

Appendix 6.1: Comments Received during the Feasibility and Development Phases

Table A6.1.1 Feasibility Phase Stakeholder Comments

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
17 May 2010	Commission Members, Gazprom, representatives from administrations, public organisations, businesses, environmental organisations, media and the General Public	Public discussion of proposed economic and other activity subject to environmental assessment in the Gelendzhik Resort Municipality	What are the social benefits for residents of Gelendzhik.	N/A as the pipeline is routed through Anapa, not Gelendzhik
			Insufficient gasification of Gelendzhik districts e.g. Tonkiy Cape.	Not within scope of ESIA Report
			Possible impact of Project on the environment.	Chapters 8-13 and Chapter 16
			For pipe-laying during construction, Need to ensure technologies are safe and reliable. Accidents should be logged.	Chapter 5 and Chapter 19
			Questioning over the option to construct the pipeline in Gelendzhik where there would be impacts on the natural environment.	N/A as the pipeline is routed through Anapa, not Gelendzhik
			Questions over the duration of the construction period.	Chapter 5
			Modern technologies should be used on the Project.	Chapter 5
			Impacts from the Project on the environment should be minimized.	Chapters 8-13 and Chapter 16
			Must assess the impact of the Project on the terrestrial ecosystem.	Chapter 11

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
17 May 2010	Commission Members, Gazprom, representatives from administrations, public organisations, businesses, environmental organisations, media and the General Public	Public discussion of proposed economic and other activity subject to environmental assessment in the Gelendzhik Resort Municipality	The land-based part of the Project will undergo public and environmental review. The Project will be implemented in accordance with the legislative framework and all comments and suggestions will be taken into account.	Chapter 6
The pipeline should not impact cultural heritage.			Chapter 16	
Discussion about the capacity to provide gas to regions of Russia. Lack of gas reported in villages of the Tuapse district.			Not within scope of ESIA Report	
Public hearings should be held to comply with the EIA process and ensure a comprehensive review of the Project.			Chapter 6	
Issue raised concerning supplying gas abroad when there is a lack of gas to the local population e.g. in the villages of Mikhailovsky Pereval and Pshada, people heat their homes using wood from valuable tree species which is having a negative impact on the environment.			Not within scope of ESIA Report	
The Project has economic benefits for Gelendzhik due to anticipated investment in the area.			N/A as the pipeline is routed through Anapa, not Gelendzhik	

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
18 May 2010	Commission Members, Gazprom, representatives from administrations, public organisations, businesses, environmental organisations, media and the General Public	Public discussion on the ToR for conducting an EIA as part of the Economic Feasibility Study for the offshore section of the South Stream gas pipeline – Russian Sector in ART Municipal District	There is cultural heritage along the proposed Pipeline route that could be disturbed.	Chapter 16
			Concerns were raised regarding the effect of the Project on the ecological balance in the region and coastal area.	Chapter 11
			The Project could damage nature, including marine organisms and the formation of silt deposits.	Chapter 12
			Concerns that the roads and road surfaces may be impacted by heavy construction traffic.	Chapter 14, Chapter 15 and Appendix 9.1
			The Project should not negatively impact natural resources, throughout all Phases of the Project. The Project must propose mitigation measures for the conservation of the unique biota in the Project area.	Chapter 11 and Chapter 12
			Pipelines should be laid away from populated areas and especially protected nature reserves.	Chapter 4 and Chapter 11
			The Project is positive and will lead to the development of infrastructure in Sukko and Varvarovka.	Chapter 14
			The Project could generate new jobs.	Chapter 14
			Possibilities for the Project to provide local gas supplies in ART Municipal District.	Not within scope of ESIA Report
Construction of the pipeline will damage flora and fauna.	Chapter 11			
I am not against the Project, as long as it does not affect the environment.	Chapter 8 – 13 Chapter 16			

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
18 May 2010	Commission Members, Gazprom, representatives from administrations, public organisations, businesses, environmental organisations, media and the General Public	Public discussion on the ToR for conducting an EIA as part of the Economic Feasibility Study for the offshore section of the South Stream gas pipeline – Russian Sector in ART Municipal District	It is positive that the Project will be assessed and that the opinions and suggestions of people are considered.	Chapter 2 and Chapter 6
			I hope that the Project will follow environmental protection laws.	Chapter 2
			I am in favour of the Project as it will lead to new jobs and will improve the environmental stability of our region.	Chapter 14 – 8 and Chapter 13
			The pipeline should be built, in compliance with the relevant safety measures for construction and the environment.	Chapter 5
18 Jan 2011	Commission Members, Gazprom, PeterGaz, representatives from administrations, public organisations, businesses, environmental organisations, media and the General Public	Public discussion on the ToR of an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) for the South Stream Gas Pipeline Route – Russian Sector in ART Municipal District	ART Municipal District is a recreation area, so any potential impact on recreation and healthcare resources of the Anapa Municipality should be assessed as part of the EIA.	Chapter 14 and Chapter 15
			Residents of ART Municipal District concerned that ecology will be put at risk by the Project.	Chapter 11
			Opposed to the Project as Anapa is a resort town, children’s resort and place of leisure. This environment should be protected.	Chapter 14

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
24 Jan 2011	Commission Members, Gazprom, PeterGaz, representatives from administrations, public organisations, businesses, environmental organisations, media and the General Public	Public discussion of planned business and other activities subject to environmental evaluation in the Gelendzhik Resort Municipality	Questions on which part of the pipeline route will geotechnical studies be conducted.	Chapter 7 and Chapter 8
			Questions what the preferred option for the gas pipeline is to come ashore.	Chapter 4
			Ecological safety of the region must be taken into account and the development of the Gelendzhik Resort Municipality specially protected natural recreation territory.	Chapter 11 and Chapter 12 The protected natural recreation territory is outside of the Project zone of Influence due to its distance from the Project. Regarding unplanned events refer to Chapter 19
			Any proposals and comments received during public discussions should be summarised, analysed and classified, and where necessary relevant corrections to the geotechnical works and engineering studies for the pipeline should be made.	Chapter 6

Complete.

Table A6.1.2 Development Phase Stakeholder Comments

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
31 May 2013	Local community of Anapa	Comments made in person in EIA Public Hearing	Project will adversely affect the natural environment, coastline and protected areas.	Throughout ESIA Report, particularly Chapter 11 and Chapter 12
			Concerned there will be pollution e.g. from waste discharge.	Chapter 18
			Concerns that the Project could negatively impact on tourists who come to the area for holidays. It is also a resort zone.	Chapter 14
			Concerned about seismic activity and hydrogen sulphide in the sea resulting in gas explosion.	Chapter 7
			The Project will result in new jobs and positive benefit.	Chapter 14
			Gas should be supplied to local communities, before being supplied to Europe.	Stakeholder questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom.
			It does not seem that our opinion counts, the Project has already been decided. The local residents should be asked about the need for the Project, emergency plans and impact on children's resort.	Chapter 6
			Trucks along the Druzhba Street are having an adverse impact on people's breathing (e.g. dust is causing breathing problems) and children's safety is also a concern as trucks do not follow speed limit. Recommend the enforcement of a speed limit.	Chapter 14, Chapter 15 and Appendix 9.1

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
10th Dec 2012	Local community of Supsekh	Comments made in person in ESIA scoping consultation meetings	Concerned about possible explosion or gas leakage.	Chapter 19
			Concerns about the presence of hydrogen sulphide.	Chapter 7
			Concern that burying the pipelines will cause seismic activity (earthquakes) or changes to soil and seabed.	The Project does not anticipate earthquakes from pipe-laying but in the event of other unplanned events, this has been addressed in Chapter 19 and Chapter 7
			Want to know who is responsible for making sure the Project is safe.	South Stream Transport is responsible for the Project
			Questions whether there have been other similar Projects and if these techniques have been used before.	The Blue Stream and Nord Stream projects provide examples that techniques and technologies are safe
			What is the defined area of construction and exclusion zones?	Chapter 5

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
10th Dec 2012	Local community of Supsekh	Comments made in person in ESIA scoping consultation meetings	Is the facility under construction (Zelenaya Polyana) within the prohibited area?	Chapter 5 – 18 and Chapter 14
			Will the benefits of the gas pipeline be cheaper gas? Will gas be supplied to the district itself?	Stakeholder questions and concerns relating gas supply are raised with Gazprom
			Concerned about noise and vibration during construction. The pipes are maintained by pumps. Concerned there will be disturbance in Varvarovka and Sukko.	Chapter 10 and Chapter 15
			Will the ecosystem be restored in accordance with international standards? Are there any planned restoration activities?	Chapter 11
			Concern over increased traffic. Will additional roads be constructed?	Chapter 14, Chapter 15 and Appendix 9.1
			Will access to the beach be restricted? How deep will the pipelines in the beach area be buried?	Chapter 5
			Will local jobs be created?	Chapter 14
			Why was the Project not located in Novorossiysk, Sochi, Gelendzhik or Temryuk, where there is low population density?	Chapter 4
			Concern that sea areas will be prohibited for shipping and fishing.	Chapter 5 – 14 and Appendix 14.1

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
11th Dec 2012	Local communities of Varvarovka and Sukko	Comments made in person in ESIA scoping consultation meeting	Concern that Juniper trees have been cut down, while PeterGaz representatives promised nothing would be cut down. Will Juniper be re-planted or the area re-cultivated. Risk of erosion.	Chapter 11
			Concern of disaster, such as earthquake.	Chapter 19 for unplanned events and Chapter 7 for seismic work
			Have any seismic surveys been carried out?	Chapter 7
			Concern over noise and vibration impact on nearest communities.	Chapter 10
			Will there be supply of gas to Varvarovka, Sukko, Bolshoi and Maly Utrish? It was promised that there would be gas supply to Local Communities.	Stakeholder questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom
			Will local jobs be created?	Chapter 14
			Who will receive compensation in case of environmental damage?	Petergaz responded that compensation for any damage will be paid to relevant state authorities

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
11th Dec 2012	Local communities of Varvarovka and Sukko	Comments made in person in ESIA scoping consultation meeting	Are there other similar projects in the Black Sea and have these techniques been safe?	South Stream Transport responded that the Blue Stream and Nord Stream projects provide examples that techniques and technologies are safe
			Where will the pipeline restriction zone be?	Chapter 5
			Request to arrange a meeting with representatives of Gazprom, authorities and SST on gas supply to local communities. Gazprom is exporting gas but not supplying local communities, not respecting our human rights.	South Stream Transport responded that stakeholder questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom
			Why was it decided to construct the Pipeline here?	Chapter 4

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
12th Dec 2012	Local community of Gai Kodzor	Comments made in person in ESIA scoping consultation meeting	How will the pipes be delivered? Concerned about impact of traffic. It is impacting houses through vibration and cracks. Will there be a bypass-road?	Chapter 14, Chapter 15 and Appendix 9.1
			Concern offshore piping has adverse impact on marine environment.	Chapter 12
			Concern that pumping station will impact communities from noise and vibration. Concern that noise from the compressor station will impact the church. Can station be re-located?	Chapter 10
			Will local jobs be created?	Chapter 14
			Where will pipe cleaning wastes be disposed?	Chapter 18
			Concern that Gazprom representatives were not present at the meetings.	Stakeholder questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom
			Gas will be supplied to Europe, but no gas supplied to local communities.	Stakeholder questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
13th Dec 2012	Regional NGOs	Comments made in person in ESIA scoping consultation meeting	Ecosystem is in critical condition due to impact of fishing and recreation. Pipeline construction will adversely impact ecosystem.	Chapter 11
			Pipeline construction may result in waste that adversely impacts marine environment.	Chapter 18
			Concern that Juniper trees were cut down, contrary to previous statements that this would not happen.	Chapter 11
			How will micro-tunnelling be performed? Provide information on construction methods, geology, depth, distance between seabed and tunnel, and tunnel outlet to the seabed.	Chapter 5
			Marine bio-filters may be damaged by construction. The Red Data Book records habitats of crabs and spawning areas.	Chapter 12
			The pipeline crosses fishing routes and migration flows will be disturbed.	Chapter 12 and Chapter 14, Appendix 14.1
			How will information/data influence decision-making and be included in the ESIA Report?	Baseline information is included in Chapter 7 to 16 and are used to assess impacts and decide on mitigation measures for the Project
			Concerned about risk of explosion.	Chapter 5 and Chapter 19

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
13th Dec 2012	Regional NGOs	Comments made in person in ESIA scoping consultation meeting	How are political risks assessed and how much money has been spent on the project so far?	Not within scope of ESIA Report
			What is the social component? What is the benefit to local communities?	Chapter 14
			Will gas be supplied to Varvarovka, Sukko and other communities?	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom
			NGO 'Black Sea' should be involved in project discussion.	Chapter 6
			Will the pipeline exclusion zone impact community expansion plans?	Chapter 14
			Concern that Gazprom representatives were not present at the meetings.	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to Gazprom will be raised with Gazprom
			Where will the pipeline restriction zone be?	Chapter 5
			Will ART Municipal District be compensated for any adverse impact to tourism? Will there be any programme of social support?	Chapter 14

Continued...

Appendix 6.1 Comments Received during the Feasibility and Development Phases

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
14th Dec 2012	National NGOs	Comments made in person in ESIA scoping consultation meeting	Gas pipeline will operate with compressor. Why is the project split between pipeline and compressor. There should be a single EIA that meets both Russian and international requirements.	Chapter 1
			Concerns that alternatives such as Blue Stream are not considered.	Chapter 4
1st – 31st Aug 2012	Local community stakeholders	Written comments (via comment forms) on EIA ToR	Concerned about seismic activity as Project is close to Caucasus mountain range. Pipes must be laid as safely as possible to prevent earthquakes. There is a danger of fire or explosion from the hydrogen sulphide layers in the Black Sea.	Chapter 5, Chapter 7 and Chapter 19
			Neither Russia, Krasnodar Krai, nor Anapa Town need this new gas pipeline.	Chapter 1
			Project does not include contractual obligations for gas supply to the nearby villages, Varvarovka and Sukko. Residents must benefit from the Project with gas supply.	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom
			Concerned about negative impact on Sukko beach, holiday destination for many Russians, and proximity of residential areas.	Chapter 14
			Concerns that Project will adversely affect ecological system. Natural environment should not be harmed.	Chapter 11 and 12
			Would like information on jobs and how to apply.	Chapter 14
			Concern that Local Communities will be negatively affected.	Chapter 14

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
1st – 31st Aug 2012	Local community stakeholders	Written comments (via comment forms) on EIA ToR	The Project will increase corruption at the highest levels of government and business.	Not within scope of ESIA Report
			The Project should be finished on time.	Chapter 5
29 Apr - 31 May 2013	Local community stakeholders	Written comments (via comment forms) on EIA	The Project will adversely affect the coastline and negatively impact the environment. This is a resort zone and people come here for the coastline and sea.	Chapter 12 and Chapter 14
			The Project should use advanced technical design and technology, and not leave an impact on the environment. All details of the Project should be considered in detail.	Chapter 4 and Chapter 5
			Concern about gas explosion, particularly as the area is a children's resort. There are underground tremors in the sea.	Chapter 19
			Project will bring positive benefits. It could lead to gasification of local communities. The Project is needed.	Chapter 14, not within scope of ESIA Report
			Concerned about impact on ecology, changes to Black Sea underwater environment, pollution from discharge of waste and effect on natural landscape. Propose using modern waste-free technologies.	Chapter 11, Chapter 12, Chapter 13 and Chapter 18
			Opposed to the Project.	N/A
			Concern that stakeholder opinions are not taken on board by the Developer. Concerned that opinions don't matter.	Chapter 6

Continued...

Appendix 6.1 Comments Received during the Feasibility and Development Phases

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
29 Apr - 31 May 2013	Local community stakeholders	Written comments (via comment forms) on EIA	Gas should be supplied to local communities before spending money on a pipeline to send it elsewhere.	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom.
			What are the measures in place for an emergency situation.	Chapter 19 and Chapter 5
			There should be a referendum on the need for the Pipeline.	Not within the scope of the ESIA Report
			Project could provide jobs.	Chapter 14
			Concerned about the impact on ecological environment.	Chapter 11
			Concern about heavy goods trucks going along Druzhba street at fast speeds. Causing safety issue and people are concerned about dust. Propose 30km speed limit and installing speed camera.	Chapter 5, Chapter 14, Chapter 15 and Appendix 9.1.
20th Nov 2012 - 8th Feb 2013	Local community stakeholders	Written comments (via comment forms) on Scoping Report	Concern that Project will adversely impact visual landscape e.g. the upland part of the landfall area and also the start of the Kiblerova ravine/gorge.	Chapter 13
			Heavily populated region with a physical and social environment which attracts lots of people. Arkhipo-Osipkova option would be better as its remote and there is infrastructure. Have other options been considered.	Chapter 4

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
20th Nov 2012 - 8th Feb 2013	Local community stakeholders	Written comments (via comment forms) on Scoping Report	Sceptical about rehabilitation of area following Project activities. Who will monitor this and be responsible. Project needs to engage with local independent ecologists.	Chapter 11
			Gazprom has not performed well on the issue of rehabilitation and environmental protection.	Chapter 11
			Concerned about the safety of the Project.	Chapter 5
			Disappointed that gas passing through our local communities will be used overseas and not supplied to local communities.	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom
			The Project should supply gas to the local communities where the Project is located.	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom
			Areas damaged by the Project must be restored and rehabilitated.	Chapter 5, Chapter 11 and Chapter 13
			The Project will raise the standard of living in the Anapa Region.	Project will not have such widespread impact, Chapter 14
			Would like to have information on Project job vacancies.	Chapter 14

Continued...

Appendix 6.1 Comments Received during the Feasibility and Development Phases

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
20th Nov 2012 - 8th Feb 2013	Local community stakeholders	Written comments (via comment forms) on Scoping Report	Concern regarding corruption associated with the gas industry.	Not within scope of ESIA Report
			Concern that the impacts of pipelines reduce people's standard of living.	Chapter 14 and Chapter 15
			Interfering with nature is a crime and the gas and oil extraction industries can have a large impact.	Not within scope of ESIA Report
			Alternatives to this Project should be considered.	Chapter 4
			Stakeholder is in favour of the pipeline.	N/A
			Project must monitor the condition of the pipeline over time.	Chapter 5, Chapter 22
			It is important to develop international relations in Russia. I am in favour of the Project.	N/A
			In accordance with requirements of the Russian and international legislation, the Project's impacts must be assessed comprehensively.	Chapter 2
			Separating the South Stream Offshore Pipeline and the Russkaya Compressor Station into two separate EIAs is not in line with good practice and standards. The gas pipeline system is an interdependent process. In the event of accidents (emergency situations) the system will work as a single entity and therefore the EIA for both the pipeline and the compressor station should be presented in one document.	Chapter 1

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
20th Nov 2012 - 8th Feb 2013	Local community stakeholders	Written comments (via comment forms) on Scoping Report	Given that marine ecosystems do not have sharply defined borders within the Black Sea, the offshore part of the Project should have been assessed as a whole EIA and not divided up by country.	Chapter 1
			Concern that undertaking both an EIA and an ESIA creates confusion and complicates meeting the Espoo Convention requirements. One international ESIA complying with the Russian EIA Provisions would have been better, with one single stakeholder engagement process.	Chapter 1, Chapter 2
			Public opinion must be taken into consideration prior to Project implementation.	Chapter 6
			The option of expanding the existing gas export pipeline Blue Stream was not considered for this Project and should be reviewed. Other alternatives concerning the landfall section have not been analysed.	Chapter 4
			The pipeline route from CS "Russkaya" to the onshore facilities crosses valuable habitats e.g. the mountain area of the Kiblerov Canyon.	Chapter 11

Continued...

Appendix 6.1 Comments Received during the Feasibility and Development Phases

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
10th to 14th Dec 2012	Local Communities and NGOs	Feedback forms submitted after scoping consultation meetings	There should have been representatives from Gazprom present at the meeting.	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to Gazprom will be raised with Gazprom
			There should be another public meeting before the Project commences.	Chapter 6
			The project is interesting and there are positive benefits for people.	Chapter 14
10th to 14th Dec 2012	Local Communities and NGOs	Feedback forms submitted after scoping consultation meetings	After the construction of the Project, negative impacts from the Project should not be felt by the local people.	Chapter 5 and Chapter 14
			How will local communities benefit from this Project?	Chapter 14
			There is risk of seismic activity from the Project. There should be a seismic station with modern safety equipment.	No risk of impacts from the Project on seismic activity. Chapter 5 outlines the Pipeline design and cons safety measures.
			Project should supply local communities with gas.	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom
			The Project should be finished on time.	Chapter 5

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
10th to 14th Dec 2012	Local Communities and NGOs	Feedback forms submitted after scoping consultation meetings	There were no representatives from Gazprom in the meeting and the quality of the microphones was poor.	Not within scope of ESIA Report
			Project must cooperate with the press that represents Anapa.	Chapter 6
			The meeting was very important and necessary and I will inform people about the South Stream Project.	N/A
			Social assessment of the Project should be more detailed.	Chapter 14
10th to 14th Dec 2012	Local Communities and NGOs	Feedback forms submitted after scoping consultation meetings	Project should consider supplying gas to local communities in Russia e.g. Varvarovka.	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom
			Interested in permanent work/jobs in Anapa.	Chapter 14
			Project should seek involvement from administration representatives.	Chapter 6
			Project should pay special attention to social responsibility and minimise impacts on local inhabitants in the ART Municipal District and the region.	Chapter 14
29th Nov 2012	Local Communities	Comments made by telephone on ESIA Scoping Report	Local communities should benefit from the Project with gas supply. Told at the meeting that nearest villages would be supplied with gas.	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom
			Natural environment should not be harmed.	Chapter 8 to 21

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
29th Nov 2012	Local Communities	Comments made by telephone on ESIA Scoping Report	There should be job opportunities for Local Communities.	Chapter 14
			How will construction of the Pipeline affect Local Communities. The Project should benefit Local Communities.	Chapter 14
April and Oct 2013	Fishing Organisations	Comments made in person in data-collection meeting	The pipelines should be buried deeper in order to prevent impact on fishing.	Chapter 14, Appendix 14.1
			Concerns about the construction of the offshore/landfall sections of the pipeline interrupting the migration of fish from north to south.	Chapter 14, Appendix 14.1
			Local hunters are concerned about the compressor station and disruption to wildlife.	Chapter 11, Chapter 20, Appendix 20.1.
			Fishing organisation was concerned primarily about the interactions with the fishing gear and pipeline and whether or not one would damage the other if struck.	Chapter 14, Appendix 14.1
			Fishing organisation stated that current Project activities e.g. noise generated from seismic surveys had already impacted their fishing activities and that their fishing catch had reduced in recent years	Chapter 12 and 14, Appendix 14.1

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
2012 - 2014	Range of stakeholders consulted for data collection		Administrations are interested in the Company's contribution to development of the rural districts.	Chapter 14
			The implementation of the bypass around Gai Kodzor has addressed the main concerns of local residents.	N/A as this is an observation
			The issue of traffic was raised by the Rassvet community. The road is currently not in a good state of repair. The road repair is not being undertaken adequately.	Stakeholder questions and concerns relating to Gazprom will be raised with Gazprom.
2012 - 2014	Range of stakeholders consulted for data collection		It is difficult for pedestrians to cross the road in Rassvet because of trucks. The kindergarten is being impacted by dust from the road.	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to Gazprom will be raised with Gazprom
			Implementation of speed controls, repair of the road, implementation of traffic safety measures such as zebra crossings, staff to assist road crossings, construction of pavements etc. will help to alleviate the traffic problems.	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to Gazprom will be raised with Gazprom
			ART will appreciate co-ordination and co-operation regarding local employment. Authority can help with advertising positions, supplying applicants and targeting those most in need of employment both in Anapa and in the surrounding communities.	Chapter 14

Continued...

Date	Stakeholder	Document / Event	Comment	Relevant ESIA Chapter
2012 - 2014	Range of stakeholders consulted for data collection		The main concern of the residents in Varvarovka is gas provision. It is also a concern in Sukko. Will the Project be supplying gas and when?	Stakeholders questions and concerns relating to gas supply will be raised with Gazprom
			Concern for Sukko is the impact of the nearshore construction activities on the beach amenity at Shingari and Sukko beach. A key concern is the silt from the dredging and Microtunnelling works in the nearshore and how that will affect the beaches and the tourists using them and any knock-on effects on businesses.	Chapter 12 and Chapter 14
2012 - 2014	Range of stakeholders consulted for data collection		A schedule for the works is vital so that residents know when they will be taking place and this schedule should be presented and discussed at any meeting with the local community. Works should not be carried out in the summer season if possible.	Chapter 5, detailed schedule of activities will also be communicated during construction
			Concerned about the noise, vibration and dust from construction activities.	Chapter 10
			Press announcements should be used when conducting further public consultations.	Chapter 6
			Concern about the quality of the road because of trucks and there are no footways along the main Rassvet road so children are walking alongside the road.	Chapter 14

Complete.