  
*Aids-to-Navigation Plan.* Commenter suggested contacting the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission to determine if an Aids-to-Navigation plan is needed. Also, elaborate on ways to mark the locations of the “side-casting habitat” so anglers can utilize the man-made habitat.  
*Hydro Power.* Commenter is concerned that “hydro power” will not be the only source of power. Would like to know all the power sources.  
*Alternative Route.* Commenter suggested adopting the route proposed by Conneaut Township Supervisors…a direct power line route from Lake Erie to Conneaut Township to the Lexington Road sub-station noting that this is Penelec land and ROWs. Commenter noted that the Project will have impact on the local ground water, local feeder stream and stormwater runoff. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Route</td>
<td>Commenter noted that there are two existing ROWs that are not being utilized for this project. One is an abandoned railroad and the other is a high power electric line. Commenter stated that both routes would affect less people and that both are direct routes from the shoreline to the substation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Property Values. Commenter would like a property value study for residents living close to the converter hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Traffic</td>
<td>Weight Limits. Commenter is concerned about the weight limits on the local roads.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Water Resources and Quality              | Drinking Water. Commenter is concerned that drinking water would be adversely affected during the laying of the transmission cables and for the long-term. Commenter suggested using the Penelec right of way (ROW) rather than disrupting residents along the proposed transmission cable path. Also, the commenter stated that the proposed transmission cable will be buried “within feet of” or “below the drinking water lines”.   
Vaults. Commenter is concerned that the vaults will affect the flow, water table, and quality of water.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
<p>| Water Temperature                        | Commenter wants assurances that the water table will not be disturbed.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Private Wells                            | Commenter is concerned that private wells will be contaminated or become dry. Would like to know plans should this occur. Also concerned if the proposed transmission cable will require ground water for cooling, how will this impact my water supply?                                                                                                     |
| Water                                     | Commenter was told by Wyatt Price, ITC representative, that all of their trees would be removed because the transmission line needs a substantial amount of water to keep the transmission lines cool. What will be the impact on the streams, wetlands and wells because of this?                                                     |
| Water                                     | Will the springs close to the surface that supply water to ponds and wells be destroyed during installation of the transmission line? Would this cause unwanted flooding?                                                                                                                      |
| Polluted Sediments                       | Commenter fears polluted sediments will be reintroduced into the lake’s waters.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Aquatic Habitats and Species             | Blasting. Commenter is concerned about the effects that blasting and burying the transmission cable will have on aquatic species and resources.                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Water Temperature                        | Commenter is concerned that the rise in water temperature will adversely affect aquatic resources.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Construction                             | Commenter is concerned that during construction and afterwards that there will be “long-term negative effects” on local fishing businesses.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| Algae                                    | Commenter is concerned that algae growth will be affected.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Side-casting.</td>
<td>Commenter would like additional information about configuration, size, and location of the side-cast material and its benefit to fish instead of side-casting material beside excavated trench. Commenter suggested this material be utilized to create fish habitat by configuring suitable-sized debris in piles to create an array of suitable fish habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spawning Season.</td>
<td>Because construction (blasting and trenching) would occur near sensitive habitats and during spawning season of yellow perch, smallmouth bass and walleye, the Commenter suggested that the size of the proposed trench in waters less than 20 feet deep, be calculated and added to the EA as permanent impacts to fish spawning habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwater Blasting.</td>
<td>Commenter recommended that anticipated fish mortality be investigated and included as part of the EA. Commenter suggested that hydroacoustics and/or sonar be utilized to determine seasonal fish density in proximity of the proposed time and locations of blasting. Include fish mortality numbers in the EA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Management.</td>
<td>Commenter recommended determining the location of the proposed electrical lines in relation to hydroacoustic monitoring equipment and any associated interference to telemetry studies by the proposed Project. Include any foreseeable impacts to these telemetry studies as a result of the Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electromagnetic Field.</td>
<td>Commenter recommended indicating which fish species would be most sensitive to electromagnetic fields (EMF), including salmonids and sturgeons, and discussing EMF thresholds for these species. Commenter also recommended comparing detectability thresholds for EMFs for each species indicated in the EA and the proposed EMF levels that will be emitted by the Project and any potential adverse impacts to these fishes. Commenter recommended that the EA indicate and further elaborate on avoidance and minimization practices (i.e., proximity to sensitive aquatic resources, burial, cable shielding, etc.) to avoid and minimize any potential adverse impacts of EMFs to fishes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Temperature.</td>
<td>Commenter is concerned about the long-term effect of heat from the transmission cables. Will even a slight temperature increase in lake water have consequences to flora and fauna, particularly the fresh water fisheries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electromagnetic Field.</td>
<td>Commenter would like 100 percent guarantee that EMFs will not damage the human body or cause interference with electrical appliances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Protected and Sensitive</td>
<td>Commenter suggested that any reference to numbers or abundance of eastern sand darters in the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species.</td>
<td>Eastern Sand Darter. Commenter suggested that any reference to numbers or abundance of eastern sand darters in the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Habitats and Species</td>
<td><strong>Ecosystem.</strong> Commenter is concerned about the detrimental impact of the Project on local wildlife, ecosystem and water table. <strong>Ecosystem.</strong> Commenter states that EPA recommends including vegetative performance standards that include a 5 percent invasive species action level and no greater than 33 percent total coverage by a single vegetative species to ensure a diverse community. <strong>Heat and Mature Trees.</strong> Commenter asks: “What effect will the heat from the transmission cable have on mature trees and their dormancy; will there be a permafrost effect; how will this affect the local wetlands and amphibians…will they thrive?” <strong>General.</strong> Commenter is concerned that up to 13 large trees will be removed along the ROW. Trees provide a wind break, heat reduction and a priceless aesthetic value to the property. Commenter notes that one hickory tree is over 250 years old. Commenter also states that cutting trees 25 feet from the center of the road, would remove the anchors and support that hold up the taller tress behind them. Ninety (90) percent of the tree roots are within the top 2 feet of the surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Protected and Sensitive Species</td>
<td><strong>Protected and Sensitive Species.</strong> Commenter is concerned that the converter hall cooling fans (due to noise and heat) will affect flight path of bald eagles and bats in the area. <strong>Protected and Sensitive Species.</strong> Commenter would like to know what will happen to the eagle’s nest, blue heron and other wildlife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Wetlands</td>
<td><strong>Wetlands.</strong> Commenter suggested that wetlands be relocated. <strong>Wetlands.</strong> Commenter suggests that five years of monitoring may be insufficient for PFO wetland establishment/restoration areas because of the amount of time required to establish a mature forested system. Commenter states that EPA recommends at least ten years of monitoring. Performance standards should include criteria aimed at describing growth of the tree stratum in the mitigation area (i.e., annual average increase in height or DBH) to demonstrate the areas are on a trajectory of being a forested system. Woody vegetation should show a positive increase in height at the end of each year of monitoring. <strong>Ecosystem.</strong> ITC should provide greater detail on construction details, treatment expected, and possible maintenance anticipated for the specific biofilter wetland areas. <strong>Water Shed.</strong> Commenter states that a large portion of the proposed line is in a High Quality Cold Water Fishery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Soil</td>
<td><strong>Thermal Pollution.</strong> Commenter is concerned about the amount of thermal pollution created by transmission cables. <strong>Thermal Pollution.</strong> Commenter questions how heat from the transmission cables will affect the local road in winter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Vaults. Commenter is concerned that vaults will be located in residential front yards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaults. Commenter is concerned that the location of the vaults has not been disclosed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Resources</td>
<td>Visual Effects. Commenter is concerned about the visual and noise impact that the converter hall will have on the residential area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Effects. Commenter is concerned that large trees that protect home from wind and dust will be removed and replaced with shrubbery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health and Safety</td>
<td>Health. Commenter is concerned about possible safety and health effects of high AC/DC transmission cables buried in home owners front yards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health. Commenter is concerned about health effects of everyday exposure to the cables on people and pets. Commenter also states there are concerns affiliated with the cable because whenever there is an electrical current there will be a magnetic field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health. Commenter is concerned that health issues have not been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electromagnetic Field. Commenter is concerned that the EMF emitted from “such a high DC/AC” transmission cable could affect health and quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electromagnetic Field. Commenter would like to know how the “line is encased or protected to not emit harmful static electric magnetic fields”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children. Commenter is concerned about health risks to children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General. Commenter would like “admission from ITC that dangers do exist and a bond to protect the community for a Project that is portrayed to be so safe”. The Commenter further notes that ITC should take responsibility for the huge change that will take place, notify all government agencies of its commitment to the community by accepting the responsibility for any damages addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health. Commenter states that human life has not been given as much concern as issues such as wildlife, fish, shrubs, wetlands, and historic sights. Commenter notes that property owners will be very much impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noise. Commenter is concerned about possible adverse effects from noise levels due the operation of the proposed Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooling Fans. Commenter is concerned that noise from cooling fans will annoy residents, pets, and wildlife; affecting quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials and Wastes</td>
<td>Sediments. Commenter is concerned that the trenching process in the lake bottom could release toxic sediments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Area</td>
<td>Comment Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling Fans</td>
<td>Commenter is concerned that noise from cooling fans will annoy residents, pets, and wildlife. Heat generated from cooling fans will change the flight patterns of birds; specifically, blue heron and eagles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drilling Fluid Management Plan</td>
<td>Commenter requested that the Drilling Fluid Management Plan (DFMP) be provided and elaborate upon in the EA. “DFMP should include contacting the appropriate authorities should a release occur.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impacts</td>
<td>Terrorist Attacks. Commenter is concerned that the converter hall would make the area susceptible to terrorist attacks due to the size of Penelec.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Erie. Commenter is concerned about the negative impact of the Project on Lake Erie in both long- and short-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EA Section</strong></td>
<td><strong>Revision to Draft EA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>• No substantive changes were made to this chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1. Purpose and Need</td>
<td>• No substantive changes were made to this chapter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Chapter 2. Proposed Action | • Provided information on the non-material route modifications  
| | • Provided additional information on the Applicant’s proposed Inadvertent Fluid Release Prevention, Monitoring and Contingency Plan |
| Chapter 3. Affected Environment | • Updated information on the status of the Section 106 process including additional studies and PASHPO consultation  
| | • Provided updated information on additional plant surveys of state listed species and effects  
| | • Added updated environmental justice criteria from state of Pennsylvania |
| 3.1.9, and 3.2.10: Cultural Resources | • Updated analysis to include expanded LOD rare plant study results |
| 3.2.7.1: Protected Species | • Additional discussion included regarding the timing of HDD and trenching activities in nearshore areas and coordination with PFBC  
| | • Provided additional information on the Applicant’s proposed Inadvertent Fluid Release Prevention, Monitoring and Contingency Plan  
| | • Discussed mitigation measures developed in consultation with PFBC regarding the use of side-cast rock for spawning habitat  
| | • Provided estimated threshold distances of expected fish mortality during blasting  
| | • Provided additional discussion regarding the effects of EMF on freshwater fish species  
| | • Additional discussion included regarding potential impacts of the Project on ongoing telemetry studies being performed by various fishery management agencies  
| | • Added information on the PFBC’s Biological Opinion determination for various state protected species (sand darter, cisco, and lake sturgeon) |
| 3.2.18: Environmental Justice | • Updated analysis to include expanded LOD rare plant study results |
| Chapter 4. Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative | • No substantive changes were made to this chapter |
| Chapter 5. Environmental Consequences of the Proposed NECPL Project | • Provided additional information on the Applicant’s proposed Inadvertent Fluid Release Prevention, Monitoring and Contingency Plan  
| | • Additional discussion included regarding the timing of HDD and trenching activities in nearshore areas and coordination with PFBC  
| | • Provided additional information on the Applicant’s proposed Inadvertent Fluid Release Prevention, Monitoring and Contingency Plan  
| | • Discussed mitigation measures developed in consultation with PFBC regarding the use of side-cast rock for spawning habitat  
| | • Provided estimated threshold distances of expected fish mortality during blasting  
| | • Provided additional discussion regarding the effects of EMF on freshwater fish species  
| | • Additional discussion included regarding potential impacts of the Project on ongoing telemetry studies being performed by various fishery management agencies  
<p>| | • Added information on the PFBC’s Biological Opinion determination for various state protected species (sand darter, cisco, and lake sturgeon) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EA Section</th>
<th>Revision to Draft EA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.17: Socioeconomics</td>
<td>• Added revised information on Environmental Justice areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.10: Cultural Resources</td>
<td>• Added expanded study results for cultural resources on the route modification LOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Added information regarding PASHPO concurrence with the findings of the Phase I B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>survey report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Added information regarding PASHPO concurrence with the findings of the Phase II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological Evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Updated Section 106 consultation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.9: Geology and Soils</td>
<td>• Provided additional information on the Applicant’s proposed Inadvertent Fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Release Prevention, Monitoring and Contingency Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7. List of Preparers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One DOE staff member was added to the List of Preparers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8. References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• References were updated based on changes to the Final EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix: Comment Table</td>
<td>• Comment Table was added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 1: EPA Notice of Availability
human health and safety to facilitate the transfer of the remaining portions of tracts.

A. Need for Existing Facilities at TA–21

In 2000, TA–21 Tract housed both the Tritium Systems Test Assembly (TSTA) and the Tritium Sciences and Fabrication Facility (TSFF) and both of these facilities were scheduled to continue operation past the year 2007. These two research facilities were identified as being needed for the national security mission and there were no formal plans to relocate them at that time. However, DOE was even then in the early stages of assessing the feasibility of relocating these operations to another facility within LANL. Over the past 24 months, DOE/NNSA has reviewed both its long-term continued need for the TSTA facility and the feasibility of relocating the TSFF tritium operations away from TA–21 to other tritium operations facilities at LANL. DOE/NNSA has concluded that the operations at the TSTA per se is no longer needed long term and may be discontinued. The nuclear material inventory of the TA–21 facilities has been reduced according to these plans. The discontinuance of the TSTA facility operations and removal of the TSFF facility operations, together with removal of TA–21 offices and assorted storage support facilities, would allow the facility and all of TA–21 to be completely decommissioned, decontaminated and demolished. It is unlikely however that all three of these steps in the dismantling of the technical area could occur before 2007. In the near term, however, DOE has determined that about an 8-acre portion of the Airport Tract at the western end of that tract (situated to the northwest of TA21 and lying south of East Road) that had been retained for the purpose of serving as a health and safety buffer for the TA–21 TSTA and TSFF operations is no longer required for that purpose. This partial tract can now be conveyed.

B. Need for Future Facility at TA–53and TA–72

In a similar fashion, preliminary planning for the advanced proton radiography facility project has proceeded since March 2000. Expectations for operations at such a facility have been refined, as have the needs for siting such a facility within the TA–53 and TA–72 area. This has resulted in the reconsideration of the potential need for retaining two portions of the White Rock Y Tract that contain stretches of public roadways along State Road 502 and State Road 4. The two portions of the tract are located adjacent to the highway interchange area and total about 74 acres; one 54-acre tract portion is located to the west along State Road 502 and one 20-acre tract portion is located to the south along State Road 4. DOE has resolved that these two portions of the White Rock Y Tract are very unlikely to be needed for the purpose of serving as future health and safety buffers as long as provisions are made in the transfer documents to provide for access to the TAs–53 and –72. These portions of the tract can now be conveyed.

III. Amended Decisions

DOE/NNSA is modifying its decision on conveyance and transfer of certain land tracts at LANL as stated in the following paragraphs. Should DOE/NNSA’s no longer need portions of these and other tracts for national security mission support needs, DOE/NNSA will again reassess the retention of partial tract areas and amend the Record of Decision, as needed.

- The Airport Tract consists of about 205 acres (83 hectares), east of the Los Alamos townsite and near the East Gate Business Park. The Los Alamos Airport is located on the northern part of the tract, while other portions of the tract are undeveloped.

Portions of the Airport Tract will continue to be needed to serve as health and safety buffer areas for the tritium activities while they continue within TA–21. In March 2000, DOE decided to convey or transfer part of the tract, approximately 110 acres North of East Road. With the shutdown of its tritium activities at TA–21, DOE/NNSA will now convey an additional approximately 8-acre portion of the Airport Tract.

- The White Rock Y Tract consists of about 540 acres (219 hectares). It is undeveloped and is associated with the major transportation routes connecting Los Alamos with northern New Mexico. Portions of the White Rock Y Tract may be needed to serve as a health and safety buffer areas for proposed LANL activities occurring elsewhere, such as the proposed proton radiography project, in support of the national security mission. In the Conveyance and Transfer EIS discussion of the Preferred Alternative, DOE identified the potential partial transfer of the White Rock Y Tract due to the developing proton radiography project, and the tract was considered as one of the tracts that would be conveyed in whole or in part by 2007. In the March 2000 Record of Decision, DOE decided to convey or transfer only approximately 125 (50 hectares) acres, including the highway exchange and areas east of it, because of the potential national security mission need for the remainder of the tract. At this time, the DOE/NNSA will convey an approximately 54-acre parcel of the White Rock Y Tract comprised of the State Road 502 easement, and an approximately 20-acre parcel of the White Rock Y Tract comprised of the State Road 4 easement, both of which about the highway exchange and eastern area previously identified for conveyance and transfer.

Issued in Washington, DC, on June 26, 2002.

John Gordon,
Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration.

[FR Doc. 02–17120 Filed 7–8–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

[FE Docket No. PP–270]

Application for Presidential Permit: Lake Erie Link Limited Liability Company

AGENCY: Office of Fossil Energy, DOE.

ACTION: Notice of application.

SUMMARY: Lake Erie Link Limited Liability Company (“LEL LLC”) has applied for a Presidential permit to construct, operate, maintain, and connect an electric transmission line across the United States border with Canada.

DATES: Comments, protests, or requests to intervene must be submitted on or before August 8, 2002.

ADDRESSES: Comments, protests, or requests to intervene should be addressed as follows: Office of Coal & Power Import/Export (FE–27), Office of Fossil Energy, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Jerry Pell (Program Office) 202–586–3362 (or by electronic mail to: Jerry.Pell@hq.doe.gov) or Michael T. Skinker (Program Attorney) 202–586–2793.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The construction, operation, maintenance and connection of facilities at the international border of the United States for the transmission of electric energy between the United States and a foreign country is prohibited in the absence of a Presidential permit issued pursuant to Executive Order (EO) 10485, as amended by EO 12038.

On June 18, 2002, LEL LLC filed an application with the Office of Fossil
Energy (FE) of the Department of Energy (DOE) for a Presidential permit. The proposed LEL Project would consist of up to three underwater High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) transmission systems under Lake Erie, each with a transfer capability of 325 megawatts (MW). The LEL Project would connect the control areas of the Ontario Independent Electric System (IEP) with the control area of the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland Interconnection (PJM). In Ontario, the LEL Project would connect to the 230,000-volt (230-kV) bulk power system at the Nanticoke switchyard. In the U.S., the LEL Project would connect to the 345-kV bulk power system at the Erie West substation in Springfield Township, Pennsylvania.

The stated purpose of the LEL Project is to develop a fully controllable, bi-directional, electric transmission interconnection with a total transfer capability of up to 975 MW between Ontario and the U.S. Each of the HVDC transmission systems would consist of several miles of buried land-based HVDC cables, approximately 68 miles (109 kilometers [km]) of cable buried underwater in Lake Erie, and converter terminal facilities in Ontario and Pennsylvania.

The proposed LEL Project is exclusively a transmission system interconnection. The proposed project neither includes construction of any generation facilities in either country, nor is it dedicated or directly connected to any particular generation facility in either country. LEL LLC would sell the rights to transmit electricity over the LEL Project through an “open season” bidding process that has been approved in the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (FERC) LEL Project Authorization of February 13, 2002, Docket No. ER02–406–0002. LEL LLC states that it would not own or take title to any electric energy transmitted over the LEL Project.

Although LEL LLC’s application to FERC contemplated a possible separate cable system constructed to Ohio, that option is not part of this application. LEL LLC represents that it has postponed further study of the Ohio cable system pending the results of the open season process. This Application proposes to construct cable systems exclusively to Pennsylvania.

Since the restructuring of the electric power industry began, resulting in the introduction of different types of competitive entities into the marketplace, DOE has consistently expressed a policy that cross-border trade in electric energy should be subject to the same principles of comparable open access and non-discrimination that apply to transmission in interstate commerce. DOE has stated that policy in export authorizations granted to entities requesting authority to export over international transmission facilities. Specifically, DOE expects transmitting utilities owning border facilities constructed pursuant to Presidential permits to provide access across the border in accordance with the principles of comparable open access and non-discrimination contained in the Federal Power Act and articulated in FERC Order No. 888, as amended (“Promoting Wholesale Competition Through Open Access Non-Discriminatory Transmission Services by Public Utilities”). In furtherance of this policy, DOE intends to condition any Presidential permit issued in this proceeding on compliance with these open access principles.

Procedural Matters

Any person desiring to become a party to this proceeding or to be heard by filing comments or protests to this application should file a petition to intervene, comment or protest at the address provided above in accordance with § 385.211 or § 385.214 of the FERC’s rules of practice and procedures (18 CFR 385.211, 385.214). Fifteen copies of each petition and protest should be filed with the DOE on or before the date listed above.

Additional copies of such petitions to intervene or protests also should be filed directly with: Michael D. Ernst, on behalf of Lake Erie Link LLC, 110 Turnpike Road, Suite 300, Westborough, MA 01581–2864, and with George H. Williams, Jr., Cameron McKenna LLP, 2175 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037–1809.

Before a Presidential permit may be issued or amended, the DOE must determine that the proposed action will not adversely impact on the reliability of the U.S. electric power supply system. In addition, DOE must consider the environmental impacts of the proposed action (i.e., granting the Presidential permit, with any conditions and limitations, or denying the permit) pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). DOE also must obtain the concurrence of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense before taking final action on a Presidential permit application.

The NEPA compliance process is a cooperative, non-adversarial, process involving members of the public, state and tribal governments and the Federal government. The process affords all persons interested in or potentially affected by the environmental consequences of a proposed action an opportunity to present their views, which will be considered in the preparation of the environmental documentation for the proposed action. Intervening and becoming a party to this proceeding will not create any special status for the petitioner with regard to the NEPA process. Also, participation in the NEPA process does not create party status in this proceeding. Notice of upcoming NEPA activities and information on how the public can participate in those activities will appear in the Federal Register.

Copies of this application will be made available, upon request, for public inspection and copying at the address provided above. In addition, the application may be reviewed or downloaded from the Fossil Energy Home Page at: http://www.fe.doe.gov. Upon reaching the Fossil Energy Home page, select “Electricity Regulation” and then “Pending Proceedings” from the options menu.

Issued in Washington, DC, on July 2, 2002.

Anthony J. Como,
Deputy Director, Electric Power Regulation,

[FR Doc. 02–17121 Filed 7–4–02; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4450–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
[Docket No. RP02–358–000]

Dominion Transmission, Inc.; Notice of Termination of Gathering Service

July 2, 2002.

Take notice that on June 7, 2001, Dominion Transmission Inc. (DTI) tendered for filing pursuant to Section 4 of the Natural Gas Act, a notice of termination of gathering services currently being provided on specified uncertificated lines in Indiana County, Pennsylvania. DTI states that the uncertificated lines are being sold to Dominion Exploration and Production. DTI states further that copies of this filing have been mailed to all customers and interested state commissions.

Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or a protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 888 First Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with sections 385.214 or 385.211 of the Commission’s Rules and Regulations. All such motions or protests must be filed on or before
Attachment 2: Newspaper Notice of Availability
This Page Intentionally Left Blank
Kleinschmidt Associates
141 Main Street
PO Box 650
Pittsfield ME 04967

REFERENCE: 90085 205072
NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY LAKE ERIE CON

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA)
COUNTY OF ERIE ) SS:
Tom Mezler, being duly sworn, deposes and
says that: (1) he/she is a designated agent of the
Times Publishing Company (TPC) to execute Proofs
of Publication on behalf of the TPC; (2) the TPC,
whose principal place of business is at
205 W. 12th Street, Erie, Pennsylvania, owns and
publishes the Erie Times-News, established October
2, 2000, a daily newspaper of general circulation,
and published at Erie, Erie County Pennsylvania;
(3) the subject notice or advertisement, a true
and correct copy of which is attached, was
published in the regular edition(s) of said
newspaper on the date(s) referred to below.
Affiant further deposes that he/she is duly
authorized by the TPC, owner and publisher of the
Erie Times-News, to verify the foregoing statement
under oath, and affiant is not interested in the
subject matter of the aforesaid notice or
advertisement, and that all allegations in the
foregoing statement as to time, place and
character of publication are true.

PUBLISHED ON: 06/03/16
TOTAL COST: $206.60  AD SPACE: 47 Lines

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 3rd day of June 2016

Affiant: [Signature]

NOTARY: [Signature]
Attachment 3: Draft Environmental Assessment Comment Letters

Mr. Douglas Lavery                              May 17, 2016
Conneaut Township Supervisors                    June 20, 2016
Pennsylvania Fish & Boat Commission               June 29, 2016
Mr. Douglas Lavery                                June 29, 2016
Mr. Douglas Lavery                                June 30, 2016
Mr. David Lavery                                  July 2, 2016
SONS of Lake Erie Fishing Club                    July 5, 2016
Ms. Gail Prunty                                   July 14, 2016
Mr. Douglas Lavery                                July 19, 2016
Mr. James Jordano                                 July 20, 2016
Mr. Dave Marino (multiple emails)                 July 21, 2016
Mr. Dave Marino                                   July 22, 2016
Pat Bartosek                                      July 22, 2016
Letter to USACE                                    July 22, 2016
Ms. Kaleen Marino                                  July 23, 2016
Ms. Kately Almeter                                July 25, 2016
Ms. Michelle Mihalak                              August 5, 2016
Signed Petition                                   Not Dated
U.S. Fish and Wildlife                            August 4, 2016
Mr. John Staffier                                 September 26, 2016
Revised Artificial Reef Conceptual Plan           September 26, 2016
Good evening council members,
My concerns are about a company called ITC, which is planning to install the project called, The Lake Erie Connector.
1000 M.W. Bi-directional High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) 
Building a converter hall on Lexington Rd, Girard, PA, Conneaut Twp.
My concerns and others living in this rural setting are

1. Has a environmental impact study been received from ITC.

2. Has a loss of property values study been done for local residents close to the converter hall.

3. The water table in our area is 13' deep and very high quality. 
   If one of the scheduled connection vaults is placed in the area the water flow and quality 
   will be destroyed. The vaults are 10'x10'x30' with 1.5' of coverage 

4. Residents with in the converter hall area will most definetly loose tremendous property 
   values on their homes along with the country living we are associated with will be disrupted. 
   This local community neighborhood which has a standard of owner pride will be lost.

5. The sound effects from the converter hall cooling fans that we have been told 
   will produce 50 + decibels will undoubtedly annoy residents, pets & natural wildlife 
   The heat generated from the cooling fans will change the flight patterns of natural birds 
   This will definitely change the daily sightings of the eagles / blue heron and other fowl.

6. Health effects or quality of life from such a high DC/AC buried cable being installed in 
   the ground of each homeowner or neighbors property. 
   Which could emit a electric magnetic field

7. Information from ITC has been basically less than informational but just enough to 
   satisfy the federal government requirements.

8. Local residents have no local government supplying information, asking for information, 
   or being supplied information from ITC to help tax paying Erie County residents from 
   basically having their country living being destroyed by the installation of the lines and 
   the converter hall for the profit of ITC, leaving the residents with property that will be 
   worth absolutely nothing and have to deal with for the rest of their lives.

9. ITC has sold its company to a Canadian power company called Fortis for 11.5 Billion dollars. 
   Fortis has sold 15.9% of its holdings to a Singapore power company G/C for 
   1.3 Billion dollars. I fail neither of these companies will care about the Americans this

DL 01- No, ITC Lake Erie prepared an Applicant Prepared Environmental Assessment. DOE determined that an Environmental Assessment (EA) was warranted for this Project, and DOE independently conducted their analysis for the EA.

DL 02- No.

DL 03- DOE addressed groundwater effects in Section 5.2.3. Where aquifers are shallow enough to be affected by construction activities, ITC Lake Erie proposes construction techniques as described in Section 5.2.11.1 to mitigate the risks to nearby groundwater supplies that use the aquifers.

DL 04- Property values are not assessed as part of the EA review process.

DL 05- See Section 5.2.15.2 for effects on particular receptors in the area of the cooling fans. DOE determined that the operational noise associated with the new Erie Converter Station would comply with current local and state regulations.

DL 06- No adverse effects of EMF on homeowners is anticipated because the transmission cable will be buried.

DL 07- Comment noted.

DL 08- DOE has provided a website to keep the public informed of the environmental review process at www.lakeerieconnectorea.com.

DL 09- Comment noted. The ownership of the proposed LEC project is not analyzed in the EA.
10. The Lexington Rd. site will most definitely be put on a terrorist hit list because Penelec will supply 12 American states including Washington DC from this sub station and it will supply Canada with unknown areas of power.

In closing the residents of Lexington Rd need the councils help to protect them from this project that has no concerns for the people or the environment it will affect. Big money will be made from the production of this electric but none of it will help Erie County or the United States because the owners are from Canada and Singapore.

Websites for Information
lakeerieconnector.com

**DL 10**-Comment noted. Ownership of the proposed LEC project is not analyzed in the EA.
CONNEAUT TOWNSHIP SUPERVISORS
12500 US ROUTE 6N
ALBION, PA 16401
(814) 756-4301

June 20, 2016

Mike Ivester, Regional Manager
Local Government & Community Affairs
ITC Midwest
123 5th Street S.E.
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401

Dear Mr. Ivester,

We, the new, local representatives of Conneaut Township, have listened to many complaints by our constituents over the last several months concerning the planned Electric Converter Station proposed by ITC.

We have also provided an open public meeting, with a presentation by ITC, to discuss the planned route, construction, and pertinent facts of operation of the planned Station. Several important points have not been addressed, however, and those points still disturb our constituents.

First, and mainly, is the drinking water concern.

Second is the possible health effect from such a large buried electrical cable in such close proximity to living space.

Third is the noise magnitude of this operation.

Fourth is the loss of quality of life.

Finally, and importantly, is the huge property devaluation.

Our Township is basically rural, with only a small portion of homes with city water near the town of Albion. Conneaut Township does not experience water shortages with the water wells in the Township. More importantly, the northwest corner of our Township, where the proposed ITC convertor Station would be located, is in the best aquifer in our Township. The proposed line is within feet of, and possibly into or below, the water line of the concerned citizens’ drinking water. This is a huge concern, as any damage to the water table could have a substantial long-term effect on our citizens.

CTS-01-Groundwater effects are discussed in Section 5.2.3 of the Final EA.

CTS-02-No adverse effects of EMF on homeowners is anticipated because the transmission cable will be buried. EMF effects are discussed in Section 5.2.14.3.

CTS-03-Comment noted. Blasting effects would be addressed in ITC Lake Erie’s blasting plan (Appendix J). Noise effects are addressed in Section 5.1.15 and 5.2.15.

CTS-04-DOE is preparing a Final EA under the National Environmental Policy Act to address the effects of the proposed LEC project on the human environment.

CTS-05-Comment noted. Property values are not analyzed as part of the EA review process.

CTS-06-No adverse effects of EMF on homeowners is anticipated because the transmission cable will be buried. EMF effects are discussed in Section 5.2.14.3.
CTS-06 Continued: See Section 5.2.15.2 for effects on particular receptors in the area of the cooling fans. DOE determined that the operational noise associated with the new Erie Converter Station would comply with current local and state regulations.

CTS-07-Comment noted.

CTS08-Comment noted.

CTS-09-ITC Lake Erie provided an analysis of other routes considered in the Joint Permit Application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative was selected by ITC Lake Erie and is being evaluated in this Final EA and the permit process conducted by the USACE for the Section 404 permit.

CTS10-Comment noted.
PFBC 01 - ITC Lake Erie developed an Inadvertent Fluid Release Prevention, Monitoring and Contingency Plan which includes procedures to monitor for inadvertent fluid releases, as well as containment and clean-up procedures in the event of a fluid release. Additional text on the Drilling Fluid Management Plan has been added to Sections 2.4.5.1, 5.1.3.1, 5.1.4.1, 5.2.9.1 in the Final EA.

PFBC 02 - Additional text was added to Section 5.1.4 indicating that ITC Lake Erie has developed, in consultation with PFBC, a conceptual plan for the creation of two artificial reefs.

PFBC 03 - Additional text was added to Section 5.1.4. ITC Lake Erie’s blasting impact analysis estimates that lethal impacts to fish would be expected to occur within a 63.3-foot radius of the blast location. Measures to avoid causing harm to fish and fish habitat include reducing charges from 10 pounds to 7 pounds and reducing blast hole spacing from 4-foot intervals to 2.5-foot intervals. Small detonating charges are proposed to be shot in the water column around the blast area 15 seconds prior to the trench blast in order to clear fish from the blast area. ITC Lake Erie’s blasting plan was added to Final EA as Appendix J.

PFBC 04 - Additional text was added to Section 5.1.4.4 to address blasting and added the proposed Blasting Plan as Appendix J.
PFBC 04 continued

PFBC 05 - The data in the Final EA represents the best available science. In addition, impacts to sand darters will only occur during a single construction period and will not be permanent or ongoing. ITC Lake Erie is currently undergoing consultation with PFBC related to the development of an application for a PFBC blasting permit. This issue is being resolved through that process. No changes were made to the Final EA.

PFBC 06 - This issue was addressed in the Joint Permit Application as follows: “In an email dated March 24, 2015, the PFBC requested additional information regarding an analysis of effects of EMF on hydroacoustic telemetry tags and receivers (the Great Lakes Acoustic Telemetry Observation System currently monitors fish migration in Lake Erie). The telemetry receivers are not close to the cable. In addition, the static magnetic field from the cable is like that of the earth and of similar intensity. These magnetic fields will neither interfere with the acoustic signals nor the receiver instrumentation (personal communication, Dr. William Bailey, Exponent, March 24, 2015).”

PFBC 07 - In consultation with PFBC, ITC Lake Erie evaluated the effects of EMFs on several key species of interest including cisco, eastern sand darter, lake sturgeon, and steelhead trout. The area of highest concern for the Project would be the HDD portion of the underwater cable route, extending approximately 0.37 miles. Additional text was added to Section 5.1.4.4.

PFBC 08 - ITC Lake Erie contacted Tom Burrell and he indicated an ATON would not be required for this project. ITC Lake Erie and the PFBC have agreed on a conceptual plan for adding artificial reefs and will provide the locations for angler awareness.
The PFBC thanks you for the opportunity to comment on draft EA. Should you have any questions, feel free to contact me at the number listed above.

Sincerely,

Daniel Ryan
Fisheries Biologist, PFBC
Watershed Analysis Section
Division of Environmental Services
DL 01 - Comment noted.

DL 02 - DOE addressed groundwater effects in Section 5.2.3. Where aquifers are shallow enough to be affected by construction activities, ITC Lake Erie proposes construction techniques as described in Section 5.2.11.1 to mitigate the risks to nearby groundwater supplies that use the aquifers.

DL 03 - Comment noted.

DL 04 - Blasting effects are addressed in Section 5.1.4.1 and additional text was added. ITC Lake Erie’s blasting impact analysis estimates that lethal impacts to fish would be expected to occur within a 63.3 foot radius of the blast location. Measures to avoid causing harm to fish and fish habitat include reducing charges from 10 pounds to 7 pounds and reducing blast hole spacing from 4-foot intervals to 2.5-foot intervals. ITC Lake Erie’s blasting plan is included in Appendix J.

DL 05 - The effects of a rise in water temperature has been addressed in Section 5.1.3.2. Exponent used a set of conservative variables in terms of soil thermal properties and water velocity and found the largest increase in temperature to be approximately 4.4°F (2.4°C) at the water/soil interface on the lakebed. The point of highest temperature increase was found to be approximately 9 inches (23 cm) in the downstream water flow direction from the cables’ centerline. As seen in the attached Figure 5.3-1, the physical extent of this temperature increase is very limited. For example if one were to move vertically by only 4 inches (10 cm) from the point of highest temperature increase on the lakebed, the temperature increase would drop to a mere 0.2°F (0.1°C) (Exponent 2015b).

DL 06 - Effects on birds of prey are discussed in Section 5.2.7.1.2.

DL 07 - DOE determined that the operational noise associated with the new Erie Converter Station would comply with current local and state regulations. The most significant sound sources at the new Erie Converter Station during normal operation are associated with the cooling fan system; however, these effects would be limited to one potential receptor. See Section 5.2.15.2 for effects on particular receptors in the area of the cooling fans.

DL 08 - DOE addressed groundwater effects in Section 5.2.3. Where aquifers are shallow enough to be affected by construction activities, ITC Lake Erie proposes construction techniques as described in Section 5.2.11.1 to mitigate the risks to nearby groundwater supplies that use the aquifers.
A DOE public meeting has not been authorized for this Project. DOE provided public input through its website and public comment period on the Draft EA.

Comment noted.

DOE is responsible for reviewing Presidential permit applications and determining whether to grant a permit for electrical transmission facilities that cross the United States' international border.
DL 01-Comment noted.

DL 02- Blasting effects are addressed in Section 5.1.4.1 and additional text was added. Lake Erie’s blasting impact analysis estimates that lethal impacts to fish would be expected to occur within a 63.3 foot radius of the blast location. Measures to avoid causing harm to fish and fish habitat include reducing charges from 10 pounds to 7 pounds and reducing blast hole spacing from 4-foot intervals to 2.5-foot intervals. ITC Lake Erie’s blasting plan is included in Appendix J.

DL 03-The effects of a rise in water temperature has been addressed in Section 5.1.3.2. Exponent used a set of conservative variables in terms of soil thermal properties and water velocity and found the largest increase in temperature to be approximately 4.4°F (2.4°C) at the water/soil interface on the lakebed. The point of highest temperature increase was found to be approximately 9 inches (23 cm) in the downstream water flow direction from the cables’ centerline. As seen in the attached Figure 5.3-1, the physical extent of this temperature increase is very limited. For example if one were to move vertically by only 4 inches (10 cm) from the point of highest temperature increase on the lakebed, the temperature increase would drop to a mere 0.2°F (0.1°C) (Exponent 2015b). Effects on birds of prey are discussed in Section 5.2.7.1.2.

DL 04-See Section 5.2.15.2 for effects on particular receptors in the area of the cooling fans. DOE determined that the operational noise associated with the new Erie Converter Station would comply with current local and state regulations.

DL 05-Property values are not analyzed as part of the EA review process.

DL 06-ITC Lake Erie provided an analysis of other routes considered in the Joint Permit Application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative was selected by ITC Lake Erie and is being evaluated in this Final EA and the permit process conducted by the USACE for the Section 404 permit.

DL 07-Comment noted.
was hydro only the ITC answer was NO. It will be supplied by different producers? I thought it was to be all hydro and green. I have some information which I will mail to you. The information is a letter to ITC from Conneaut Township supervisors stating they will not give approval of any further movement on the projects until all the concerns from the residents located close to the hall are resolved. Water, loss of property values, noise levels, quality of life, health concerns all related to the construction of the lines, vaults and the hall. Please put a halt to the approval of ITC's application because of the sale to foreign companies and the people, wildlife, aquatic and pets this project will affect. Thank you

http://www.lakeerieconnectoreu.com

Site

Date/Time: June 30, 2016 12:50 am

DL08-Comment noted. Property values are not analyzed as part of the EA review process.
DL 01-DOE has addressed the effects on well water, health, noise, and wildlife in Sections 5.2.4, 5.2.14, 5.2.15, and 5.2.6, respectively.

DL02-ITC Lake Erie provided an analysis of other routes considered in the Joint Permit Application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative was selected by ITC Lake Erie and is being evaluated in this Final EA and the permit process conducted by the USACE for the Section 404 permit. This information is summarized in Section 2.6 and Appendix C.

DL03-Comment noted.
JS 01- ITC Lake Erie anticipates that the blasting would occur for about 130 days between May and November. Blasting outside of spawning season would reduce impacts to spawning habitat and behaviors and would likely be coordinated with the PFBC. Effects on fisheries resources from blasting are addressed in Section 5.1.4.1 and in Appendix I of the JPA, Volume III and Appendix J of the Final EA.

JS 02- No significant effects on cisco, eastern sand darter, or lake sturgeon are expected due to the small thermal increase in water temperature associated with operating the transmission system in Lake Erie. Thermal effects of the transmission cable are discussed in Section 5.1.5.2.

JS 03- Property values are not analyzed as part of the EA review process.

JS 04- Comment Noted.
We only have so much groundwater

By Gail Prunty

When we use the tubs and showers, we use a lot of water that is not being reused. But there are ways we can conserve water and reduce our impact on the environment. Here are some tips:

1. Fix Leaks
   - Check for leaks in faucets, toilets, and around faucets. Fixing leaks can save a lot of water over time.

2. Use Water-Efficient Fixtures
   - Install water-efficient toilets and faucets. These fixtures use less water to operate.

3. Fix the Leaks
   - Check for leaks in faucets, toilets, and around faucets. Fixing leaks can save a lot of water over time.

4. Use Water-Efficient Fixtures
   - Install water-efficient toilets and faucets. These fixtures use less water to operate.

5. Use a Water Timer
   - Use a water timer to help you keep track of how much water you are using.

Water underground. Groundwater is water found below the land surface and fills the spaces and cracks...
associated with private household drinking water supplies, with the majority of documented outbreaks caused by groundwater.

While routine testing ensures state and federal standards in public water supplies, it is the primary responsibility of the individual well owners to ensure that the water drawn from their wells is safe.

In Ohio, more than 700,000 people have their own wells. Routine monitoring of your water well is extremely important, not only to determine the current water quality, but also to provide a baseline of quality and the ability to detect changes in future water tests.

The Ohio Department of Health recommends that private water system owners test total coliform bacteria, E. coli, nitrates, and arsenic annually as well as any time there is a change in taste, odor, or appearance of your drinking water.

In addition to your water chemistry and bacteria tests, your annual water supply maintenance check should also include a static water level check, a water yield test, and a visual inspection of the well cap and cover.

Reviewing this drill. If planning a new or replacement water well, contact your local health department to begin the process of obtaining a well permit. A lot evaluation is required by a registered private water system contractor.

The Ohio Department of Health requires every well to have a permit prior to being drilled. Private water system permits are good for one year.

Within this timeframe, the installation or alteration must be performed, the system must pass a final inspection, and the water supply must pass a water test through a state-certified water testing lab.

Learn more. For more information on water well maintenance, visit odh.ohio.gov, epa.ohio.gov/home, your local health department, the Ohio Watershed Network (ohiowatershed.osu.edu), or your local Soil and Water Conservation District.

(Call Prunty is the education/communication specialist for the Geauga Soil and Water Conservation District.)
7/19/2016
Mr. Fode,

In response to the ITC/Lake Erie Connector Project.

Section 1 of the DoE permit ITC states they are not owned by any foreign companies, as at the time of the application. This was a true statement, ITC has sold to a Canadian power company called Fortis, for $1.3 billion. Fortis has sold 19.9% to a Singapore company GIC for $1.3 billion.

This alone causes concern about the USA being supplied electricity from foreign owned companies. The sale should be completed, according to the Fortis website, by the third quarter of 2016. When the sale is completed ITC has no stock in this project.

The Conneaut Township supervisors have submitted a letter to ITC/Nick Leventer that until the concerns of local residents in the future converter hall location have a guarantee that the water table will not be disturbed and what health issues can happen from such large buried power lines being located in the front yards will or possibly have on residents the supervisors can not approve this project to continue forward.

Some other local residents concerns are loss of property values, quality of life living next to the hall and last the impact from the cooling fans on residents, pets and wildlife.

I have included a copy of the supervisors letter to ITC.

My concerns which I brought to Conneaut Township, Erie County Council, Erie County Executive Cathy Dahlkemper, State Representative Parke retarded among others are facts stated in the application.

The possible blasting of the bedrock which goes 2000 feet into the lake from the shore, will definitely kill many aquatic life species, along with the four local fish that will have some affects for long term from the buried lines.

Another concern is where the lines are to be buried the water temperatures will rise 2.3 degrees. The Erie area is a fishing community and fishing is a year round benefit to the local economy. The disruption during construction and after will leave the long term negative effect to local fishing business. There will be an effects on algae growth.

Local birds that the hall will affect should be considered from the local American Bald Eagle which has a flight path over the future site. This family of Eagles have been local residents for 20 + years and disrupt their life along with local residents is a shame all for a foreign owned power company. The other birds in the report should also be reviewed even down to the bats, which are feeding population in America.

The reason for concern is the multiple cooling fans that will be installed in the hall will produce a decibel of 50 + and unknown heat generated into the atmosphere. That high of a constant decibel will be heard by humans, dogs, birds and wildlife. Please save our community from this great disturbance. The heat generated will cause unknown atmosphere issues.

On a personal concern from having to live so close to this foreign owned power business, the local water table is nine feet to sixteen feet deep. The vaults they propose to install are 10x10x8 ft with 1.5 foot of ground cover and a 6 ft gravel base. That puts them in the water table which if disrupted could possibly go away. I have asked the land agent repeatedly where the location of the vaults are and his comments are they have not been established.

I feel a project of this size and being pushed this fast, an important detail like vault locations should have been decided long ago. ITC knows that PA DOT has told them about weight limits on local roads. The application states there are 15 to 16 vaults on the land route. The location community is not being given the whole truth about this project.

May 21, 2016 Erie County Councilwoman Carol Loff requested ITC come to the Erie County Courthouse for a public meeting. I attended and asked all and more of the issues stated above.
Unfortunately ITC's Mike Ivester, Andrew Jamieson nor Steve Halmi were able or were willing to answer these questions.

This meeting brought up concerns from the PA Fish and Boat Commission to the Dept. of Energy along with the SONS of Lake Erie have also submitted a letter to the Dept. of Energy with their concerns.

All the information sent to the Dept. of Energy is on their website www.lakeerieconnectorca.com

February 2016 the Supreme Court put a stay on the EPA, closing coal powered electric producing plants down. Their concerns were that closing plants without given them a chance to meet emission standards is making America electric weak. In a era when the USA wants to not be energy dependent on foreign companies, we are considering letting one build in America and produce power in Canada to be owned by foreign business.

I asked ITC if the power to be supplied was produced by hydro and the answer was NO.

In closing, Please forward all information to any other organization that currently has a application in their office waiting for approval of this project.

I do understand from our phone conversation that the issues in this letter does not involve your office for permitting, but please take all the information your office has received from local residents and postpone the current permit application from ITC/Fortis,GIC who ever is the current owner of this project.

Give the American power companies a chance to meet emissions and save American jobs before suppling other foreign companies with work opportunities funded by the American public who buy electricity.

Thank You

Douglas Lavery
To Whom It May Concern:

I spoke to you a month ago, my complaint is why are they coming on peoples private property when they could have used an alternate route going from the lake shore to Lexington PENELEC substation. We have had our well checked by Moody which we had an excellent report on return of water into our well with no contamination. Our water vain is located between 5 and 6 feet down below ground, our main water supply comes from across the road which is east of our home, if they contaminate our water supply or our well goes dry are they going to purchase our home at market value. We have major concerns about our water supply, if you would like to speak with us concerning this matter, please feel free to contact us at your convenience, thank you for your time.

James Jordan
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 10:37 AM  
To: Fodse, Michael M LRP  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public notice Response to app No 2013-1434 notice 16-21

Mr. Fodse,

I am a resident of Girard Township, 2101 Townline Road, and I have several concerns and questions regarding the proposed HVDC line that is planned to be placed within 50’ of my home where my family of six reside.

I am disappointed that I have not personally received a letter for the public notice and that I was informed of the Notice from a previous land owner across the street. (James Truant 2342 Townline road) We recently purchased that property also.

First and foremost I’m concerned with the safety and health affects the line would have on my residence and family.

How is the line encased or protected to not emit harmful static electric or magnetic fields?

Is there a recommended distance for buffer zone for residential living space from these types of lines?

I have other questions and will follow up with separate emails regarding each.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Dave Marino, LA

DM 01-Comment noted. The availability of the Draft EA was noticed in the Erie Times and posted on the project website. If you would like to receive further notification from DOE, please sign up on the project website at www.lakeerieconnectora.com.

DM 02- Effects on health and safety are discussed in Sections 5.1.14 and 5.2.14. These sections focus on contractor health and safety, electromagnetic field effects, and public safety and health effects, which would be primarily recreation and navigation on the lake for the Lake Erie segment. The proposed transmission line would be primarily underground or under the lake bed, limiting exposure to the public.

DM 03-Yes, a description of the transmission cable is presented in 2.4.2 and electromagnetic field effects are discussed in Sections 3.1.14.3, 3.2.14, 5.1.4.3, 5.2.4.3, 5.1.14.3, and 5.2.14.

DM 04- As described in Section 2.4.1, the majority of the transmission cable in buried underground and in previously disturbed rights of way.
DM 01-Thermal effects on soils are discussed in Section 5.2.9.1. In Section 5.1.2.1, DOE discusses the thermal effects on aquatic species. Typically operation of the transmission cable would slightly raise the temperature of sediment immediately surrounding the transmission cable and most terrestrial wildlife would move from the immediate area. Regarding thermal effects on cold water fisheries habitat, anticipated increases in the temperature of the sediment and water column would not significantly affect populations of aquatic species because the increases would fall within the range of natural ambient variability. Mature trees and other plants would not likely be in the ROW area where the cable would be buried. Soil temperature above the transmission cables is anticipated to increase due to operation of the proposed HVDC transmission cables; however, the heat would dissipate quickly with increasing distance from the proposed transmission cable, particularly if the soil is appropriately moist (HDR 2016). Large-rooted plants would be removed to avoid interference with the buried transmission cable at the actual site of the cable.

DM 02-Effects on wells along the proposed route are discussed in Section 5.2.11.1 and include proposed construction techniques to avoid, reduce, or mitigate risks to wells adjacent to the proposed LEC Project route.

Mr. Fedde,

Here are a few of my other environmental concerns regarding my land, trees, water supply and even my house foundations.

What effect will the line have regarding heat. I have heard that it is very hot. Will there be a permafrost affect from the line in the winter? How will that affect mature trees and their dormancy? How will this affect the local wetlands and the amphibians that thrive here?

The water shed for a good portion of the proposed line is in a HQ CWF.

Will the line affect my drinking water; we have a shallow well of 12-15' which is plentiful and I'm concerned the trench may redirect the ground water in some way or fashion or the water table be contaminated due to the very sandy parent soil material.

Thanks!

Respectfully,

Dave Marino, LA
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Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 11:04 AM
To: Fodse, Michael M LR
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public notice Response to app No 2013-1434 notice 16-21
Attachments: IMG_7433.jpg, IMG_7425.jpg

Mr. Fodse,

We went to a meeting last night at the Girard township building and they are currently discussing with the power company to widen the right of way for tree removals to 50'. My house is an old farm house build before there were automobiles and there are 13 trees along the ROW that will be removed if they move forward with the 50' clear area. They are going to compensate us for the trees (they say they will) but these trees provide a wind break, heat reduction and aesthetic that is priceless. Not to mention that it will reduce my property value and sale potential. The one tree is a hickory that is over 250 years old.

I have recently purchased the property across the street and it has mature forest along the right of way. This forest of 15 acres is possibly some of the oldest 2nd growth in Erie County. Many trees there are upwards of 100' tall and 30 to 40' diameter. I have attached a few pictures. If they cut the trees down 25' from the center of the road I will lose the anchors and support that hold up the taller trees behind them.

I don't believe they should be able to cut the trees down, they should encase the line so that the trees will not affect them. 90 per cent of roots are within the top 2' of the surface.

Respectfully,

Dave Marino, LA

DM 01-Some clearing would be required to install and maintain the cable. Avoidance of mature selective trees would be preferred but may not be feasible.

DM 02-Comment noted.

DM 03- The USACE and DOE required ITC Lake Erie to look at other routes for the transmission cable. Due to the many factors discussed in the Final EA, the proposed route was selected by the applicant and analyzed further in the EA. The route alternatives are discussed in Section 2.6 and Appendix C.
Lake Erie Connector Project  

Comment Response Document

Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 11:47 AM
To: Fodse, Michael M RCP
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Public notice Response to app No 2013-1434 notice 16-21

Mr. Fodse,

As you have seen I have several concerns regarding the line location to my properties and the affects it will have on them and the environment. One of the other main issues I have is that there are two existing right of ways or routes that are not being utilized for this line. One is an abandon railroad and the other is a High Power Electric line. Both of these existing routes affect less people than the current route and both are direct routes from the shoreline location to the substation. Most people are in favor of the line being located in one of the existing right of ways but money talks. Our township supervisors said the main reason they want the line here is to strengthen the Power Grid of the country and its our duty to allow it. I feel that it is important for green power but everything I have worked extremely hard for will be affected permanently and will not recover in my lifetime due to the loss of aesthetic and sale value. The power grid of the country can be strengthened but it should not be on the backs of citizens who pay taxes and are not getting any compensation for use of the right of way while it destroys their properties and values. They need to utilized one of the other routes that are available. This is a multi billion dollar project, half a million for another route is a drop in the bucket to them, please have a voice for the working folks of these townships whose properties will suffer.

Please do not accept this permit based on the availability of other less intrusive routes available for the proposed line. I can send a map of the other more direct routes that are available if you would like.

Thank you for your attention and concern.

Respectfully,

Dave Marino, LA

DM 01-ITC Lake Erie provided an analysis of other routes considered in the Joint Permit Application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative was selected by ITC Lake Erie and is being evaluated in this Final EA and the permit process conducted by the USACE for the Section 404 permit. DOE discussed the alternative routes in Section 2.6 and Appendix C of the Final EA.

DM 02-Comment noted.

Department of Energy  
Attachment 3-24  
October 2016
Mr. Fodse,

I have not heard back from you regarding my previous emails so please let me know you have received them.

Also, I have attached a few pictures of my front yard trees that will be removed due to the new power line. As you can see they protect my house from wind and dust from the dirt road. The power company does not want any large trees to be placed back. Only shrubbery.

Thanks.

Respectfully,

Dave Marino, LA
July 22, 2016

Michael Fosse
US Army Corps of Engineers, Pittsburgh District
1000 Liberty Ave.
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-4185
Re: Application No. 2013-1434

Dear Mr. Fosse,

I have concerns about the HVDC transmission line being installed underground in front of our property where we reside. We were approached by Wyatt Price, a representative from ITC. In the conversation we were told that all of our trees would have to be removed because the transmission line needs a substantial amount of water to keep the transmission line cool. Since the line needs substantial amount of water, what will be the impact on the streams, wetlands, and our wells? Also, there are springs close to the surface that supply water to ponds and wells which will be destroyed from the insulation of the transmission line. Would this cause unwanted flooding? Penelec has an existing right-of-way which would be better suited for this transmission line. This would be less of an impact on wetlands streams and the water table that supply water to our wells. There are many concerns and questions from property owners affected by this HVDC transmission line. We are asking if a public meeting can be held on this matter.

Sincerely,

Pat Bartosek

PB 01: Operation of the proposed Project would slightly elevate the temperature of soil immediately surrounding the cable, but not to the extent that temperatures would affect plant growth. The effects on temperature of the soils and water are discussed further in Sections 5.2.9.2 and 5.1.9.2.

PB 02: The USACE and DOE required ITC Lake Erie to look at other routes for the transmission cable. Due to the many factors discussed in the Final EA, the proposed route was selected by the applicant and analyzed further in the EA. ITC Lake Erie provided an analysis of other routes considered in the Joint Permit Application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative was selected by ITC Lake Erie and is being evaluated in this Final EA and the permit process conducted by the USACE for the Section 404 permit. Alternatives are discussed in Section 2.6 and Appendix C.
This letter is in response to the public notice, 16-21, dated June 24, 2016, from Chief, Regulatory Branch, Scott A. Hans, Army Corps of Engineers. We would like to make known our response to the proposed activities of ITC Lake Erie Connector Project.

In our small community of Northwest Conneaut Township, which will be in close proximity to the site for the proposed ITC Converter Station, there are twenty-one (21) properties or parcels that will be affected in one way or another by this project. Of the twenty-one households, four (4) properties have made or anticipate land sale/agreements. Four more are in negotiations for easement passage for the underground cable. That leaves thirteen properties that will have to live next to, within sight, within hearing distance, or have property near or bordering the ITC property. All the homes are in a relatively tight rural agriculture setting. There is no concern for the health, safety, welfare, responsibility for damage or compensation by any entity to anyone of the thirteen properties.

The permit process mentions the concern for wetlands and rare shrubs; concerns for endangered species, fish, wildlife, and historic places. Section no. 4 paragraph of the letter references unavoidable impacts to Waters of the United States. Additionally, no. 5 mentions the Encroachment Permit Water Quality Certification. Finally, no. 22 section gives residents a chance to respond.

Our neighborhood has been proactive in a timely manner, gathering information, attending meetings with ITC officials, township and county representatives. We are proud to say that we have gained the support of Conneaut Township Supervisors, our first line of defense in the American form of democracy known as constituent support. They support our legitimate neighborhood grievances for our drinking water. We have also gained the support of the S.O.N.S. of Lake Erie, a 3000 member sportsmen’s organization concerned about our drinking water. Pollution of our water will cause run off issues downstream and eventually effecting trout waterways. We are located on one of the top aquifiers for residential water use in Conneaut Township. All drainage goes directly into Lake Erie.

Our residents have been respectful, courteous and have communicated our expressed concerns for quality of life issues. Furthermore, we are concerned about the high levels of noise. Can anyone guarantee one hundred percent that the high-electromagnetic wave disturbance will not damage the human body or cause interference to electrical appliances? Another legitimate complaint is the possible pollution to our drinking water, not only the construction, but the maintenance and inspection in future years. Lastly, is the physical, aesthetic, and radical change to our rural way of life. What compensation can address that fact? These issues are a major source of anxiety to this neighborhood. The problem of noise disturbance, slight, drinking water and bodily effects from electromagnetic waves, and property devaluation all remain unanswered. Each of these dynamic forces of change will affect each property in

Property Owners 01-Comment noted.

Property Owners 02-The Draft and Final EA addresses noise, health and safety of the human environment, specifically in Sections 5.1.14 and 5.2.14.

Property Owners 03-The Draft and Final EA includes an analysis of effects on wetlands (Sections 5.1.8 and 5.2.8), rare plants (Sections 5.1.7 and 5.2.7), wildlife (Sections 5.1.6 and 5.2.6) and cultural resources (Sections 5.1.10 and 5.2.10).

Property Owners 04-Comment noted.

Property Owners 05-the Draft and Final EA addresses effects on groundwater, specifically in Section 5.2.11 and Section 5.2.3.3. ITC Lake Erie proposed construction techniques to avoid, reduce, or mitigate risks to wells adjacent to the proposed LEC Project route.

Property Owners 06-See Section 5.2.15.2 for effects on particular receptors in the area of the cooling fans. DOE determined that the operational noise associated with the new Erie Converter Station would comply with current local and state regulations. Electromagnetic effects are discussed in Sections 5.1.4.4 (added text) and 5.1.14.1.

Property Owners 07-Responses to these issues are addressed in the above responses.
Property Owners 08-Comments noted.

Property Owners 09-The USACE and DOE required ITC Lake Erie to look at other routes for the transmission cable. Due to the many factors discussed in the Final EA, the proposed route was selected by the applicant and analyzed further in the EA. ITC Lake Erie provided an analysis of other routes considered in the Joint Permit Application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative was selected by ITC Lake Erie and is being evaluated in this Final EA and the permit process conducted by the USACE for the Section 404 permit. Alternatives are discussed in Section 2.6 and Appendix C.
KM 01-DOE will not be hosting a public meeting for the LEC Project.

KM 02-Comment noted.

KM 03-The effects of a rise in water temperature has been addressed in Section 5.1.3.2. Exponent used a set of conservative variables in terms of soil thermal properties and water velocity and found the largest increase in temperature to be approximately 4.4°F (2.4°C) at the water/soil interface on the lakebed. The point of highest temperature increase was found to be approximately 9 inches (23 cm) in the downstream water flow direction from the cables’ centerline. As seen in the attached Figure 5.3-1, the physical extent of this temperature increase is very limited. For example if one were to move vertically by only 4 inches (10 cm) from the point of highest temperature increase on the lakebed, the temperature increase would drop to a mere 0.2°F (0.1°C) (Exponent 2015b). Regarding sediment pollutants, Section 5.1.3 discusses the transmission cable installation methods and effects on turbidity and suspended solids.

KM 04-Health risks due to EMF have been addressed in the Final EA; in addition, temperature effects have been addressed in Section 5.2.6.2, and as noted, the heat from the transmission cable dissipates very quickly with increasing distance from the cable.

KM 05-ITC Lake Erie provided an analysis of other routes considered in the Joint Permit Application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative was selected by ITC Lake Erie and is being evaluated in this Final EA and the permit process conducted by the USACE for the Section 404 permit. Alternatives are discussed in Section 2.6 and Appendix C.
EPA has reviewed the public notice and application for ITC Lake Erie Connector, LLC and is providing the following comments:

- For the PFO wetland establishment/restoration areas, 5 years of monitoring may be insufficient due to the amount of time associated with establishing a mature forested system. EPA recommends at least 10 years of monitoring.

- Furthermore, performance standards should include criteria aimed at describing growth of the tree stratum in the mitigation area (i.e., annual average increase in height or DBH) to demonstrate that areas are on a trajectory of being a forested system. Woody vegetation should show a positive increase in height at the end of each year during the monitoring period.

- Additionally, EPA recommends including vegetative performance standards that includes a 5% invasive species action level and no greater than 33% total coverage by a single vegetative species to ensure a diverse community.

- The applicant should provide greater detail on the construction details, treatment expected, and possible maintenance anticipated for the specific biofilter wetland areas.

Thank you for the opportunity to review. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me at 215-814-2797.

Thanks,
Katelyn
Hi Michael,

Thank you again for taking the time to talk with me today. Per our discussion, I'm not opposed to the project per se however the route is my concern. My house sits very close to the road, my guess would be 40 feet. My bedroom is in the front of the house (as is my nephew), therefore I feel like I would basically be sleeping on top of this cable every night which can't help make me wonder how it can or will affect my health. Not only my health but my pets and nephew that live with me as well. I try to live a fairly healthy lifestyle so that is something that is very important to me. I would probably be told that there are no health concerns affiliated with the cable but whenever there is an electrical current there will be a magnetic field.

Another major concern is my water well. I was informed that this cable requires ground water/moisture to keep it cool. If this cable is then utilizing any water that would be supplied to my well, how will this impact my water supply? I did have Moody and Associates test my well this past spring (March or April) at that time my water recovery was great. I truly appreciate that I have a baseline for how my well performs but then again, what good will that do me if my well stops producing water? I've been at this residence for roughly 30 years now and have never had an issue with my well.

If an alternate route was found that would be less intrusive to the residents of Grand Township, I would like to think that it could be a viable option as well? Have other routes been thoroughly investigated? If not, is it still possible for them to do so? If they have and are not viable options, has this information or can this information be given to either the residents or township supervisors?

Thank you again for your time

Michelle Mirabai

---

**MM 01** - DOE evaluated the effects of the transmission cable on human health in Section 5.2.14.3. The LEC Project would pose very little risk for public health and safety because the proposed transmission cable would be buried underground.

**MM 02** - DOE addressed groundwater effects in Section 5.2.3. Where aquifers are shallow enough to be affected by construction activities, ITC Lake Erie proposes construction techniques as described in Section 5.2.11.1 to mitigate the risks to nearby groundwater supplies that use the aquifers.

**MM 03** - ITC Lake Erie provided an analysis of other routes considered in the Joint Permit Application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative was selected by ITC Lake Erie and is being evaluated in this Final EA and the permit process conducted by the USACE for the Section 404 permit. Alternatives are discussed in Section 2.6 and Appendix C.
PETITION TO STOP THE ITC LAKE ERIE CONNECTOR PROJECT CONVERTOR HALL LOCATION

The goal of this petition is to prevent the Lake Erie Connector project proposed for the Lexington Road site. The impact of this project to local environment is detrimental to our local wildlife, ecosystem, to say nothing to the damage to our local water table. We currently enjoy our local eagle’s nest and many blue heron among other wildlife. What will happen to those?

We, the local residents have great concerns over the fact that we have had no access to any in depth environmental impact studies that have been conducted by the company (ITC). There are great concerns regarding the health effects of the constant noise from the cooling fans located in the convertor hall. The long term health effects from having high AC/DC buried cables in our front yards is unknown. To say nothing for the effect the entire project will have on our property values.

Please sign this petition if you agree.

Petition 01 – Comment noted. Potential impacts to terrestrial species are discussed in Section 5.2.6 of the Final EA.

Petition 02 – The Draft and Final EA addresses noise, health and safety of the human environment. See Section 5.2.15.2 for effects on particular receptors in the area of the cooling fans. DOE determined that the operational noise associated with the new Erie Converter Station would comply with current local and state regulations.

Petition 03 – Electromagnetic field effects are discussed in Sections 3.1.14.3, 3.2.14, 5.1.4.3, 5.2.4.3, 5.1.14.3, and 5.2.14 of this Final EA. Property values are not assessed as part of the EA review process.
FWS 01-Comment noted. The April 11, 2016 USFWS letter has been added to the LEC project website.
From: John R. Stuller
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 2:39 PM
To: Mills, Brian <Brian.Mills@hq.doe.gov>; Smith, Julie A (OE) <Julie.A.Smith@hq.doe.gov>; Kelly Schaeffer <Kelly.Schaeffer@KleinschmidtGroup.com>; Alison Jukupca <Alison.Jukupca@KleinschmidtGroup.com>
Cc: Jamieson, Andrew <AJAMIESON@lerumsco.com>; Browne, Peter <Peter.Browne@hduinc.com>; Ellen Young <eyoung@stuller.com>
Subject: RE: Lake Erie Connector - revised artificial reef conceptual plan

Per our discussion last Friday, we were able to forward our revised conceptual plan for artificial reefs to the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission this morning. By the email below, the PFBC has advised that the plan, a copy of which is attached hereto, will suffice for its purposes. Let me know if you have questions. Thanks.

JRS
John R. Stuller
Stuntz, Davis & Stuller, P.C.
555 Twelfth Street, NW
Suite 630
Washington, DC 20001
(T): 202-737-8060
(F): 202-638-6581

---

From: Ryan, Daniel [mailto:danielryan@pa.gov]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 9:36 AM
To: Browne, Peter
Cc: Jamieson, Andrew <AJAMIESON@lerumsco.com>; Mitchell, Robert; Smiles, Hendler A; Fischer, Douglas; Hartle, Mark
Subject: RE: Lake Erie Connector - revised artificial reef conceptual plan

Peter,

This plan will suffice for PFBC needs on the Chapter 105 side. I've copied Doug Fischer, Hendler Smiles and Mark Hartle as an FYI. Let me know if you need anything else.

Thanks,
Daniel Ryan
Fisheries Biologist
450 Robinson Lane
Belleville, PA 16823
Phone: 814-359-5100
Fax: 814-359-5175
Email: danielryan@pa.gov

---

JS 01 – Noted.

JS 02 - Concurrency noted.
From: Browne, Peter [mailto:Peter.Browne@hdrinc.com]
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2016 8:49 AM
To: Ryan, Daniel
Cc: Jamieson, Andrew (AJAMIESON@lternseco.com); Mitchell, Robert
Subject: Lake Erie Connector - revised artificial reef conceptual plan

Hi Dan,

In follow up to our call last week, attached please find the revised conceptual plan for the artificial reefs for the Lake Erie Connector Project. Following your review, can you please respond with your approval, and we will update the Corps and DEP of our discussions.

Thanks,

Peter
Peter Browne
Senior Consultant, Renewable Energy Services

HDR
970 Baxter Boulevard, Suite 301
Portland, ME 04103
207.259.3863
peter.browne@hdrinc.com

hdrinc.com/follow-us

JS 03 – Communication noted.