

**Corrib Onshore Pipeline**  
**DRAFT Evaluation of Alternative Pipeline Routes (Landfall to Gas Processing Terminal) - Sheet 3**

26th November, 2007

	Preferred	Constraints				
	Environmental Constraint on this Route (Priority Habitat)	1	3	4	5	Rosspoint
Technical Criteria	Route A	Route A1	Route B	Route C	Route C1	APPROVED ROUTE
<b>1 Safety</b>						
Risk to people and community during operation	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Risk of disturbance e.g. by third parties	Low	Low	Low	Minimal	Low	Low
Construction Safety Risk including offshore approaches and landfall	Low	Low	Low to medium. Longer section in estuarine areas (approximately 1.4km).	Low to medium. Longer section in estuarine areas (Approximately 4km).	Low to medium. Longer section in estuarine areas (approximately 1km).	Low
<b>2 Design</b>						
Length of Pipeline - downstream of landfall valve	10.6km	10.31km	8.3km	8.2km	8.64km	8.9Km
Approximate additional length to currently approved Off-shore pipeline	0km	0km	0km	0km	0km	0km
Pipeline flow assurance issues	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable
Offshore pipeline routing risk	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	N/A
Offshore pipeline permitting risk	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	N/A
Risk of incompatibility with approved off-shore pipeline design/alignment	None	None	None	None	None	N/A
Suitability of landfall valve location	High	High	High	High	High	High
<b>3 Construction</b>						
Risk of Construction Difficulties	High. Mainly land based including construction in deep bog with bog pools. Two short water course crossings.	Low. Mainly land based including construction in bog. Two short water course crossings.	Medium. One relatively long crossing of Bay. Section traversing bay technically challenging	Medium/High. Long section traversing bay technically challenging	Medium. Mainly land based including construction in bog. One relatively long crossing of Bay. Section traversing bay technically challenging.	Low. Mainly land based. Two short water course crossings.
Complexity of construction methodology	Low. Generally conventional construction with short crossings of Sruwaddacon Bay and rivers.	Low. Generally conventional construction with short crossings of Sruwaddacon Bay and rivers.	Medium. Specialist (trenchless option) crossing of Sruwaddacon Bay (approximately 1km).	High. Specialist (trenchless option) long crossing of Sruwaddacon Bay (approximately 4km).	Medium. Specialist (trenchless option) crossing of Sruwaddacon Bay (approximately 1km).	Low. Generally conventional construction with short crossings of Sruwaddacon Bay and rivers.
Ease of access for construction	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
<b>4 GROUND CONDITIONS</b>						
Risk of landslides / peat slides and sandbank movements (with mitigation)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
<b>Community Criteria</b>						
<b>5 Proximity</b>						
Distance from dwellings (over entire onshore pipeline)	74m. One dwelling must be acquired to achieve >100m separation distance on this route. This dwelling is currently 74m from pipeline route. Dwelling to east is >100m from pipeline route.	74m. One dwelling must be acquired to achieve >100m separation distance on this route. This dwelling is currently 74m from pipeline route. Dwelling to east is >100m from pipeline route.	>100m	>100m	74m. One dwelling must be acquired to achieve >100m separation distance on this route. This dwelling is currently 74m from pipeline route.	70m
<b>6 Planning / Land Use</b>						
Impact on development potential	Low	Low	Low	Minimal	Low	Low
Temporary impacts on land use	Low	Low	Low to medium.	Low	Low	Low
Permanent Impacts on land use	Low/Medium. Turbery rights affected.	Low/Medium. Turbery rights affected.	Low	Minimal	Low/Medium.	Low/Medium. Turbery rights affected close to roadside.
<b>7 Landowner Consent</b>						
Level of landowner agreement with corridor / Route (excluding commonage shareholders)	Substantial agreement expected. Possible CAO requirement.	Substantial agreement expected. Possible CAO requirement.	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.
<b>8 Number of Affected Landowners</b>						
Number of landowners involved directly	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Number of commonage shares involved directly	High	High	None	None	High	High
<b>9 Number of Affected Residents</b>						
Population Density (as per IS 328)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Level of compliance with recommendations of 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
<b>10 Predicted Impacts on Human Beings during Construction</b>						
Air Quality	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary
Drinking Water	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary
Noise	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary
Vibration	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary
Traffic	High & temporary	High & temporary	High & temporary	High & temporary	High & temporary	High & temporary
Access to private property	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary
Access to public areas and amenities	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary
Negative economic impacts e.g. tourism, fishing	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary	Low & temporary
<b>Environmental Criteria</b>						
<b>11 Impacts on Habitats and Wildlife</b>						
Annex I Habitats (within SAC)	Atlantic salt meadows (Saltmarsh), Blanket Bog and Depressions on peat (Rhynchosporion), Estuaries & sandflats not covered by seawater at low-tide.	Atlantic salt meadows (Saltmarsh), Blanket Bog and Depressions on peat (Rhynchosporion), Estuaries & sandflats not covered by seawater at low-tide.	Atlantic salt meadows (Saltmarsh), Estuaries & sandflats not covered by seawater at low-tide.	Atlantic salt meadows (Saltmarsh), Estuaries & sandflats not covered by seawater at low-tide.	Atlantic salt meadows (Saltmarsh), Blanket Bog and Depressions on peat (Rhynchosporion), Estuaries & sandflats not covered by seawater at low-tide.	Atlantic salt meadows (Saltmarsh), Blanket Bog and Depressions on peat (Rhynchosporion), Estuaries & sandflats not covered by seawater at low-tide.
Annex I *Priority Habitat (within designated areas)	*Intact Blanket Bog (c.1km)	*Intact Blanket Bog (c. 950m)	None	None	*Intact Blanket Bog (c. 150m)	*Intact blanket bog (c. 500m)
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)
Predicted adverse impact on the integrity of the site as a whole (SPA and Ramsar site)	None	None	None	None	None	None
Potential to impact on Protected Flora	Slight to Moderate (Blanket bog species)	Slight (Blanket bog species)	None expected	None expected	Slight	Slight
Potential to impact on Marine Fauna	Salmonids: None Marine Inverts: imperceptible temporary	Salmonids: None Marine Inverts: imperceptible temporary	Salmonids: None Marine Inverts: imperceptible temporary	Salmonids: None Marine Inverts: imperceptible temporary	Salmonids: None Marine Inverts: imperceptible temporary	Salmonids: None Marine Inverts: imperceptible temporary
<b>12 Archaeology, Culture &amp; Local Heritage</b>						
Recorded Monuments and Place Sites within 100m	None	None	None	None	None	None
Features of Archaeological Potential within 100m	Four	Three	Three	One	Two	One
Architectural Heritage Constraints**	No protected structures	No protected structures	No protected structures	No protected structures	No protected structures	No protected structures
Potential for Cultural Heritage Constraints**	Field & townland boundaries, past mining remains	Field & townland boundaries, past mining remains	Field & townland boundaries, past mining remains	Field & townland boundaries, past mining remains	Field & townland boundaries, past mining remains	Field & townland boundaries, past mining remains
<b>13 Other / General Criteria</b>						
Potential Visual Impacts - Pipeline Construction	Temporary Impact during construction phase only.	Temporary Impact during construction phase only.	Temporary Impact during construction phase only.	Temporary Impact during construction phase only.	Temporary Impact during construction phase only.	Temporary Impact during construction phase only.
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
Schedule induced additional costs	N/A	N/A	N/A	Likely	N/A	N/A

Notes:

Route evaluation is an ongoing process. Comments and colours on this spreadsheet may change as routes are further defined.

Routes A, B and C are centrelines of Corridors A, B and C evaluated for short-listing. All routes evaluated here are taken to be of wayleave width (approximately 40 - 60m wide)

Criteria that are no longer relevant to this stage of the Route Development Process have been omitted for greater clarity