

Corrib Onshore Pipeline

DRAFT High Level Evaluation of Alternative Pipeline Routes (Landfall to Gas Processing Terminal) - 'Reduced Route Evaluation Matrix'

Sheet 5

4th January, 2008

| | |
|-----------|-------------|
| Preferred | Constraints |
|-----------|-------------|

| | | Environmental Constraint on this Route (Priority Habitat) | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Rossport |
|---------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| High Level Criteria | | Route A | Route A1 | Route B | Route C | Route C1 | APPROVED ROUTE |
| | Length of Pipeline - downstream of landfall valve | 10.6km | 10.31km | 8.3km | 8.2km | 9.13km | 8.9Km |
| | Distance from dwellings (over entire onshore pipeline) | 2No. Unoccupied dwellings must be acquired to achieve >100m separation distance on this route. | 2No. Unoccupied dwellings must be acquired to achieve >100m separation distance on this route. | >100m | >100m | 2No. Unoccupied dwellings must be acquired to achieve >100m separation distance on this route. | 70m |
| | Level of landowner agreement with corridor / Route (excluding commonage shareholders) | Substantial agreement expected. Possible CAO requirement. | Substantial agreement expected. Possible CAO requirement (see comments below). | Documented objection. | All landowners agreed previously on sections of consented route. Possible CAO requirement. This corridor may not require any new landowner consent. | Substantial agreement expected. Possible CAO requirement. | Documented & Unresolved Landowner Opposition. |
| | Agreement from Commonage Shareholders | Unknown. Probability of objection from some share holders. | Unknown. Probability of objection from some share holders. | No commonage | No commonage | Unknown. Probability of objection from some share holders. | Unknown. Probability of objection from some share holders. |
| | Stated objectives for modifying the pipeline route (Cassells Report) | Meets expectations on increased proximity to housing. | Meets expectations on increased proximity to housing. | Meets expectations on increased proximity to housing but involves another community. | Generally exceeds expectations on increased proximity to housing. | Meets expectations on increased proximity to housing. | N/A |
| | Predicted Adverse Impact on Integrity of the SAC & SPA/Ramsar | Low/Medium | Low | Low | Low/Medium | Low | Low |
| | Predicted adverse impact on the integrity of the site. (SAC) | Slight to Moderate (SAC 500 Glenamoy Bog Complex) | Slight (SAC 500 Glenamoy Bog Complex) | Potential (SAC 476 Carrowmore Lake Complex) - in event of run off into Lake via Aghoos River | Slight to Moderate (SAC 500 Glenamoy Bog Complex) | Slight (SAC 500 Glenamoy Bog Complex) | Slight (SAC 500 Glenamoy Bog Complex) |
| | Risk of delay to project due to lengthy statutory process | High | Low/Medium | Medium | High | Medium | N/A |
| | Impact on Project Programme (Construction phase, excluding third party interference) | Medium | Low/Medium | Medium | High. Potential delays due to slow construction and seasonal constraints. | Medium | Low/Medium |
| | Additional Capital costs | Low/Medium | Low | Medium | High | Medium | N/A |

Comments

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Route A | Not preferred mainly due to environmental constraint (approximately 1km of intact blanket bog with bog pools. (Priority Habitat)). Other viable alternatives exist. |
| Route A1 | Potential constraint (approximately 140m crosses land belonging to documented objector). More direct alternatives exist. |
| Route B | Documented objection on this route. Route involves another local community which could lead to further division in the area. This route may be beyond scope of Cassells Recommendations. Other acceptable routes meeting these recommendations exist. |
| Route C | Not preferred for environmental, technical, cost and programme reasons. Other more appropriate alternatives exist. |
| Route C1 | Preferred route as it is acceptable under all criteria including landowner issues. |