



STATE OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
41 STATE STREET
ALBANY, NY 12231-0001

GEORGE E. PATAKI
GOVERNOR

RANDY A. DANIELS
SECRETARY OF STATE

October 18, 2002

Mary G. Holt, Esq.
Attorney-Advisor
National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration
U.S. Department of Commerce
1305 East-West Highway, Room 6111
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

RE: Federal Consistency Appeal by Millennium Pipeline Company From an
Objection by the New York Department of State

Dear Ms. Holt:

The table of contents attached to the front of the initial brief of the New York Department of State contained typographical errors, in that it did not track exactly the main headings in the argument portion of the brief. Please find enclosed a corrected table of contents. My apologies for the inconvenience.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Glen Bruening
General Counsel

Enclosure

cc: w/enclosure:
Frederic G. Berner, Jr., Esq.
Mark P. McIntyre, Esq.
Neil L. Levy, Esq.
Daniel Riesel, Esq.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION**

**Federal Consistency Appeal
by Millennium Pipeline Company
From an Objection by the
New York Department of State**

**Initial Brief and
Supporting Information and Data
of the New York Department of State**

New York Department of State
41 State Street
Albany, New York 12231
(518) 474-6740

William L. Sharp
Principal Attorney

Glen T. Bruening
General Counsel

October 16, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT ..

ARGUMENT

I.	THE DOS OBJECTION WAS TIMELY BECAUSE IT WAS RENDERED WITHIN THE TIME PERIOD AGREED UPON BY DOS AND MILLENNIUM	2
A.	The Six-month Review Period Commenced on March 12, 2001 ..	3
B.	DOS and Millennium Agreed To Extend the Six-month Review Period	5
C.	DOS Did Not Exceed the Review Period Under the Agreement Because Significant Project Changes Were Identified	9
D.	The DOS Objection Was Made At the Earliest Practicable Time After Receipt of the Necessary Information	12
II.	ALTERNATIVELY, THE SIX-MONTH REVIEW PERIOD EXPIRES ON OCTOBER 23, 2002 AND THEREFORE THE DOS OBJECTION WAS TIMELY	15
III.	ALTERNATIVELY, THE MILLENNIUM PROJECT WAS FOUND INCONSISTENT ON DECEMBER 14, 2001 AND THE APPEAL BY MILLENNIUM IS NOW UNTIMELY	15
IV.	ALTERNATIVELY, MILLENNIUM WITHDREW ITS CONSISTENCY CERTIFICATION ON MAY 9, 2002	17
V.	MILLENNIUM IS ESTOPPED FROM ASSERTING THAT ANY APPLICABLE SIX-MONTH REVIEW PERIOD HAS EXPIRED	18
VI.	DOS PROPERLY CONSIDERED THE POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THE PIPELINE TO THE BRYN MAWR SIPHON BECAUSE THE ENTIRE PIPELINE ROUTE, AS IT AFFECTS THE COASTAL AREA, IS SUBJECT TO REVIEW AND, MORE PARTICULARLY, BECAUSE AN IMPACT TO THE SIPHON MAY IMPACT OTHER AREAS IN THE COASTAL ZONE	23

MILLENNIUM'S APPEAL SHOULD BE DISMISSED BECAUSE THE PROJECT IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE OBJECTIVES OR PURPOSES OF THE ACT 27
A. The Millennium Pipeline Does Not Further any of the Objectives of the CZMA in a Significant or Substantial Manner	28
B. Any National Interest Furthered by the Activity Does Not Outweigh the Activity's Adverse Coastal Effects, When Those Effects Are Considered Separately or Cumulatively	44
C. Reasonable Alternatives Are Available Which Would Permit the Project to be Consistent with the Enforceable Policies of the Coastal Management Program	83
THE MILLENNIUM PIPELINE IS NOT NECESSARY IN THE INTEREST OF NATIONAL SECURITY	107
CONCLUSION	109