



## Simplified comparison of alternative routes of the proposed NordStream II gas pipeline in the Russian part of the Gulf of Finland

Criteria	Zero option	Northern (NS1)	Southern-1 (cape Kolganpaa)	Southern-2 (Kurgalskiy)
<b>1. Technical and economic features</b>				
1.1. Length of land-based part		?	750 m	4 km
1.2. Length of sea-based part		?	156 km	114 km
1.3. Proximity to gas & chemical industry sites being designed or under construction at southern coast of the Gulf of Finland		-	++	++
1.4. Technical limitations for pipe-laying		?		
1.5. Costs of construction		higher?	higher	lower
<b>2. Environmental features and impacts</b>				
2.1. Russian nature protected areas (on land and at sea)		-	+	++
2.2. International nature protected areas (Ramsar, HELCOM)		-	-	++
2.3. Macrophytes (near-bottom flora)		Impacts of NS1	++	+?
2.4. Benthic communities		Impacts of NS1	+	+
2.5. Fish spawning areas in coastal waters		Impacts of NS1	?	++
2.6. Baltic ringed seal		Impacts of NS1	?	++
2.7. Important bird areas		Impacts of NS1	?	++
2.8. Wintering and resting waterfowl birds		Impacts of NS1	+	++
2.9. Salmon migration routes		Impacts of NS1	?	++
2.10. Dredging			-	+
2.11. Dangerous objects (incl. shipping)			-	-
<b>3. Social and cultural features</b>				
3.1. Provision of natural gas supply to households	?	?	+?	+?
3.2. Cultural sites		Impacts of NS1	+	++
3.3. Indigenous people and their traditional way of living			+	+