

**Islander East Pipeline (IEP) Project
Multi-Agency Meeting Notes
(Attendance List Attached)
April 15, 2003**

Opening remarks from Gene Muhlherr (IEP) noted that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the engineered backfill plan and to reach consensus that the IEP methods to minimize environmental impacts addressed the Federal and state agencies environmental concerns about the project. Gene concluded that sufficient information has been developed and presented to allow the regulating agencies to move forward in processing Islander East's permits.

The engineered backfill plan was outlined by Joe Reinemann (IEP). Mike Ludwig (NMFS) and Jim Citak (Bureau of Aquaculture -"BOA") stated that sand scour could be a concern and they felt that Islander East should evaluate the grain size of the sand and its susceptibility to erode. George Whisker (OLISP) stated that the sand coarseness and habitat restoration were a concern. Joe (IEP) indicated that Islander East evaluated the option of returning excavated spoil to the trench, but dismissed it for the following reasons:

- Would result in a second pass of the spoil in the water column;
- Would result in requiring the spoil be stored for a period of weeks; and
- Would result in uneven seafloor contours for a short period of time.

Joe (IEP) stated that replacing the spoil with an engineered backfill such as sand would minimize the environmental impact of pipeline installation. Sue Jacobsen (OLISP) asked Jim (BOA) if clams could live in the sand environment. Jim (BOA) said that clams can live in a variety of habitats. Sue also followed up on a concern raised by John Volk (BOA) regarding the potential for pipeline backfill to create a predator environment. It was agreed that the sand habitat did not create a predatory environment, but that rock could create such habitat. As the meeting participants discussed marine installation, Peter Francis (OLISP) and Jim (BOA) accepted an offer by Mike (NOAA) to provide them with photos of a subsea plow.

ACTION ITEMS:

- IEP will review the Hjulstrom and Reynolds published data on sand weight and prepare information for the agencies on the potential for sand scour over its dredge section pipeline and how to prevent it.
- Mike (NMFS) will provide subsea plow photos to CTDEP and BOA.

Mike (NMFS) stated that in his opinion, he could not move forward on the project as he felt that the CTDEP and the COE had outstanding concerns about the route. To date, he feels IEP has presented construction installation modifications that could be applied to any project alignment. Gene explained that for the CTDEP the route in the modified 401 WQ application was the route that the CTDEP was reviewing, and he had been assured by Betsey Wingfield (OLISP) and Charlie Evans (OLISP) that the route certificated by FERC and presented in our applications was the only route CTDEP was reviewing. Peter (OLISP) and Sue (OLISP) expressed concern that they had not heard

this and the comment letter will include a request for alternative route data such as the landfall in Guilford. Mike (NMFS) also mentioned he felt the landfall in Guilford was a alternative route. Gene (IEP) explained that the CTDEP had not identified the route as a concern to date and the CZM denial had identified only impacts of the proposed route: water quality, sedimentation, benthic impact and water dependent use. Joanne Wachholder (FERC) stated that, as the lead federal agency in determining the location of interstate natural gas pipelines, the IEP route alternatives were evaluated and the final route had been determined. She recommended that OLISP staff review the FERC Order on Rehearing dated January 17, 2003. The discussion concluded with Peter (OLISP) stating he would go back to Charlie (OLISP) to discuss if the CTDEP was still evaluating route alternatives.

Sue (OLISP) asked about "Option A, B and C routes that were described in Islander East's application materials". Joe (IEP) identified the general locations of these route options on a map of the Connecticut nearshore area, and provided background on why those routes alternatives were not determined to be preferable to the certificated Islander East offshore route. Joanne (FERC) commented that these offshore route alternatives were discussed in the project's DEIS and FEIS.

ACTION ITEM:

- Peter (CTDEP) will speak with Charlie (OLISP) regarding evaluating the route alignment and get back to Joe (IEP).

The meeting wrapped up with the following items discussed:

- Joe (IEP) identified pre- and post-construction monitoring as the next issue IEP will be soliciting input from the agencies. Joe (IEP) proposed that IEP send out a draft construction and post construction monitoring plan and then a meeting date will be set to discuss the plan.
- Peter (OLISP) stated that the CTDEP comment and fee letter was being routed for review and final comments within the agency. IEP could possibly expect the letter on Monday April 21, as Friday April 18 is a holiday.
- Mike (NMFS) asked if updates on the permitting status, either through e-mail or phone calls, could be completed to keep the agencies updated on the progress of permitting. It was agreed that IEP would keep the Federal and state agencies informed on permitting progress.

**Attendance List
April 15, 2003**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Telephone Number</u>
Joanne Wachholder *	FERC	(202) 502-8056*
Sue Jacobson	CTDEP/OLISP	(860) 424-3034
Peter Francis	CTDEP/OLISP	(860) 424-3034
George Wisker	CTDEP/OLISP	(860) 424-3034
David Caroy	CTDA/BOA	(203) 874-0696
James Citak	CTDA/BOA	(203) 874-0696
Michael Ludwig	NOAA/NMFS	(203) 882-6504
Gene Muhlherr	Islander East	(617) 694-0772
Joe Reinemann	Islander East	(203) 488-1800
Elizabeth Dolezal	Islander East/NRG	(612) 347-7866
Jim Elgin	Islander East/PCS	(504) 220-3738

Attended by teleconference.