

survey, production records). Each gallery's length and span at proposed ultimate capacity must be shown on the map. The distance, in feet, between proposed ultimate cavern outlines and other caverns/galleries in the field must be shown (i.e., remaining pillar thicknesses). These determinations must take into account any additional solution mining that may occur as a result of brine production at the US Salt LLC operation. For proposed storage Galleries 1 and 2, all current and past sonar surveys (outermost outline) must be included on the plan view. The Department has previously run sonar survey information (excluding the 2009 surveys) in its files as follows: Well Nos. 34, 43 & 44 – 1997, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2004 and Well No. 30 – 1997. Finger Lakes may submit as many maps as needed to clearly display the requested information, however; all sonar survey outlines should be shown and appropriately labeled on a single map.

*See italics on next page for remaining issues.*

For the portion of the cavern outline currently shown on the map due west of Well No. 34, it is the Department's understanding that this linear feature would be re-evaluated prior to submission of this storage application because the sonar for Well No. 34 does not show such a feature. Rather, the linear feature shown is from Well No. 44's sonar. This issue with the map for the facility was discussed during our field visit in May 2009. Please explain why the linear feature was retained or correct this portion of the cavern outline.

*Above issue satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA (Page 4 and Exhibit D).*

In addition, for wells with directional surveys, wellhead and production casing shoe locations must be clarified on Finger Lakes' map or maps. In addition to any symbol used to denote casing shoe locations, wellhead symbols (e.g., 33, 43, 34, 44, new wells) must also be included in a legend.

The relative closeness of the gallery (Well Nos. 18, 5552, 57, aka International Gallery 10) immediately to the north of proposed storage Gallery 1 is of potential concern to the Department. For each of the three wells identified in the gallery, provide a well diagram showing the depth of top of salt, existing casing, mechanical plugs and cement. Please provide any additional information Finger Lakes may have to show that no interconnection between the noted galleries currently exists or will be formed during operation of the proposed project or if such a connection is made, that International Gallery 10 would adequately contain LPG stored in Gallery 1. Inadvertent communication between Finger Lakes Gallery 1 and International Gallery 10 could provide a possible route of escape for stored product at some future date after Gallery 1 is activated. In addition, do directional surveys exist for the identified wells (Well Nos. 18, 5552, 57)? Finger Lakes facility map shows a current pillar thickness between the galleries of approximately 70 feet. Is any pressure testing of International Gallery 10 contemplated? The Department may require re-entry and hydrostatic pressure testing of International Gallery 10 (along with full complement of directional survey, sonar survey, nitrogen/brine interface MIT on re-entered well) upon receipt and evaluation of Finger Lakes' response to this NOIA.

*See italics on next page for remaining issues.*

**The following issues remain and must be addressed concerning Finger Lakes' Exhibit 2 "Finger Lakes LPG Storage Gallery Map" and related topics:**

1. Please label "Finger Lakes Gallery 1" and "Finger Lakes Gallery 2" on the gallery map.
2. Please add and show the cavern outline from the most recent sonar (i.e., October 2009) of Well No. 58 (Gallery 2) on the gallery map.
3. If the purple outlines (Max Gallery Outline) of the caverns forming Gallery 1 also represent the current outlines of the gallery, they should be identified on the map as such on the gallery map.
4. The data table on the left side of the gallery map should be updated to reflect current information for Well Nos. 34 & 58.
5. The "Brinefield Color Code" on the gallery map shows a "red" cross for the "Top of Cavern" but this symbol is not used on the map, please correct color code or the map itself.
6. For all wells on the gallery map, please include a legend which explains the different symbols used to show well status.
7. "Well FL1" should be identified as a proposed well on the gallery map.
8. Explain why two different symbols are used on the gallery map to show the pressure connections between the caverns in Gallery 1 (i.e., between Well Nos. 33 & 43 and Well Nos. 43 & 34/44).
9. Explain why the revised gallery map shows the pillar width between Gallery 1 and International Gallery 10 more than doubled (increased from approximately 70' to 165.9') compared to the plan view map previously provided in the October 13, 2009 application.
  - a. Describe how the outline for Gallery 10 was determined and provide all supporting information. Provide a copy of all sonar surveys and production records for all wells in Gallery 10 as the notation on the map indicates the gallery outline was determined by "Sonar & Production Records." Additionally, Exhibit C of the May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA should be corrected to include the referenced sonar(s) unless none actually exist. If none exist, correct notation on map.
  - b. Page 9 of the May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report states "there was no pressure encountered on well 52..." In other parts of the application (i.e., Gallery 1 & Gallery 2), Finger Lakes says that encountered pressure during well re-entry is an indication of tightness for the proposed storage galleries. Conversely, is "no pressure encountered" an indicator of Gallery 10 not being tight?
  - c. Finger Lakes indicates that it could not obtain a cavern sonar survey on Well No. 52 because the casing extending through the cavern is surrounded by cement. Was any consideration given to cutting the casing and attempting to re-sonar? If "no," why not? If dropping the casing in Well No. 52 and re-sonaring is not doable, has Finger Lakes considered re-entering another well in the gallery (i.e., 18 or 57) to perform a sonar survey? Based on information supplied thus far by Finger Lakes, it appears there is still some uncertainty with regard to the actual pillar width between proposed storage Gallery 1 and Gallery 10. The Department is aware that Finger Lakes' parent Inergy Midstream, LLC applied for and received well re-entry permits for Well Nos. 18 & 57 in January 2010 but let the well permits recently expire before

*commencing work. What was the reasoning for obtaining the permits but not using them?*

- d. *The Department understands that Finger Lakes re-entered Well No. 52 to evaluate the well and cavern, and ran a directional survey, bond log, casing inspection log and a sonar survey. Because of the relative closeness of proposed storage Gallery 1 and Gallery 10, and perceived uncertainty of the actual pillar width between Galleries 1 & 10 (see Exhibit 20, Item 6 of "Section 6. Conclusions and Recommendations"), provided Well No. 52 is properly constructed, has Finger Lakes considered running a long-term brine pressure test on Gallery 10 and MIT on the Well No. 52, and then converting Well No. 52 for monitoring use of Gallery 1 storage operations? Ensuring LPG containment in Gallery 10, if inadvertently connected to Gallery 1, should be considered and pros/cons of such evaluated by Finger Lakes.*
- e. *Additionally, the Finite Element Analysis ("FEA") included as Exhibit 20 with Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report discusses the effect of the relatively small pillar between the galleries, and states "This implies some micro-cracks and fissures might have been induced in the pillars during the brine storage. This is due to the relatively large 34/44 LPG gallery compared to small cavern spacing of 166 ft." and "Certain conservative assumptions were made relating to pressure, location and the size of the cavern associated with Gallery 10. Inability to access the gallery for sonar due to well conditions necessitated the use of these worst case assumptions." It is unclear what conservative worst-case assumptions were made in the FEA relative to the location and size of the adjacent cavern (Gallery 10)—please elaborate.*

- d. All faults or other structural or stratigraphic features depicted on the cross-sections described in item 6a below. See Department responses to below Items 6a and 6b.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA (Page 4) and May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Pages 9-11 and Exhibits 15, 16 & 17).*

- e. The proposed location of compressors and other surface equipment, structures, tanks, impoundments (e.g., brine ponds), discharge points, flare stacks and pipelines associated with the proposed storage operations. Satisfactorily addressed by Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 (Maps 1 & 2) of Finger Lakes' storage application.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lake's revised submissions (Exhibits 1 & 2 of May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report).*

- f. Notation of the applicant's surface and mineral rights within the vicinity of the proposed storage area. Such notation must be included with the applicant's storage rights affidavit required in below Item 10.

*Satisfactorily addressed by the revised Storage Rights Affidavit and attachments (Exhibit E of Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA).*

- g. Topographic and cultural features such as roads, railroads, oil or gas pipelines, utility rights-of-way, surface waters, springs, public and private water supplies, buildings or

dwellings, agricultural districts, significant landmarks and any other public area which may be used as a place of occupancy, resort, assembly, lodging, manufacture, storage or traffic. Satisfactorily addressed by Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 (Maps 1 & 2) of Finger Lakes' storage application.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lake's revised submissions (Exhibits 1 & 2 of May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report).*

6. **Reservoir Suitability Report** - This report must document suitability of the reservoir for storage. The report must include a cavern development plan & geomechanical (including finite element analysis) study including and analyzing, but not necessarily limited to, items listed below. Note that the geomechanical study must use supportable baseline cavern information and a justifiable projection for future cavern growth—existing cavern size(s) and shape(s) must be based on reliable information such as historical cavern development records and recent sonar surveys.

On pages 9 & 10 of the storage application, Finger Lakes indicates that it does not intend to perform any cavern/gallery specific Finite Element Analysis ("FEA") [or Finite Difference Analysis ("FDA")] for proposed LPG storage Galleries 1 and 2, and instead proposes to rely on SLSI's 2002 natural gas storage analysis for Gallery 2. This proposal is not acceptable to the Department, and is fundamentally flawed because the 2002 analysis was performed on a no-growth natural gas storage cavern/gallery. We concur that a natural gas cavern analysis is typically more rigorous than a LPG analysis because of the operating range associated with such operations but Finger Lakes has stated that it anticipates its galleries will grow at a rate of approximately 1-2% annually due to operational solution mining. The Department estimates the caverns will double in capacity in approximately 35 years using an annual operational solution mining growth rate of 2%. We agree with Finger Lakes that future sonar surveying may reveal some cavern capacity being masked by bulking of insolubles forming the rubble pile. However, from a structural perspective, the storage galleries will not be static and will grow over time. Finger Lakes must take this growth into account in its analysis and evaluation of the caverns, and demonstrate stability and containment of LPG over the projected life of the project. Gallery interaction between proposed storage Galleries 1 and 2 must be analyzed over the entire projected life of the facility. A prediction of the time required for each gallery to grow from its existing capacity to proposed ultimate capacity based on individual cavern characteristics and proposed operation of individual wells (i.e., injection, withdrawal) must be included in the required geomechanical analysis. Modeled dimensions must be provided in the required geomechanical analysis. Minimum and maximum operating pressures, including MIT pressures, must be stated and considered in the required geomechanical analysis. A prediction of total subsidence at the end of the operating life of the project must be included.

*See italics on next page for remaining issues.*

In addition, because of the close proximity of New York State Electric and Gas' ("NYSEG") existing natural gas storage operation, the required geomechanical analysis and report must include a gallery interaction study, under all existing and proposed operating and testing conditions, which analyzes currently permitted operations at NYSEG's existing storage cavern and operation of Finger Lakes' proposed LPG storage galleries over the proposed life of the Finger Lakes' facility. A copy of NYSEG's 1995 Underground Storage Permit with allowable operating pressures was previously provided to the applicant. A copy of the gallery interaction study must be provided to Mr. Mark Cole of NYSEG at the same time the interaction study is provided to the Department, and proof of delivery of such to NYSEG must be provided to the Department.

*The pending sale of NYSEG's existing natural gas storage facility to Inergy Midstream, LLC affiliate Arlington Storage Company, LLC makes the conveyance of the gallery interaction study to NYSEG unnecessary. Instead, the gallery interaction study should be shared with appropriate Finger Lakes' personnel. However, if the NYSEG sale does not close, this requirement will be reinstated.*

***The following issues remain and must be addressed concerning Finger Lakes' Finite Element Analysis ("FEA"):***

- 1. The FEA (Exhibit 20) entitled "Finite Element Analysis on 33/44 Gallery, Gallery 10 and Caverns 33 and 34 of Finger Lakes LPG Storage, LLC" does not address proposed storage of LPG in Gallery 2 (Well No. 58). It does not include modeling and analysis of Gallery 2. In support of its application and as previously requested, Finger Lakes must specifically model proposed LPG storage (including MIT) in Gallery 2 and provide the analysis and conclusions to the Department.*
  - 2. The FEA (Exhibit 20) does not include a prediction of ultimate subsidence at proposed LPG storage Gallery 2 (Well No. 58). In support of its application and as previously requested, Finger Lakes must provide a prediction of ultimate subsidence at Gallery 2.*
  - 3. The FEA (Exhibit 20) was performed for a 50-year facility life for the storage of LPG in Gallery 1. If and when issued, please note that the storage permit will be conditioned to expire in 50 years unless Finger Lakes supports a longer facility life.*
- a. Geologic cross-sections of the area shown on the map listed in item 5 showing lithologies, storage wells (including casing strings and setting depths) and overlying and underlying formations, and vertical profiles of the existing and ultimate caverns including all prior sonar surveys. These cross-sections must also depict any faults or other structural or stratigraphic features that affect either continuity and extent of the formations shown or effectiveness of containment of gas in the storage reservoir. Cross-sections of Galleries 1 and 2 are included in Finger Lakes' application as Exhibits 5 and 6 respectively. Some additional cross-sections for Gallery 2 are included in Exhibit 10. However, these cross-sections do not satisfy the Department's informational requirements as previously requested. Finger Lakes may add information to the previously submitted cross-sections or provide focused cross-sections of the proposed storage caverns with the required additional information. All interconnections through rubble piles must be identified on the cross-sections to show communication, where appropriate, within each gallery and storage capacity. A single gallery outline must be provided for both existing and proposed ultimate conditions for Galleries 1 and 2. For Gallery 1, distinct salt and "rock" units and cavern development within such must be identified similar to what was already provided for Gallery 2 (Exhibit 6). However, for both Gallery 1 and 2 cross-sections, the standardized salt unit naming convention ("D, E, F," sequence starts at bottom, see Figure 3-1 of Exhibit 10 and "Stratigraphy of the Upper Silurian Salina Group, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Ontario," Map and Chart Series Number 12, New York State Museum and Science Service, Rickard, 1969.) must be used instead of naming units numerically from top to bottom. The cross-section must include a notation of the method by which the existing outline was determined (e.g., sonar survey, production records). For the purpose of this application (and permit, if and when issued), all water-filled capacity, including any in rubble pile, is considered potential product storage capacity regardless of how deep Finger Lakes intends to set its brine

strings. All current and past sonar surveys (outermost outline) must be included on the cross-sections to facilitate identification of rubble-filled portions of each gallery and cavern growth characteristics. Finger Lakes may submit as many cross-sections as needed to clearly display the requested information, however; all sonar survey outlines should be shown and appropriately labeled on a single cross-section. The Department has previously run sonar survey information (excluding the 2009 surveys) in its files as follows: Well Nos. 34, 43 & 44 – 1997, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2004 and Well No. 30 – 1997. The Department does not have the “8/16/78 Sonar Survey” noted and shown on Exhibit 5—please provide a copy of the referenced 1978 sonar survey. The Department does not have the “July 1978” sonar survey for Well No. 30 noted on page 6 of Exhibit 10 – please provide a copy of the survey. All requested cross-sections must correspond to the map or maps requested in above Item 5.

***The following issues remain and must be addressed concerning Finger Lakes' cross-sections.***

1. *For Exhibit 17 "Vertical Section B-B' (South-North) Well Caverns 31, 33, 43, 34, 44, 52 and 57," no pressure connections are shown in Gallery 1 (i.e., between Well Nos. 33 & 43 and Well Nos. 43 & 34/44)—please include and show the inter-cavern pressure connections on the cross-section (i.e., which correspond to those shown on the plan view).*
2. *Gallery 10 cavern outline(s) must be added to Exhibit 17 "Vertical Section B-B' (South-North) Well Caverns 31, 33, 43, 34, 44, 52 and 57"—please include and show the cavern outline on the cross-section (i.e., which corresponds to that shown on the plan view).*
3. *Also, on the same cross-section mentioned above, is the cavern outline identified by "Well 43 1976 Sonar" open cavern space or rubble filled? Is this space currently accessible? Is this space accounted for in the estimated 5 million barrels of water-filled capacity? It is unclear due to the continuous shale layer above it and minimal caving of the roof represented on the cross-section.*
4. *For Exhibit 17 "Finger Lakes LPG Storage, LLC Structural Cross Section A-A" and "Finger Lakes LPG Storage, LLC Structural Cross Section B-B," there appears to be a typo in that the line designations "A-A" & "B-B" in the title block and labels next to the well logs are swapped and do not correspond to the correct lines. If you concur, please correct and resubmit.*

- b. Discussion of the information illustrated on the cross-sections described above. Any zones or planes of weakness referenced in other published reports (e.g., Jacoby) potentially affecting the suitability of the reservoir for storage must be documented and explained in the Reservoir Suitability Report.

Discussion of the project's regional and local geology and structural features is included on pages 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8 and pages 11 through 15 of Exhibit 10. On page 3, Finger Lakes states "The overlying sediments are characterized by broad, gentle east-west synclines and anticlines with axes generally paralleling the sharp folds of the underlying evaporates." Finger Lakes' discussion on page 8 of its application includes statements from Jacoby and Dellwig that "The structure contour map on top of the salt gives no indication of the faults breaking up into the overlying sediments" and that the "zones or planes of weakness" referenced in the same paper are confined to the salt section. For proposed storage Gallery 1, while general statements are made regarding the continuity of the Camillus Shale, it is unclear from the discussion in the application if Finger Lakes has performed its own independent analysis and evaluated each well's geophysical logs

(along a north-south line running through Gallery 1 from Well No. 18 or 57 to Well No. 31 and an applicant-selected representative east-west line through Gallery 1) to determine if repeat or missing sections occur as an indication of faulting in the caprock overlying the Syracuse salts. Please provide analysis if previously prepared. If such an analysis has not been performed, please do so and provide results. If the analysis shows that faults are present, they must be shown on the cross-sections. The objective of this requirement is to demonstrate the lack of potential pathways for the escape of stored product.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA (Pages 8-9) and May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Pages 2-3, 9-11 and Exhibits 15 & 16). Exhibit 15 "Gross Isopach Camillus Shale" and Exhibit 16 "Structure Base of Camillus Shale" of the Reservoir Suitability Report along with the discussion of geology and features provide documentation and support of adequate geologic containment for Finger Lakes' proposed use of Galleries 1 & 2.*

- c. Discussion of any core test results including caprock and salt properties. Addressed by Item 7.3 and Exhibits 8 & 9 of Finger Lakes' storage application. Please explain how the referenced cores correlate to Finger Lakes' proposed Galleries 1 and 2. The caprock and salt properties discussed in Exhibits 8 & 9 should be used in the project-specific geomechanical analysis requested in Item 6.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA (Pages 9-10) and May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Pages 11-12 and Exhibits 18 & 19).*

- d. Description of the material to be stored and analysis of the physical and operational parameters required for safe containment of the stored material and any displacement fluid for the life of the project. Satisfactorily addressed with respect to stored material. Finger Lakes states that propane and butane will be stored, and included MSDS for both as Exhibits 12 and 13 respectively. Finger Lakes also included a MSDS for Ethyl Mercaptan which will serve as an odorant when product is loaded into trucks. It is understood that the Ethyl Mercaptan is stored at the truck loading dock and is introduced into product only when trucks or containers are filled for public distribution. Operational parameters are discussed below in 6e.

*Satisfactorily addressed with respect to stored material by Finger Lake's May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Exhibits 23, 24 & 25).*

- e. Existing and proposed total storage capacity (i.e., water-filled capacity) which includes rubble pile capacity, if any, and minimum and maximum operating storage pressures. The underground storage permit for the facility will specify total capacity; any future increase in permitted total capacity, however caused, will require an underground storage modification permit in accordance with ECL §23-1301(5)(b).

Page 2 of the storage application states that Gallery 1's existing capacity is "close to 5 million barrels" and Gallery 2 "will store 1,000,000 barrels." In addition, no proposed ultimate total storage capacities were provided by Finger Lakes except that Finger Lakes states on page 11 of its application that "The only increase in cavern dimensions will be about 1-2% annually by the displacement of hydrocarbon products with slightly undersaturated brine..."

For each gallery, please restate or state, in more precise terms a) existing total storage capacity (i.e., water-filled capacity) which includes rubble pile capacity, if any, b) proposed ultimate total storage capacity (i.e., water-filled capacity) which includes rubble pile capacity, if any, c) gallery length and span at proposed ultimate capacity, and d) operating storage pressures as follows for each proposed storage well: maximum storage pressure at the wellhead (psig), and minimum and maximum storage pressure gradients measured at the casing shoe (psi/ft) with corresponding casing shoe depth. For each gallery's stated existing and proposed ultimate capacity, explain how determined. Submission of a "Capacity Matrix" as was provided with the Savona LPG application would be one means of providing some of the above requested information.

***The following issues remain and must be addressed concerning Finger Lakes' Cavern Development Plan and Proposed Operations:***

1. *Finger Lakes must elaborate and explain its cavern development plan and proposed operations in more precise terms, including the following.*
  - a. *Finger Lakes must explain and identify what areas of the proposed storage galleries will remain as currently constructed and what areas of the galleries will be subject to operational solutioning (i.e., less than 2% annual growth) during the proposed LPG storage operations. It is understood that no active mining will take place once the storage caverns are put into service. Finger Lakes must identify on a plan view and vertical section the 1) areas of the galleries that account for the projected 30% cavern growth during LPG operations and 2) areas of the galleries that will not be affected (i.e., no growth) by LPG storage operations.*
  - b. *Finger Lakes must explain how it intends to prevent operational solutioning certain areas of the storage galleries. An explanation by Finger Lakes that certain wells will be used only for monitoring is not sufficient as it does not explain why cavern space being used for LPG storage does not grow laterally due to operational solutioning. It is unclear from Finger Lakes application how lateral growth of the galleries will be prevented. Finger Lakes must describe any controls, including operational, that will be used to prevent gallery growth including lateral growth.*
  - c. *Finger Lakes must describe any controls, including operational, it will use to protect the cavern roofs and limit operational solutioning of the cavern roofs.*
  - d. *The maximum requested product fill level must be depicted on a plan view and vertical section of the storage galleries (i.e., show where product will be stored at maximum fill). The setting depth of the brine strings must also be shown on the vertical section. If the setting depth of any brine string will be used to control cavern growth, it should be stated and explained. The Department must understand Finger Lakes cavern development and operations plan. It is acknowledged that Finger Lakes' states on page 14 of the May 14, 2010 Revised Reservoir Suitability Report that "Well 33 will not increase in diameter if and when put into LPG storage service since any 30% increase in solutioning by undersaturated brine product displacement will take place above the existing maximum diameter" and "Wells 43 and 44 will be monitoring wells and will not be solutioned mined..." Nevertheless, Finger Lakes' current descriptions as noted above and in "Section 11. Cavern*



*Development Plan" lack clarity and do not adequately explain its cavern development program and its planned operation of the storage galleries.*

2. *Finger Lakes must explain the basis for the "30% additional Mining" noted on Exhibit 21 "Finger Lakes Cavern Matrix." How was it determined and over what time period does it relate?*
3. *Finger Lakes states that Gallery 1's water-filled capacity is approximately 5 million barrels. Why is Finger Lakes requesting limited product storage use of this gallery (i.e., 1.5 million barrels)? If limited use restricted to the top of Gallery 1 relates to controlling lateral cavern growth, it should be stated and explained.*
4. *Finger Lakes states that Gallery 2's water-filled capacity will be approximately 700,000 barrels when storage operations are initiated. Why is Finger Lakes requesting limited product storage use of this gallery (i.e., 600,000 barrels)? Is the remaining water-filled capacity lost in the rubble pile?*
5. *Exhibit 21 "Finger Lakes Cavern Matrix" must be revised to include a column "Ultimate Capacity" (i.e., water-filled) in barrels. With respect to the heading "30% additional Mining," please note that for any solutioning occurring during operation of the LPG galleries (i.e., 2% or less annually), we prefer the use of the term "operational solutioning" or "operational solution mining" rather than just "mining" as it infers active mining. Generally speaking, the organization and clarity of the matrix is lacking in that it is difficult to follow and understand. Finger Lakes should rework the matrix to clarify its proposal.*
6. *For each well including proposed Well FL1, provide maximum storage pressure at the wellhead (psig).*

- f. Past and current sonar reports and surveys, and schedule for future sonar surveys. Sonar schedules must take into account the cavern development plan. Any other materials including other types of surveys and/or determinations of current cavern size and shape including records of prior cavern development. Directional surveys for wells for determining spatial relationship of caverns.

Recently run sonars and directional surveys have been provided by Finger Lakes (or its parent Inergy Midstream, LLC). The Department also has some past sonar surveys for some of the subject wells in its files. Finger Lakes must provide a listing of all available sonars so that the Department can verify it already has a copy.

Finger Lakes states that Gallery 1 sonar surveying is complete at this time and that future sonars will be conducted at least every ten years. With regard to Gallery 2, Finger Lakes states that "When the wells for gallery 2 are redrilled or new wells drilled, new sonars will be performed (and periodically thereafter every 10 years). Directional surveys will also be performed when the new wells are drilled." It is the Department's understanding that no wells in Gallery 2 will be redrilled (see "Finger Lakes Gallery 2," page 12 of application). Please clarify.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA (Page 12 & Exhibit C) and May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Pages 14-15).*

- g. Discussion of historical earthquake activity, if any, within a one-half mile radius of the project area. Satisfactorily addressed by Item 13 and Exhibit 11 of Finger Lakes' storage application.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Page 17 and Exhibit 22).*

- h. Proposed safety and emergency shut-down systems for the storage facility. Upon review of items a through h, the Department may require additional geologic and/or engineering analysis to further support the applicant's proposed operations.

If and when the storage permit is issued, prior to any injection of storage gas, Finger Lakes must provide two copies of its Emergency Response Manual to the Director of the Bureau of Oil & Gas Regulation in the Department's Albany office.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA (Page 12)*

- 7. **Subsidence monitoring plan.** The subsidence monitoring plan must take into account the cavern development plan. Finger Lakes' proposal to continue US Salt's subsidence monitoring schedule of every 5 years for the proposed LPG storage facility is not acceptable because US Salt's five-year program is designed for solution salt mining and not storage of hydrocarbons. Early detection is inherently more critical at hydrocarbon storage facilities. Consistent with existing subsidence monitoring programs at the Savona and Harford Mills LPG storage facilities, if and when the storage permit is issued, subsidence monitoring will be required at least every 2 years at all injection, withdrawal and plugged wells in each gallery. In addition to the storage and plugged wells in Galleries 1 and 2, please identify additional monuments or wells, if any, that will be included in Finger Lakes bi-annual subsidence surveying program when implemented.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA (Pages 12-13) and May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Page 17).*

- 8. **Mechanical integrity testing ("MIT") plan.** Proposed MIT pressures must be accounted for in the geomechanical analysis. On page 13 of its application Finger Lakes states that it will conduct a nitrogen/brine interface MIT at all storage wells prior to first injection of product and thereafter at least every five years. Please state proposed MIT test pressure for each well (Galleries 1 and 2) in psi/ft. Test pressures must be taken into account in the required geomechanical study. In addition, if and when the storage permit is issued and prior to injection of product, Finger Lakes will be required to submit for Department review and approval a summary of test data and a narrative report detailing the results of all MITs.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA (Pages 13-14) and May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Pages 18-19 and Exhibit 26).*

- 9. **Well Status and Condition Report** - The purpose of this report is to show that prior to commencement of storage operations, the condition of all wells located within and immediately adjacent to the storage area is such that storage gas containment is not compromised. Please include the following items.

- a. A well summary covering all plugged and unplugged wells which documents the well use histories and current status or downhole condition of each well.

*See below Item 9b italics for remaining issues.*

- b. A proposed remediation plan for wells described in item a above which are not adequately completed or plugged to ensure storage gas containment. With respect to Items a and b above, Finger Lakes provided information on the wells in proposed storage Galleries 1 and 2 as Tab D of its storage application, and at other locations within the application. Well construction and well history information is also included on page 4 of the storage application. Please provide a well diagram showing existing casing and cement for each plugged and unplugged well in Galleries 1 and 2. The diagrams for existing and proposed plugged wells must show the location of existing or proposed mechanical and/or cement plugs in the wellbore. Information on the historical use of Gallery 2 for LPG storage is provided on page 4 of the storage application and in Exhibit 10. Details and results of the Vertilog well casing evaluation logs recently run on the wells during re-entry are provided on page 5 of the storage application. Well Nos. 33 and 44 were recently relined to ensure integrity of the storage system. Provide an explanation as to why well No. 43 does not require relining.

For proposed storage Gallery 2, Finger Lakes' intended use of Well No. 30 is unclear. Page 2 of Tab D states "will be converted to LPG storage" while page 12 of the application states "Finger Lakes plans to replug and abandon well 30..." Please clarify.

Finger Lakes did not provide any information on wells "immediately adjacent to the storage area" as requested in Item 9. For the purpose of this requirement, immediately adjacent is defined as all wells in a cavern or gallery within 500 feet of the ultimate cavern outlines for proposed storage Galleries 1 and 2. For all identified immediately adjacent wells, provide well name, number, API No., current status, year plugged, if applicable, and well owner's name. For clarification sake, a tabulation of all wells (Galleries 1 and 2, and immediately adjacent) documenting each well's current status, proposed status and remedial or plugging work already performed or required is requested.

***The following issues remain and must be addressed concerning Finger Lakes' Well Status and Condition Report:***

- 1. Page 4 of Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report states that "Well 33 pressure was not affected when pressure was bled to 0 psig on wells 34, 43, 44." If communication exists between the wells as represented by Finger Lakes' proposal to operate Gallery 1 (Well Nos. 33, 34, 43, 44 and new well FL1) as a single storage reservoir, why didn't Well No. 33 respond when pressure was bled to zero on the other wells in the gallery?*
- 2. We acknowledge Finger Lakes provided copies of the "Micro Vertilog" and "Gamma Ray Segmented Bond Log" for Well Nos. 52 & 58, and references to the logging results are found in the May 14, 2010 application. Nevertheless, for each evaluation log run (except sonar surveys) and as a supplement to Exhibits 9 & 10 of Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report, please consolidate logging results and provide a narrative analysis explaining the results of each log on a well-by-well basis with particular attention to cement bonding across the Camillus Shale. For each well, please include the corresponding depths of the Camillus Shale in the narrative. Additionally, provide copies of evaluation logs run on Well Nos. 33, 34, 43 & 44.*
- 3. We understand Finger Lakes plans to P&A Well No. 34. We also are aware that Finger Lakes recently installed a new fully cemented 8" casing string in Well No. 33, a new fully cemented 4" string in Well No. 43 and a new fully cemented 6" string in Well No. 44. Explain why Well No. 58 does not need to be*

*relined—if applicable, Finger Lakes may refer to its reply to Item 2 above. Further, it is the Department's understanding that no evaluation and base logs (i.e., casing evaluation, cement bond log) were performed on the wells reworked with new casing strings which were cemented in place. Evaluation and base logs of these wells and new well FL1 along with a narrative analysis of each log will be required prior to the injection of LPG as a condition of any tentative storage permit.*

- c. A proposed monitoring/observation well protocol, if any, which lists proposed monitoring/observation wells, identifies their locations and describes the purpose, methodology and frequency of the planned monitoring and observation.

Finger Lakes did not identify any permanent monitoring or observation wells for its proposed LPG storage facility. Please confirm that Finger Lakes will not have any dedicated monitoring or observation wells.

Prior to commencing any work on an existing or new well, including re-entry, drilling, conversion and plugging, the applicant must contact the Regional Minerals Manager to determine application, notification and/or permitting requirements for individual wells in accordance with 6NYCRR Parts 550 - 559.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA (Page 15) and May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Exhibit 9).*

10. **Storage Rights Affidavit** - Please provide an affidavit stating that the applicant has acquired at least 75 % of the storage rights within the proposed storage formation in the reservoir and buffer zone, and reference and include a lease tract map. In addition to the affidavit itself, include a tabulation which corresponds to the lease tract map of the names and complete mailing addresses of all surface owners within and adjacent to the proposed storage area (reservoir and buffer zone). Finger Lakes did not provide the requested lease tract map and tabulation. Finger Lakes must provide a new affidavit, lease tract map (including ultimate cavern outlines) and tabulation.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA (Exhibit E).*

11. **Permit Application Fee** - The application fee for a new underground storage facility is \$10,000. The fee was received by the Department on October 13, 2009. Please find enclosed receipt No. 558202.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' prior submission.*

#### Other Comments/Questions

Page 1, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph – The statement “US Salt has been in the business of salt production for over 100 years by solution salt mining underground salt deposits on property adjacent to Seneca Lake” is incorrect as written. The sentence should be revised to state “US Salt and its predecessors at the facility...” US Salt's predecessors at the facility include Cargill, Akzo-Nobel, Akzo and International Salt.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Page 1).*

Page 2, 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph – Finger Lakes states “Brine circulated from the caverns will be stored in one or more above-ground ponds.” Please clarify the location of the multiple ponds that may be used to store brine.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Page 2).*

Page 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph – Finger Lakes states “The wells were abandoned in 1986 when the storage contract terminated with TEPPCO since they required a larger volume of storage than what US Salt was willing to provide” is incorrect as written. US Salt did not own the subject facility in 1986. The sentence should be revised to state “...than what one of US Salt's predecessors at the facility was willing to provide.”

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Sentence deleted).*

Page 4, 4<sup>th</sup> full paragraph – Finger Lakes states “When wells 33, 34, 43 and 44 at the US Salt facility at Watkins Glen were drilled out and reopened, there was positive pressure held on the cavern since abandonment indicating the 4-well gallery retained mechanical integrity.” What were the positive pressures encountered?

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (Page 4).*

Page 5, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph – Finger Lakes states “NYSEG performed a hydrotest on Gallery 2 and Inergy has reviewed the MIT and the entire Gallery had pressure integrity.” Please provide a copy of the referenced hydrotest of Gallery 2 performed by NYSEG. A recent long-term brine hydrotest for Gallery 1 was performed in May 2009, and the results are provided as Exhibit 7 of the storage application. It is understood that Finger Lakes will have performed or will perform a nitrogen/brine interface MIT on every storage well (injection and withdrawal) prior to the injection of any storage gas.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Reservoir Suitability Report (New Gallery 2, Pages 7-8 & Exhibit 12).*

Page 5, 3<sup>rd</sup> full paragraph – Finger Lakes states “These tools are important to the operation of the reservoir since repetitive and comparative logs will alert Finger lakes to any changes that might affect the well and cavern operation.” What is Finger Lakes schedule for running comparative gamma ray and neutron logs?

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA (Page 16).*

Page 5, last full paragraph – Finger Lakes states “Finger Lakes and Inergy are cognizant of the overall pressures required for safe operations of hydrocarbon storage caverns based on years of experience and will never permit leakage that would jeopardize the public or USDW.” At what frequency will Finger Lakes monitor the wellhead pressures of its storage wells to ensure safe operation of its facility? It is understood that Finger Lakes Emergency Response Manual will be provided at a later date per above Item 6h.

*Satisfactorily addressed by Finger Lakes' May 14, 2010 Response to NOIA (Page 17).*

Page 6, 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph – Finger Lakes states “The actual extent of the cavern...is based on the hydrostatic testing that took place.” Please elaborate and explain this statement.

Page 6, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph – Finger Lakes states “Hydrostatic pressure testing at a gradient of 0.8 psi/foot was performed by injection of nearly saturated brine into well 43 to determine the integrity of the casings