

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs ■ MEPA Office

ENF Environmental Notification Form

For Office Use Only
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs

EOEA No.: **13473**
 MEPA Analyst: **Rick Bourré**
 Phone: 617-626- **1130**

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: Northeast Gateway Energy Bridge Deepwater Port Project (Northeast Gateway Deepwater Port, Port or Project)		
Street: The Port is located approximately 13 miles southeast of Gloucester, Massachusetts in Federal waters		
Municipality: N/A	Watershed: N/A	
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: UTM Zone 19 North X= 368135.44550 Y= 4695022.52501	Latitude: 70.60219	Longitude: 42.39631
Estimated commencement date: November 2006	Estimated completion date: First half of 2007	
Approximate cost: \$240,000,000	Status of project design: 10 %complete	
Proponent: Northeast Gateway Energy Bridge, L.L.C. (Northeast Gateway)		
Street: 1330 Lake Robbins Drive, Suite 270		
Municipality: The Woodlands	State: TX	Zip Code: 77380
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Aileen Giovanello		
Firm/Agency: Tetra Tech EC, Inc	Street: 133 Federal Street – 6th Floor	
Municipality: Boston	State: MA	Zip Code 02110
Phone: 617-457-8236	Fax: 617-457-8499	E-mail: Aileen.Giovanello@tteci.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): N/A

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 Attachment A

Which ENF or EIR review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03):
Northeast Gateway is voluntarily undertaking MEPA Review

- Land
- Water
- Energy
- ACEC

- Rare Species
- Wastewater
- Air
- Regulations

- Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands
- Transportation
- Solid & Hazardous Waste
- Historical & Archaeological Resources

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits & Approvals
LAND				<input type="checkbox"/> Order of Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Superseding Order of Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Chapter 91 License <input 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 (including Legislative Approvals) – Specify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CZM Federal Consistency Certification • Federal Deepwater Port Act :Governor of Massachusetts approval
Total site acreage	Acres of seafloor disturbed during construction: 42 Acres of seafloor permanently occupied: .44 Acres of seafloor intermittently disturbed during operation: 42 Acres of seafloor in No Anchor Area:			
New acres of land altered		See above		
Acres of impervious area	None	None	None	
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		None		
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		See above		
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		None		

STRUCTURES			
Gross square footage	None	None	None
Number of housing units	None	None	None
Maximum height (in feet)	None	None	None
TRANSPORTATION			
Vehicle trips per day	None	None	None
Parking spaces	None	None	None
WATER/WASTEWATER			
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	seawater	Gallons of water used by EBRV for ROUTINE ship operations while at buoy: 54 MGD NOT FOR LNG WARMING Ballast water intake during 7 days at Port 13.8 MGs	Gallons of water used by EBRV for ROUTINE ship operations while at buoy: 54 MGD NOT FOR LNG WARMING Ballast water intake during 7 days at Port 13.8 MGs
GPD water withdrawal		See above	See above
GPD wastewater generation/treatment		Gallons of wastewater generated by EBRV for normal ship operations while at buoy: 3,170	Gallons of wastewater generated by EBRV for normal ship operations while at buoy: 3,170
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

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?

Thresholds / Impacts

Yes (Specify) No

Research indicates there are documented shipwreck sites in the general project area. Precise locations are in the process of being identified.

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

Yes (Specify) No

Unknown at this time

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.)

(a) The purpose of the Northeast Gateway Deepwater Port Project is to provide a reliable supply of clean-burning natural gas through a portal into the natural gas transmission system for Massachusetts and New England that minimizes environmental impacts, mitigates safety concerns, and increases energy diversity for the onshore infrastructure and the communities that it serves. Studies have confirmed the need for new gas supplies and delivery infrastructure. Section 1 of Attachment D describes how the Project will meet that need.

Northeast Gateway is proposing to construct, own and operate the Port to import liquefied natural gas (LNG) into the New England region. A detailed Project description is contained in Section 3 of Attachment D. The Port, which will be located in Massachusetts Bay, will consist of a submerged buoy system to dock LNG carriers approximately 13 miles offshore in federal waters 250-270 feet in depth. This facility will deliver regasified LNG to onshore markets via pipeline facilities (Pipeline Lateral) owned and operated by Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC (Algonquin). Algonquin will build and operate the Pipeline Lateral to interconnect the Port to Algonquin's existing offshore pipeline system (HubLine). The proposed Pipeline Lateral is described in a separate ENF submitted by Algonquin concurrent with this form.

(b) Northeast Gateway evaluated a range of alternatives in light of the purpose and objectives for the Port (see Section 1 of the Project Narrative – Attachment D). Potential impacts of these alternatives are described in Section 2 of Attachment D. Alternatives considered include those listed below.

No Action Alternative

The alternative of not undertaking the Port (*i.e.* the “No Action Alternative”) was considered.

Non-Gas Energy Alternatives

Other feasible non-gas alternate means of meeting energy demand in New England were explored and a comparison of these alternatives against the proposed Port was conducted. These alternatives include electric generation using other fossil fuels or renewables as well as energy conservation.

Existing LNG Alternatives

Existing LNG import terminals operating in the US that could feasibly meet, in part, the project objectives were considered, with a focus on the Cove Point and Everett LNG Terminals.

Proposed LNG Alternatives

Proposed LNG import projects (six US projects and five Canadian projects) in various stages of permitting and development in the Northeast US and eastern Canada that could feasibly satisfy, at least in part, the

stated Port objectives were evaluated.

Pipeline System Alternatives

Existing natural gas pipeline systems with the ability, with or without expansions, to bring new sources of natural gas supply directly to Massachusetts and New England were studied. Each was evaluated against the Project objectives. These systems include the existing pipeline systems of Algonquin, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, Iroquois Gas Transmission System, Maritimes & Northeast Pipeline, L.L.C., and Portland Natural Gas Transmission System.

Alternative Offshore LNG Technologies

Offshore technologies for coastal facilities with the ability to import LNG into the United States were reviewed. These technologies include Gravity Based Structures (GBS), Floating Storage and Regasification Units (FSRU), Existing Platform Conversions, a shuttle regasification vessel technology proposed by Tractebel using a similar technology to the Energy Bridge™ system proposed by Northeast Gateway.

Deepwater Port Site in the Northeast

Northeast coastal locations for the deepwater port were evaluated and narrowed down to a coastal region extending from New Hampshire to Rhode Island. Ocean locations and sites off the Massachusetts and New Hampshire coastline were evaluated for potential deepwater port sites.

Deepwater Port Sites in Massachusetts Bay

Alternate Port locations in Massachusetts Bay southeast of Gloucester were evaluated to find the best deepwater port site.

(c) Mitigation measures currently being evaluated include construction timing, installation methods, and compensation for loss of use.

LAND SECTION – all proponents must fill out this section

I. Thresholds / Permits

A. Does the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to land (see 301 CMR 11.03(1))
 Yes No; if yes, specify each threshold:

The Port will be located entirely in Federal waters. No land will be affected.

II. Impacts and Permits

A. Describe, in acres, the current and proposed character of the project site, as follows:

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
Footprint of buildings	N/A	N/A	N/A
Roadways, parking, and other paved areas	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other altered areas (describe)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Undeveloped areas	N/A	N/A	N/A

B. Has any part of the project site been in active agricultural use in the last three years?
 Yes No; if yes, how many acres of land in agricultural use (with agricultural soils) will be converted to nonagricultural use?

C. Is any part of the project site currently or proposed to be in active forestry use?
 Yes No; if yes, please describe current and proposed forestry activities and indicate whether any part of the site is the subject of a DEM-approved forest management plan:

D. Does any part of the project involve conversion of land held for natural resources purposes in accordance with Article 97 of the Amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth to any purpose not in accordance with Article 97? Yes No; if yes, describe:

E. Is any part of the project site currently subject to a conservation restriction, preservation