

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Executive Office of Environmental Affairs ■ MEPA Office

ENF

Environmental Notification Form

<i>For Office Use Only</i> <i>Executive Office of Environmental Affairs</i>	
EOEA No.:	13641
MEPA Analyst:	BRIONY ANGUS
Phone:	1029

The information requested on this form must be completed to begin MEPA Review in accordance with the provisions of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, 301 CMR 11.00.

Project Name: Neptune Deepwater Port Project		
Street: Not Applicable		
Municipality: Offshore waters of Manchester-by-the-Sea, Beverly, Salem, and Marblehead		Watershed: Massachusetts Coastal
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: (UTM Zone 19 North)		
Northern Unloading Buoy: E: 1,207,435.37 N: 15,435,945.12		Northern Unloading Buoy: Latitude: N 42° 29' 06.3" Longitude: W 70° 36' 20.8"
Southern Unloading Buoy: E: 1,207,077.70 N: 15,423,798.13		Southern Unloading Buoy: Latitude: N 42° 27' 06.2" Longitude: W 70° 36' 22.5"
Estimated commencement date: May 2009		Estimated completion date: September 2009
Approximate cost: \$870 million		Status of project design: 10 %complete
Proponent: Neptune LNG LLC		
Street: One Liberty Square, 10th Floor		
Municipality: Boston	State: MA	Zip Code: 02109
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Doug Jones		
Firm/Agency: Suez LNG North America LLC		Street: One Liberty Square, 10th Floor
Municipality: Boston		State: MA
		Zip Code: 02109
Phone: 617-381-8509	Fax: 617-889-6047	E-mail: Doug.Jones@suezenergyna.com

- Does this project meet or exceed a mandatory EIR threshold (see 301 CMR 11.03)?
 Yes No
- Has this project been filed with MEPA before?
 Yes (EOEA No.) No
- Has any project on this site been filed with MEPA before?
 Yes (EOEA No.) No
- Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11.05(7)) requesting:
- a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8)) Yes No
 - a Special Review Procedure? (see 301CMR 11.09) Yes No
 - a Waiver of mandatory EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.11) Yes No
 - a Phase I Waiver? (see 301 CMR 11.11) Yes No

Identify any financial assistance or land transfer from an agency of the Commonwealth, including the agency name and the amount of funding or land area (in acres): **Not Applicable**

Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency?
 Yes (Specify: **United States Coast Guard**) No

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals:
See Appendix B for a complete list of applicable permits and approvals.

Which ENF or EIR review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03):

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land | <input type="checkbox"/> Rare Species | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Wastewater | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Air | <input type="checkbox"/> Solid & Hazardous Waste |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ACEC | <input type="checkbox"/> Regulations | <input type="checkbox"/> Historical & Archaeological Resources |

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits & Approvals
LAND				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Order of Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Superseding Order of Conditions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chapter 91 License <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 401 Water Quality Certification <input type="checkbox"/> MHD or MDC Access Permit <input type="checkbox"/> Water Management Act Permit <input type="checkbox"/> New Source Approval <input type="checkbox"/> DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/ Extension Permit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Permits <i>(including Legislative Approvals) – Specify:</i> CZM Federal Consistency Certification Federal Deepwater Port Act, Governor of Massachusetts Approval
Total site acreage	Acres of Seafloor temporarily disturbed during construction: 97 Acres of seafloor permanently occupied: 0.55 Acres of seafloor intermittently disturbed during operation: 56			
New acres of land altered		See above		
Acres of impervious area	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		N/A		
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		See above		
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0		

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits & Approvals
STRUCTURES				
Gross square footage	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Number of housing units	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Maximum height (in feet)	N/A	N/A	N/A	
TRANSPORTATION				
Vehicle trips per day	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Parking spaces	N/A	N/A	N/A	
WATER/WASTEWATER				
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	seawater	Gallons of water used for routine SRV operation: 7 MGD	Gallons of water used for routine SRV operation: 7 MGD	
GPD water withdrawal		See above	See above	
GPD wastewater generation/treatment		Gallons of engine colling water discharge by SRV during normal operations while at buoy: 4.4 MGD (Note: 2.6 MGD diverted to Ballast Tanks) No grey or blackwater will be discharged while the SRV is anchored at the buoy.	Gallons of engine colling water discharge by SRV during normal operations while at buoy: 4.4 MGD (Note: 2.6 MGD diverted to Ballast Tanks) No grey or blackwater will be discharged while the SRV is anchored at the buoy.	
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)		N/A	N/A	

CONSERVATION LAND: Will the project involve the conversion of public parkland or other Article 97 public natural resources to any purpose not in accordance with Article 97?

Yes (Specify _____) No

Will it involve the release of any conservation restriction, preservation restriction, agricultural preservation restriction, or watershed preservation restriction?

Yes (Specify _____) No

RARE SPECIES: Does the project site include Estimated Habitat of Rare Species, Vernal Pools, Priority Sites of Rare Species, or Exemplary Natural Communities?

Yes (Specify _____) No

A total of 9.9 miles of gas transmission pipeline is located in State waters where Federally- and State-listed threatened or endangered species may occur. The Neptune project will not alter designated significant habitat within state jurisdiction nor will it result in the taking of an endangered or threatened species or species of special concern, and it does not encompass an area that is mapped as a Priority Site, Rare Species, Vernal Pools Habitats or Exemplary Natural Communities.

HISTORICAL /ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Does the project site include any structure, site or district listed in the State Register of Historic Place or the inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth?

Yes (Specify _____) No

Surveys conducted in June - July 2005 show that shipwrecks exist in the general project area. However, pipeline route and terminal alternatives avoid these areas. Attachment A provides additional information on submerged historical resources.

If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction of any listed or inventoried historic or archaeological resources?

Yes (Specify _____) No

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: Is the project in or adjacent to an Area of Critical Environmental Concern?

Yes (Specify _____) No

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project description should include (a) a description of the project site, (b) a description of both on-site and off-site alternatives and the impacts associated with each alternative, and (c) potential on-site and off-site mitigation measures for each alternative (*You may attach one additional page, if necessary.*)

Neptune LNG LLC (the Applicant), a Delaware limited liability company, is filing an application for a license pursuant to the Deepwater Port Act of 1974, as amended (the DWPAct), and the United States Coast Guard's (USCG's) January 6, 2004, Temporary Interim Rules to construct, own and operate a deepwater port. The proposed submerged deepwater port, named Neptune, would be located in the federal waters of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) blocks NK 19-04 6525 and NK 19-04 6575, approximately 22 miles northeast of Boston, Massachusetts, in a water depth of approximately 250 feet.

The deepwater port would receive and vaporize LNG from a purpose-built and dedicated fleet of shuttle regasification vessels (SRVs) equipped with vaporization equipment that would convert the LNG to natural gas. The natural gas would be transported to shore by a pipeline lateral that connects the deepwater port to the existing 30-inch Algonquin HubLineSM approximately 9 miles west of the proposed deepwater port location. From shore, natural gas would be transported to serve residential, commercial, industrial and electricity generation consumers, primarily in the New England area. Approximately 9.9 miles of the pipeline lateral is within State waters, and approx. 0.9 miles is within Federal waters.

Neptune considered and evaluated several alternatives, as discussed in Attachment A, against evaluation criteria that must be met in order for the project to be commercially and economically feasible. Alternatives considered included:

- **No Build Alternative** – Under the No Build alternative, the demand for natural gas in the New England area would not be satisfied by the project and would not be met by other natural gas supply options, or significant energy conservation measures. Under this option, energy conservation alternatives and energy source alternatives, including fossil fuels, nuclear, and renewable energy were explored.
- **Alternative Natural Gas Supply Systems** – This alternative explored the use or expansion of existing or proposed pipeline or LNG facilities to supply additional volumes of natural gas that the Neptune LNG deepwater port would deliver.
 - Existing pipeline facilities included Algonquin, Tennessee Gas Pipeline System, Portland Natural Gas Transmission System, Maritimes and Northeast Pipeline System, and Iroquois Gas Transmission System.
 - Existing and proposed LNG facilities that were evaluated in the northeast and Canada included Everett Marine Terminal, Northeast Gateway, Weavers Cove LNG, Quoddy Bay LNG, Downeast LNG, Broadwater Energy LNG, Rabaska LNG, Gros Cacouna LNG, Canaport LNG, Keltic LNG, and Bear Head LNG.
- **Offshore Terminal Concept Design Alternatives** - Neptune considered deepwater port concept designs or technologies in concert with screening of suitable locations within coastal waters of the New England region. Four basic deepwater port concept designs that have been developed by the LNG industry and are currently considered commercially available for use as an offshore LNG import terminal were considered: (1) gravity-based structure (GBS), (2) platform-based unit, (3) floating storage and regasification unit

(FSRU), and (4) shuttle and regasification vessel (SRV). All four terminal concepts include use of subsea natural gas pipelines.

- New LNG Terminal Site Alternatives – Onshore and offshore terminal alternatives were considered and evaluated based on evaluation criteria.
 - Onshore locations in the central New England area (Rhode Island to New Hampshire) that could feasibly meet project objectives were considered.
 - Neptune used a phased process to identify and evaluate potential locations for an offshore LNG import terminal considering the opportunities and constraints posed by each deepwater port concept design available. Three terminal locations were considered: Northern, Central, and Southern terminal alternatives.

Neptune LNG is evaluating several mitigation measures, including construction timing, installation methods, and compensation for loss of use.

Attachment A provides details on the project description.