SECTION 6.0 A DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT





TABLE OF CONTENTS

			PAGE
6.0	A DI	ESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT	6-1
	6.1	THE DO-NOTHING ALTERNATIVE	6-1
	6.2	ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS	6-1

September 2013 Page i



6.0 A DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

6.1 The Do-Nothing Alternative

The Project design is to move surplus natural gas from North America to overseas markets. Currently, there is just one practical and economically feasible approach to this gas export and that is by marine transport of LNG. As such, the only alternative to this undertaking is to not realize the Project at all (often referred to as the "Do-Nothing Alternative"). Implementing the Project as proposed would be associated with some adverse environmental effects, but significant adverse effects are not likely to occur. This is described in Section 10.0 of this EA Report. The Project realization is also expected to provide for extensive and lasting economic benefits as detailed in Section 10.13 of this Report. Without the Project, neither the adverse effects nor the extensive economic benefits would be realized.

6.2 Alternative Locations

Due to the above, the only reasonable alternative to the Project development in Goldboro was the development of the LNG facility in another location. To be economically feasible, the Project had to be in a location with existing pipeline infrastructure, a deep water port relatively close to markets, safe navigational access, and compatible land use (ideally a site zoned for industrial/marine terminal use). These criteria effectively narrow the potential areas to New Brunswick (NB) and NS. Locations in the Northeast US were categorically ruled out as the pipeline access is generally not adequate and represents the single most important siting criterion since planning and regulatory approval processes for new pipelines would not facilitate the required timely Project implementation. Considering the location of the M&NP pipeline system and available land that is potentially suitable, a number of possible alternative locations exist in the Maritime region. These are discussed below.

As stated above, the two most important criteria for site selection were a coastal area suitable for a tanker terminal and nearby access to a natural gas pipeline system. Two other major factors were suitability of the potential location(s) for short development timeline and for maximizing benefits to the Project and the community. Four potential locations were seriously considered including:

- Bear Head (Sunnyside, NS);
- Canaport (Saint John, NB);
- Goldboro Industrial Park (Goldboro, NS); and
- Melford Industrial Park (Middle Melford, NS).

All of these locations have only minor variations in access to the coast, but have varying access to the natural gas pipeline system. Among these, Goldboro stands out compared to the other locations in that the property was already subject to an extensive EA for a large industrial proposal with very similar LNG terminal, wharf and tank storage components (the Keltic Project), which was approved by both provincial and federal regulators. This meant that there would be an abundance of existing study data for the site and that the local government and non-government organizations and the general population were already somewhat familiar with

September 2013 Page 6-1



the nature of LNG liquefaction and transportation. Therefore, by selecting this site, much time and effort could be saved in the crucial planning and permitting stage of the Project which would contribute significantly in meeting the proposed short timeline for Project development.

In addition, since the nature of the Project would be very similar (if generally somewhat smaller) than the previously assessed Keltic Project, it was reasonable to assume that the environmental impacts would generally be less and therefore would also be acceptable. This would not necessarily be true at any other potential location.

Finally, Pieridae considers the potential of economic benefits for the region to be well placed relative to the slow decline which has been experienced in recent decades. This opinion has been well supported by public comments received during the course of the assessment.

In this regard, Goldboro, NS, is the location that best meets both the needs of the Project, and minimises potential negative environmental impacts while offering significant economic benefits to a supportive local and regional community.

September 2013 Page 6-2