

APPENDIX F

Scoping Meeting Transcripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Healy, Alaska
August 18, 2014

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Healy, Alaska - 8/18/2014)

(On record - 5:30 p.m.)

MR. TRUDGEN: Let's go ahead and get started. I want to thank everyone for coming this evening to our first actually supplemental EIS public meeting. I certainly appreciate you coming out and joining us and spending your time with us.

So a little bit about what we're going to cover tonight. We'll go through some introductions of who's here. My name is Dave Trudgen. I work for ERM Alaska. We are the third-party contractor for the Corps of Engineers. Mary from the Corps of Engineers is here. She'll introduce herself and the other folks that are here from AGDC, the agencies.

We're going to look at the difference between -- we are here to talk about the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline Project, the in-state pipeline project. I'm sure you've heard about another gasline project, the Alaska LNG Pipeline. That's a project that AGDC is also associated with, but also associated with the producers, so BP, ConocoPhillips and Trans-Canada as well as AGDC, our partners in that pipeline. So we're going to talk a little bit about that.

We're going to look at where we are in the NEPA process. We're going to take a quick look at why we're doing a supplemental EIS. We're going to look at a project description and go through a high level project description of what the ASAP project is. A little bit of comparisons between the new project and old project. Then just what is going to happen with the scoping comments that you'll be providing and then the reports and the rest of the NEPA process and look at dates. Also we'll show you where we're doing all the public meetings.

So that's where we're going right now. So, Mary, if you want to spend a couple minutes.

MS. ROMERO: I too want to thank everyone that has come out tonight. My name is Mary Romero. I'm with the Corps of Engineers. We are the lead Federal agency on this project. The way the lead was determined is by the particular Federal agency that

1 has the most regulatory authority. So since the Corps
2 deals specifically with work in wetlands and Section 10
3 work over rivers as well as Section 103 for any
4 transport of direct material and dumping in the ocean,
5 we have considerably more jurisdiction.

6

7 I want everyone to know that our
8 meeting tonight is being recorded and that's so that we
9 can get each of your comments succinctly and be able to
10 address it in a proper manner.

11

12 So the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline,
13 also known as ASAP, is the project that we're talking
14 about tonight, just like David said. The Alaska
15 Gasline Development Corporation, AGDC, is the proponent
16 and applicant for the project. It's also very
17 important to let everyone know that the Corps is
18 neither an opponent of the project or a proponent of
19 the project. Other Federal agencies may be proponents
20 or opponents of the project, but the Corps is in a
21 special position in that we have to look at everything
22 and we are not for it or against it.

23

24 There are six other agencies that are
25 going to be cooperating on the writing of the
26 supplemental EIS and they are -- and as I say them, I'm
27 going to ask them to stand up and I think I only have
28 one agency that's represented here tonight. So EPA,
29 BLM, which is the Bureau of Land Management, and their
30 authorities are for providing right-of-way permissions.
31 Then
32 National Park Service and we have Steve Carwile here,
33 so I'm going to let him tell you what -- if you want to
34 come up here and just quickly say why you would be
35 involved in the process, that would be great. Then you
36 could either stay up here with me or go sit down.

37

38 MR. CARWILE: Thank you, Mary. The
39 National Park Service was granted permission by
40 Congress in the Denali National Park Improvement Act of
41 2013 to consider allowing the gas pipeline to route
42 through the seven mile corridor alongside the Parks
43 Highway. Prior to that law the Park Service had no
44 authority to grant a permit for a gas or petroleum
45 pipeline. So one of the alternatives in the
46 supplemental EIS as was in the prior EIS we'll consider
47 an alternate route through the Park, which route does
48 include about seven miles through McKinley Village as
49 well before the routes reunite down at Carlo.

50

1 So we're here to provide resource
2 information for that alternative and whatever we know
3 outside the Park and don't have a position on which
4 alternative is best at this point.

5
6 MS. ROMERO: Thank you. Also
7 cooperating on the EIS is PHMSA, which stands for
8 Pipeline Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and
9 they're under the Federal Department of Transportation.
10 They have authorities over pipeline safety.
11 Additionally, the State Pipeline Coordinator's Office
12 is a cooperating agency for right-of-ways on State
13 lands. Then the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is also
14 cooperating and their authorities would be for
15 endangered species.

16
17 As Dave said, he works for ERM, which
18 is the third-party contractor. The Corps doesn't do
19 the writing itself, but a third-party contractor is
20 hired, that is ERM. They will also be giving the
21 presentation tonight on the project.

22
23 By the time we get to the final
24 supplemental environmental impact statement most of the
25 agencies that are cooperating will give a preferred
26 alternative, but the Corps of Engineers does not state
27 a preferred alternative. We actually have to go
28 through our record of decision process and consider all
29 the factors before we can come up with the least
30 environmentally damaging practicable alternative, the
31 LEDPA.

32
33 The Corps has two responsibilities on
34 this particular project. The first one is under NEPA
35 and what we're doing here tonight is NEPA, the National
36 Environmental Policy Act. There are two aspects of
37 NEPA that are critical for the whole process. The first
38 one is that it's supposed to provide full disclosure on
39 the environmental impacts that this project would have.
40 Additionally it provides three different times that the
41 public, private sector, everyone can comment on this
42 project.

43
44 The first one is tonight or during this
45 process until October 14th. This is the scoping
46 period. The second time will be after the draft
47 supplemental EIS is completed and we have published it
48 at the notice of availability and there will be a 60-
49 day comment period at that time. There could be
50 additional changes and rewrites based on the comments

1 that are provided on the project. The last comment
2 period is when we do the final SEIS and that's a 30-day
3 comment period.

4
5 Again I just want to remind everyone
6 that the Corps' authorities are under Section 10 of the
7 Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 for work in or affecting
8 navigable waters, under Section 404 of the Clean Water
9 Act for discharge of dredged and fill materials into
10 waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Then Section
11 103 of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries
12 Act of 1972 and that's for the transport of dredged
13 material for dumping within the ocean.

14
15 At this time I'm turning it back over
16 to David to do the presentation.

17
18 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank, Mary. So one of
19 the first parts about why the project in the beginning,
20 so you have to have a purpose for the project. So this
21 is the stated project purpose, is to provide natural
22 gas from the North Slope and provide it to the citizens
23 of the state. Running from the North Slope actually
24 and terminating just in the Matanuska Valley, west of
25 Wasilla. It's to provide Alaska communities with a
26 stable, long-term supply of natural gas. So that
27 stated purpose of the project is to be able to do that.

28
29 So what are some of the differences
30 between this project and the other project that I'm
31 sure everybody's heard about, which is the Alaska LNG
32 project. So this is an in-state pipeline. Well, both
33 pipelines would be in-state. One of the biggest
34 differences to point out is this is gas for the state
35 only. It is not for export. The Alaska LNG pipeline,
36 a larger diameter pipeline, terminates in Nikiski at an
37 LNG plant. There the natural gas would be liquified
38 and then shipped out of the state. So that is really
39 one of the major differences between these two
40 projects.

41
42 As you can see, I don't need to read
43 this whole slide, there are several other differences.
44 The ASAP project line is a little bit shorter by 70-
45 plus miles. Another major difference I think is the
46 lateral line that's associated with this project that
47 provides a line to Fairbanks. It's not part of our
48 analysis to analyze any hook-ups in Fairbanks, but it
49 is part of our analysis to look at that lateral line
50 coming off the main line and going to Fairbanks. As we

1 said, the terminus for this is near Big Lake. The
2 terminus for the LNG plant is in Nikiski and then
3 several other differences.

4

5 So why are we doing a Supplemental EIS.
6 Well, since the EIS was originally published there have
7 been several changes that have taken place in the
8 project. Let me just highlight a couple of what those
9 changes are. One of the changes is associated with
10 alignment, so there's been several alignment changes
11 since the EIS was published and written.

12

13 There's also been elimination of all of
14 the compressor stations along the pipeline, so there's
15 going to be a gas processing plant associated with this
16 on the North Slope and we'll show you where that's
17 located in a minute. Then there's going to be just
18 where it terminates outside of Big Lake with no
19 compressor stations in between. There are, of course,
20 still several construction camps located along the
21 pipeline. So that's some of the differences and why
22 we're having to do a supplemental EIS.

23

24 Then another thing that I want to point
25 out is as we're writing the supplemental EIS we'll
26 certainly take the original EIS into consideration.
27 This is truly a supplement to that. All of the
28 information that was produced in the original EIS is
29 good information, so we're going to look at those
30 changes, how the changes in the line are affecting the
31 environmental and that's what we're going to analyze.
32 So it's tiered off the original 2012 final EIS. As we
33 said, we're going to focus on a lot of the reroutes.

34

35

36 So where are we in the NEPA process?
37 These are sort of the steps that we have to go through
38 from the beginning to a record of decision. Mary did a
39 great job of telling you the record of decision and
40 what the Corps has to think about. So we're really all
41 the way up there at the top.

42

43 The Corps and Mary published a notice
44 of intent. This is how the process gets started.
45 Well, the process really gets started by AGDC putting
46 in an application. So they needed to put in an
47 application to the Corps. That starts a Federal
48 process. That Federal process then gets everything
49 kicked off. The Corps and Mary published this notice
50 of intent to prepare a supplemental environmental

1 impact statement, so that's what we're going to be
2 writing.

3
4 So that's where we are. We're at the
5 beginning. We're in a 75-day scoping period and just
6 beginning the process. After this we'll do an analysis
7 of alternatives. We'll draft the supplemental impact
8 statement. That will be drafted over this winter. The
9 draft will be published the next spring and then we'll
10 be back, as Mary said. We get to come back for some
11 additional public meetings. You will have an
12 opportunity to be able to comment specifically on the
13 draft EIS and go through comments. We will then
14 respond to the comments, prepare a comments report and
15 then prepare the final EIS in the fall of 2015 and
16 then, of course, go to the record of decision.

17
18 So what is this project. Basically the
19 project is -- and this is an important change as well
20 from the 2012. It's utility-grade natural gas. It
21 makes it much easier for communities to be able to tie
22 into this line and be able to utilize the natural gas
23 coming down.

24
25 The whole pipeline is buried with the
26 exception of a few above ground areas in earthquake-
27 prone zones, so over our fault zones it has to cross,
28 and then it's also above ground at a couple of the
29 river crossings. That said, several of the major river
30 crossings, Yukon River for example, the pipeline will
31 be directionally drilled underneath it. So the vast
32 majority of the line is buried.

33
34 The line is a 36-inch line, as we said.
35 It will operate at about 1,500 psi. The route in
36 general follows TAPS down as far as Livengood, then
37 goes west of Fairbanks, follows the Parks Highway and,
38 of course, comes right through the area that we're in
39 now, the areas that everybody here I think is really
40 interested in, in Denali. Goes down and stays
41 southwest of Big Lake and ties into the Beluga
42 pipeline.

43
44 It's a 120-foot-wide construction
45 right-of-way. You can see it on the map. You'll see
46 other areas. There's access roads associated with it.
47 There are material sites associated with it and a few
48 areas where the right-of-way needs to be a little bit
49 wider depending on what type of construction is
50 happening.

1 Generally the construction is an
2 open-cut trench. These couple of drawings over on the
3 side are some typicals that you'll be able to look at
4 at the type of construction that's going to be done.
5 Horizontal drilling as I mentioned. Mobile
6 construction camps. The strive for the mobile
7 construction camps is to try to utilize areas that have
8 been disturbed already, so there are several of those
9 to minimize new area of disturbance for the
10 construction camps. Of course there's material sites
11 along the line. They have to have 33 million-plus
12 cubic yards of material.

13

14 So generally this is the route. Here's
15 the Fairbanks off-take there. So coming down TAPS,
16 west of Fairbanks and then down the Parks. This is the
17 lateral line going into Fairbanks. Follows.....

18

19 MS. ROMERO: Murphy Dome.

20

21 MR. TRUDGEN:Murphy Dome. Thank
22 you. Then on the Slope there will be a gas
23 conditioning facility, so this is a brand-new facility
24 to be constructed. For those maybe familiar with the
25 Slope, it's relatively close to West Dock. This area
26 is about 70 acres, 70-plus acres, and then has a
27 storage pad off here and then an operations and
28 construction camp pad and each one of these are about
29 20 acres to give you an idea of sizes.

30

31 So this is what's going to be happening
32 at West Dock. This is actually one of the changes from
33 the old project to this project. The project is going
34 to build most of the conditioning facility offsite and
35 they'll bring it in in ocean-going barges. To be able
36 to get the ocean barges into West Dock, they will need
37 to do some dredging. So this is a dredge corridor.
38 They need to dredge to 10 feet. So there's dredge and
39 disposal associated with this project that was not in
40 the original design.

41

42 In addition, they need to widen the
43 road. This is Dock Head 3 where the dredging will
44 happen and where the barges are offloaded. They need
45 to widen this part of the road slightly.

46

47 Then lastly, the barges are too heavy
48 to go over this bridge, so they will make a barge
49 bridge by building some ramps that come down on each
50 side and then taking barges that have ballast in them,

1 they will sink the barges so they sit on the ocean
2 floor, offload all of the modules, bring the modules in
3 and then they can refloat the barges and take them
4 away. So it's not a permanent facility that gets put
5 in. Just a conceptual of what one of those barges
6 would look like.

7

8 So a quick review. What's driving the
9 necessity for this supplemental environmental impact
10 statement that we're working on. Some of the
11 highlights again, the original design was in rich
12 natural gas, now it's lean, which is utility grade.
13 Easier to offload and tie into the various communities
14 along the line. The pipeline is somewhat shorter. The
15 Fairbanks lateral line is shorter. Support facilities
16 are less, no compressor stations along the route. And
17 then, of course, the West Dock that we just spoke
18 about.

19

20 So the important part, how do you
21 submit comments. We're here this evening. Verbal
22 comments this evening are more than welcome. Everybody
23 signed up in the back, so what we're actually going to
24 do is take a quick break after I get done, give you an
25 opportunity to look at maps. I know a lot of you have
26 already done that, but then be able to ask any of us
27 questions that you may have, so sort of an informal.
28 Then we're going to come back together and anybody that
29 would like to give a verbal comment tonight please give
30 us verbal comments.

31

32 As Mary said, it's being recorded. We
33 want to make sure that we capture everyone's comments.
34 So I'm being recorded right now and then you would be
35 recorded as well. But there are other ways to be able
36 to provide comment. You can go to the website and
37 there's a comment page on the website, so
38 www.asapeis.com. You can send Mary all the email that
39 you want. Well, maybe not her but the Corps, so please
40 do. This email address is actually on the website as
41 well for communication. You can use snail mail. We
42 have comment forms in the back if you'd like to fill
43 one of those out and mail it to the Corps. That's more
44 than acceptable to do that.

45

46 I want to emphasize this is a key date
47 right here, October 14, 2014. For the written
48 comments, the key is also make sure it's postmarked by
49 the 14th and then the comments would be accepted. Any
50 sort of email comments, once again the date on the

1 email needs to be the 14th as being received.

2

3 Just a couple last things. We did
4 promise to show you where we're doing the public
5 meeting, so this is the list of the public meetings
6 that we will be doing. As you can see, it pretty much
7 goes from the North Slope as far south as Willow,
8 Anchorage, Kenai and Seward.

9

10 Once again, just to re-emphasize, I
11 can't tell you this date is more important, October
12 14th, 2014. We'll then do a scoping report that will
13 be published and available on the website. This fall
14 we'll get that done. Over the winter we're going to be
15 drafting the SEIS. We'll be back in the spring with
16 additional comments and then continue on with the
17 process.

18

19 So that concludes what I wanted to say.
20 So what I'd like to do now is we'll just stop, give you
21 an opportunity to look at maps, give you an opportunity
22 to ask questions. I think then what I'd like to do --
23 it's just about 10 after -- at 25 minutes after we'll
24 take any sort of public comments that any of you would
25 like to make verbally. We're happy to do that and that
26 would be great.

27

28 Once again, I know everybody is busy
29 and really appreciate you coming out and spending some
30 time learning about what's going on with us now.
31 Thanks.

32

33 (Off record)

34

35 (On record)

36

37 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you. Now would be
38 the time if anybody would like to give public comment.
39 This is a small room. You can come up and stand in
40 front, but I'm more than happy to just pass you the
41 mic. I am going to ask you to speak into the
42 microphone. Please say your first and last names and
43 spell it for us for the record and for the
44 transcriptions of the tape. That would be most
45 helpful. Does anybody want to -- great, great, give
46 some testimony.

47

48 MR. CARWILE: Hi. Steve Carwile, C-A-
49 R-W-I-L-E. Can the proponents or AGDC inform us as to
50 why the routing changed from straight down the DOT

1 ditch line in most sections of the pipeline to totally
2 away from the DOT ditch line. Is it related to PHMSA
3 requirements on pipe thickness and it's cheaper to get
4 away from the ditch line?

5
6 MR. THOMPSON: This is Mike Thompson.
7 I'm with the ASAP Project. I think it's a combination
8 of things. I think one of the reasons was to shorten
9 the length of the pipeline itself. If you look at the
10 Rev 6 version, which we're talking about here tonight,
11 it's at least 10 miles shorter than the Rev 5 version.
12 of the pipeline, therefore fewer environmental impacts.
13 The Fairbanks lateral also was reduced by I think about
14 five miles. So that was a piece of it.

15
16 The other piece was -- so, in
17 straightening the pipeline we had to get away from all
18 the bends and curves in the highway system. That was
19 one reason. The other was, when they started looking
20 at putting the pipeline within the DOT right-of-way,
21 there was a safety factor in that from PHMSA
22 regulations that required additional wall thickness in
23 the pipe, so there was a reduced cost also by moving
24 away from the highway system.

25
26 MR. TRUDGEN: Anyone else.

27
28 MR. SCHIROKAUER: David Schirokauer, S-
29 C-H-I-R-O-K-A-U-E-R. My comment is that I think the
30 applicant should reconsider the alignment. I don't
31 believe that a shorter route is necessarily less
32 impactful. Following the highly impacted road corridor
33 would, to me, clearly have the least environmental
34 impact because it's a road, it's in already, instead of
35 taking the pipeline across wildlands, providing
36 additional access, increasing the potential for
37 wildland fire by people hunting, trapping, driving
38 ATVs, partying along a pipeline corridor that would
39 otherwise be unavailable because it's heavily
40 vegetated.

41
42 There's additional river crossings so
43 the cost -- I don't have the figures, I don't know
44 everything that goes into it, but it seems like the
45 access roads that you'd have to build to access those
46 wildlands and the extra river crossings would add a
47 significant expense as well as access for maintenance
48 would be a lot easier along the highway.

49
50 As far as impacts to the National Park,

1 at first glance it might seem like bringing a pipeline
2 through a National Park, what on earth is that, but
3 really the impacts are probably going to be worse to
4 the Park, especially the viewshed because the pipe is
5 going to be visible from the Park on lands outside the
6 Park, whereas if it were right along the highway it
7 would be kind of part of the already built landscape.

8

9 So those are my comments. I think that
10 should be reconsidered. I think doing the easy thing
11 or the least expensive thing is not necessarily the
12 right thing.

13

14 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you.

15

16 MR. FORSYTHE: Jeff Forsythe, F-O-R-S-
17 Y-T-H-E. A couple questions. I see the size diameter
18 of the pipe went from 24 to 36-inch. I have a question
19 on that. Also a right-of-way goes very close to my
20 property. I don't think it's on mine, but at what
21 point does the condemning of land, I guess it is, or
22 eminent domain occur and is it just sort of a blanket
23 ability to do that or is there a process for each
24 parcel or how does that process go?

25

26 MR. THOMPSON: I'm sorry. I didn't
27 hear the question totally.

28

29 MR. FORSYTHE: The eminent domain, the
30 acquisition of the private properties near Healy
31 especially. It's very close to my property. It
32 doesn't look like it's on mine exactly, but when does
33 that occur, the acquisition of lands, and is it just
34 sort of a blanket ability to acquire those properties
35 or is each piece acquired individually in a different
36 process.

37

38 MR. THOMPSON: We can speak generally
39 to that now. The process probably won't start until
40 sometime later, after the open season process is
41 finished and if we have a successful open season. I
42 think those discussions will begin in earnest around
43 that timeframe. At this point each landowner is an
44 independent landowner and that's how we deal with them.
45 We would go and just evaluate their interest in
46 providing us an easement, whether they want to sell
47 their property. So there's a lot of different options.
48 A lot of those would be dealt with individually with
49 each landowner.

50

1 MR. FORSYTHE: The pipeline going from
2 24 to 36-inch diameter, how did that get.....

3
4 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah, what was the
5 question? Why?

6
7 MR. FORSYTHE: Yes.

8
9 MR. THOMPSON: So the 24-inch pipeline
10 was a high-pressure pipeline. It was 2,500 psi and it
11 also carried natural gas liquids, so it was fairly
12 thick-walled to handle those pressures. This pipeline
13 is at 1,480 psi and, by design, the pipeline under it's
14 current throughput, 500 million cubic feet a day.
15 Those design parameters allowed the pipeline to be
16 constructed without any additional compression.

17
18 So right now we have a gas conditioning
19 facility on the North Slope. As part of the processing
20 of the gas on the North Slope, it's compressed and sent
21 out of that facility at zero degrees -- actually 30
22 degrees I believe and it will travel the entire length
23 of this project without any additional compression
24 required. In the original project, I'm not sure, I
25 think it was more than two compression stations. It
26 may have been up to four or five that would have been
27 required to ship that much gas.

28
29 Miles Baker would like to add to that.

30
31 MR. BAKER: I'm Miles Baker with Alaska
32 Gasline Development Corporation. One last thing on the
33 pipe. The 36 is also an industry standard pipe. The
34 24 was a bit of an oddball in that respect and I think
35 in refining it, going to an industry standard pipe
36 there was a considerable cost savings, but the change
37 from the enriched gas to the lean gas also allowed us
38 to do that.

39
40 We get the eminent domain question a
41 lot, obviously. That's a very important issue to
42 everyone. I would just add that, one, of the 757
43 miles, including the Fairbanks lateral, I think we're
44 crossing less than 70 miles of private land. So in
45 this process and part of the process we're going
46 through now is to identify any potential problems in
47 those 70 miles. We want to mitigate those. We want to
48 work with private landowners.

49
50 The eminent domain power that came with

1 the corporations enabling statute is the same eminent
2 domain power that the State has, so it's not any
3 additional power in that sense. So it would be the
4 same very difficult process to go through eminent
5 domain, so it's not an easy process. It's one that we
6 want to avoid at all cost. So I would just add those
7 comments.

8

9 MS. RUSSELL: Nancy Russell, R-U-S-S-E-
10 L-L. My question is do you have survey markers for
11 these lines? Are these lines set in stone or are they
12 likely to move around? So all these people who are
13 close to it as far as our private property goes, we
14 think we're okay, but how certain is this?

15

16 MR. THOMPSON: So the line is not set
17 in stone and, no, it hasn't been surveyed. It's being
18 refined even as we speak, so there's several areas.
19 One is Dry Creek here where we've been informed that
20 maybe we need to move our line a little to the west
21 because of cultural resource issues associated with
22 that. There's some land issues that we've identified
23 and we've informed the engineers about potentially
24 moving the alignment east or west a little to avoid
25 some lands. It appears it might be easy to do. So
26 there is refinement going on right now.

27

28 MS. RUSSELL: So you realize that you
29 are affecting a fair amount of private property in
30 Healy, right?

31

32 MR. THOMPSON: Correct.

33

34 MS. RUSSELL: And how about the
35 archeological dig? You realize also that you're going
36 right through an archeological dig?

37

38 MR. THOMPSON: Correct, we've been
39 informed of that.

40

41 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you.

42

43 MR. CARWILE: Steve Carwile again. I'd
44 like to congratulate, I guess, the AGDC in what appears
45 to be a serious attempt to do horizontal directional
46 drilling on the Slope immediately south of the Grand
47 Denali Hotel, as shown on the maps with the false
48 right-of-way. Given that as a hopeful outcome, then I
49 would wholeheartedly support the route around the Park
50 given that all but two miles of that would be paired

1 with the existing intertie utility corridor and a good
2 part of the rest of that is potentially a scar on the
3 hillside could be mitigated by the directional drilling
4 underneath.

5
6 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you. Any other
7 comments.

8
9 MR. FORSYTHE: This is Jeff Forsythe
10 again. I saw there's a major access road. It looks
11 like it connects to the railroad and it's south of Otto
12 Lake north of the Windy Bridge. Is that sort of common
13 to have a major railroad access road to get supplies
14 and presumably pipe from that point? I mean I don't
15 think it's even at the Healy rail yard, but I don't
16 know of any other reason to have that access road. Is
17 that likely to be what is happening there, access for
18 hauling pipe to the right-of-way?

19
20 MR. THOMPSON: I think that's a comment
21 we'll just have to accept as a comment at this point
22 and respond when we put our scoping comments together
23 because I can't answer that specific question tonight.

24
25 MR. TRUDGEN: Any other comments.
26 Okay.

27
28 MR. SCHIROKAUER: Not really a comment,
29 a question. Sorry, I missed the presentation. Dave
30 Schirokauer again. So what are the next steps? I mean
31 this is kind of early on. How does this get funded and
32 what's the timeline and the likelihood of funding under
33 best case scenarios and worst case scenarios?

34
35 MR. BAKER: Are you talking about the
36 SEIS process itself or the overall.....

37
38 MR. SCHIROKAUER: The whole thing, SEIS
39 to Anchorage, Fairbanks, North Slope.

40
41 MR. BAKER: Do you want to address the
42 SEIS and then I can.....

43
44 MR. TRUDGEN: Sure. So the SEIS
45 process will take this -- the scoping comments that
46 we're receiving right now over the next several weeks.
47 We'll draft the supplemental EIS over this winter. The
48 draft will then go back out to public comment. This is
49 pretty good, so spring 2015. Fall 2015 then we'll
50 produce the final SEIS draft. There will be a public

1 comment period after that and then right now we're
2 hoping that the record of decision would be in the
3 early 2016.

4
5 Mary.

6
7 MS. ROMERO: I was going to say
8 something, but never mind.

9
10 MR. TRUDGEN: Okay. So that's our
11 timeline right now. We see no reason not to be able to
12 meet that timeline or make that timeline. We're
13 looking for a record of decision, so that would
14 conclude the supplemental environmental impact process.

15
16 MR. BAKER: So this process is running
17 sort of in parallel to the larger, I guess, commercial
18 viability of the project, but the project has been
19 publicly funded at this point, a little bit less than
20 \$400 million. That was funded by the Legislature to
21 get the project up through a project sanctioning
22 decision, which at the time of the funding was
23 anticipated to be sometime in 2016.

24
25 Obviously this is potentially the most
26 critical permit we would need so the timing of those
27 two things are in sync, but there are several things
28 that have to happen on the project site for us to reach
29 a sanctioning decision. One of those is to file a
30 recourse tariff package with the Regulatory Commission
31 of Alaska, which will regulate the rates and the
32 tariffs for this project.

33
34 We are waiting -- that was initially
35 intended to happen this fall. It's probably now
36 unlikely to happen before the end of the Legislative
37 session next year. That's basically a filing that
38 would include all or most of our updated project costs
39 and then that would be what we need to go into a
40 commercial open season, which in essence would be when
41 gas suppliers and gas buyers would come together.
42 They'd look at our project, they'd look at the tariffs,
43 they'd look at the capacity and they would decide
44 whether they wanted to ship on the project.

45
46 So that's really the determinant
47 whether the project will move forward if we can get
48 those commercial shipping agreements because if we can,
49 then we would take those out to the capital markets and
50 we'd raise money against those firm transportation

1 agreements. So I don't see that happening before --
2 the earliest, mid 2016.

3
4 Complicating all of this is, of course,
5 the State has decided to partner in another project, so
6 how that other project comes together may result in the
7 Legislature giving the corporation a different
8 direction in terms of that timeline.

9
10 MR. SCHIROKAUER: Does the 400 million
11 take it to like a final engineering state or is it
12 still like what we're seeing here, a not final
13 engineering state?

14
15 MR. BAKER: The 400 million was 5
16 percent of what the estimated construction cost was,
17 which is about \$8 billion and that's sort of the
18 industry standard for what you're going to have to
19 spend to get the project up to a cost estimate that you
20 could reasonably take to people and say this is a
21 reasonable cost, this is the tariff we would need to
22 recover those costs. So that's the project sanctioning
23 decision.

24
25 So we feel that the money we have will
26 get us -- even if that timeline is stretched a little
27 bit, we still believe that that's enough money to get
28 us to that point. The corporation -- the project team
29 right now has been involved in a very detailed cost
30 design exercise because the \$8 billion was a 2012 plus
31 or minus 30 percent cost estimate. By the end of this
32 year we hope to have a much more refined cost estimate
33 and in 2014 dollars.

34
35 MS. RUSSELL: Nancy Russell again. I
36 would urge you to reconsider maybe using the road
37 corridor again even though it's going to be more
38 costly. There's less of an environmental impact and
39 there's certainly less impact on people's private
40 property. Beyond all that, you're going to get it all
41 back in the end eventually. It's just going to maybe
42 take you a little longer, but you'll make it back.

43
44 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you. Any other
45 additional thoughts.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 MR. TRUDGEN: Okay, great. So one more
50 time I'd like to thank you all for coming and sharing

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 19 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Healy Scoping Meeting on August 18, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Cantwell, Alaska
August 20, 2014

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Cantwell, Alaska - 8/20/2014)

4
5 (On record - 5:35 p.m.)

6
7 MR. TRUDGEN: We'll get started. Thank
8 you all for coming. I know the room is small and
9 normally I wouldn't speak into this mic, but we are
10 recording everything this evening, so I'm going to talk
11 into the mic because it will help us record it. If
12 hopefully any of you want to provide comments after a
13 short presentation, then I will ask you as well to
14 speak into the mic so we can record it.

15
16 Welcome. This is the public meeting to
17 talk about the supplemental EIS process that's now
18 going on for the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline Project,
19 ASAP. I love that acronym ASAP. Every time I read it
20 in my emails it's like, oh, boy, I have to do something
21 immediately and it doesn't seem to happen.

22
23 We're going to start off with some
24 introductions. Mary Romero is here with the Corps, so
25 she's going to give you some introductions. We're
26 going to talk about as well what's the difference
27 between this project and the other gasline project, the
28 Alaska LNG Project, which is the project that is
29 sponsored by the Alaska Development Corporation. They
30 are partner in that, but that's the project also with
31 the producers. So we'll talk about the differences
32 between these two lines a little bit.

33
34 We'll show you where we are in the NEPA
35 process, why we're doing the supplemental EIS, a little
36 bit of the project description as it stands now. Also
37 talk about some of the project comparisons, old versus
38 new routes. And then show you where we're doing the
39 scoping meetings, the list of where we are and then any
40 next steps that we have and then we'll finish up with
41 any sort of comments that you would like to make.

42
43 So, with that, I'm going to ask Mary to
44 come up and do an introduction.

45
46 MS. ROMERO: Like Dave said, my name is
47 Mary Romero. I'm with the Corps of Engineers and we
48 are the lead Federal agency for the supplemental
49 environmental impact statement, the SEIS, that is being
50 written. Again, Dave said that this is being recorded

1 and that is so that we can get your comments exactly
2 the way you ask them. That's a very important part of
3 the whole NEPA process.

4
5 So the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline
6 Project is the one we're talking about tonight, ASAP.
7 The Alaska Gasline Development Corporation is the
8 applicant and proponent for this project. I'm going to
9 go ahead and introduce those from AGDC that are here
10 tonight. We have Mike Thompson.

11
12 MR. THOMPSON: Hello. Mike Thompson.
13 I'm with the ASAP project and I'm the environment
14 regulatory and land manager.

15
16 MS. LEVINTON: Hi. I'm Leah Levinton.
17 I am part of the corporate side, the Alaska Gasline
18 Development Corporation, and I'm the external affairs
19 coordinator.

20
21 MS. ROMERO: Okay. So we've told you
22 who the proponent is. Now I also need to let you know
23 that the Corps of Engineers is neither a proponent or
24 an opponent of the project. Some of the other Federal
25 agencies that are involved may be a proponent or an
26 opponent and they will let you know as we -- the few
27 that are here are introduced.

28
29 There are six other agencies that are
30 cooperating with the Corps of Engineers to write the
31 supplemental EIS. The way the Corps was selected to be
32 the lead agency is that it is determined by the scope
33 of the jurisdiction that each agency has. Since there
34 are so many wetlands and rivers and the ocean on the
35 North Slope are part of this project and we have
36 jurisdiction over those different things.

37
38 Additionally EPA is a cooperating
39 agency and they actually have oversight over the Corps
40 of Engineers under the Clean Water Act.

41
42 BLM is a cooperating agency and their
43 authority is the right-of-ways that would be on their
44 land and they either grant that right-of-way or deny
45 it.

46
47 Then the National Park Service is also
48 a cooperating agency and Eric Smith is here with the
49 Park Service and I'm going to have him say what their
50 authorities are.

1 MR. SMITH: I'm Eric Smith. I'm with
2 Denali National Park and Preserve. I'm the chief of
3 maintenance there, but I'm here representing the
4 superintendent's office and kind of like the BLM with
5 the old route that was proposed through the Park, but
6 this one is kind of going around the Park. We are a
7 very big proponent of this project and would like to
8 see it come just for reducing energy cost for the
9 Interior of Alaska.

10

11 Then we also have PHSMA, which is the
12 Pipeline Hazardous Safety Materials Administration and
13 their authorities are on safety regulations of the pipe
14 itself.

15

16 And the last Federal agency is the U.S.
17 Fish and Wildlife Service. Their specific authorities
18 are for endangered species that might be impacted along
19 the route.

20

21 Additionally the State Pipeline
22 Coordinator's Office is also a cooperating agency and
23 we have two gentlemen from SPCO. We have Chris
24 Grundman.

25

26 MR. GRUNDMAN: Chris Grundman with the
27 Department of Natural Resources, State Pipeline
28 Coordinator's Office. Our authority is under Alaska
29 Statute 38.35 for the common carrier, contract carrier
30 pipelines and we manage any authorization that would be
31 needed for this project on State lands and waters that
32 we manage and that would include the actual right-of-
33 way itself, easements, permits for temporary land use,
34 material sales and like access roads and those types of
35 authorizations.

36

37 MR. SMITH: I'm Graham Smith. I work
38 with Chris at the SPCO and as a cooperating agency
39 we're here to see the Corps presentation, but we're
40 also here to answer any questions you might have or at
41 least point you in the right direction and try to get
42 you the information that you need from the State's
43 perspective. Feel free to talk to any of us after the
44 meeting is over and we'll be happy to try to help you
45 out.

46

47 MS. ROMERO: Okay. So those are the
48 six different agencies that will be working with us to
49 write the EIS. The Corps does not typically do the
50 actual writing of the EIS. We have authority to have a

1 third party contractor and that's where Dave, who I
2 don't even think said his name.

3

4 MR. TRUDGEN: I didn't.

5

6 MS. ROMERO: ERM will actually write
7 the whole supplemental environmental impact statement
8 and the Corps, along with the other agencies, will
9 review it for accuracy and legal deficiency. Did you
10 want to say anything else about writing.....

11

12 MR. TRUDGEN: No.

13

14 MS. ROMERO: Okay. And he will also be
15 giving the presentation tonight on the project. So by
16 the time we get to the final SEIS, many of the
17 different agencies will list a preferred alternative.
18 Through the development of the supplemental EIS we will
19 look at what other alternatives should be included for
20 this project that aren't even talked about tonight.
21 The Corps does not make a statement of a preferred
22 alternative. We actually have to go through the record
23 of decision process before we make our determination of
24 the least environmentally damaging practicable
25 alternative, also known as the LEDPA.

26

27 So the Corps has two responsibilities
28 for this project. The first one is NEPA, the National
29 Environmental Policy Act, and that's why we are here
30 tonight. Under NEPA there are two specific things that
31 we're required to do. We're required to give full
32 disclosure on any and all environment impacts that
33 would be caused by this project if it were to be built,
34 and then the other one is we are required to get public
35 input.

36

37 So there are three different times that
38 we do that and the first one is scoping and that's
39 where we are right now. The second one will be when
40 the draft supplemental EIS is completed and put out.
41 It's called the Notice of Availability. The scoping on
42 this project is 75 days long. At the draft
43 supplemental EIS that one will be 60 days long and then
44 the final chance to comment is at the final SEIS and
45 that's 30 days.

46

47 So what scoping and draft public
48 meetings allow the public to do is provide input so
49 that the applicant can or may make changes based on the
50 comments that you provide. So it's really critical

1 that if there are things that you feel need to be
2 changed or you would like to see involved in this
3 project that you make those things known by providing
4 comment.

5
6 The second thing that the Corps does is
7 we go through the permitting process on this project.
8 So there are three different authorities that I briefly
9 touched on and the first one is section 10 of the River
10 and Harbors Act of 1899 and that's for any work that
11 would affect navigable waters. Then Section 404 of the
12 Clean Water Act, which is for the discharge of dredged
13 or fill materials into waters of the U.S., including
14 wetlands.

15
16 The third authority on this project,
17 which was not an authority we had under the original
18 EIS is Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research
19 and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 and that would be for
20 transport of dredged materials and ocean dumping. The
21 reason that one is new to the SEIS is that there's
22 considerable expansion on the project within the West
23 Dock area.

24
25 Now I'm turning it over to Dave.

26
27 MR. TRUDGEN: Thanks, Mary. So in any
28 sort of supplemental EIS you always have to have a
29 purpose and a need for project. The purpose for this
30 project put forth by our State Legislature was to
31 provide natural gas to residents of Fairbanks and
32 Southcentral, right down the railbelt line. Also to
33 provide a stable, long-term supply of that natural gas.
34 This is the stated need. This is going to be the
35 stated purpose in the supplemental EIS and it's
36 virtually the same as the EIS that was written in 2012.

37
38
39 So, as I mentioned briefly before, the
40 project is running parallel with another gasline
41 project. This is a chart to just show you some of the
42 differences between the two projects. To point out a
43 couple key things, of course the sponsor is the
44 industry, but I'd like to point this one out. The ASAP
45 project provides lean gas, in other words it's more
46 commercially available, readily easy to tap into the
47 line to be able to -- for communities to tap into the
48 line and utilize the gas.

49
50 The LNG line is a much higher pressure

1 line and it is specifically designed for LNG. The LNG
2 gas would be taken to Nikiski where it would be
3 liquified and put for export and then that's the second
4 that's really a difference between the two. The In-
5 state Gas Pipeline is truly in-state. It's for use in
6 the state of Alaska and this line is designed for
7 export. It will be available to the residents of the
8 state of Alaska, but it would be harder to be able to
9 take this gas as opposed to this gas.

10

11 You can see some other differences.
12 The ASAP pipeline is a little bit shorter, 727 to 800
13 miles. Then the ASAP has, as part of the design, a 29-
14 mile lateral line to supply natural gas to Fairbanks.
15 Then you can see the other differences.

16

17 So why do we have to do a supplemental
18 EIS. What is driving this process. Why are we having
19 to even stand up here and come and talk with you.
20 Well, there's a couple of driving factors in NEPA that
21 drives an SEIS. It's either significant new
22 circumstances or information or substantial. We're
23 actually focusing more on the substantial changes. It
24 will evaluate those changes from the original design.
25 So this bullet right here is important in terms that
26 we're building on an EIS that's already been done. We
27 don't have to rewrite the whole thing again. We will
28 look at all the changes, the environmental impacts of
29 those changes and I'll review some of those changes
30 over the next couple of slides. So the changes are
31 what's driving and doing this. Then, as well, like I
32 said, we're going to build on an EIS that's already
33 been completed and already done.

34

35 Mary, you already went through this, so
36 I don't have to. So where we are in the overall NEPA
37 process. Of course, we're just right up here at the
38 beginning. Just to re-emphasize there are a couple
39 other comment periods. After all the scoping meetings
40 are complete we'll write an analysis of alternatives
41 and a scoping meeting report and put that together,
42 then we will draft the SEIS. That actually happens
43 this winter with a draft being done in the spring and
44 then you'll see us back in late spring in all the
45 communities that we're going in right now.

46

47 Your opportunity now is to address and
48 talk about the draft EIS, so you'll have an opportunity
49 to read that and comment on that. We will review and
50 respond to all the comments, draft the final EIS and

1 then once again there will be an opportunity for
2 comment on that. We hope to publish the final record
3 of decision in early 2016.

4
5 So what is the project, the current
6 one. This is where I hope to point out some
7 differences between the other one. The project is
8 utility-grade natural gas that we already talked about.
9 The pipeline now is 100 percent buried with a few
10 exceptions at the fault lines and then it will go above
11 ground at a few river crossings, but by and large the
12 entire pipeline is buried.

13
14 There is one gas conditioning facility
15 located on the Slope and no other compressor stations
16 are needed. So that is a big change from the last one.
17 I think there were four compressor stations in the
18 original design, so those were eliminated with this
19 design because we used utility-grade natural gas. The
20 lateral line to Fairbanks that we know about.

21
22 The route generally follows TAPS until
23 you get just north of Fairbanks, then goes west of
24 Fairbanks, and as we all know comes through where we
25 are right now and then terminates just out of Big Lake,
26 by Big Lake, an ENSTAR system.

27
28 The permanent construction right-of-way
29 will be 120 feet wide. The permanent right-of-way 53
30 feet wide. There's some maps and drawings of this up
31 on the wall. It's going to be open-cut trenching for
32 the huge amount of the pipeline. One of the reasons
33 that it's below ground in a lot of places is that
34 they've been able to figure out to use HDD, horizontal
35 directional drilling, under a lot of the major river
36 portions. So we'll just use the Yukon. So we're going
37 to be able to directionally drill underneath the Yukon
38 for example. To do that it will have mobile
39 construction camps and certainly material sites along
40 the entire route.

41
42 So this is a map of the general
43 alignment which you've all seen and the lateral line
44 going out to Fairbanks.

45
46 On the North Slope was said there was a
47 gas conditioning plant, so this is the plant on the
48 North Slope. For those that might be familiar, the
49 central gas facility is here, West Dock is off in this
50 direction. The next slide I'll give you more.

1 This encompasses 70-plus acres in size.
2 It has a lay-down yard off to the side. This is about
3 20 acres. Then construction camp as well as an
4 operation center on another pad of about 20 acres as
5 well, so that's the imprint that will be made up on the
6 Slope and some additional connecting roads.

7
8 This is another major change in the
9 project and it has to do with West Dock. Initially
10 lighter modules are going to be brought in. The
11 modules that need to be brought in are large-scale
12 modules, so there needs to be some dredging done at
13 West Dock, which was not in the original plan at all.
14 It needs to be dredged to a 10-foot depth amount and
15 that will happen in this area right here. The road
16 itself needs to be widened a bit, so right in here,
17 this dock head corresponds with that. The road needs
18 to be widened to about 75 feet.

19
20 Lastly, what will be done here is
21 they're going to put in a barge. This bridge is not
22 stout enough to be able to support the modules, so
23 they're going to use a barge bridge. They'll build a
24 ramp on this side and take two barges that have
25 ballasting capabilities and basically sink them so they
26 sit on the ocean floor, bring in the modules, offload
27 the modules and then they can refloat those and take
28 them out. During that process they'll work with Fish
29 and Game actually to provide fish passage through here
30 and, of course, once it's gone then it's gone. A
31 conceptual photo of one of the barges.

32
33 So again just to look at and review a
34 little bit on why we're having to do the SEIS and some
35 of the differences. We've talked about them all. It's
36 a rich natural gas and now we're at lean natural gas.
37 We have no natural gas liquids. A little bit shorter
38 pipeline, a little bit shorter lateral line to
39 Fairbanks, a single compressor compared to multiples
40 and then, of course, one of the bigger changes is the
41 modification at Dock Head 3 and what's going on up on
42 the Slope.

43
44 So how can everybody get involved. I
45 mean the folks that are sitting here, provide us your
46 comments. Tonight is the first opportunity. When
47 we're done with this, then we'll take any comment that
48 you have, any verbal comment would be wonderful.
49 Besides that there is a website, asapeis.com. Lots of
50 information on that website. The maps and photos that

1 are posted here are being uploaded hopefully as we
2 speak, but this week. We're working on uploading
3 those. There are other maps and lots of background
4 documents on that site. There's a list of all the
5 places that we're going for these public meetings and
6 public hearings.

7
8 And you would have availability for a
9 link on there to be able to provide comments. You can
10 send Mary emails all day lone. This is the email
11 address to the Army Corps. On that back table we have
12 comment sheets. You can fill out those comment sheets
13 and send them to the Corps of Engineers at this
14 address.

15 Lastly and very important date is this
16 date October 14, 2014. That is the last date comments
17 will be accepted for this period. If you do mail them
18 in, it needs to be postmarked by that date. If you're
19 doing email, the date on the email need to match that.
20 So please keep that in mind. It's October 14th.

21
22 These are where we're doing the
23 meetings. I think nobody would be surprised on where
24 these are. Literally from the North Slope right
25 through the middle part, ending in Anchorage, Kenai and
26 Seward.

27
28 Once again, this is what's going to
29 happen. This scoping period will close on October 14th
30 and then we'll do our scoping report and post that. We
31 were talking today on when that might be accomplished
32 and, to tell you the truth, it depends on how many
33 comments we get over the next two and a half weeks of
34 meetings. Get that out and then right after that we'll
35 prepare the draft EIS to be published hopefully by the
36 end of the first quarter of next year and then public
37 comment period after that.

38
39 So that's really it. That's the
40 highlights of what we wanted to go through, give you an
41 idea what is happening now, comparisons, why we're
42 doing a supplemental EIS in the first place. Now we
43 get to -- really, if anybody has any comments, this is
44 going to be the period when you can provide that
45 comment.

46
47 Once again I'd like to thank everybody
48 for coming. It's in the evening and you've driven a
49 ways. It's always hard for us to get out and -- the
50 sun is even out. For me being from Anchorage, I mean

1 when the sun is out it's really hard to stay inside.
2 So would anybody like to provide a comment? I do ask
3 that you please state your name and spell it if you
4 would so we get it accurate.

5
6 MR. CARLSON: Gordon Carlson, G-O-R-D-
7 O-N C-A-R-L-S-O-N. I live here in Cantwell. Pretty
8 much a strong supporter of the gasline only if it
9 actually benefits people. To me, the current thing I'm
10 seeing right now and I've been seeing is there's going
11 to be no take-offs coming through the smaller
12 communities. I think it's extremely important that the
13 State design that in there or whoever is designing this
14 go ahead and just start factoring in take-offs in
15 Nenana, Healy, McKinley Village, Clear, Cantwell, all
16 the way down.

17
18 I mean I don't think the onus should be
19 just on the community because it won't happen if it's
20 on the community. It's a bigger deal after the line is
21 up and running for somebody to shut a line down, do a
22 hot tap into the system versus having it designed and
23 built right into the system as it comes through.

24
25 That way a smaller -- maybe ENSTAR
26 decides to come to Cantwell and say we're going to
27 supply gas. Here's a place we can screw a pipe fitting
28 right to it and open a valve because that's how basic
29 it will get if it's already in there. If somebody has
30 to go and shut a line down and put a hot tap, that's a
31 bigger deal and the expense is going to be a whole lot
32 more after the fact instead of before the fact.

33
34 For me, if that isn't there, then I'm
35 not even a supporter of it. It's just like why watch
36 the area get tore up through here and don't see any
37 benefit from it. That's my comment. Thanks.

38
39 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you very much.
40 Anybody else.

41
42 (No comments)

43
44 MR. TRUDGEN: That's great. Remember
45 about the comments. I'd really appreciate friends,
46 neighbors. That website is available for comments.
47 The email is available for comments. If you want to
48 take a package of these comment sheets with you before
49 you leave, please do that. Please take copies of the
50 handouts, as many as you'd like. The more comments we

1 get I think the better of a pipeline we get, just like
2 that comment. So it's very helpful.

3

4 All right. I appreciate everyone
5 coming. Thank you.

6

7 (Off record)

8

9 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 13 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Cantwell Scoping Meeting on August 20, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Talkeetna, Alaska
August 21, 2014

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Talkeetna, Alaska - 8/21/2014)

4
5 (On record - 5:35 p.m.)

6
7 MR. TRUDGEN: Okay. Everyone, if you
8 could have a seat, we're going to go ahead and get
9 started. Thank you all for coming this evening. I
10 know, particularly on a beautiful, sunny evening, for
11 you to come and spend time, we really appreciate you
12 coming in. Welcome to -- this is a public meeting
13 associated with a supplemental EIS for the in-state
14 pipeline, so the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline Project.
15 My name is Dave Trudgen. I work for ERM Alaska. We're
16 the third-party contractor that's been hired by the
17 Corps of Engineers, Mary Romero, to actually write the
18 supplemental EIS.

19
20 So what are we going to cover tonight.
21 I just briefly in this brief presentation will go
22 through -- Mary is going to introduce a lot of the
23 project and introduce the Corps' role in the project as
24 well as the cooperating agencies. We're going to look
25 at the little differences between the ASAP project as
26 well as -- I'm sure you know, a couple weeks ago,
27 whenever, the producer's line, the Alaska LNG line
28 folks came through and that's a different pipeline
29 project from this one, so we'll talk about some of
30 those differences and make sure that we all know that
31 we're talking about the ASAP project this evening. So
32 the Alaska Stand Alone Project.

33
34 We'll look at where we are in the NEPA
35 process and what it's going to take then to finish the
36 supplemental EIS and the timeframe associated with that
37 and we'll look at why it's needed, go through a brief
38 project description of what the current ASAP project
39 looks like and some of the old versus new routes and
40 some of the differences and talk about the scoping
41 comment period and how long it is and how you can
42 provide your comments and then just meeting schedules
43 and some of our next steps.

44
45 So I think with that I'm going to
46 introduce Mary and she's going to go ahead and talk to
47 you about her agencies and the other agencies that are
48 involved.

49
50 MS. ROMERO: Thank you for coming

1 tonight. My name is Mary Romero and I work for the
2 Corps of Engineers. We are the lead agency on the
3 supplemental environmental impact statement that is
4 being written. The Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline is
5 ASAP. The proponent and applicant for it is AGDC, the
6 Alaska Gasline Development Corporation, and we have a
7 couple people here tonight with AGDC. We have Mike
8 Thompson and I'll let you talk a little bit about AGDC
9 and introduce Miles.

10

11 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. I'm Mike
12 Thompson. I'm the environmental regulatory and land
13 lead for the ASAP Project. ASAP is one of two projects
14 that AGDC is managing. Tonight we have with us Miles
15 Baker and he's with the corporation.

16

17 MR. BAKER: Hi. Good evening. Miles
18 Baker. I run the external affairs and government
19 relations for Alaska Gasline Development Corporation,
20 which is publicly-owned, a corporation you own, the
21 Legislature created about two years ago. This project
22 we're talking about tonight has been funded with public
23 funding to date, about \$400 million. I'll be happy to
24 answer your questions.

25

26 MS. ROMERO: Okay. The Corps is
27 neither a proponent or an opponent of this project. As
28 we go along and I introduce or talk about the different
29 agencies that are involved, you'll find out that some
30 of them actually are proponents or could be opponents
31 of the project too.

32

33 So the way that we determine who will
34 be the lead Federal agency is by which agency has the
35 most jurisdictional authority. Since the Corps has
36 jurisdiction over wetlands and waters of the U.S.,
37 Section 10 over navigable waters as well, there's an
38 awful lot of that along this line. So the Corps
39 actually has the most area to have jurisdiction over.

40

41 So there are six other agencies, five
42 Federal and one State, that are cooperating agencies to
43 help write the supplemental EIS. As Dave indicated
44 earlier, the Corps doesn't write the EIS themselves.
45 We actually have a third-party contractor that is hired
46 who will do the writing and then the Corps, along with
47 the other agencies that are cooperating, will oversee
48 it to make sure that everything is covered that needs
49 to be covered within that.

50

1 So then I'll start telling you who the
2 different agencies are. We have EPA and they actually
3 have oversight over the Corps on the Clean Water Act.
4 Then BLM and they would be involved because they are
5 the ones who would give authorization for right-of-ways
6 on their land. Then we have the Park Service and
7 they're involved because one of the alternatives from
8 the original FEIS would go through the Park and we
9 don't have anyone from the Park Service here tonight,
10 but they have been very vocal about stating that they
11 are a proponent of the project and are looking forward
12 to getting gas off of the project if it is to be built.
13 Then we also have PHMSA, which is the Pipeline
14 Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, and they
15 have oversight on the safety of the pipeline. Then we
16 have the State Pipeline Coordinator's Office and we
17 have Jason Walsh with us here tonight. Jason, do you
18 want to tell what your authorities are.

19
20 MR. WALSH: The State Pipeline
21 Coordinator's Office is representing the Department of
22 Natural Resources and other State agencies as a
23 cooperating agency in this SEIS. We recognize and want
24 to make sure everybody knows there's two projects right
25 now out there. There's this ASAP Project and there's
26 an AK LNG Project. The commissioner Joe Balash of DNR
27 and Dan Opalski have acknowledged that it's likely only
28 one project will be built. The Governor has referred
29 to this project as the ace in the hole should another
30 project not go through all the way.

31
32 Another important thing to note with
33 this particular project, the State has already issued a
34 right-of-way lease for it and ASAP is going through the
35 process of refining the route for that right-of-way
36 lease within the area that they've identified, which is
37 why we're all here this evening. Part of why we're all
38 here. I'm here to answer any questions you might have
39 about the other project or the relationship that the
40 State has with either of these projects. Thank you for
41 coming.

42
43 MS. ROMERO: In addition to ERM writing
44 the supplemental EIS, they will also be giving the
45 presentation tonight. So while most agencies, when we
46 get to the final supplemental EIS, will state what
47 their preferred alternative is after going through the
48 review of all the environmental factors, they will
49 decide if one route is better than the other and it
50 will be stated in the FEIS.

1 The Corps of Engineers does not list a
2 preferred alternative. We actually go through a record
3 of decision and after writing that we come up with the
4 least environmentally damaging practicable alternative,
5 the LEDPA, and then it's only after all that that we
6 have reviewed all the public interest factors and
7 everything that we would make a decision on that.

8
9 So the Corps has two responsibilities
10 for this project and the first one is NEPA, which is
11 why we're here tonight, the National Environmental
12 Policy Act, and there are two distinct things within
13 NEPA that we are required to do. We are required to
14 provide full disclosure of all the environmental
15 impacts that would occur from this proposed developed
16 and we are also required to provide opportunities for
17 the public to provide comment. Any different agencies
18 that might be for it or against it, any environmental
19 groups or whatever.

20
21 So the first one is this scoping period
22 that we're in right now and that is 75 days long at
23 this time. The second opportunity is at the draft
24 supplemental EIS, which will be about six to nine
25 months down the road. Then the final opportunity to
26 comment would be at the final SEIS and that's a 30-day
27 comment period.

28
29 Besides the NEPA process the Corps also
30 is involved in the permitting process and that is based
31 on our three different jurisdictional regulations. So,
32 for this particular project it would be Section 10 of
33 the River and Harbors Act of 1899 for any work on
34 navigable waters. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act
35 and that's for discharge of dredged or fill materials
36 into waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Then
37 Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research and
38 Sanctuary Act of 1972 and that's for any transport of
39 dredged materials and ocean dumping. As Dave is going
40 to explain to you, that is a new authority that the
41 Corps would be adding in the supplemental EIS because
42 of all the work that's going to occur in West Dock.

43
44 At this time I'm going to turn it over
45 to Dave.

46
47 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you, Mary. To do
48 this project either as an EIS or a supplemental EIS
49 each one has to have a purpose and need. It is the
50 foundation for doing any sort of NEPA-type EIS

1 document. So this is the purpose for this particular
2 project. As requested by our Alaska State Legislature,
3 it is to provide -- and it calls out Fairbanks, but
4 Fairbanks, Southcentral, the Railbelt with natural gas
5 and, more importantly, a long-term supply of natural
6 gas to be used as fuel services for homes as well as
7 businesses. So this is fundamentally the reason and
8 the purpose for the project in the first place.

9

10 So, as I mentioned before and as you've
11 heard, there's two gas lines that are out there, so
12 let's talk about some of the differences between the
13 two. There's a few highlights that I want to point out
14 on this chart. ASAP, this is the project that we're
15 talking about. The Alaska LNG is the project that AGDC
16 is a partner and a sponsor in that project, but of
17 course the others are BP, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil
18 and Trans-Canada.

19

20 So some of the differences -- and this,
21 I think, is a big one right here, ASAP is going to be
22 utility-grade lean gas. What does that mean? It means
23 that it's much simpler to be able to take the gas off
24 and use right away for homes and businesses. There's
25 not a lot that needs to be done to it to make it ready
26 for use. The LNG Project is for liquid natural gas.
27 It's a larger diameter. That gas will end up in
28 Nikiski to an LNG plant where it's liquified and then
29 exported. That's another major difference. Really the
30 LNG line is being constructed primarily for export and
31 the ASAP project is for in-state gas use, so another
32 difference.

33

34 Mechanically, some of the differences.
35 ASAP is a little shorter line, it's a smaller diameter
36 pipeline. Another point is both will have a gas
37 processing plant on the North Slope, but the ASAP
38 project that's the only gas treatment plant. There's
39 no need for any other compressor stations along the
40 length of the line. So the gas will be compressed, put
41 into the pipeline on the Slope and then it connects
42 actually with the Beluga line west of Wasilla. The
43 Alaska LNG line will have eight compressor stations, I
44 believe, associated with that line. So some
45 differences there. Then you can see some of the other
46 ones in cost and work force capacities.

47

48 So why are we doing a supplemental EIS.
49 We already know an EIS was written for this project.
50 It was completed in 2012. There's a couple of drivers

1 to do a supplemental EIS. Either significant new
2 circumstances or new information or substantial
3 changes. Really, for this project, it's the second
4 bullet that's driving the EIS as much as anything. The
5 project has continued to be refined since 2012. The
6 alignment has changed. Some 70 miles or so has been
7 changed.

8

9 I'll go through a project description
10 and highlight some of the other changes that have taken
11 place since 2012. The other aspect that I wanted to
12 point out here as well, in doing a supplemental EIS we
13 really tier off the EIS that's already been written.
14 We don't have to write an entire new, huge document for
15 this. I have no idea right now how long or short it's
16 going to be, so I don't want to give you an idea that
17 it could be just a short document, but there's been a
18 lot of good work done, so we focus on the changes while
19 we write the supplemental EIS. Changes in the project
20 from 2012 and that's what we'll be focusing on. We
21 know a lot of good work was done in the original EIS
22 and we'll use that information.

23

24 So where are we in the process. Mary
25 highlighted this a little bit. We're really just
26 beginning. The whole supplemental EIS process gets
27 started with the Corps publishing a notice of intent.
28 They published that on August 1st and now we're in our
29 scoping meetings and just starting there. So this is
30 the first opportunity for public comment and we'll go
31 through how you can do public comment in a little
32 while.

33

34 After this we'll write an alternative
35 analysis. Also a scoping report will be written. That
36 will be done by the fall of this year and then we'll
37 draft the supplemental EIS. We hope to have the draft
38 done by the first quarter of next year and then there
39 will be the second period where we'll have public
40 meetings. We'll come back, you'll see us again and
41 that will be the opportunity to comment on the
42 supplemental EIS. You'll be able to have an
43 opportunity to read through it and provide comment.

44

45 So that's the second time you'll be
46 able to do it. We'll then take those comments, write
47 an analysis of those in response and it goes on. Then
48 we prepare the final supplemental EIS. That goes back
49 out for public comment. We won't come back out for
50 public hearings, but you will have a chance to comment

1 on that again. Then we hope early in 2016, if the
2 schedule holds, which we are all shooting for, would be
3 the record of decision by the Corps.

4
5 So what is this ASAP Project and how
6 has it changed a little bit from 2012. First off it's
7 all buried. Before parts of it were above ground. Now
8 it's buried. It starts being buried. There's only a
9 couple exceptions to that. One exception is the fault
10 lines and then the second exception is there's a couple
11 river crossings, but the majority of river crossings
12 will be directionally drilled under. Yukon River, for
13 example, will be directionally drilled under.

14
15 I mentioned a gas conditioning facility
16 is just one at Prudhoe Bay and that will be all that's
17 needed. There won't be any other compressor stations
18 needed. It's a 36-inch line operating just under 1,500
19 psi. Then there's a 12-inch lateral line that's part
20 of this project that goes to Fairbanks. I'll show you
21 a map on where that connects in and where it goes.

22
23 In essence, the pipeline parallels TAPS
24 until it gets to Livengood, stays west of Fairbanks,
25 comes down and goes through Denali and then it's west
26 here and then continues on down and connects into
27 Milepost 39 at Beluga.

28
29 The right-of-way during construction
30 will be 120 feet wide. There will be a few areas where
31 they'll have to go wider. For example, when you're
32 doing directional drilling, you may have to go off that
33 a little bit, but by and large 120-foot wide
34 construction right-of-way. A permanent right-of-way of
35 53 feet wide.

36
37 Construction techniques, they're
38 showing up here in some of the diagrams. Open-cut
39 trench. I mentioned HDD, horizontal directional
40 drilling under many of the river crossings. There will
41 be mobile construction camps and material sites, some
42 33 million cubic yards at this point has been figured
43 in to how much material will be needed. So there will
44 be material sites as well.

45
46 So this is a general facility map.
47 There's the off-take in Fairbanks. Then this is more
48 of where that off-take will go.

49
50 Up on the Slope the gas conditioning

1 plant is located really near the central gas facility.
2 For those who may be familiar with the Slope, West Dock
3 is up in this direction. The next slide will give you
4 a little bit more of an aerial shot. A gas
5 conditioning plant takes about 70 to 75 acres. There's
6 a construction lay-down yard of 20 acres adjacent to it
7 and then there's this operations and construction camp,
8 an additional 20 acres. That associated with a few
9 connecting roads. So this is the proposed location of
10 the gas conditioning plant.

11
12 One of the things that Mary mentioned
13 and this is a major difference between the 2012 EIS
14 that was written and the supplemental EIS is what's
15 happening at West Dock. The project is going to use
16 relatively -- they're going to build the modules for
17 the gas conditioning plant off site. They will bring
18 it in via barges. To be able to land those barges they
19 need to do some dredging, so this canal right here is a
20 dredge canal. They need to go down to a 10-foot
21 contour level, so it needs to be 10 feet deep. They
22 need to widen this section of the road right here to
23 about 75 feet, so there will be a little bit widening
24 in here.

25
26 Then this bridge right here is not
27 strong enough to be able to support the module, so what
28 they're going to do is build a couple ramps on the
29 side, take two barges, put them end to end, they're
30 ballastable barges, so they'll in essence sink them to
31 the ocean floor, take the modules across that and then
32 the barges would be refloated and removed, working with
33 ADF&G.

34
35 So this is a major change in the
36 project in that there's dredge and fill material
37 associated with this and dredging and filling and that
38 was not contemplated during the 2012 EIS effort. A
39 conceptual of what one of those barges looks like with
40 the module.

41
42 So just to review then quickly some of
43 the primary differences between the two. The original
44 project had gas liquids in it. Now we're at utility-
45 grade gas. The pipeline was shortened a bit. The
46 Fairbanks line was shortened a bit. Support
47 facilities, only one now up on the North Slope. Then,
48 of course, the West Dock that we just spoke about.

49
50 Sort of an important page as far as I'm

1 concerned and this is how can you provide comment and
2 why you're here hopefully. Not only to learn about the
3 project, but to provide your comments. Tonight, verbal
4 comments for anybody that wants to give verbal
5 comments. We will be happy to and welcome those
6 comments. There's certainly folks that can answer some
7 questions that are here as well.

8

9 On the back table is a comment form.
10 So if you want to do written comments, pick that
11 comment form up and you're more than welcome to fill
12 out that particular form. We do have a website that's
13 set up, www.asapeis.com. That website has links to
14 comment forms. You can provide comment there.

15

16 I also wanted to mention the maps that
17 you're seeing in the back and the aero photos. They
18 also are on the website and you'll be able to pull up
19 each one of those. Everything that's back here you'll
20 be able to pull up and see on the website. There's
21 background material there, so it's a good resource
22 location to go to.

23

24 You can provide comments directly by
25 email. Mary is going to be just tickled to get all
26 your email comments. That's another one. We can
27 always use snail mail. That's just perfectly fine to
28 do that. Any written comments on your little plain
29 white piece of paper and send it in. That's just fine.
30 It's great.

31

32 Lastly, but not leastly, there's a very
33 important date right here. October 14th, 2014. That
34 is the last day that we will be able to accept
35 comments. So if you're doing written comments, just
36 like your taxes, it just has to be postmarked by this
37 date and it will be accepted. If you're doing email
38 comments, the date on the email needs to be on the
39 14th.

40

41 Where are we doing these meetings.
42 Pretty much, I think, is what you would expect, the
43 entire length of the line. There are meetings up on
44 the Slope, meetings certainly through the Railbelt area
45 through here, as well as Anchorage, Seward and Kenai.
46 This list of meetings is also on the website, so you'll
47 be able to see those locations and where they are and
48 timing for them.

49

50 So our next steps, there's that date

1 again, that important date, October 14th, so keep that
2 in mind. We hope to have the scoping report done -- to
3 be honest with you, the length of time
4 that will take to be completed will depend on how many
5 comments we get. That will be completed early fall,
6 then we're going to be drafting the EIS and publish
7 that next spring and then we're going to come back out
8 with the next comment period.

9
10 So that's really what I wanted to say
11 in terms of why we're doing this, a little description
12 of the project and what we've been doing and what we've
13 been up to. At this point we can do one of two things.
14 I notice some people have come in since I've started.
15 We can take about 15 minutes and give you an
16 opportunity to look at the maps and then talk
17 informally.

18
19 We are recording this meeting, so this
20 piece gives you an opportunity to speak informally to
21 the folks that are here or we can just directly go into
22 taking comments. I am going to ask that if you want to
23 provide a verbal comment tonight that you do use the
24 microphone as it helps our recording and that you also
25 state and spell your name before you start speaking.

26
27 I really do -- I mean since some folks
28 came in that haven't had a chance to look at the maps,
29 is there any thoughts on which way folks want to go?

30
31 (No comments)

32
33 Not really. Okay. Let's just go ahead
34 and do the comments and then we'll all stay around
35 afterwards and we can answer some informal questions
36 afterwards. So let me just ask if there's anyone that
37 would like to provide a comment this evening. Once
38 again there's lots of different ways, as we mentioned,
39 to provide comment, but we'd love to hear from you this
40 evening if anybody would like to do that.

41
42 MR. CROSBY: Thanks. My name is Randy
43 Crosby, R-A-N-D-Y C-R-O-S-B-Y. I live in Trapper
44 Creek. The one thing I wanted to make, you know, kind
45 of my number one point is this meeting should be held
46 in Trapper Creek because the pipeline is going through
47 Trapper Creek, not Talkeetna. I'm glad the people of
48 Talkeetna have an opportunity to hear all this stuff
49 too, but it's certainly more difficult to travel
50 outside our community.

1 Also tonight the LNG people are meeting
2 at our community council meeting, which is a regular
3 scheduled meeting tonight, so there's another gasline
4 discussion going on in Trapper Creek and this is very
5 confusing for our community and there are a lot of
6 upset people and a lot of confusion.

7
8 So I just think that as this process
9 moves forward, and this has been brought up before at
10 the ASAP meetings that, you know, you need to come to a
11 central location along the actual proposed route. The
12 high school would be more than adequate for everybody
13 down at the intersection. So that's the number one
14 thing.

15
16 The other thing is, just from
17 listening, what little I've heard -- originally we
18 were, I believe, being told it was 100-foot wide
19 construction zone. Now it sounds like it's being
20 widened to 120-foot wide. The thing is like over by me
21 it's going to be in the road right-of-way and one of my
22 concerns from the very beginning on this whole project
23 was that the road right-of-way, you know, more or less
24 was designed for a road and the width was to
25 accommodate future expansion into, you know, possibly a
26 four-lane freeway. They're fighting this issue down
27 trying to get from Wasilla to Big Lake and how
28 difficult it is to put a wider highway in once
29 development occurs.

30
31 So it just seems like it's short-
32 sightedness to consume so much of a road right-of-way
33 with a pipeline when there's plenty of room adjacent to
34 the road right-of-way to make it happen. There's going
35 to be places where it's just not possible I realize,
36 but for the whole length of a large section to be in
37 the road right-of-way I think it's just unnecessary and
38 should really be thought about.

39
40 Just to point out one situation. They
41 ran power up past my house the past year or so. So we
42 applied for power. You know, we've been living off the
43 grid for 18 years or something like that and that, you
44 know, is our choice and we're glad to see power come
45 and all, so we applied for it. So MEA goes through the
46 process of trying to go through all the permits to get
47 power across the road.

48
49 One of the things, and it's been one of
50 the big obstacles, has been to go across this proposed

1 pipeline. So it's just ridiculous. To me, ridiculous,
2 but I mean it's just silly that, you know, now we have
3 this other elephant in the room that we have to deal
4 with just to get -- you know, we're not going to be
5 direct benefitters of the pipeline. It's going to be
6 right in our front yard, which, hey, I've got no big
7 heartburn about that. I mean literally in our front
8 yard. It's going to be right out my door. It's on my
9 side of the highway. Our house is adjacent to it.
10 But, you know, the one thing we can take advantage of
11 is power and yet we're having to wrangle with the
12 pipeline already and it's not even built and may never
13 get built. We don't know.

14
15 And then another issue is all the
16 surveying that's been going on up on the Parks Highway.
17 Two pipelines, two road construction projects. I mean
18 we're just flooded with people just doing all sorts of
19 things. It would just be nice to hear a little bit
20 more about why are they cutting large swaths in the
21 trees off into a point, why are we having four or five
22 surveyors -- I mean I have a survey point in my
23 driveway and that thing has been surveyed, and I'm not
24 exaggerating, 12 times this summer. Different survey
25 people coming out. Why can't that knowledge be shared?
26 I mean it's ridiculous.

27
28 Anyhow, those are kind of the points I
29 wanted to hit on. Any meetings need to be somewhere on
30 the pipeline route where the communities that are
31 directly affected can attend and be informed. There's
32 nothing wrong with having to meet in Trapper Creek.
33 We're pretty good folks over there. Appreciate your
34 time. Thanks.

35
36 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you very much.
37 Anyone else? You don't have to be shy.

38
39 (No comments)

40
41 MR. TRUDGEN: Once again there's
42 certainly several ways. Any thoughts that you have we
43 certainly welcome. You've seen the other ways you can
44 provide your thoughts, provide your comments. We'll
45 stay for a little while. Take a look at the maps, have
46 questions. Certainly folks from AGDC are here.

47
48 MR. OKONEK: My name is Brian Okonek.
49 I just got a question and it might help some of the
50 other people in the room too. After the pipeline is

1 built, what is the status of the right-of-way as far as
2 a public right-of-way?

3
4 MR. TRUDGEN: Actually I'm going to let
5 Jason, who will issue the right-of-way for the State
6 speak to that a little so you get it directly from DNR.

7
8 MR. WALSH: Thanks. Some of you
9 weren't in the room when I was introduced. I work for
10 the State Pipeline Coordinator's Office. ASAP already
11 has a lease and they -- in order for them to go to a
12 construction phase there's parts of the lease built in
13 that they have to have certain plans in place prior to
14 being issued a notice to proceed. That's a ways down
15 the road after they go through this revision process
16 for the SEIS, but part of those plans are proposed
17 plans for how you're going to re-vegetate the right-of-
18 way after you're done with construction, reduce the
19 right-of-way down to what size for operations purposes.

20
21 DNR is very aware that different
22 communities feel differently about wanting that to be
23 an access area or not wanting it to be an access area.
24 So one of the things we're kind of paying close
25 attention to is what different community's needs are,
26 what the project needs are and maybe how these kind of
27 can be mitigated as we move to that notice to proceed
28 process when they actually get everything in place and
29 construction is actually being planned.

30
31 So, until that time, we can't say the
32 whole thing is going to be public, the whole thing is
33 not going to be public, but there will be measures
34 taken to address different community needs and also
35 protect the project itself. During construction, of
36 course, for safety purposes, none of it will be open to
37 the public and they'll close it down for safety
38 reasons, but operations is different.

39
40 Did that answer your question?

41
42 MR. OKONEK: It does. And I've got
43 another question. Have you received right-of-way
44 access through Denali State Park?

45
46 MR. WALSH: Not yet. There's
47 discussion right now for how that will be addressed
48 because as it stands the legislation that created the
49 Park -- it's a conservation legislatively-designated
50 area, so the Legislature created that and it will

1 probably have to be addressed by the Legislature in the
2 next session as to whether they would allow a right-of-
3 way for a gasline to go through the Park.

4

5 MR. OKONEK: Do you know what the
6 provisions would be if they did allow? Do you purchase
7 land from them? Do you trade land? How does that
8 work?

9

10 MR. WALSH: Well, it's not a Federal
11 Park. It's a State Park, so there wouldn't have to be
12 a trade or a purchase for the State's purposes for the
13 right-of-way. There are other issues with land
14 conservation funds that trigger Federal dollars. We
15 can talk about that in depth later if you like, but for
16 the State's purposes the Legislature can say that this
17 land can be used for right-of-way purposes.

18

19 We've talked to the State Park, just
20 like ASAP has and the State Park has said, well, if we
21 did do that, it would be great to have possibly a
22 snowmachine corridor in the winter or some other type
23 of access. So they're thinking about what might
24 benefit the Park or what might hurt the Park in
25 granting this right-of-way.

26

27 Those are discussions that are
28 happening right now before it's being presented to
29 anybody who might bring it to the Legislature, so I
30 can't give you finite answers on that.

31

32 MR. OKONEK: All right. Thank you very
33 much.

34

35 MR. WALSH: Yeah.

36

37 MR. THOMPSON: Thanks, Jason. I'd just
38 like to add onto that. The landowners really dictate
39 the use of their land by ASAP. What we'll enter into
40 with the State of Alaska is really a contract and it's
41 the same with the Federal government, BLM. It will be
42 a contractual relationship through the lease and the
43 grant. The landowner dictates what we'll do on that
44 land after construction and how the land will be
45 managed. The landowner, of course, will recognize our
46 needs to provide for safety and environmental
47 protections or whatnot, but it's a contractual
48 relationship.

49

50 Thanks, Jason.

1 MR. TRUDGEN: State your name.
2
3 MR. THOMPSON: Excuse me. Mike
4 Thompson, ASAP.
5
6 MR. BAKER: If I could add to that.
7 Miles Baker again with AGDC. Mike sort of clarified,
8 but correct me if I'm wrong, but what Jason described
9 is for the State land, which there's a tremendous
10 portion of this. I think the figure we're using for
11 private land for the entire 757 miles, including the
12 Fairbanks lateral, is right around 70 miles of private
13 land.
14
15 So, as Mike said, those individual
16 private landowners, whether they're Native corporations
17 or private citizens, it's a whole separate
18 relationship, but they will determine for the most part
19 the access land use after the pipeline is built.
20
21 MR. OKONEK: Thank you.
22
23 MR. TRUDGEN: Any other comments,
24 questions.
25
26 (No comments)
27
28 MR. TRUDGEN: All right, great. Once
29 again thank you all for coming. I'll emphasize again
30 look at the maps. We'll be here for informal
31 questions. I do appreciate, we all appreciate you
32 spending some time coming out and learning about the
33 project and go back and tell your friends about it.
34 Tell your friends that they can comment on it. We
35 certainly appreciate the comment on Trapper Creek as
36 well.
37
38 So thank you for coming. End Talkeetna
39 scoping meeting 6:46, August 21st.
40
41 (Off record)
42
43 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 17 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Talkeetna Scoping Meeting on August 21, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

→

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Willow, Alaska
August 25, 2014

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Willow, Alaska - 8/25/2014)

(On record - 5:35 p.m.)

MR. TRUDGEN: I'd like to welcome you all and thank you for coming this evening to our continuing public meetings associated with the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline Project, the in-state gasline project. We certainly appreciate you spending some time coming out learning about the project. As I said before, the maps on the wall show differences between the line that was proposed in 2012 and the line now. Also some representative drawings of construction techniques and we'll talk about those.

Tonight, what are we going to do, what are we going to cover this evening. We're going to cover some introductions and welcome. My name is Dave Trudgen. I work for ERM Alaska. We're the third-party contractor that will actually be writing the supplemental environmental impact statement for this project. The original EIS written for the in-state gasline was completed in 2012.

Mary Romero is here from the Corps. They're the lead agency. She is going to introduce herself, tell you what the Corps' responsibilities are and some other folks that we have in the room as well.

We're going to look at the differences between this project and another one, which I'm sure you've heard about, which is the Alaska LNG Project. We're going to look at where we are in the NEPA process for the supplemental EIS, we're going to see why it's needed in the first place, we're going to look at the current project description and some of the old versus new routes. We're going to then go over this scoping meeting, what we do with the comments, how it fits into the NEPA process and then some schedules and next steps.

So with that actually I'd like to introduce you to Mary Romero from the Corps and she'll give you the Corps' perspective on what's going to happen.

MS. ROMERO: Thank you, Dave. My name is Mary Romero and, like Dave said, I am with the Corps

1 of Engineers. I want to make sure everyone knows that
2 we are recording this meeting tonight so that we can
3 capture your comments exactly as you state them and be
4 able to address them correctly.

5
6 This project is the Alaska Stand Alone
7 Pipeline, also known as ASAP, and the proponent for the
8 project is Alaska Gasline Development Corporation, also
9 known as AGDC. We have several people from AGDC here
10 tonight. I'm going to start with Kalb since he is the
11 one who -- it's his group that has the application put
12 forward for this.

13
14 MR. STEVENSON: I'm Kalb Stevenson.
15 I'm the environmental section lead for the project.

16
17 MR. SNISARENKO: I am Shawn Snisarenko
18 and I'm responsible for the pipeline engineering for
19 the project. I work for Michael Baker, Jr.

20
21 MR. BAKER: I'm Miles Baker. I do
22 external affairs and government relations for the
23 corporation. It's a public corporation that you own
24 and is currently the owner and proponent and applicant
25 for the project.

26
27 MS. ROMERO: Okay. The Corps is
28 neither a proponent or an opponent of this project. We
29 are here to look at the project objectively and to make
30 sure that the environmental impact statement, this one
31 being the supplemental, addresses all the environmental
32 impacts.

33
34 There are six other agencies that are
35 cooperating on making sure that this gets written
36 properly. The reason the Corps was selected as the
37 lead is all the different agencies that would have any
38 permitting authority for the project get together and
39 whoever has the largest jurisdictional authority ends
40 up being the lead. In Alaska, that happens to be the
41 Corps a lot lately.

42
43 The other Federal agencies that are
44 involved in this process are EPA and we don't have
45 anyone from EPA here tonight. Also BLM and their
46 authorities would be for permitting the right-of-ways
47 that happens to be located on BLM lands. The Park
48 Service and their authority is for permitting through
49 the Denali National Park and they are a proponent of
50 this project. PHMSA, which is the Pipeline Hazardous

1 Materials Safety Administration, and their authority is
2 for pipeline safety. The State Pipeline Coordinator's
3 Office is obviously a State office and we have two
4 ladies here from SPCO tonight. I'm going to introduce
5 Shannon and then she can tell you what it is their
6 responsibilities are and introduce Cathy.

7
8 MS. MILLER: Thank you, Mary. My name
9 is Shannon Miller. I work with DNR at the State
10 Pipeline Coordinator's Office and what our office does
11 is we look at AS 38.35 pipeline right-of-way leases and
12 we issue those permits that are associated with those
13 lease authorizations and right now I wanted to also
14 mention that we do not currently have an amendment
15 lease for the Revision 6 for the ASAP Project. Please
16 feel free to come and see me if you have questions
17 after the presentation. Also I'd like to introduce
18 Cathy Heroy. She's also available to answer any
19 questions you might have.

20
21 MS. ROMERO: Okay. So then the last
22 Federal agency is the U.S. Fish and Wildlife and their
23 authorities are over the endangered species that would
24 be impacted by this project.

25
26 So by the time we get to the final SEIS
27 most of the agencies will have selected a preferred
28 alternative, but the Corps does not select a preferred
29 alternative. We have to go through a record of
30 decision and look to find out what the least
31 environmentally damaging practicable alternative, also
32 known as LEDPA, is for the project. So that doesn't
33 happen until after the final SEIS has been published
34 and then we have a chance to go through everything,
35 including additional public comments.

36
37 The Corps has two responsibilities as
38 far as this project is concerned. One is NEPA, which
39 is what we're partaking in tonight, and NEPA has two
40 specific guidelines that we are required to follow.
41 The first is that we have to provide full disclosure of
42 the project for the environmental impacts that would be
43 caused if it were to be developed. Secondly, we have
44 to provide an opportunity for the public and whoever
45 wants to comment to make comments. So there's three
46 different times during the process that that happens.

47
48 The first one is during scoping, which
49 is what we are here doing tonight. The second one
50 would be at the draft supplemental EIS, and we're

1 expecting that to occur early spring of 2015. Then
2 the final chance to comment is when the final SEIS has
3 been published and that's a 30-day comment period.

4
5 Secondly, the Corps also would be
6 looking at this for permitting purposes and there are
7 three different regulations that the Corps would have
8 authority over on this project. The first one is
9 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and that's for
10 discharge of dredged or fill materials into waters of
11 the U.S., including wetlands. The second is Section 10
12 of the River and Harbors Act of 1899 for any structure
13 that would be placed in navigable waters. The third
14 one is Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research
15 and Sanctuary Act of 1972 and that is for any transport
16 and dumping of dredged materials. That particular
17 authority is new to this SEIS because of the West Dock
18 portion of this project that's now included.

19
20 At this time, the other thing that ERM
21 is doing is giving the presentation.

22
23 MR. TRUDGEN: Which would be me again.
24 Every time we do an EIS, whether it's an EIS, a
25 supplemental EIS, there needs to be a reason for it and
26 forms the foundation for writing an EIS or writing a
27 supplemental EIS. So really the foundation for this
28 one comes out of Alaska State statute and this is
29 directly from it, to make North Slope natural gas
30 available to residents of Fairbanks, the Southcentral
31 Region and other communities in the state as directed
32 by the Legislature. So this is going to form the
33 foundation.

34
35 This particular line is an in-state
36 gasline. It provides natural gas to the residents of
37 the state. That's the foundation for what the original
38 EIS was written for and this supplemental EIS is going
39 to be written.

40
41 So I wanted to take a couple of minutes
42 because I know people have heard about both gas lines.
43 There are two gas lines that are out and AGDC is
44 actually involved in both gas lines. The gas line
45 we're talking about tonight is the ASAP project. It is
46 sponsored solely by AGDC and it's compared to the
47 Alaska LNG project. The LNG Project is sponsored by
48 the State, AGDC, BP, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil and
49 Trans-Canada.

50

1 So there are two lines that are being
2 contemplated right now. This line has been talked
3 about for quite some time and then one is really a
4 little bit newer in terms of calendars for those of you
5 have been around waiting for a gas line for as long as
6 I have. Some of the differences. The ASAP Project is
7 utility-grade lean natural gas. There's one station
8 that will treat the gas up on the North Slope.

9
10 This (AK LNG) is specifically for a
11 liquid natural gas pipeline and it is for export. This
12 gas (ASAP) is used internally in the state and it won't
13 be for export. This gas line (AK LNG) can provide gas
14 for the residents of the state, but also it will be for
15 export. There's a gas treatment facility for ASAP.
16 One facility on the North Slope and no compressor
17 stations. That's all that's needed for this particular
18 line. Then the Alaska LNG line has the same gas
19 treatment plant on the Slope, but then they will also
20 have eight compressor stations along the line. This
21 line runs to a liquid plant in Nikiski, LNG plant.

22
23 There's a little difference in the
24 length of the lines. ASAP is a bit shorter. ASAP
25 includes a lateral line to Fairbanks. The Alaska LNG
26 line does not. The Alaska LNG has storage tank and
27 tanker berths at Nikiski that will need to be
28 constructed and ASAP does not. Terminus is near Big
29 Lake. Actually the ASAP ties into the ENSTAR natural
30 gas line near Beluga. Of course, this one terminates
31 in Nikiski to be the natural gas to be loaded on
32 tankers and sent for export.

33
34 Here are just some of the other design
35 differences between the two. Construction three years;
36 construction five to six. We'll take questions after
37 if I could, okay. So that would be great. We won't
38 stifle questions, I promise you.

39
40 So why are we doing a supplemental EIS.
41 NEPA really calls for if there are significant new
42 circumstances or new information relative to
43 environmental concerns or if there are substantial
44 changes in the proposed action. So this particular
45 project, it's the second bullet that's driving the
46 supplemental EIS more than the first bullet. We will
47 go through the project shortly and I'll highlight some
48 of those changes.

49
50 I wanted to also emphasize this second

1 bullet. Everything is important, so we will be
2 evaluating the significant changes to the project, but
3 we will build on the 2012 EIS that's written. There's
4 lot of good information in that EIS. We will be
5 looking at only the changes. So we won't be re-making
6 another complete EIS. We'll only look at the changes
7 between the two and evaluate the environmental impacts
8 of those changes. It will focus on reroute, reduced
9 pipeline length, et cetera.

10

11 So where are we in the NEPA process.
12 Mary explained a little bit of this, but we're really
13 right up here at the beginning. It all gets started
14 when AGDC gave the Corps the permit application and the
15 Corps sent out what's called a notice of intent and
16 that got us going. That happened on August 1st and now
17 we're in the scoping meeting and there are several of
18 these meetings that are happening all the way from the
19 North Slope to Seward.

20

21 After we're done with this we'll do an
22 alternatives analysis. We'll look at the comments that
23 we get from these scoping meetings from everybody that
24 gives us written comments, oral comments. Then we'll
25 draft the supplemental EIS over this winter. ERM will
26 be drafting that. We will have the draft done in the
27 spring of 2015 and then we'll be back out for a second
28 round of public meetings and those public meetings
29 you'll be able to actually comment on the draft itself.

30

31 So what has been put forth for any type
32 of environmental impacts. We'll have a synthesis and
33 review after that of the public comments. We'll
34 respond to them. There will then be a selection of a
35 preferred alternative that will be put into the final
36 supplemental EIS that will be produced and written in
37 the fall of 2015. Then it will be given to the Corps,
38 they will do a review and then it will be published.
39 Once again, as Mary said, there would be an opportunity
40 for the public to comment on the final. Then we hope
41 for a record of decision in early 2016. So that's the
42 overall schedule for the NEPA process.

43

44 So what is this project. A little bit
45 on the design and what's changed. As I said before,
46 it's utility-grade natural gas. This allows for a
47 relatively simple hookup for the communities. The gas
48 is virtually ready for you and I to burn in our homes
49 with a step-down in some of the pressure and some
50 additives to the gas.

1 It's a buried pipeline, so this is a
2 change. The pipeline before portions were above
3 ground. The entire pipeline now is buried from the
4 North Slope all the way down. There's just a couple
5 exceptions. One at the fault lines, so the pipe will
6 be above ground when it goes through a couple of our
7 major faults, and then the second area it will be above
8 ground over some river crossings.

9
10 It has only one gas conditioning
11 facility that's on the North Slope. None other are
12 needed. The old project had four or five compressor
13 stations along the route. This project has zero
14 compressor stations along the route. It's a 36-inch
15 line, 727 miles long. It's slightly shorter. A 12-
16 inch lateral line connecting to Fairbanks.

17
18 In the route, people are seeing the
19 blow-up maps in the back. The route generally follows
20 TAPS down as far as Livengood, stays west of Fairbanks,
21 comes down west, comes through Denali Park and Preserve
22 to the east and parallels the Parks Highway until here
23 where it goes further to the west and then goes down
24 and connects into ENSTAR's natural gas line at Beluga.

25
26 The construction right-of-way is 120
27 feet wide. This is generally the case through the
28 entire line. There are some sections that will need to
29 go a little bit wider. For example, there's
30 directional drilling that's used in those particular
31 areas. It takes a little bit wider right-of-way. The
32 permanent right-of-way will be just 53 feet wide.

33
34 Primarily it's an open-cut trench
35 technique to bury the pipeline and there are some
36 drawings of that on the back wall that you can look at.
37 We use horizontal directional drilling at some of the
38 largest river crossings. So like the Yukon River, for
39 example, they'll drill under the river. The pipe will
40 go under the river. It won't be hung above it on a
41 bridge or a new bridge does not need to be constructed
42 for it.

43
44 There will be several mobile
45 construction camps. These take 5 to 10 acres. The
46 project has focused on locating these in areas that
47 have already been disturbed and then there are several
48 material sites that are being contemplated and still
49 investigated, but there's 33 million-plus cubic yards
50 of material needed for the project.

1 So this is the general route. You can
2 see the off-take here at Fairbanks. Then this is the
3 route coming 27 miles coming into just the west side of
4 Fairbanks.

5
6 On the North Slope itself, as we talked
7 about, there is a gas conditioning plant that's going
8 to be constructed there. For those who may be
9 familiar, this is the central gas processing facility.
10 West Dock is in this direction. The plant itself takes
11 approximately 70 acres in size. The modules for the
12 plant will be constructed offsite and barged in. This
13 is one of the changes too and I'll speak to that in the
14 next slide. It also has a 20-acre construction lay-
15 down pad and also 20 acres of operations and then this
16 is a construction camp that would be built.

17
18 At West Dock, this is one of the
19 changes also that took place. Right now the thought is
20 they're going to, as I said, build the modules offsite
21 and bring them in via barge. In order to do that, they
22 need to bring it in to West Dock and they need to do
23 through this area some dredging and they need to dredge
24 to a 10-foot contour level, so it needs to be 10 feet
25 deep. So there's dredge material that would need to be
26 disposed of and that was not in the prior design for
27 the project.

28
29 Also this part of the road right here
30 needs to be beefed up a little bit and made a little
31 bit wider because the modules are large that will be
32 coming. This bridge right here that's in West Dock is
33 not stout enough to be able to take the barges that are
34 coming over, so this design actually will build a ramp
35 on this side and this side. They will take two large
36 barges, put them end to end, and they're barges that
37 have the ability to put ballast in them and they will
38 sink them and they will sit on the ocean floor, they'll
39 take the modules over, refloat them and take them out.

40
41 That's primarily what's happening at
42 West Dock that is all new for this supplemental EIS.
43 Of course we always work with ADF&G. This is an
44 important area for fish passage. There's a lot of fish
45 that migrate right along the shoreline on the North
46 Slope. This is a conceptual drawing of that barge and
47 one of the modules.

48
49 Once again, this is just to review.
50 Here's the original 2012 design. Here's the current

1 design. Here's why some of the designs were changed.
2 The original design was enriched natural gas. Now we
3 have lean natural gas. It reduces cost, risks and
4 increases in-state access for off-takes. The pipeline
5 itself is a bit shorter. The lateral line to Fairbanks
6 is also shorter, 34 to 29 miles. A couple things
7 interesting here, it certainly maximizes existing fire
8 breaks. So really looking at how that corridor is
9 aligned with everything outside of Fairbanks. For
10 support facilities, it's just a single compressor
11 station, not several. Then, of course, the West Dock
12 that we just went through.

13

14 So now a couple very important things
15 and that is how can you provide comments on this
16 project. Well, tonight is your first opportunity.
17 We'll take verbal comments tonight. We hope that you
18 do. If you wish to provide comments, as Mary said,
19 this meeting is being recorded, so your comments would
20 be recorded and we'll have those comments transcribed.

21

22 So that's one. The second way is you
23 can fill out a comment form. On the table when you
24 came in, there's a written form. You can fill that
25 form out and you can leave it with us tonight or you
26 can take it with you and then just mail that form in.
27 You can scan it and email it, whatever you would like
28 to do with that form for written.

29

30 You can submit comments on our website.
31 We have a website www.asapeis.com. That will have
32 links for you to be able to provide comments. And you
33 can send Mary a million emails till your heart is
34 content. So definitely an email address that goes into
35 our general comment mailbox actually. She doesn't have
36 to see them all, but she will by the time it's all
37 done.

38

39 Snail mail, of course, is always
40 accepted. You can just mail it in to the Corps of
41 Engineers your comments on the comment form, but you do
42 not have to do it on a comment form. Any type of
43 comment, any type of letter, anything. Stick it in the
44 mail and mail it and it will certainly be accepted.

45

46 This is the key. October 14th, 2014,
47 that's when the comment period closes. So we will
48 accept comments through that date. If you mail them,
49 just like your taxes, it has to be postmarked by this
50 date. Any sort of email or other correspondence also

1 needs to show that date for the comment to be accepted
2 for this go round.

3

4 So these are our meeting dates and
5 locations. There are some additional that I'm seeing.
6 Mary is shaking her head yes. As I said earlier, it
7 literally goes from the North Slope, Barrow, through
8 Anaktuvuk Pass, Minto, Wiseman, Fairbanks. So far
9 we've been to Healy, Nenana, Cantwell, Talkeetna and
10 then tonight Willow, so these have been completed.
11 Tomorrow night we'll be in Anchorage, Seward and Kenai.
12 It's all the way along the length of the line to have
13 an opportunity to be able to provide comment for folks.

14

15 So our next steps, this important date
16 this period closes. We're going to do a scoping report
17 after that that we'll work on right away and that will
18 be done by the fall of this year. Over the winter
19 months we'll draft the SEIS. In the spring it will be
20 out for public review and public comment and we'll be
21 back to be able to talk about it in the spring of 2015.

22

23 So that's really what we have to go
24 over the project and for this presentation part. What
25 we're going to do right now is take about 25 minutes.
26 As people walked in, a lot of people were looking at
27 the maps. We want you to continue to do that. Folks
28 here can answer some questions informally and then what
29 I'd like to do is come back at 6:30 and we're going to
30 take formal -- well, it's not formal. We would like
31 then to hear any comments that you have, any questions.

32

33 We will record that part, so I will ask
34 you to speak into this mic because it helps us get the
35 recordings, but this part will also allow you an
36 opportunity to stare at the maps and just speak
37 informally with the representatives from AGDC and Mary
38 and myself on the process of what's going on.

39

40 So once again we'll do that until 6:30,
41 come back and then anybody that would like to speak
42 we'll take all those comments, answer questions there
43 as well.

44

45 MR. STRASENBURGH: Can I just ask a
46 question before we break?

47

48 MR. TRUDGEN: Yes. Please state your
49 name.

50

1 MR. STRASENBURGH: My name is John
2 Strassenburgh. I live in Talkeetna, not Willow, because
3 I missed the meeting in Talkeetna. Can you clarify
4 what you mean by looking at only the changes and their
5 impacts. The reason why I ask is there was an issue up
6 north that was not satisfactorily resolved in my
7 opinion. Is that going to get a second look or not?
8

9 MR. TRUDGEN: Great question. So here
10 is how we can take a look at that and that is in your
11 comments you bring that particular item up to make sure
12 that we look at it and address it. We certainly will
13 focus on changes, but if there's a feeling of something
14 that hasn't been adequately addressed in the other EIS,
15 mention that in one of your comments. That will make
16 us take a look at that and then address the issue.
17

18 Does that help?
19

20 MR. STRASENBURGH: Yes, that helps.
21 There's some good information in this presentation. Is
22 that available in a PDF that can be emailed?
23

24 MS. ROMERO: If they want it, we can
25 mail it.
26

27 MR. STRASENBURGH: Yeah, I would very
28 much like that because I can't write clearly or fast.
29

30 MR. TRUDGEN: Okay. That would be
31 great. We can do that. And it's available on the
32 website. So this presentation itself is out on the
33 website as well.
34

35 MR. STRASENBURGH: All right. My last
36 question, is the LNG and the ASAP going to use the same
37 right-of-way or is it an either/or situation? What's
38 the relationship as both of them kind of move forward
39 and parallel?
40

41 MR. TRUDGEN: I know they don't share
42 the same right-of-way, but that's all that I will go.
43 Do you have any other comment on that?
44

45 MS. MILLER: This is Shannon Miller
46 with SPCO. So it's likely that only one line will be
47 approved, will go through and, no, they do not share
48 the exact same route.
49

50 MR. STRASENBURGH: Thank you.

1 MR. TRUDGEN: Okay. So let's break,
2 look at these and then I still think we'll come back at
3 6:30, in between 6:30 and 6:35, and ask you to provide
4 some comments.

5
6 (Off record)

7
8 (On record)

9
10 MR. TRUDGEN: This is how we're going
11 to go ahead and do this. As I said, we'd like -- this
12 piece is going to be recorded, which is great, comments
13 or questions. I would ask that you state your name and
14 we'll give you the microphone to speak into. We ask
15 that you state your name and spell your last name so we
16 make sure we have that correct and then we will try to
17 either respond to questions or if it's a straight
18 comment, that's great as well. So we can just get
19 started.

20
21 MR. MCCAIN: Can you hear me? Ed
22 McCain, M-C-C-A-I-N. Most of these questions you've
23 already asked, but I just want to get them on record as
24 to how much the line can move before you have to start
25 doing a new assessment of the situation. So this is
26 just a question and no answers?

27
28 MR. TRUDGEN: No. I mean do you want
29 to give an idea? I mean really what you're asking is
30 if.....

31
32 MR. MCCAIN: I'd like to see it on
33 tape, yes.

34
35 MR. TRUDGEN:the line moves, when
36 we might have to start like another SEIS process or
37 something like that.

38
39 MR. MCCAIN: Yes.

40
41 MR. TRUDGEN: Mary, do you want to
42 respond.

43
44 MS. ROMERO: So I would say that if
45 some alignment -- this is Mary Romero, Corps of
46 Engineers, R-O-M-E-R-O. So if an alignment were to
47 change during the SEIS process, that would just be part
48 of this process and hopefully those changes would be
49 made at the draft. That's not saying that things could
50 not be made after that, but as long as it happens

1 during this process, it might require further wetlands
2 information or other kinds of information, but that
3 could happen within this process.

4

5 MR. MCCAIN: Okay. Then the question
6 about you're cutting off a corner of my property. Can
7 I have access to it and can I farm over the top of the
8 line?

9

10 MR. TRUDGEN: That one I don't know.

11

12 MR. STEVENSON: This is Kalb Stevenson
13 with ASAP. On the easement you could travel over the
14 corridor with heavy equipment. There would be openings
15 to travel back and forth. You wouldn't be cut off from
16 one side or the other. The landowners' input is
17 evaluated and taken into account in the accessibility
18 and use of that easement, but in terms of agriculture
19 and farming, you couldn't disk over the top of the line
20 or farm on the line itself. We just actually discussed
21 that this morning.

22

23 MR. BAKER: If I could just add a
24 couple to your first questions. Miles Baker with AGDC.
25 The current plan corridor is 2,000 feet, is that
26 correct?

27

28 MS. ROMERO: Sure.

29

30 MR. BAKER: So I think what you heard
31 earlier tonight is a lot of what's driving this current
32 supplemental EIS are sort of major changes, not sort of
33 little tweaks here and there, so I think going forward
34 that would be a similar situation if we have to make
35 slight changes to the alignment within that general
36 planning corridor. Unless it makes a major change
37 environmentally impacted, we wouldn't expect to
38 initiate a whole new EIS.

39

40 And then, as we talked earlier, just
41 for folks that weren't part of that conversation, of
42 the 760 miles basically, including the Fairbanks
43 lateral, we only cross about 70 miles of private land.
44 We're continuing to refine that and the sort of use of
45 that land and the easements of that land are going to
46 be determined in large part by the landowners.

47

48 So we're working with the State and the
49 DNR and the Pipeline Coordinator's Office on the State
50 lease and we've got an amendment pending for the

1 changes we're making to that. This process is what
2 will eventually hopefully get us the Federal permit for
3 the Federal land and then we will have to have
4 negotiations with all the other private landowners in
5 terms of what they will allow or not allow.

6

7 MR. STEVENSON: This is Kalb Stevenson
8 again. One last thing I just wanted to say. We still
9 have some internal discussions going on as it pertains
10 to agricultural lands. Ed, I'd like to get your
11 information and as we hammer a few things more out
12 here, keep in contact with you and give you the most
13 accurate information as possible.

14

15 Obviously, in addition to land
16 ownership with farming and agriculture there's also
17 things like farming leases and things like this that
18 we're still thinking about and mulling over. Let me
19 get your contact info and we can continue to correspond
20 and make sure we get you all the correct information
21 that you need.

22

23 MR. MCCAIN: Okay. This is another
24 question I asked there too. Is this going to be an
25 easement or is it going to be fee simple?

26

27 MR. BAKER: Jump in Kalb, but we are in
28 the very preliminary stages of developing our private
29 land acquisition plan, so none of those determinations
30 have been made. I think it will be dependent on the
31 individual circumstance.

32

33 MR. MCCAIN: Okay. Now is this the
34 time to make a suggestion about moving the line?

35

36 MR. BAKER: Yes, exactly.

37

38 MR. MCCAIN: Okay. This is your
39 Milepost 703 where it crosses the Dshka Landing Road
40 to the south. I suggest you go due south and leave it
41 on State land instead of crossing private property.
42 Revision 5 went across the north end of my property.
43 Now Revision 6 goes across the south end. It's State
44 land, you know, to the west there.

45

46 MR. TRUDGEN: Okay. That's perfect for
47 us and then we can address that.

48

49 MR. MCCAIN: Thank you.

50

1 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you. Other
2 comments.

3
4 MR. SMOLDON: Hi. My name is Todd
5 Smoldon, S-M-O-L-D-O-N. My family lives on Willow
6 Creek Parkway where Willow Creek Parkway intersects
7 with Crystal Lake Road. I have two concerns. One is
8 the possible work campsite, which I believe is right
9 now proposed for on State game refuge land and that is
10 about Mile 1 of Willow Creek Parkway.

11
12 My more pressing concern is the
13 materials investigation site, which is adjacent to Mile
14 701. It looks like it would be accessed from Crystal
15 Lake Road, but it is adjacent to my southern property
16 line. It also looks to cross -- like it crosses
17 Windsock Trail, which is a multi-use recreational trail
18 for snowmachines, sled-dogging, cross-country skiing
19 and so on. There's quite a few sled dog trails in that
20 area and my family and others mush through there, so
21 that would be a major disruption to the recreational
22 activities at that materials site. There's one proposed
23 slightly north of that location, which looks to impact
24 fewer people as it's not off a paved road.

25
26 I think that's all I have for comments
27 unless there are any questions for me.

28
29 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you. Anybody else.

30
31 MR. STRASENBURGH: My name is John
32 Strassenburgh, S-T-R-A-S-E-N-B-U-R-G-H. I did miss the
33 Talkeetna meeting, so my comments are not Willow-
34 related directly, but further north. My first comment
35 has to do with Denali State Park. From what I gathered
36 from looking at the maps, the alignment for this
37 pipeline is on the east side of the Parks Highway. The
38 problem with that is, first of all, the east side would
39 mean -- the trailheads up to Curry and Kesugi Ridge
40 start on the east side, so it would be very disruptive
41 of people trying to use that ridge for recreation,
42 hiking, camping, things like that.

43
44 The other thing is, if you did it on
45 the west side, if the alignment was on the west side of
46 the Parks Highway instead of the east, you'd avoid that
47 problem, but you would also -- the clearing would --
48 the offset to that would be beautiful views of the
49 Alaska Range, so you could kind of mitigate the
50 ugliness of the clearing by having a great view.

1 The next thing is if it's coming down
2 the west side, if you cross the Chulitna River north of
3 Troublesome Creek, you won't conflict with the trails
4 that go from the Parks Highway along Troublesome Creek
5 to the Chulitna River. So if you come down the west
6 side and then cross north of Troublesome Creek, you'll
7 be able to avoid impacting those trails and you'd avoid
8 impacting the delta of Troublesome Creek, which there's
9 a lot of salmon in there. There's a lot of bears, a
10 lot of wildlife. So it would be much, much, much
11 better to cross north of Troublesome Creek.

12
13 The next thing that I have has to do
14 with public notification and I'm just suggesting -- I
15 don't remember seeing anything in the mail, but Mary
16 says that she sent it, so she did, and I'm sure
17 overlooked it, but I commented -- I've attended a lot
18 of meetings, put my email on a lot of lists and
19 commented, yet I didn't get an email heads-up on this
20 deal. That's one of the reasons why I missed the
21 Talkeetna meeting.

22
23 The other thing is I was going through
24 the EIS materials on the website that you had up there
25 and I happened to notice a friend of mine listed as an
26 adjacent property owner, so I called him up the next
27 day and he hadn't heard a thing about this. I'm just
28 thinking that it would probably be a good idea to have
29 outreach to any adjacent property owner or any property
30 owner that's, you know, within, I don't know, 600 feet
31 or something like that just so they can get a heads up.

32
33 The next thing, and this has to do with
34 the unresolved issue. There's a lot of properties that
35 are west of the Parks Highway, especially between
36 Denali State Park and Trapper Creek and there's some in
37 this area too. What you've got slated is a pipe yard
38 and camp for 1,000 people at Milepost 131 of the Parks
39 Highway, which is on the west side of the Parks
40 Highway. That's a major access for a lot of people.
41 Not only to go into Denali State Park, especially in
42 the wintertime on snowmachines, but also for people to
43 access their private property and cabins. It's a
44 pretty major place.

45
46 I know I've written letters and a lot
47 of people wrote letters at the last EIS to try to get
48 that moved to Mile 128 when there's a gravel pit on the
49 east side of the Parks Highway that's a lot flatter.
50 The sight distance for coming out onto the Parks

1 Highway is a lot better, but that didn't seem to get
2 any consideration and none of us got responses back
3 saying why they can't move it to Mile 128 where there's
4 already a gravel pit that, like I said, has better
5 terrain, better sight distance. So I'm asking that
6 that be done.

7
8 There's also access lower down at
9 various places that people need a place to park and
10 hike into their cabin or park their snowmachine trailer
11 and get in in the wintertime and there's going to be a
12 disruption during construction that I think it's
13 important to not only inform the public that that's
14 happening ahead of time, but also to provide a way by
15 whatever it is you're creating.

16
17 Anyway, those are my comments.

18
19 MR. TRUDGEN: That's great. Thank you.

20
21 MS. ROMERO: I would like to get your
22 neighbor's address because we did send public notices
23 to about 300 adjacent property owners and I want to
24 make sure that he's on there.

25
26 MR. STRASENBURGH: I can tell you right
27 now. Should it be off the record or on the record?

28
29 MS. ROMERO: On the record.

30
31 MR. STRASENBURGH: Okay, on the record.
32 It's Ken Lane Marsh and his -- let me see if I can find
33 it. I wrote some of this down. No, I guess I didn't.
34 Oh, yes, I did. It's P.O. Box 13011, Trapper Creek,
35 but he's in the phonebook. That's all the address you
36 have there, but I don't know his zip code.

37
38 MS. ROMERO: I'd let you know if I have
39 it on record at least that one address.

40
41 MR. STRASENBURGH: Okay. Well, send
42 him again. I'm sure he's concerned.

43
44 MS. MCCAIN: Brenda McCain, M-C-C-A-I-
45 N, B-R-E-N-D-A, McCain. I have a question on the slide
46 that showed the difference between the ASAP and the LNG
47 line there. What you said a few minutes ago is it will
48 be one or the other but not both and that's not been
49 determined yet, is that correct? Okay. So if it is the
50 LNG line, then no gas will come to Alaska? It's just

1 for export and there's no benefit?

2

3 MR. TRUDGEN: No, that's a good
4 question. Miles, do you want to -- okay. So the
5 question is should the Alaska LNG line be constructed
6 does that mean it's only for export.

7

8 MR. BAKER: These are obviously very
9 high level differences because we knew the public might
10 be confused that there were two different projects and
11 the Alaska Gasline Development Corporation is involved
12 in both. The design objective is the key word there.
13 The design objective of the big project, the Alaska LNG
14 Project, you see the capacity there of 3.5 billion
15 cubic feet a day is for export. It will have the
16 ancillary benefit of providing gas to Alaskans once the
17 line is built.

18

19 The design objective of the ASAP
20 project, which has been underway now for several years,
21 is gas to Alaskans. It's going to deliver excess
22 capacity then can be consumed in-state, so we're going
23 to be looking for industrial customers to purchase the
24 excess capacity. What they do with that gas will be up
25 to them, but the objective of the design is in-state
26 consumption for this project.

27

28 Did that answer your question? No?

29

30 MS. MCCAIN: No, not really, but that's
31 okay. I know what you're trying to say. But it
32 specifically states the objective for the LNG is for
33 export.

34

35 MR. BAKER: Yes.

36

37 MS. MCCAIN: But you're saying it's
38 also for in-state or just not.....

39

40 MR. BAKER: Well, I think all those
41 partners up there, including the corporation that I
42 work for, would say that is the objective of that
43 project is to generate revenue for the state, export --
44 commercialize our gas on the North Slope. It's going
45 to create potentially 1,000-plus year-round jobs and it
46 will also bring energy to Alaskans. But the driving --
47 the reason those companies are willing to put \$50
48 billion into this project is because of the export
49 markets.

50

1 MS. MCCAIN: I wouldn't trust that one,
2 but appreciate your answer.

3

4 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you.

5

6 MR. WADE: My name is Bruce Wade, W-A-
7 D-E. It's my understanding that there's a difference
8 between LNG and natural gas. Can you explain that to
9 us.

10

11 MR. SNISARENKO: My name is Shawn
12 Snisarenko, S-N-I-S-A-R-E-N-K-O. I do that every time
13 somebody calls me on the phone. There is no difference
14 per se between natural gas and LNG. If you thought of
15 natural gas as filling this room that we're in, and
16 we're in a large gymnasium-type room, to make it LNG
17 you simply cool it down and it would end up being
18 probably something like a 2x2 container of liquid LNG.
19 So there is no difference per se in the gas. LNG is
20 not under pressure. It is only simply chilled to a
21 liquid. So you can take the liquid and make it back
22 into natural gas. Take the natural gas and make it
23 into LNG. So there's no practicable difference between
24 the two except one is chilled and is a liquid.

25

26 Does that answer your question?

27

28 MR. WADE: It was still my
29 understanding that the LNG would contain things like
30 propane and hexane and go into higher carbons where the
31 natural gas that you're pumping down does not. That
32 would be a difference, wouldn't it?

33

34 MR. SNISARENKO: The two different
35 projects have different gas compositions; however, the
36 LNG tends to be -- the people who make LNG tend to like
37 to have things like propane and butane because they're
38 a higher BTU value for their LNG. However, that
39 doesn't mean that you couldn't turn pure methane into
40 liquified natural gas. It wouldn't have the higher BTU
41 content that people who ship LNG like to have in their
42 gas.

43

44 Now the contents of the two projects
45 are slightly different. The ASAP Project is a more
46 utility-grade gas, more of a methane gas. The
47 composition of the Alaska LNG project I don't know what
48 that is. I do understand that it is slightly more
49 butane and propane than we have in the ASAP Project.

50

1 MR. WADE: My understanding is because
2 the LNG has the higher things in it, you would have to
3 go to a processing plant to separate out your natural
4 gas. What we're talking about a project here is we
5 could tap off of it right here in Willow and use it in
6 our house.

7
8 MR. SNISARENKO: You could generally
9 tap off it here in Willow and use it in your house,
10 correct. I don't know what the process would be for
11 the Alaska LNG Project. Somebody would have to answer
12 that. I don't know the answer to that.

13
14 MR. TRUDGEN: Ed, do you want to say
15 something?

16
17 MR. MCCAIN: If I could just interject.
18 Ed McCain. When this came up several years ago there
19 was only going to be two processing plants in that
20 whole line, one in Fairbanks and one in Point MacKenzie
21 and nobody was going to be able to hook into it in
22 between those points, the LNG line, and it was going to
23 be millions and billions of dollars for these
24 processing plants.

25
26 MR. BAKER: You're referring to the
27 original project design?

28
29 MR. MCCAIN: The LNG line said that
30 there was only going to be two processing plants.

31
32 MR. BAKER: Okay. The ASAP Project
33 originally was similar because -- to the earlier point.
34 It was an enriched gas stream, which would require you
35 to have a straddle plant that would pull the liquids
36 off the gas, separate the gas, and then inject them
37 back into the pipeline and then we would have an
38 extraction facility at Point MacKenzie to extract the
39 liquids before we put the gas into the ENSTAR system.

40
41 The new optimized design that was
42 delivered to the Legislature in 2012 went to this lean
43 gas and the primary reason was to eliminate -- well,
44 there are two primary reasons. One is that straddle
45 plant at Fairbanks, was about a \$250 million plant,
46 would have substantially increased the tariffs into
47 Fairbanks. The second reason is because our research
48 showed that there really wasn't a commercial market for
49 the liquids at Point MacKenzie. So, for those two
50 reasons, we went to this lean gas design.

1 But to Shawn's point, it's still early
2 in the design of the Alaska LNG project and we don't
3 know what the gas composition is yet there, but I think
4 you will hear the same thing from the designers of that
5 project is that there are a few things you've got to do
6 to the gas. You've got to de-pressurize it, you've got
7 to put in an odorizer, which is a safety precaution,
8 but they don't expect to have to do a lot. It
9 shouldn't be that costly to pull gas off of that
10 project either. It's much earlier in the design phase.

11

12 MR. TRUDGEN: Okay.

13

14 MR. RENFRO: Hi. This is Chuck Renfro,
15 R-E-N-F-R-O. The question I've got is if you say you
16 may have an excess at Tidewater or at the end of the
17 line, would that then be a possible opportunity to
18 export that as a liquid as a feasibility? I mean I know
19 there's laws against that sort of thing at this point
20 in time, but just wondering if that is a feasibility.

21

22 MS. ROMERO: I'll just state this from
23 the Corps' position and then maybe Kalb has something
24 to say. For this project it would then transfer the
25 whole EIS process to FERC. Once there's export
26 involved, the Corps would not be the lead. So then
27 I'll let Kalb answer any further.

28

29 MR. STEVENSON: The project that's
30 being permitted is capped at 500 and it's being
31 designed for 500, so it's one compressor station at
32 Prudhoe that can push the gas. Certainly the pipeline
33 capacity could hold more than 500, but there's other
34 components, like compression, that go into that. The
35 pipeline design of 36" and the 1,480 pounds per square
36 inch gauge, it's all being designed around a 500
37 million cubic feet per day design even though the
38 pipeline could hold more gas, you would need more
39 compression, more compressor stations and other
40 considerations.

41

42 So right now that's not on our minds.
43 What's on our minds is permitting this project that's
44 capped at 500 and that's designed around that, to push
45 that amount of gas.

46

47 MR. RENFRO: That's everything I had.

48

49 MR. TRUDGEN: Okay. Thank you. Any
50 other.

1 MR. WADE: Bruce Wade again, W-A-D-E.
2 As you're building and after this is built and buried,
3 is there going to be fences up all around it? Because
4 we've got lots of snowmachines and four-wheelers and
5 all. Can they use this as a line to -- because they
6 will use it as a line -- can they use it as a line to
7 travel on?

8
9 MR. STEVENSON: Kalb Stevenson again.
10 This falls under the category of getting input from the
11 landowners. So I think some landowners would prefer
12 different types of access than others. I think ASAP
13 and the State Pipeline Coordinator's Office and people
14 that deal with the right-of-ways and leases and things
15 like that would have input into this and maybe they
16 want to say something about that as well.

17
18 MS. MILLER: This is Shannon with SPCO.
19 Again, I'd like to echo his comments in that it really
20 depends on the area, it depends on several different
21 factors and it's really difficult to say just a blanket
22 statement.

23
24 MR. BAKER: If I could add onto that.
25 At our meeting in Talkeetna actually some of our
26 colleagues were there and I think they made a really
27 good point. There are parts of the state where people
28 are looking at this as increased access and that's a
29 good thing because you'll have a cleared easement and
30 then there are other parts of the state that are very
31 sensitive to that and don't want increased access.

32
33 I know DNR is very focused on that and
34 wants comments and obviously we're focused on it to the
35 extent that we want everyone -- at the end of the day
36 we'd love everyone to support this project. We
37 understand everyone has different needs. There will be
38 a need for some access roads for maintenance. We'll
39 have requirements to put valves at certain distances
40 for maintenance purposes and safety and shutoff.

41
42 I think the general design would be to
43 allow -- you know, wildlife shouldn't have any
44 difference, wouldn't have new fences up to permit
45 people from egress/ingress, but to the extent the
46 property owners might want that to prevent that sort of
47 thing, those are the things we've got to work out.

48
49 MS. ROMERO: I'd like to say that if --
50 this is Mary -- if you don't want people having access

1 in a certain area, you need to comment or if you do
2 want access, you need to comment that way.

3

4 MR. WADE: This is Bruce again. Can
5 you comment on using this right-of-way and the upkeep
6 of it after it's built and keeping it up and maybe
7 using it as a fire break for the State and the local
8 area?

9

10 MS. ROMERO: Can you state whether
11 that's what you would like or that you're opposed to
12 that.

13

14 MR. WADE: I would like all projects to
15 be built with as many uses as they can.

16

17 MR. TRUDGEN: Can anybody comment on
18 the other part?

19

20 (No comments)

21

22 MR. TRUDGEN: Okay. Not right now.
23 That will be a good piece of a comment that we'll
24 address. Any other thoughts.

25

26 MR. WADE: So the comment is nobody
27 knows or the answer is nobody knows or there is no
28 comment on it.

29

30 MR. TRUDGEN: Not right now. That's
31 correct. Nobody knows right now.

32

33 MR. MCCAIN: Ed McCain again. There's
34 been a lot of questions here about access. One of the
35 big problems with the railroad was whether they're
36 going to honor the section line easements every mile
37 for access across the tracks. Have you guys given that
38 any thought? Are you going to let people cross it
39 every mile at will or are you going to try to vacate
40 the section line easements?

41

42 MS. MILLER: This is Shannon Miller
43 with SPCO again. So we actually have a copy of the
44 issued lease and one of the stipulations specific to
45 public access is basically that the lessee shall
46 regulate or prohibit access, including vehicular
47 traffic, to and upon the leasehold to the extent
48 necessary to facilitate pipeline activities; however,
49 pipeline activities shall not interfere with the
50 public's free and unrestricted access to and upon the

1 leasehold.

2

3 MS. HEROY: This is Cathy Heroy, H-E-R-
4 O-Y, also with the SPCO. I want to just further add to
5 what Shannon had to say by specifying that the SPCO
6 right-of-way lease applies to general State lands. It
7 doesn't apply to university lands, mental health trust,
8 railroad lands, State Parks. Those are all regulated
9 separately from the general State lands that our office
10 has authority over. So just to be clear our right-of-
11 way lease does not cover all of the lands that this
12 pipeline would cross.

13

14 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you. Any
15 additional comments.

16

17 (No comments)

18

19 MR. TRUDGEN: Okay. I want to reemphasize --
20 if you're like me, you're going to walk out of here and
21 you're going to think of four other things that you
22 wanted to say, so you still have plenty of opportunity
23 to be able to go to our website to provide comments.
24 Take a couple of comment sheets with you. You can mail
25 those comment sheets in. You can scan and email them
26 in, so there are several ways for comment. Go to the
27 website, comment there, and we'll go from there.

28

29 I thank you all very much for coming
30 and expressing your comments this evening. We
31 certainly appreciate them all. We're all looking at
32 sunshine and we're all sitting in here after a rainy
33 day, so I certainly appreciate that and spending your
34 time and sharing your thoughts with us. Thank you a
35 lot for coming.

36

37 End scoping public meeting in Willow at
38 7:20 p.m.

39

40 (Off record)

41

42 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 26 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Willow Scoping Meeting on August 25, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Anchorage, Alaska
August 26, 2014

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Anchorage, Alaska - 8/26/2014)

4
5 (On record - 6:35 p.m.)

6
7 MR. TRUDGEN: Good evening. We'll go
8 ahead and get started for a public scoping meeting
9 associated with the Alaska In-state Stand Alone
10 Pipeline Project. My name is Dave Trudgen and I work
11 for ERM Alaska. We're responsible for writing the
12 supplemental environmental impact statement for this
13 project.

14
15 So a little bit about what we're going
16 to go over tonight and then give you an opportunity to
17 provide comment, which would be great. That's why
18 we're all here really. So what we're going to do is
19 we're going to talk about the project and Mary Romero
20 is here from the Corps of Engineers. They are the lead
21 agency. She's going to give you an introduction to the
22 Corps and some of the other agencies involved with the
23 project.

24
25 Then we're going to talk about this
26 pipeline and I'm sure you've all heard about another
27 pipeline that's out there, the Alaska LNG Pipeline.
28 We'll look at some of the differences between the two
29 projects and keep you focused on this particular
30 pipeline. We'll look at where we are in the NEPA
31 process. We'll look at why we need a supplemental EIS,
32 what the driver is behind it. We'll take a look at the
33 current project description of the SEIS. We'll look at
34 comparison between old and new routes.

35
36 There was an EIS written for this
37 project in 2012, so this truly is a supplement to that
38 EIS of 2012 and we'll take a look at what we're going
39 to be looking at. We'll look at this scoping comment
40 period, how to submit comments and then schedules in
41 our next steps.

42
43 So, with that, I'd really like to
44 introduce Mary and she'll tell you about the Corps'
45 responsibilities, cooperating agencies.

46
47 MS. ROMERO: Thank you, Dave. So we
48 want to make sure that we welcome everyone. We're so
49 glad that you came. My name is Mary Romero. I'm with
50 the Corps of Engineers and we are the lead agency for

1 the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline Project, also known as
2 ASAP. AGDC, which is Alaska Gasline Development
3 Corporation, is the proponent for the project, the
4 applicant, and we have Kalb Stevenson here. I'll let
5 him tell you a little bit and then he can also
6 introduce Miles.

7

8 DR. STEVENSON: Hello, everyone. My
9 name is Kalb Stevenson. I'm the environmental section
10 lead within the environmental regulatory lands division
11 for ASAP. We also have Miles Baker here.

12

13 MR. BAKER: Good evening. My name is
14 Miles Baker. I work for the Alaska Gasline Development
15 Corporation, which is a public corporation that you own
16 and I'm in charge of external affairs and government
17 relations. Thank you for coming and I'm happy to
18 answer questions.

19

20 MS. ROMERO: So the reason the Corps
21 was selected to be the lead agency is based on all the
22 different agencies that might have any permitting
23 authority for the project get together and whoever has
24 the largest amount of jurisdictional property within
25 the project usually becomes the lead. So with all the
26 waters of the U.S. and the wetlands, that falls to the
27 Corps almost always lately.

28

29 So additionally there are six other
30 agencies that are going to cooperate on writing of the
31 supplemental EIS and, like Dave said, the Corps doesn't
32 usually write their own EISs. Third party contractors
33 are hired to do the writing and then the Corps along
34 with the different agencies will review it and make
35 suggested changes and whatever until it becomes a
36 legally defensible document to be provided.

37

38 So now I'm going to tell you who the
39 different Federal agencies are that are involved,
40 cooperating, and if they have a representative here,
41 then I'll introduce them and they can tell you what
42 their authorities are.

43

44 The first one we have is BLM. They are
45 not here tonight, but their authority is over right-of-
46 ways for where the project might cross their borders.

47

48 Next is the National Park Service and
49 we don't have anyone here from the Park Service tonight
50 either. They are also a proponent of this project

1 because they would like to be able to have gas for the
2 Denali Park.

3
4 The next Federal agency we have is
5 PHMSA, Pipeline Hazardous Materials Safety
6 Administration and Gabriela is here, so I'm going to
7 let her state what their authority is.

8
9 MS. ROHLCK: Hi. We're US DOT PHMSA
10 for short and we're just going to be working with these
11 agencies and AGDC through the SEIS process and we're
12 going to make sure that the pipeline design is in
13 compliance with Federal safety regulations.

14
15 MS. ROMERO: Okay. And then also from
16 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service we have Jenny
17 Spegon.

18
19 MS. SPEGON: Hi. My name is Jenny
20 Spegon. I'm with the Fish and Wildlife Service. So we
21 provide technical assistance about fish and wildlife
22 resources. We offer assistance to the Corps to try to
23 avoid and minimize impacts to fish and wildlife and for
24 those impacts that can't be avoided and minimized we're
25 also involved with providing technical assistance for
26 compensatory mitigation.

27
28 MS. ROMERO: So those are the Federal
29 agencies and then we also have a State agency, the
30 State Pipeline Coordinator's Office and, Shannon, I
31 couldn't find you.

32
33 MS. MILLER: Thank you, Mary. My name
34 is Shannon Miller. I work at the State Pipeline
35 Coordinator's Office and what our office does is we
36 adjudicate AS 38.35 pipeline right-of-way
37 authorizations and also permits associated with those
38 authorizations. It's important to note here that these
39 authorizations are issued on general State land, so
40 that excludes railroad properties, US DOT properties,
41 other legislatively designated areas and State parks.

42
43 MS. ROMERO: Okay, thank you. So I
44 stated that the Park Service was a proponent, but I
45 need to say that the Corps -- we do have someone from
46 EPA here, Gayle Martin. Gayle, would you like to --
47 continue standing and tell us what EPA's authorities
48 might be. It's a good thing you came. I almost forgot
49 EPA.

50

1 MS. MARTIN: I actually have notes.
2 Hi. My name is Gayle Martin. I work for the
3 Environmental Protection Agency and I work in the 404
4 Program. That's shorthand for Clean Water Act Section
5 404, which is for the disposal of dredged or fill
6 material into waters of the United States. Our agency
7 also covers a formal review of EISs under the Clean Air
8 Act Section 309, so we have a hand in writing comments
9 on those. In this case we are a cooperating agency.

10

11 We also, under the Clean Air Act,
12 evaluate emissions, air emissions and sources of those
13 emissions and levels. There's also the MPRSA, marine
14 protected areas reserves something act.

15

16 MS. ROMERO: Marine Protection,
17 Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972.

18

19 MS. MARTIN: Thank you. There's a
20 section of that act that deals with giving EPA the
21 authority to designate disposal areas in the ocean for
22 ocean dumping.

23

24 MS. ROMERO: Thank you, Gayle. So I
25 guess I better check my notes to make sure I got
26 everyone. EPA, BLM, National Park Service, PHMSA, SPCO
27 and US Fish and Wildlife. Okay. So while I stated
28 that the Park Service has told us that they are a
29 proponent of this project, the Corps is neither an
30 opponent or a proponent for the project. AGDC is the
31 proponent and applicant. As we get to the final EIS, we
32 will actually have several of the different agencies
33 that will state their preferred alternative.

34

35 Once again the Corps does not state a
36 preferred alternative. We actually have to go through
37 our record of decision before we can determine what the
38 least environmentally damaging practicable alternative,
39 also known as LEDPA, would be for the project.

40

41 So then the Corps has two
42 responsibilities for this project. One is NEPA, the
43 National Environmental Policy Act, and that's why we
44 are here tonight. It has two forks on it. One is that
45 we have to provide full disclosure of the impacts that
46 this project would have to the environment and,
47 secondly, we have to provide an opportunity for the
48 general public and whoever wants to comment to comment
49 on this project.

50

1 So there are three different times
2 during this process that that will happen and the first
3 one is now during the scoping, which will go through
4 October 14th and you'll hear that date again. The
5 second time will be during the draft supplemental EIS
6 and we're currently thinking that will be spring of
7 2015. The final time to comment is during the final
8 SEIS and that probably will be late 2015 to early 2016.

9
10 So the authorities that the Corps has
11 for this project are under Section 404 of the Clean
12 Water Act for any discharge of dredged or fill material
13 into waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Section
14 10 for any structures that might be placed in navigable
15 waters. Then 103 -- I have to say, Gayle, I have the
16 same issue as you. I haven't done Section 103 that
17 often, that's why I have my notes. It's for the Marine
18 Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 and
19 that's for transport of dredged material and for
20 disposal of it.

21
22 The other thing that the third party
23 contractor gets to do is give the presentation. So,
24 Dave. And I'm also supposed to tell you that it's
25 being recorded so that we can have your comments
26 succinctly and make sure that we get it all on there.

27
28 MR. TRUDGEN: Thank you. That's true.
29 I also wanted to introduce Frank Richards, who is the
30 vice-president of engineering and project development
31 for AGDC, so hopefully he's going to stick around if
32 there's any tough questions.

33
34 Every time we do an EIS we have to have
35 a purpose, purpose and need for the EIS. This project
36 is no different. This drives what we do, why we're
37 doing an EIS. In this case, a supplemental EIS and why
38 it's important. So the purpose of this project has
39 been really defined and helped defined by the Alaska
40 State Legislature. Just to make sure, I mean this is a
41 quote right from them, to make North Slope natural gas
42 available to residents of Fairbanks, the Southcentral
43 region and other communities in the state as directed
44 by the Legislature.

45
46 So this particular line, again
47 referring to the In-state Gas Pipeline, goes from
48 Prudhoe Bay and then connects to the ENSTAR natural gas
49 line at Beluga. It is to service Alaska communities
50 and provide an access to stable, long-term supply of

1 natural gas that can be used in communities as well in
2 commercial and personal use.

3

4 So what are some of the differences
5 between these two lines. I'm sure you've heard about
6 both lines. So this is the line that we're going to be
7 talking about tonight along this column and the Alaska
8 LNG line. So the State actually is a sponsor in both
9 lines and has connected with both lines, but the Alaska
10 LNG line goes on with BP, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil
11 and Trans-Canada. So there are four partners in that
12 particular line that are looking at that.

13

14 ASAP line is going to be lean gas for
15 in-state markets and the Alaska LNG is liquified
16 natural gas and it is for export. It can be used for
17 in-state markets as well, but it is -- really, when we
18 look at what it's really being designed for, it is
19 being designed -- each winner had different design
20 parameters. This one being designed to carry lots more
21 cubic feet per day for export.

22

23 There's differences in gas
24 conditioning. There's a gas conditioning plant for
25 each one of the projects on the Slope. That's all for
26 ASAP. There's no other compressor or stations along
27 the line. There are eight compressor stations along
28 the line for Alaska LNG. There are differences in the
29 length of the line. The Alaska LNG line terminates in
30 Nikiski at a liquid natural gas plant, LNG plant. Of
31 course the ASAP line terminates at Beluga primarily.

32

33 There's a lateral line that's designed
34 and will be evaluated in the SEIS that goes to
35 Fairbanks. There isn't one currently designed with the
36 Alaska LNG line. We talked about the LNG plant already
37 and where the terminuses are. Design capacity quite a
38 bit different, 500 million cubic feet per day compared
39 to 3.5 billion cubic feet per day. And then some of
40 the cost differences, construction and the work force
41 and years of construction.

42

43 So why do we need an SEIS. As we said,
44 there's been an EIS already written for this project.
45 Why do we need to go and do another one? Well, NEPA
46 calls for two reasons that you have to do an SEIS.
47 Either significant new circumstances and new
48 information become relevant. Say Fish and Game
49 nominates and puts forth a new endangered species or
50 something, that could trigger it, or substantial

1 changes in the proposed action.

2

3 This particular case, that's bullet
4 number two, that's driving the EIS more than anything
5 else. I'll go through the project description and
6 point out some of those changes. One of them is
7 there's 70 miles of realignment to the line, for
8 example. So this one drives it. ASAP will evaluate
9 those changes and I really want to point this out right
10 here. We're going to build on the 2012 EIS that's
11 already done. We really will look at the differences.
12 We don't have to write an entire new EIS. We'll look
13 at the differences, evaluate the differences from 2012.
14 So we will be able to utilize this information and
15 build off it. We'll focus on certainly the re-route,
16 the reduced length and other changes.

17

18 So where are we in this overall
19 process? Well, really pretty much at the beginning.
20 It started with a notice of intent published on August
21 1st, so AGDC gave an application to Mary and away we
22 go. Now we're in the scoping period, so a 75-day
23 period. We're going to communities literally all the
24 way up and down the pipeline corridor, from Barrow down
25 to actually here, Kenai and Seward.

26

27 After we're done with this we'll do an
28 analysis of alternatives. Over this winter we'll be
29 drafting the SEIS and then with publication of that in
30 the spring of 2015 and then we'll come back out after
31 that's published for a second round of public meetings,
32 so we'll be right back here in late spring of 2015 to
33 do a second round of meetings and that gives everybody
34 a chance then to comment on the actual draft EIS. Then
35 we'll do synthesis of those comments and responses. A
36 preferred alternative is selected. We'll draft the
37 final EIS then in the fall of 2015 and then we all hope
38 by early spring of 2016 the Corps will be ready to
39 issue the record of decision. So that's the overall
40 EIS process for the project.

41

42 So what does it look like. What is
43 this new project. Not a really new project. What does
44 the overall project look like. So it's utility-grade
45 natural gas. This is a little bit different than the
46 original gas line. The original one had four
47 compressor stations. This one doesn't need any and
48 this is primarily because it is utility grade natural
49 gas which will be carried. It's all buried.

50

1 There's only a couple areas where it's
2 going to be above ground; over the fault lines, and it
3 crosses several fault lines as we know, and then it
4 will be above ground at a few river crossings, but many
5 of the river crossings, such as at the Yukon River,
6 it's directionally drilled, so it's under the river.

7
8 There will be a gas conditioning
9 facility that we talked about near Prudhoe. I'll show
10 you a figure of that in a minute. The line is a 36-inch
11 line, 727 miles long, operating just under 1,500 psi.
12 It includes a 12-inch lateral line, 29 miles long, that
13 goes to Fairbanks.

14
15 In general, it parallels TAPS down to
16 Livengood, then stays west of Fairbanks, comes down
17 through Denali National Park and Preserve. Of course,
18 right in between the two major parks there. Stays west
19 of Nancy Lake Recreation Area, stays west of Willow,
20 comes down and then connects into Beluga.

21
22 The construction right-of-way will be
23 120 feet wide. There will be some areas where it will
24 have to be wider depending on some of the construction
25 directional drilling. For example, every once in a
26 while it takes additional area, but primarily it's 120-
27 foot wide construction right-of-way. Final
28 right-of-way will be 53-feet wide.

29
30 Most of the construction technique is
31 fairly typical. Open-cut trenching. You can see over
32 on the wall over here we have some drawings that are
33 some typicals, and back here too, and some typicals of
34 some of the construction technics that you could look
35 at.

36
37 I mentioned HDD, the horizontal
38 directional drilling, through some of the bigger rivers
39 that we're going to be having to cross and get through
40 the Yukon and others. There will be mobile
41 construction camps. The project right now is trying to
42 use already disturbed areas along the pipeline corridor
43 to minimize the impact of those construction camps.
44 There are lots of material sites being evaluated along
45 the corridor as there needs to be about 33 million
46 cubic yards of material.

47
48 So this is generally it, this map is --
49 we have this one up as well over here of the line. You
50 can see the full line, the off-take to Fairbanks and

1 then a little bit more detailed of the off-take to
2 Fairbanks. Then on the North Slope when we do have the
3 gas conditioning plant that we talked about. So for
4 those that might be familiar here's the central gas
5 facility and West Dock is up this direction. We have a
6 slide of that coming.

7

8 So the gas conditioning facility is
9 approximately 70 acres and that has two auxiliary pads
10 associated with it. One is a lay-down area for help in
11 construction and the second is a construction camp and
12 operations pad. Each one of those is approximately 20
13 acres. So we have a little over 100 acres for the
14 combined effort on the North Slope and some access
15 roads coming into it.

16

17 One of the changes that has taken place
18 with this compared to the first project is
19 modifications at West Dock. The project assigned now
20 includes transport of several large modules that would
21 be brought to West Dock via barge and offloaded there
22 and then taken to the central processing facility that
23 we just looked at and put together there.

24

25 So the barges will come in at Dock Head
26 3, which is this, and it will now need -- because the
27 barges are big, there will need to be a dredge area,
28 which is that area. You need to dredge to about 10 feet
29 deep. So it's dredge and disposal and that was never
30 in the original one, so there will be evaluations,
31 environmental evaluations associated with that dredging
32 activity to be done in the winter. About 170,000 cubic
33 yards is the estimate right now for doing that. Also
34 they'll need to widen this part of the road right here
35 to about 75 feet just to be able to accommodate the
36 width of the modules.

37

38 Lastly, this bridge that's right here
39 is not stout enough to be able to handle the weight of
40 the modules or the width, so what they'll do is they'll
41 build a ramp on this side and the opposite side.
42 They'll take two barges, put them end to end, and
43 they're ballasted barges so they can sink them.
44 They'll sit on the ocean floor, bring the modules
45 across. After all the modules have crossed, they'll
46 refloat the barges and take them out.

47

48 The design, there's a drawing of that
49 too. There's a drawing of that over there taking in
50 fish passage in consideration with that barge bridge

1 design. This is just an artist conception of one of
2 those barges that would come in.

3
4 So just to review now some of the
5 differences between 2012, which was the original, and
6 of course what we're doing now and some of the
7 rationale why they went -- as the project was modified
8 what was looked at during that. So as we talked about,
9 the original design was in rich natural gas with
10 natural gas liquids at the compressor stations. This
11 natural gas, lean natural gas, is really utility grade.
12 It can be burned in our houses. It needs some work to
13 be able to do, but it's pretty much ready to go.

14
15 Mainline pipe's distance was reduced by
16 10 miles or so. The lateral line was also reduced.
17 While they were designing the lateral line they looked
18 at even things like existing fire breaks and improved
19 construction access to the new alignment. Support
20 facilities that we talked about. Several compressor
21 stations, now only one compressor station on the North
22 Slope, so that general gas conditioning plan on the
23 Slope compresses the gas enough to take it all the way
24 to Beluga.

25
26 Then, lastly, it was the West Dock and
27 we just went through West Dock.

28
29 So how can you provide comments. I
30 mean really the key in why we're here in the first
31 place. Tonight you can provide comments verbally as
32 soon as I'm done and provide comments or ask questions.
33 We certainly have a number of people here that could
34 answer some questions as well and that would be great.

35
36 There are other ways to do it. On the
37 table is a form that you could grab for written
38 comments, so you could write something down. You could
39 leave that either tonight or you could just take it
40 with you. We have a website that we've set up that has
41 links to every comment. Mary has generously offered
42 her email address so she gets to have two million
43 comments come directly to her. Well, not really.
44 Anyway, a direct comment from the Corps. Then you can
45 use snail mail to do any type of comment.

46
47 Key date. Mary said it earlier. I'm
48 going to say it at least two more times or three,
49 October 14, 2014. That is the end of the comment
50 period. If you mail anything in, it needs to be

1 postmarked like your taxes by that date. Send it in by
2 email, that date needs to show. So that's when we'll
3 stop taking comments for this scoping period.

4
5 These are some of the communities that
6 we're going to and dates that we're going to. All this
7 information right now is up on the website so you can
8 go to it. This presentation is on the website.
9 There's a page with these communities on it. We have
10 gotten some requests for some additional communities
11 that we're looking at and fulfilling right now. So
12 this list is actually being added to. Bettles, I
13 believe, was one of the communities that we've added.

14
15 Evansville will be the 11th of
16 September and then Trapper Creek, which was a very
17 specific request we received while we were in Talkeetna
18 will be done on the 15th.

19
20 Once again, scoping closes on the 14th
21 and then right after we get all the comments we'll be
22 putting together a scoping report and that will be
23 available on the website this fall. Prepare the draft
24 EIS over the winter. That will be prepared and ready
25 for publication in the spring of 2015. So our next
26 public comment period will be right after the draft EIS
27 is published.

28
29 So that's what I wanted to go through.
30 Highlight the projects and differences between this
31 project and the other gas line, the LNG project, that
32 are running parallel right now. So it's really time if
33 anybody has questions or would like to provide comment.
34 As Mary said, we are recording it, so I am going to ask
35 you if you'd like to provide comment, which would be
36 great, that you do use one of our microphones, say your
37 first and last name and spell your last name so that we
38 can get that accurate in our records.

39
40 After we're done also we'll stay for a
41 while and give you an opportunity to look at the maps
42 and then informally ask some questions if you like as
43 well. Would anybody like to comment?

44
45 MR. BULLOCK: Hi. My name is Max
46 Bullock and that's B-U-L-L-O-C-K. I came here at the
47 request of my parents who are both out of town. I just
48 had two quick questions. The first one, is it either
49 the Alaska Stand Alone Gas Pipeline or the LNG one?
50 And who are the main beneficiaries of this pipeline if

1 it's built?

2

3 MR. BAKER: Miles Baker with Alaska
4 Gasline Development Corporation. So the project we're
5 talking about tonight was initiated -- early stages of
6 it probably in 2009, but really picked up speed in 2012
7 and 2013 the Legislature appropriated about \$350
8 million in public funds to progress this project to the
9 stage you see it today. This year the Legislature
10 decided that they wanted the State to also look at
11 participating in the Alaska LNG project and
12 appropriated some money towards that. That project is
13 in an earlier stage of design.

14

15 At this point our corporation is
16 involved in both and the direction we've been given is
17 -- in essence, it's too early to tell which one of
18 these projects is in the best long-term interest of the
19 state, so we're progressing both. It's our expectation
20 that only one of these projects will be built. In the
21 next 12 to 18 months we will be expecting a robust
22 public policy discussion and as more data comes in on
23 both of these projects that decision is going to have
24 to be made.

25

26 Did that answer.....

27

28 MR. BULLOCK: Yeah. And then who are
29 the major beneficiaries?

30

31 MR. BAKER: Oh. I think it's fair to
32 say that for certainly the corporations' perspective at
33 this point is that the larger project in terms of
34 revenue for the state, long-term jobs for the state has
35 a tremendous amount of benefit, but it's a much longer
36 time horizon, so one of the objectives of both these
37 projects is to get gas to Alaskans. They both have the
38 opportunity of doing that, but under the current
39 timeline this project can do that quicker. So that's
40 going to be the trade off that's going to have to be
41 looked at in the public discussion.

42

43 MR. TRUDGEN: Thanks, Miles. Any other
44 comments.

45

46 MS. BALE: Do you prefer to get
47 questions one on one? I only have questions. I don't
48 have comments.

49

50 MR. TRUDGEN: Let's come back, okay.

1 Any other comments.

2

3

(No comments)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

MR. TRUDGEN: I don't mind hearing questions so everybody can hear answers. So let's ask some questions. That would be great. But we would still like you to say your name.

MS. BALE: Nancy Bale and that last name is B-A-L-E. What do you expect the life span of this project to be versus the life span of LNG and would the same gas be available to both projects?

MR. STEVENSON: I'll pass it to Frank. I can just say in terms of the life span the ASAP project is capped at 500 million cubic feet a day. The other project will push about seven times that amount. Depending on the reserves available, that would equate to different volume of gas transported at about 7 to 1. Do you want to build on that?

MR. RICHARDS: I'd be glad to. Frank Richards, R-I-C-H-A-R-D-S. In terms of the reserves, we're looking at the Prudhoe Bay unit, the Kuparuk unit and those associated oil and gas fields that are already interconnected with the infrastructure that's already developed. We talk about the ASAP project. We originally looked at the basin that is around Prudhoe Bay. So those reserves are equal to approximately 30 trillion cubic feet of known reserves and you have proven reserves and there's a next category of reserves that are not yet proven but are likely there and, there again, in tens of trillions of cubic feet, and then you look at the unconventional gas hydrates and that's in the hundreds of trillions of cubic feet of potential natural gas. So Alaska, specifically on the North Slope, has abundant reserves available to us.

So, as Kalb said, at 500 million cubic feet a day, the ASAP project could literally operate for hundreds of years to supply gas to Alaskans and to other commercial interests. The AK LNG project is looking at the reserves not only at Prudhoe Bay but also at Point Thompson. At Point Thompson, the proven reserves are nearly 9 trillion cubic feet and, again, with associated reserves around there, both onshore and offshore, are more than tens of trillions of cubic feet potentially available in the near vicinity.

1 So that project at the 3.3 billion
2 cubic feet a day looks like it has a time span of
3 approximately 25 to 30 years before the proven reserves
4 would then be -- they would need to add more gas to
5 those reserves to be able to make it marketable.

6
7 MS. BALE: Well, I don't want to hog
8 the lines, but I could ask a couple more questions.

9
10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's okay.

11
12 MS. BALE: With respect to burying
13 versus above ground, you state there's fault crossings,
14 rivers and pigging and valve stations, so I just wanted
15 to ask with the more seismic areas how are you going to
16 engineer that line when there's a fault and then five
17 miles later there's another fault? Is it going to go
18 up and down and up and down or would you have a period
19 -- how are you engineering it for faults?

20
21 And then do you have the names of the
22 rivers that you're going to bridge versus the ones
23 you're going to tunnel?

24
25 And on the pigging and valve, how long
26 is the section that would be above ground in the
27 pigging and valve areas?

28
29 MR. RICHARDS: Okay. Very good
30 questions. In regards to the faults, there are
31 probably five primary faults that we're mapping today.
32 The Castle Mountain fault, which is out here in the
33 Susitna River drainage. Up north is the Denali fault,
34 there's the Park Road fault. It's in the vicinity of
35 Denali Park headquarters. There's the northern
36 foothills thrust zone and then there's what appears to
37 be a fault across in the area of Minto Flats. So we're
38 looking at those in terms of geohazards right now.

39
40 The crossings are being designed in
41 approximately the same manner that the Trans-Alaska
42 Pipeline fault crossing were, where the pipe comes
43 above ground and they were put on horizontal -- what
44 are known as sleepers or essentially beams at grade
45 which allow the pipe to move horizontally. So the
46 design earthquake that TAPS was designed for occurred
47 back in 2002 November. Essentially that magnitude 7.2.
48 TAPS moved approximately 40 feet horizontally right on
49 those sleepers and performed well. Didn't drop a bit
50 of oil.

1 So that same fault crossing, the Denali
2 fault, in the words of our paleoseismologist, will
3 likely rupture to the same level, so we're designing
4 again for approximately up to 40 feet of horizontal
5 movement and we'll be in that same design capacity. So
6 we're not having a fault that will be from my location
7 to Dave's. Probably the Denali has the longest span
8 where we're looking at several hundred feet above
9 ground and then the next one is probably 30 to 40 miles
10 away, so it will be buried in between those two
11 locations.

12
13 I believe in the SEIS document we have
14 identified where we anticipate having the horizontal
15 directional drilling and that's where you'd be boring
16 underneath the major rivers like the Yukon, the Tanana,
17 areas along the major fish streams along the east side
18 of the Parks Highway where we don't want to impact the
19 fish habitat, so Montana Creek and Kashwitna, Sheep
20 Creek and those types of streams.

21
22 MS. BALE: You would be digging.

23
24 MR. RICHARDS: That's the design,
25 correct. And then the above ground or the river
26 crossings, again, where we had the need for a -- where
27 there are existing DOT bridges we'd like to be able to
28 utilize those to the maximum extent possible so we
29 don't have to use -- create new infrastructure and then
30 use the existing infrastructure if it can handle the
31 loads.

32
33 And your third question?

34
35 MS. BALE: How much of it is up at a
36 valve area?

37
38 MR. RICHARDS: Where we come out -- we
39 have mainline block valves that by PHMSA regulations
40 we're going to space them approximately every 20 miles.
41 So they come up out of the ground, go through the
42 valving and we will have mainline block areas and it's
43 measured in tens of feet, not thousands of feet.

44
45 MR. STEVENSON: I'll also direct you to
46 our plan of development, which we have a copy of here
47 and it's also available online, but there's an appendix
48 in that document that has our stream crossings listed
49 out and it also lists the method of crossing, whether
50 it's an open-cut or horizontal directional drill or

1 existing bridge, and you can also look in the water
2 resources chapter of that document or -- yeah, the
3 water resources chapter of the forthcoming supplemental
4 EIS. It is not yet, but the EIS has been published, so
5 there's a water resources chapter, which is 5.2, and
6 that should have more information for you, but the plan
7 of development will be the most up to date in terms of
8 the stream crossing method and line list of the streams
9 and where they're located. My name is Kalb Stevenson.
10

11 MS. BALE: One more question. I come
12 from the Denali area and local folks had thought that
13 the line -- well, you know, I don't know. I can't
14 speak for all local folks, but many local folks had
15 thought the line would be going down the Park Highway
16 throughout the area. Not that they weren't concerned
17 about that placement, especially in the tourist area,
18 but that's what they thought. When the more recent
19 meetings came out, it was shown to be going east and I
20 think that the National Park Service was a proponent
21 when they thought it was going to go down the Parks
22 Highway because then it would be easy to take gas off
23 up to into the Park, but otherwise maybe not so.
24

25 My question really is why the decision?
26 Why what you're showing on your maps is now all east?
27 Are there a number of reasons why? It would be great
28 to hear them if it's not too long.
29

30 MR. RICHARDS: Okay. Again, Frank
31 Richards. The route that went through the original
32 EIS, the FEIS that we're now doing a supplemental to,
33 actually had the pipeline on the east side of the
34 Nenana River south of the commercial area right before
35 you enter into the National Park on the north side. So
36 that's the original alignment and that was the
37 alignment that was granted to us by the State.
38

39 So, in the supplemental, we haven't
40 changed the alignment and we're staying on the existing
41 alignment that we.....
42

43 MS. BALE: Lisa Murkowski
44 (indiscernible - away from mic).
45

46 MR. RICHARDS: Yes, you're correct. So
47 the.....
48

49 MS. BALE: So, you know, it's kind of
50 like -- I think that was done because people raised

1 their voices that maybe that would be a better way to
2 go.

3

4 MR. RICHARDS: What she's referring to
5 is, again, Senator Murkowski and then ultimately
6 President Obama signed a law that allowed a
7 high-pressure natural gas pipeline to run through
8 Denali National Park along or near to the vicinity of
9 the Parks Highway Corridor. So that's an option.

10

11 However, one of the main proponents,
12 meaning the National Park Service, was hoping to gain
13 access to natural gas and they'll still be able to have
14 access to natural gas because the pipeline will be
15 running again from, say, Nenana or through Healy south
16 to the commercial area just north of the Park where
17 we'll have the potential, if there's the desire, for
18 off-take points. The communities will have to then
19 identify the need for an off-take point and then, as
20 the National Park would, to then access the gas. So
21 from that point it would be a small distribution line
22 that would lead from the commercial off-take to the
23 National Park as opposed to having a 36-inch
24 high-pressure line running down through the Park.

25

26 MS. BALE: Just to follow up a little
27 bit further though. Why would Senator Murkowski have
28 taken the time to authorize that right-of-way if she
29 didn't think maybe you would choose it? And a
30 corollary to that, are there engineering reasons not to
31 go down the Parks in that region?

32

33 MR. RICHARDS: The actual genesis I
34 understand of that law dated back to the original
35 proponent of this project, which was ENSTAR. At that
36 point it was to try and utilize the existing corridors
37 for the DOT and Alaska Railroad rights-of-way to the
38 maximum extent possible, which included the Parks
39 Highway through Denali National Park. So I think that
40 was part of the genesis.

41

42 I'm not sure why the legislation
43 continued to go forward. It was Senator Murkowski's
44 prerogative to do that. In looking at the overall
45 option of going through the Park as opposed to the
46 existing alignment, it's essentially the same distance,
47 it's essentially the same cost. So had the existing
48 right-of-way, we're on the east side on a State right-
49 of-way granted to us at no cost, so we elected to stay
50 on that right-of-way.

1 MR. STEVENSON: This is Kalb Stevenson.
2 Again, I'll just add to that and also say within
3 environmental regulatory lands we're also tasked with
4 evaluating the affected environment, the impacts,
5 looking at those things and trying to minimize impact
6 where we can. To bypass the Park to the east in our
7 minds is a minimization as opposed to going through the
8 Park, having a construction period and then a permanent
9 right-of-way through the Park as well.

10
11 MR. BAKER: I just have to jump in on
12 this because I worked for Senator Murkowski when this
13 was going on and I would just add two things, which is,
14 to your earlier point, I think the test -- I don't want
15 to characterize the Park Service's testimony, but what
16 we heard last week from them was that because of the
17 horizontal drilling proposal that we're now doing just
18 north of Denali Grand Lodge area and then the ability
19 to utilize the existing power corridor I think is
20 something they're supportive of.

21
22 One of the other concerns, the
23 legislation authorized the Secretary of Interior to
24 consider -- basically gave the Secretary of Interior
25 the authority to potentially issue a permit. The
26 legislation didn't issue the permit or authorize the
27 action in itself. One of the concerns is that -- and
28 there's different sort of legal interpretations, but
29 that it could potentially trigger Title XI of ANILCA
30 and, therefore, subject the entire pipeline, not just
31 the portion that goes through the National Park, to
32 Title XI, which drastically changes the way the project
33 is permitted from a timeline perspective and your
34 ability to pull all your Federal permits together and
35 they all have to be submitted.

36
37 I'm not an expert on that section of
38 law, so I just wanted to add those two comments.

39
40 MR. TRUDGEN: Okay, thanks. Any other
41 comments. Thank you for the questions.

42
43 (No comments)

44
45 MR. TRUDGEN: Once again we will kind
46 of hang out if there want to be some informal or just
47 further discussions. I can't thank you more for coming
48 this evening. I mean it's almost sunny in Anchorage
49 and it certainly was sunny most of the day and it's
50 always hard for us to come inside after work. So we

1 really appreciate you coming out this evening. Thank
2 you for your interest in this pipeline and the other
3 pipeline.

4

5 We'll be back, so look for the draft
6 EIS. Thank you. End Anchorage public scoping meeting
7 on August 26 at 7:35 p.m.

8

9 (Off record)

10

11 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 21 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Anchorage Scoping Meeting on August 26, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Kenai, Alaska
August 27, 2014

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Kenai, Alaska - 8/27/2014)

4
5 (On record - 5:30 p.m.)

6
7 MS. SOUTHAM: This is our public
8 scoping meeting in Kenai for the Alaska Stand Alone
9 Pipeline Project. My name is Anne Southam. I am with
10 ERM Alaska, the third-party contractor that was
11 selected for this SEIS project. Thank you for coming
12 tonight.

13
14 We will give a presentation, but we'll
15 review what we're doing for the project. I'd like to
16 introduce Mary Romero with the Corps of Engineers.
17 They are the lead agency on this project. We do have
18 some cooperating agencies as well that we'll review in
19 just a minute. We'll also address the difference
20 between the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline and the Alaska
21 LNG Pipeline. There may be some confusion there. And
22 then review the steps in the NEPA process, why we're
23 doing the supplemental environmental impact statement,
24 run through the project description and some of the key
25 differences between this revised project and what had
26 been proposed in 2012. Go through the process for
27 accepting scoping comments and other periods throughout
28 the project where comments will be accepted. The
29 scoping meeting schedule and then some next steps
30 specifically within the next six months or so.

31
32 So, with that, I'd like to pass it to
33 Mary.

34
35 MS. ROMERO: Hello. My name is Mary
36 Romero and I'm with the Corps of Engineers. Like Anne
37 said, we are the lead agency for the supplemental
38 environmental impact statement. This meeting is being
39 recorded tonight so that we can get your comments
40 succinctly and be able to address them properly.

41
42 In addition to the Corps of Engineers
43 there are six cooperating agencies that will also be
44 helping us to gather the information and, like Anne
45 said, ERM will be doing the actual writing of the
46 supplemental EIS and then all the different cooperating
47 agencies will review it to make sure that comments are
48 addressed sufficiently for their different permitting
49 authorities and for legal sufficiency.

50

1 There are five Federal agencies that
2 are cooperating. They are EPA, who has oversight over
3 the Clean Water Act; BLM, whose authorization is for
4 permitting of right-of-way on their lands; the National
5 Park Service that has authority over this project
6 should it go through Denali National Park and they are
7 a proponent of this project; PHMSA, which is under
8 Department of Transportation and stands for Pipeline
9 Hazardous Materials Safety Administration and their
10 authority is over the safety aspect of the pipeline;
11 then U.S. Fish and Wildlife and their authority is over
12 endangered species that would be impacted by this
13 project.

14
15 Then we have one State agency that is
16 also cooperating and that's SPCO, the State Pipeline
17 Coordinator's Office and Cathy Heroy is here with us
18 and she's going to say what their authorities are.

19
20 MS. HEROY: So, as Mary said, my name
21 is Cathy Heroy. I'm with the State Pipeline
22 Coordinator's Office. We have authority over general
23 State lands to issue 38.35 common carrier or contract
24 carrier pipelines across general State lands. We also
25 issue permits and other authorizations that are related
26 to pipeline activities.

27
28 MS. ROMERO: Thank you. So I stated
29 that the Park Service is a proponent and I want to
30 state that the Corps of Engineers is neither an
31 opponent or a proponent for the project. The proponent
32 is AGDC and we have several people from AGDC here
33 tonight. The first is Kalb Stevenson and I'll let him
34 speak.

35
36 MR. STEVENSON: I'm Kalb Stevenson.
37 I'm with the ASAP project and I'm in the environmental
38 regulatory and lands group, so that covers everything
39 from land access to right-of-ways to permits and
40 regulatory to assessing and evaluating how we can best
41 minimize and avoid environmental impact.

42
43 MR. BAKER: I'm Miles Baker. I'm with
44 Alaska Gasline Development Corporation, which is the
45 publicly-owned corporation that's advancing this
46 project and I'm in charge of external affairs and
47 government relations.

48
49 MS. ROMERO: All right. So as we're
50 cooperating, most of the agencies through the

1 supplemental EIS by the time we get to the final will
2 have a preferred alternative route that they think
3 should be permitted. The Corps of Engineers however
4 does not list a preferred alternative. We actually
5 have to go through our record of decision process and
6 then come up with the least environmentally damaging
7 practicable alternative, also known as the LEDPA.

8

9 So the Corps of Engineers has two
10 responsibilities as far as receiving this application
11 and what we do with it. The first one is NEPA and
12 under NEPA, which is the National Environmental Policy
13 Act, we are required to provide full disclosure of the
14 project and all of the impacts that could occur if it
15 were to be permitted.

16

17 Secondly, we also are required to allow
18 people to comment and there are three different times
19 during the NEPA process when that happens. This first
20 one is now during scoping and there are 75 days in this
21 scoping period. The second opportunity will be when we
22 have written the draft supplemental EIS and that is
23 usually a 45-day comment period. The final time is
24 when we do the final supplemental EIS and that's a 30-
25 day comment period before the record of decision is
26 written by the Corps of Engineers.

27

28 So the second thing that the Corps does
29 once we receive the application is we have to look at
30 permitting the project, whether we're going to deny a
31 permit or issue a permit for it. There are three
32 different jurisdictional authorities that the Corps has
33 for this particular project. The first one is under
34 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and that's for
35 dredged or fill materials placed into waters of the
36 U.S., including wetlands. Then also Section 10 of the
37 Rivers and Harbors Act and that's for any structure
38 that would be placed in waters that are navigable. The
39 third one is Section 103 of the Marine Protection,
40 Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972. That is new
41 under the supplemental EIS based on what is new in the
42 West Dock area and that is for the possibility of
43 transport of dredge materials and dumping within the
44 ocean.

45

46 The other thing that the third-party
47 contractor gets to do is give the presentation, so I'm
48 turning it back over to Anne.

49

50 MS. SOUTHAM: So every environmental

1 impact statement, including this one, has a purpose and
2 need statement and this is basically the foundation of
3 the proposed project and the environmental impact
4 statement is written based on what is being proposed in
5 terms of the project purpose and need.

6
7 This project is the result of an Alaska
8 statute that was passed by the Legislature specifically
9 to make North Slope natural gas available to residents
10 in Fairbanks, Southcentral region and other communities
11 in the state. So this project is essentially to
12 provide utility-grade natural gas to the state of
13 Alaska and its residents.

14
15 There are two pipeline projects that
16 are in the news right now. The Alaska Stand Alone
17 Pipeline Project is this project that we're talking
18 about today and accepting public comments on through
19 October 14th. There is another one that is called the
20 Alaska LNG Project and I think it's important to point
21 out some of the differences.

22
23 While the Alaska Gasline Development
24 Corporation is a proponent of advancing both of these
25 projects, this project is the one that we're preparing
26 the supplemental EIS for. Again, it's to provide
27 utility-grade natural gas for Alaska. I think there's
28 some key differences. The project sponsor for this
29 project is just AGDC. The other pipeline does have
30 some oil and gas companies that are also proponents
31 including BP, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil and Trans-
32 Canada. That is a project that is primarily for export.
33 This project is for utility-grade natural gas for in-
34 state.

35
36 There are some other key differences.
37 This project has one compressor station up near Prudhoe
38 Bay and the other project does consider including up to
39 eight compressor stations currently in the design.
40 This project is just a little bit shorter in terms of
41 the pipeline length than the other project and the
42 diameter is smaller.

43
44 There is a lateral line that is part of
45 this proposed project to Fairbanks, a 29-mile, 12-inch
46 lateral line. The terminus of this project is near Big
47 Lake whereas the other pipeline would end in Nikiski.
48 There are some other differences you can see here in
49 terms of construction, time frame and just the
50 magnitude of the work force and so on.

1 So supplemental EIS is needed for this
2 project specifically because of some changes that were
3 made in the end of 2012. There was a document, a final
4 EIS that had been prepared for the project design at
5 that time and then there were some changes made towards
6 the end of that project that is a requirement
7 preparation of this supplemental EIS. So the
8 foundation of this supplemental will still be the 2012
9 final EIS document but really focusing in on those
10 changes that are significant that we'll review tonight,
11 including some rerouting, reduction in length and so
12 on.

13
14 So again, as Mary said, we're at the
15 very beginning of the supplemental EIS process. The
16 notice of intent was published on August 1st this year
17 and we're now in the scoping period. We're accepting
18 comments until October 14th. So we're just in the
19 beginning of the project. Development of the EIS will
20 take some time with a tentative date of publishing the
21 draft in the spring of 2015 and then a final EIS being
22 issued in the fall of that same year and a record of
23 decision in 2016.

24
25 The project as proposed again is
26 utility-grade natural gas. Design capacity of 500
27 million cubic feet per day. Another big difference
28 between this design now is that the pipeline will be
29 buried except for at fault crossings and elevated
30 stream crossings, and then some of the pigging and
31 valve facilities as well.

32
33 There is only now one gas conditioning
34 facility near Prudhoe Bay. The pipeline length has
35 been reduced a bit from the previous design. In
36 general it parallels the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and
37 Dalton Highway through to just northwest of Fairbanks,
38 and then at Livengood will continue on the west side of
39 Fairbanks and Nenana. It will now bypass Denali
40 National Park and Preserve on the east and generally
41 parallel Parks Highway to Willow and then southwest of
42 Big Lake will connect in with ENSTAR's system of the
43 Beluga Pipeline.

44
45 This right-of-way proposed for
46 construction will be about 120 feet wide. It will be
47 slightly wider in some areas where directional drilling
48 is needed, but that is just for construction. Then
49 operation of the pipeline the right-of-way would be
50 maintained at about 53 feet wide.

1 There are open-cut trenching techniques
2 and we do have some drawings of those and what they
3 look like here for you to see so you can get a better
4 sense of that process. Horizontal directional drilling
5 is going to be used at the major river and stream
6 crossings so that we're minimizing some of the in-water
7 work. There will be some mobile construction camps
8 that range from eight to ten acres and then there will
9 also be some material sites along the route as well.

10

11 This is the general overview of the
12 route. This Fairbanks line will somewhat parallel for
13 the most part Murphy Dome Road, about 29 miles there.

14

15 This is the gas conditioning facility
16 up near Prudhoe, so for those familiar with Prudhoe
17 this is the central compressor pad now. This is the
18 proposed 72-acre plot here with about a 20-acre lay-
19 down area proposed here and then another area over here
20 about 20 acres, I believe.

21

22 The West Dock area work is also what is
23 new from the last design and the reason for including
24 work now at West Dock is to be able to bring in these
25 pre-built modules that will be used for the gas
26 conditioning facility. So there will be some dredging
27 up at West Dock and there's an area -- because of the
28 size of these modules this part of the West Dock will
29 need to be widened slightly and there will also be a
30 temporary bridge, some ballasted barges that would be
31 used to bolster the bridge so that the modules can be
32 brought on shore. This is a picture of what a module
33 would look like on a barge.

34

35 So just to review, some of the benefits
36 that have come from the redesign of these components of
37 the project, it is reducing cost and risk somewhat for
38 the overall environmental and social and economic
39 impacts. Again, it's a slightly shorter and straighter
40 pipeline, so lower pressure. It avoids the railroad
41 and DOT right-of-way and in so doing it it also
42 maximizes some of the existing fire breaks and utility
43 corridors that are already there. That will help with
44 general access to the area for the pipeline. There's
45 improved safety with reducing the number of compressor
46 stations and then again this work at West Dock that
47 will include some dredging and modification of the
48 current facility there.

49

50 So tonight we're happy to take

1 comments. Those comments will be recorded and would be
2 part of the project record. You can also fill out a
3 comment form that we have on the back table there.
4 Mary is the lucky one that will receive emailed
5 comments as well. So any time before October 14th you
6 can send comments to this email address, which is also
7 shown on the project website asapeis.com. And then if
8 you'd like you can send hard copies in the mail as well
9 to this address. All of this is on the project
10 website. Again, formal comments will be accepted
11 through October 14th and if they're in the mail must be
12 postmarked by that date as well.

13

14 These are the public meetings that we
15 have scheduled. Right now we're in Kenai, August
16 27th. Tomorrow we'll be in Seward and then kicking up
17 again next week after the holiday. We did add two
18 additional meetings. One in Trapper Creek on September
19 15th and the other one in Evansville on September 11th
20 in addition to these.

21

22 Again, the comment period for scoping
23 ends October 14th. We'll have a scoping report that
24 will summarize all the input that we received. That
25 will be posted on the website this fall after that.
26 Then we'll move into preparing the draft supplemental
27 EIS. Again, that should be published in the spring and
28 we'll have another comment period after that.

29

30 So thank you and with that I think
31 we'll see if we have some questions. Actually before
32 you start if you could please state and spell your name
33 and then we'll make sure that's part of the recording.

34

35 MS. OSOWSKI: I'm Kaylee Osowski.
36 That's K-A-Y-L-E-E and last name O-S-O-W-S-K-I. I'm
37 with the Peninsula Clarion. I was wondering if -- you
38 mentioned kind of some of the changes reduced overall
39 footprint, that the line is going to be buried. Was
40 there considerations if the line was above ground,
41 would that reduce the footprint even more or was that
42 considered at all in the planning of the project?

43

44 MR. STEVENSON: Yeah, some of the above
45 ground -- you are correct that the footprint is
46 slightly less when we use vertical support members or
47 VSMS on the North Slope. We still do use those to
48 connect to the central gas facility, but the first
49 seven miles of the pipe are now buried and there's --
50 we're also above ground at fault crossings. There's

1 five major fault crossings that we're looking at. The
2 Castle Mountain fault, Denali fault and others. As our
3 engineers would explain, I'll try to do my best to use
4 the terminology they use, but they're a different type
5 of support member that slide and they're above ground
6 for several hundred feet.

7

8 But in terms of reducing overall
9 footprint, there's still -- even the first seven miles
10 would be on vertical support members and, you're right,
11 that peg is a smaller footprint than if the whole thing
12 is buried. You still have the pipe going through that
13 area, so it's just raised up seven feet above the
14 ground to allow for caribou passage and now the whole
15 thing is buried, so now caribou can still pass. It
16 doesn't do anything different in terms of impeding
17 wildlife. Either way wildlife are not impeded. It
18 just does technically take up more land because it's
19 all buried instead of on pegs every 65 feet or so.

20

21 MR. BAKER: I'd just add that I think
22 the reference to the lower footprint here I think is
23 specifically -- I think was mainly designed to point
24 out that the lean gas design reduced several support
25 facilities that would be associated with the project.
26 Mainly a straddle plant at the point at which the
27 Fairbanks lateral where you'd have to extract the
28 liquids from the gas and then re-inject and that was a
29 fairly large facility. Probably several other
30 compressor stations along the route and then at Big
31 Lake, at the terminus, you would have also had an
32 extraction facility.

33

34 So those are the things that have been
35 removed. We've also shortened the line, which
36 straightens it and reduces the footprint. I can't
37 speak to the cost of buried versus above, but certainly
38 from a -- and there may be also some PHMSA and safety
39 reasons for burying this pipeline as opposed to having
40 it above ground, but we certainly, by burying it, have
41 a much better ability to allow the land to be used sort
42 of in the way it was used prior to the pipeline being
43 built and certainly that's a condition that the State
44 or our current lease with the State emphasizes, a
45 desire to allow people to continue once the line is
46 buried as much as possible.

47

48 MS. OSOWSKI: About how much of the
49 land is Federal land and how much is State and local
50 government?

1 MR. MILES: I know that of the -- so
2 727 miles main line and 29 miles of the lateral, so
3 it's basically 756 miles, a little less than 70 of
4 those are private land, which would include individual
5 landowners, Native corporation, Native allotments, so
6 that's all within the 70. The remainder is Federal,
7 State and Municipal land, but I don't have -- maybe
8 Kalb can find it quickly what the breakdown is.

9
10 MR. STEVENSON: Okay. I have it in
11 terms of mileage and also number of parcels. Federal
12 land is over 223.4 miles of the pipeline, State of
13 Alaska land is 367.9, and then there's a breakdown.
14 The remainder is a combination of Native allotments,
15 Native corporation, private land, University of Alaska
16 and Municipal or Borough land.

17
18 So that's in our plan of development,
19 which you can find online. That's Table 4 on Page 19
20 of the ASAP plan of development, which can be found at
21 asapeis.com under the project documents tab.

22
23 MS. OSOWSKI: Have you guys been
24 working to acquire any land at this point?

25
26 MR. BAKER: No. We're still developing
27 our land acquisition plan. I shouldn't even call it a
28 land acquisition plan because we may not need to
29 acquire land if we can get easements or other things,
30 but part of what we're doing now and we'd be doing in
31 the field season this year and other years is doing our
32 survey work, identifying -- we do have people on staff
33 that are identifying title and ownership, but we
34 haven't pursued any acquisition.

35
36 MS. OSOWSKI: Of the changes in the
37 current project design, what kind of presents the most
38 challenges? I mean a lot of them -- I mean I guess you
39 increase the diameter but reduce the miles. So I guess
40 are there any challenges, maybe like the West Dock, if
41 that presents kind of the biggest challenges in the
42 changes.

43
44 MR. STEVENSON: Sure. So, as you
45 mentioned, a lot of the changes that we're making are
46 positive. We're reducing our number of stream
47 crossings both on the mainland and lateral quite
48 substantially. We are reducing the total facilities
49 footprint.

50

1 As far as challenges with the new
2 design, a comment that we're hearing frequently is, you
3 know, can we have access to gas and the answer to that
4 is yes, you can. The scope of the project however is a
5 main line with a terminus at Cook Inlet into the ENSTAR
6 line and a terminus in Fairbanks. One of the
7 challenges is just helping the public understand the
8 scope of the project and understand how access to gas
9 would come about and how it would fall within their
10 responsibility to -- well, all the different things
11 that would go into that; the community or the project
12 or whoever would desire gas, how that might all come
13 about.

14

15 West Dock is new. There will be some
16 dredging and disposal of material, but one of the
17 things we do to mitigate against that is to have a lot
18 of that activity or almost all that activity occur in
19 the winter, so we'll be cutting through the ice. It
20 gives us a longer time period and a little more
21 stability to dig all that out, put it on trucks and
22 dispose of it in the nearshore environment and we hope
23 to dispose of that on bottom-fast ice in an area where
24 there's ice scour and not really a biologically
25 sensitive environment. So bottom-fast ice breaks up.
26 It's scouring the bottom.

27

28 There's not a lot that can live there
29 in those areas, so we hope to dispose of it there and
30 work with the different groups in the North Slope
31 Borough and, you know, trying to just avoid and
32 minimize impact where we can. There's barges coming in
33 and out. We want to be sensitive to marine wildlife
34 and threatened and endangered species. So part of the
35 challenges is to take all those things into account and
36 to avoid and minimize impact to the greatest extent
37 possible.

38

39 MS. OSOWSKI: Do you guys see both this
40 project and Alaska LNG moving forward or is it going to
41 end up being one or the other? What are your thoughts?

42

43 MR. BAKER: The short answer is our
44 expectation certainly from the corporation and from the
45 -- I can speak from the State Gas team perspective is
46 that only one of these projects are going to go
47 forward. So they're both in different stages of
48 development. The State does not -- the idea is to pick
49 the one that's in the best long-term interest of the
50 state and people have different interpretations of what

1 that means, but trying to get energy to Alaskans,
2 maximize the value of the resource, create jobs,
3 economic development. We just don't know enough yet
4 really about either project to make an either/or
5 decision yet.

6

7 MS. OSOWSKI: Do you have an idea of
8 when -- like a timeline of when that decision might be
9 made?

10

11 MR. BAKER: The current -- I think the
12 Legislature has funded both of these initiatives
13 through FY15, which takes us to July 1st of 2016. It's
14 our expectation that this coming legislative session
15 there will be a healthy discussion of both of these
16 projects and an interest in getting updated on where
17 they each are. I think the Alaska LNG timeline is
18 what's going to drive in the short term. The next
19 major decision point for that is probably first quarter
20 of 2016.

21

22 MS. OSOWSKI: Is there a copy of the
23 EIS online?

24

25 MR. BAKER: Yes, the original FEIS is
26 available at the ASAP Project website, which is
27 accessible through the corporate website or it's
28 asapgas.agdc.us. It was previously available at this
29 website, but we've now converted this to the
30 supplemental EIS, but all the FEIS documents are
31 available on the project website.

32

33 MS. OSOWSKI: I think that was it.

34

35 MS. SOUTHAM: So I think we will close
36 the comment period for the Kenai scoping meeting.
37 Thank you.

38

39

(Off record)

40

41

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 13 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Kenai Scoping Meeting on August 27, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Seward, Alaska
August 28, 2014

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Seward, Alaska - 8/28/2014)

4
5 (On record - 5:35 p.m.)

6
7 MS. SOUTHAM: Welcome to the Alaska Stand Alone
8 Pipeline Project draft supplemental EIS public scoping
9 meeting. Thanks for coming both of you. My name is
10 Anne Southam. I work for ERM. We are the third party
11 contractor that was selected to produce the
12 supplemental EIS and we're responsible for preparing
13 the document, doing these meetings and assisting the
14 Corps of Engineers in publishing both the draft final
15 and then the record of decision.

16
17 Tonight we're going to go through some project
18 information as well as explain the difference between
19 this pipeline project and the Alaska LNG pipeline just
20 to clarify some differences there. It gets a little
21 confusing with two pipelines being in the news and
22 things.

23
24 So this is the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline
25 Project. We'll
26 take you through the NEPA process. The National
27 Environmental Policy Act is the reason that we're
28 preparing this disclosure document, the environmental
29 impact statement. Comparing this revised version of
30 the project 2014 with the previous version. There was
31 a final EIS that had been published in 2012 and there
32 were some changes made at the end of that project that
33 had spurred the development of this supplemental EIS.

34
35 We're currently in the scoping period of this
36 project, so we're accepting public comments through
37 October 14th. We have a chart that explains the other
38 opportunities in the future through this project where
39 you can provide comments. This is one of several
40 meetings that we're having, so we can show you the list
41 of the other places that we'll be through the end of
42 September. Then just some next steps of what to expect
43 in the next six months.

44
45 Mary Romero is here from the Corps of
46 Engineers, the lead agency on this supplemental EIS and
47 I'd like to introduce her so she can explain the
48 agency's role as well as some of the cooperating
49 agencies.

50

1 MS. ROMERO: Thank you, Anne. Like Anne said,
2 my name is Mary Romero. I work for the Corps of
3 Engineers. We are the lead agency on this project. We
4 are recording this meeting tonight, so when you provide
5 comments we will have them succinctly and can address
6 them properly.

7
8 Additionally there are six other agencies that
9 are also cooperating with the Corps of Engineers on the
10 supplemental EIS. The third-party contractor ERM that
11 Anne works for is actually doing the writing of it and
12 then the Corps along with the cooperating agencies will
13 review it to make sure that it addresses all the
14 comments and provides the answers that the different
15 agencies need to also do their decision documents as
16 well.

17
18 So the six different agencies are -- we have
19 five Federal agencies, EPA, BLM. BLM is involved for
20 authorizing right-of-ways for where the project would
21 cross their land. The National Park Service is
22 involved because there's a potential for one of the
23 alternates would go through Denali National Park and
24 they are also a proponent of the project. They would
25 like to have gas available both for their facilities as
26 well as for their buses to utilize too. Then we also
27 have PHMSA, which is the Department of Transportation
28 Pipeline Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, and
29 they oversee safety on the pipeline. U.S. Fish and
30 Wildlife Service is involved for reviewing the impacts
31 to wildlife and also because endangered species would
32 be impacted by this project.

33
34 Then we also have one State agency. That's the
35 State Pipeline Coordinator's Office and we have a
36 representative from SPCO here tonight and that's Cathy
37 Heroy.

38
39 MS. HEROY: As Mary said, I'm Cathy Heroy. I'm
40 with the State Pipeline Coordinator's Office. We have
41 jurisdiction over Alaska Statute 38.35 pipelines, which
42 are for common and contract carrier pipelines. We
43 issue the right-of-way lease for pipelines across
44 general State lands. That doesn't include mental
45 health trust, university, railroad, but across general
46 State lands we issue those right-of-ways. We also
47 issue permits and authorizations that are related to
48 pipeline activities.

49
50 MS. ROMERO: Thank you. So the Corps is

1 neither an opponent or a proponent of the project. We
2 do have the proponent and applicant for the project,
3 that's AGDC, which is Alaska Gasline Development
4 Corporation, and Kalb Stevenson is here from AGDC.

5
6 MR. STEVENSON: I'm Kalb Stevenson. I'm with
7 the ASAP Project and I am specifically within the
8 environmental regulatory and lands division of ASAP.
9 So that means everything that deals with the physical,
10 the biological and the human environment we are working
11 in that arena and attempting to avoid and minimize
12 impact wherever possible. If there's any questions,
13 I'll do my best to answer them.

14
15 MS. ROMERO: Thank you, Kalb. By the time we
16 get through the whole process and get to the final
17 supplemental environmental impact statement, most of
18 the agencies will state what their preferred
19 alternative is, whether it's one of the alternate
20 routes or if it is the proposed route that AGDC has
21 sent an application to us, but the Corps of Engineers
22 will not. We do not make our decision until we have
23 finished the record of decision and at that time we
24 will determine which is the least environmentally
25 damaging practicable alternative, also known as the
26 LEDPA.

27
28 So the Corps of Engineers has two different
29 responsibilities for this project. The first one is
30 for the NEPA, which is the National Environmental
31 Policy Act. That's why we're here tonight. Under NEPA
32 we are required to provide full disclosure of all the
33 impacts to the environment that would occur from the
34 project. Additionally, commenting. We have to provide
35 an avenue for comments to be provided for the project.
36 Any comments you have, whether it's for it, whether
37 it's against it, we want to hear what you have to say.

38
39 The first opportunity is tonight during
40 scoping. Once we get to the draft supplemental EIS,
41 there will be a 60-day comment period at that time.
42 Then the third time is when the final supplemental EIS
43 is completed and published and that we are expecting to
44 be in 2016.

45
46 The reason the Corps was selected as the lead
47 agency on this is when all the agencies that are
48 involved in permitting for a project get together,
49 whichever one has the largest portion of jurisdiction
50 over the project usually ends up being the lead.

1 Within the last couple years that's the Corps almost
2 always. That is because for this project there's a lot
3 of waters of the U.S., including wetlands.

4
5 So we actually have three different
6 jurisdictions for this project. The first one is
7 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and that's for
8 dredged or fill materials that's placed into waters of
9 the U.S. or wetlands. Also Section 10 of the River and
10 Harbors Act for any structures that might be placed in
11 navigable waters. Then Section 103 of the Marine
12 Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, which
13 is for the transport of dredged materials and ocean
14 dumping that could occur. That's new from when we did
15 the original FEIS. They have added a West Dock
16 component, so there is a potential for transport and
17 dumping of dredged materials.

18
19 The other thing that ERM gets to do as the
20 third-party contractor is give the presentation of the
21 project and I'm going to turn it back to Anne now.

22
23 MS. SOUTHAM: Thanks, Mary. So the Alaska
24 State Legislature actually had passed a statute that is
25 the foundation of the project. Every time there's an
26 environmental impact statement, such as this one,
27 there's always a project purpose and need. That's,
28 like I said, the foundation of what we're analyzing.

29
30 So this project stems from that Alaska statute
31 and it's to make North Slope natural gas available to
32 residents of Fairbanks, the Southcentral region and
33 other communities in the state as directed by the State
34 Legislature. So it's to provide gas to residents of
35 Alaska.

36
37 As I said earlier, there are two pipeline
38 projects that you're hearing about in the news right
39 now. This one, the ASAP project for in-state gas, and
40 then there's also the bigger one that's been discussed
41 quite a bit, Alaska LNG. There are some similarities
42 between the two in that it's a pipeline from the North
43 Slope down through the state. This pipeline is being
44 advanced as well as the other one both by Alaska
45 Gasline Development Corporation, AGDC, but there's a
46 key difference in that the LNG project also has some
47 large oil and gas companies that are proponents as
48 well, including BP, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil and
49 Trans-Canada.

50

1 This project is utility-grade gas, so there
2 would be one compressor station on the North Slope and
3 then some off-take valves provided along the route so
4 that it can tie in directly to existing systems or
5 systems that would be developed in the future by
6 communities that would want to tie in. The other
7 project would be liquified natural gas, so that's a
8 slightly different process. As I said, there is one
9 compressor station at Prudhoe. The other project would
10 propose eight compressor stations, so it's a bit larger
11 footprint. There's some differences in the length of
12 each pipeline as you can see.

13
14 This one also has a critical difference in that
15 it includes a 29-mile lateral line to Fairbanks so that
16 it would provide natural gas to the community there.
17 The terminus of the ASAP project is near Big Lake
18 versus Nikiski, where there would be an LNG plant for
19 the other pipeline, Alaska LNG pipeline. Again, there
20 are some differences just in the sheer sort of
21 magnitude of the projects as you can see in terms of
22 work force and cost as well as the estimated
23 construction time.

24
25 So a supplemental EIS is prepared when you have
26 an original document and in this case it was the final
27 EIS that was published in 2012. Towards the end of
28 that project it became clear that the engineers wanted
29 to make some pretty significant design changes now. So
30 under NEPA that means you've got to sort of start over
31 in terms of making sure that you're analyzing those new
32 components from beginning to end and also providing the
33 public and stakeholders an opportunity to make comments
34 both at scoping and public meetings on those new
35 components.

36
37 So this project will be based heavily on that
38 2012 final EIS that had been published with the key
39 differences focusing on those new elements that I'll
40 run through in just a minute in terms of route changes
41 and some work at West Dock Mary mentioned.

42
43 So this is the process that we go through to
44 produce this document. The notice of intent was
45 published on August 1st. We're currently in the
46 scoping phase, which is a 75-day period where we're
47 accepting comments until October 14th. Then we'll go
48 through and produce the draft EIS by spring of 2015,
49 working through another comment period and then the
50 tentative date for publishing the final is fall of 2015

1 with the record of decision early the following year.

2

3 The project, as I said, is utility-grade
4 natural gas with a design capacity of 500 million cubic
5 feet per day. This new design is actually buried pipe,
6 so it would be buried for almost the entire route with
7 the exception of some of the fault crossings and major
8 stream crossings along the route, as well as some of
9 the valve facilities that would provide off-takes for
10 communities that would want to tie into the natural
11 gas.

12

13 There is only one gas conditioning facility at
14 Prudhoe Bay. It's a 36-inch pipe, which is also
15 slightly different from the last proposed pipeline.
16 The pressure is slightly lower with this new design.
17 It generally parallels the TAPS pipeline along the
18 Dalton Highway, just northwest of Fairbanks, and then
19 would continue to the west side of Fairbanks and
20 Nenana, down to where it would bypass Denali National
21 Park and Preserve on the east. Again the terminus is
22 in the Big Lake area.

23

24 Generally the construction right-of-way will be
25 about 120 feet. It may be slightly wider in some areas
26 where directional drilling would be required for stream
27 crossings and those sorts of things. That would only
28 be during construction phase. The right-of-way would
29 then shrink down to about an average of 53 feet for
30 most of the pipeline once it's constructed.

31

32 Open-cut trenching techniques are going to be
33 used and there are some engineering drawings over there
34 that provide a little more detail of what that actually
35 looks like and how it's done. As I said, there will be
36 horizontal directional drilling for the major river and
37 stream crossings, including the Yukon, so that
38 minimizes a lot of the in-water work and reduces
39 impacts in that sense. There will be some mobile
40 construction camps just during construction and then
41 also some material sites that would provide gravel and
42 fill for along the route.

43

44 This is the lateral line to Fairbanks. It
45 generally parallels the Murphy Dome Road if you're
46 familiar with that area. This is from the North Slope,
47 a picture of the Prudhoe Bay area. These are existing
48 facilities that are there. West Dock is generally up
49 in this direction. This is about a 72-acre pad with a
50 20-acre lay-down area and then another lay-down area up

1 here.

2

3 West Dock is one of the new components. The
4 reason it's now part of the project is to bring in some
5 pre-fabricated modules that would then be constructed
6 into the gas conditioning facility. It will involve
7 bringing in about 23 barges through the West Dock area.
8 Because of the size of these modules, there would be
9 some widening of the existing West Dock. Here is the
10 current breach that will also need a little bit of
11 bolstering. It's currently planned to have some
12 temporary barges that would be ballasted, so then they
13 would be removed after the modules are brought on
14 shore. There would be some winter dredging to remove
15 some of the material in order to get the barges in.
16 The project would work closely with Fish and Game to
17 make sure fish passage would not be impacted. This is
18 just an example of what it would look like bringing
19 them in.

20

21 So again through some of these changes we're
22 looking at reduced cost and risk because, in general,
23 the pipeline is about 10 miles shorter. The Fairbanks
24 lateral line is about five fewer miles. The project is
25 using existing fire breaks and utility corridors as
26 much as possible to try to reduce the level of impact
27 in general. There's overall a reduced footprint
28 because we've reduced the number of compressor stations
29 at Prudhoe Bay and then again the new design change
30 involves now bringing these modules in at West Dock, so
31 that's the other major component that's new.

32

33 So as we've said multiple times tonight there
34 are three opportunities for comments. One is right now
35 and there are three ways that you can make comments.
36 Either tonight recorded, which would be later
37 transcribed for part of the project record. You can
38 also mail in one of the forms with your handwritten
39 comments and either provide it to Mary tonight or send
40 it through snail mail if you like.

41

42 There's also a project website, which I would
43 encourage you to visit. There will be updates to that
44 website regularly with new information as well as a
45 summary of all the comments that we heard during
46 scoping. There will be a scoping summary report
47 provided on the site later this fall. Then you can
48 also link there to this email address where you can
49 send in email comments. Comments have to be received
50 or postmarked by October 14, 2014 in order to be part

1 of the scoping record, so keep that in mind.

2

3 Tonight is one of several meetings. We're
4 doing a tour de Alaska this fall. There are two other
5 meetings besides the list here. We've added Trapper
6 Creek on September 15th and then September 11th is
7 Evansville/Bettles area.

8

9 Again, this is just a review of what I've just
10 said. Comments by the 14th of October, draft SEIS by
11 next spring and then another comment period at that
12 time. Thank you.

13

14 So now I think we'll pause and if you all would
15 like, you can look at some of the maps or we can also
16 accept comments if you'd like to make a comment
17 tonight.

18

19 If you can state your name and spell it if you
20 would like to comment.

21

22 MS. MCDERMOTT: Kaysea McDermott. First name
23 K-A-Y-S-E-A. Last name McDermott, M-C-D-E-R-M-O-T-T.
24 I'm actually wondering, the two projects, the two
25 separate projects, is it going to be either one or the
26 other? Are they going to work together or is there any
27 opportunity for them to work together?

28

29 MR. STEVENSON: This is Kalb Stevenson. I
30 guess there's always a chance of anything, but the
31 current thinking is that it will be one or the other
32 and we won't have a decision -- AGDC will not have a
33 decision on that probably for another 12 to 18 months.
34 Probably in that range. Probably closer to 18, but the
35 other project is still in the pre-FEED stage looking at
36 the economics. The State of Alaska is involved in
37 both. So right now we have one project that's in a
38 supplemental EIS and another one that's in pre-FEED and
39 hasn't yet entered into an EIS, so there is a time
40 difference between the two projects. So this project
41 would potentially be studied and ready before the other
42 project, so there would be some decisions that would
43 have to be made probably within the next year and a
44 half. If that helps.

45

46 MS. MCDERMOTT: So if this one was approved and
47 went through, the other one wouldn't happen.

48

49 MR. STEVENSON: No, that's not correct. If
50 this project is fully permitted and the other project

1 is still being studied or still within an EIS, it's
2 really a question for AGDC, for the corporation of the
3 State to make that call.

4

5 (Pause)

6

7 MS. SOUTHAM: So I think we'll go ahead and
8 formally close the meeting tonight. Thanks for coming.

9

10 (Off record)

11

12 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 11 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Seward Scoping Meeting on August 28, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Fairbanks, Alaska
September 2, 2014

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Fairbanks, Alaska - 9/2/2014)

4
5 (On record - 5:30 p.m.)

6
7 MS. SOUTHAM: Welcome to the Alaska
8 Stand Alone Pipeline scoping meeting in Fairbanks,
9 Alaska. My name is Anne Southam. I work for
10 Environmental Resources Management, ERM, the
11 third-party contractor that's been hired to do the
12 supplemental environmental impact statement as part of
13 this project.

14
15 So tonight I just want to run through
16 the lay of the land. We will give a presentation that
17 describes the project, including an introduction to the
18 lead agency. Mary Romero is here from the U.S. Army
19 Corps of Engineers and several other agency folks are
20 here. We'll go through some differences.

21
22 Actually before I get into the
23 presentation, we'll give the presentation and then
24 likely have a little bit of an open house where folks
25 can informally ask some questions, look more at the
26 maps we have on the wall, some engineering drawings as
27 well and mingle with some of the agency folks and
28 Alaska Gasline Development Corporation folks that are
29 here if you have some specific questions to ask them.
30 Then after that move into the actual formal comment
31 period. We are being recorded tonight as part of the
32 official project record, so after this process we will
33 have some official transcripts put together and then a
34 scoping report as well, which I'll describe in a bit.

35
36 The presentation, as I said, we'll have
37 Mary speak to the Corps of Engineers' role in the
38 project and some of the other agencies as well, talk
39 about the differences between this pipeline project and
40 the other pipeline that you're also likely hearing
41 about, the Alaska LNG project, the steps in the
42 National Environmental Policy Act process, which is
43 spurring why we're here tonight to take comments, why a
44 supplemental EIS is needed after the 2012 final EIS was
45 published, the project description and some more detail
46 about the differences between the revised project now
47 compared to what it was when you may have last seen it
48 in 2012, the scoping comment process and how you can
49 submit comments, the scoping meeting schedule. We have
50 16 now scoping meetings and we'll have a list of those,

1 which are also listed on the project website. And some
2 next steps in terms of just the next six months or so
3 what we'll be doing.

4

5 With that, I'd like to introduce Mary
6 Romero with the Corps.

7

8 MS. ROMERO: Like Anne said, my name is
9 Mary Romero. I work for the Corps of Engineers. We
10 are the lead agency on the supplemental environmental
11 impact statement along with six other cooperating
12 agencies, five Federal and one State. AGDC, the Alaska
13 Gasline Development Corporation, is the proponent of
14 the project and we have Kalb Stevenson here from AGDC
15 and I'll have him introduce the other people from AGDC
16 that are here tonight as well.

17

18 MR. STEVENSON: Thanks, Mary. My name
19 is Kalb Stevenson. I'm with the ASAP Project. I'm in
20 the environmental regulatory and lands division of
21 ASAP. So that means part of our role is studying the
22 physical, the biological and the human environment.
23 Everything from baseline studies to trying to avoid and
24 minimize impact. I'll just pass the mic around. We've
25 got Miles Baker here.

26

27 MR. BAKER: Hi. I'm Miles Baker. I'm
28 in charge of external affairs government relations for
29 the Alaska Gasline Development Corporation, which is
30 the public corporation that you own and is advancing
31 this project. I've also got Leah Levinton, who works
32 in public affairs as well, and Frank Richards, who is
33 our vice president of engineering and program
34 development, is also here. We're happy to answer
35 questions if you have them.

36

37 MS. ROMERO: Like I said, they are the
38 proponent. The Corps is neither an opponent or a
39 proponent of the project. At this time I'm going to
40 state the other agencies that are involved. BLM is
41 involved because they would have to provide right-of-
42 way approval over the lands that this project is
43 proposed to cross. The National Park Service is
44 involved for the potential on the alternative to go
45 through Denali National Park and they are a proponent
46 of the project because they would like to be able to
47 use some of this gas. Then we also have EPA, which has
48 oversight over the Clean Water Act and the Air
49 Pollution Act. We have U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
50 and we have Jewel Bennett here from U.S. Fish and

1 Wildlife.

2

3 MS. BENNETT: Hello. My name is Jewel
4 Bennett. I work in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
5 office here in Fairbanks. My counterpart in Anchorage
6 is working on the south end of the project with the
7 Corps. Our role in this project as a cooperating
8 agency will be helping to develop the alternatives of
9 the project and then as a technical assistance to the
10 Corps throughout the project in terms of providing
11 input on the value of the wetlands that may be impacted
12 by the project and the migratory fish and wildlife that
13 could be impacted. And we will be helping them
14 implement Endangered Species Act consultation for the
15 species that are listed on the north end project.

16

17 MS. ROMERO: Thank you. Then the last
18 Federal agency that is involved is PHMSA, the Pipeline
19 Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, and that's
20 for safety on the pipeline. Then the State Pipeline
21 Coordinator's Office we have Jason Walsh and a few
22 others.

23

24 MR. WALSH: Thank you. I'm Jason Walsh
25 with the State Pipeline Coordinator's Office. I have
26 Chris Grundman here also with the SPCO and Don Perrin,
27 who is also with DNR SPCO. Our role as a cooperating
28 agency is to coordinate the State's involvement in this
29 SEIS and we've issued the major authorization for this
30 project, which is a right-of-way lease that's already
31 been issued. We'll be managing that lease as things
32 progress for this project.

33

34 Also, as representative of the State,
35 I'd like to mention that we are aware there's an AK LNG
36 Project who is also looking at early studies for
37 locating a pipe similar in nature. They'll talk about
38 it here tonight. The State is aware that both projects
39 are happening and working with both projects to forward
40 the early stages of development. It's likely there
41 will be only one pipeline, so we'll continue to be
42 working with them. If you have any questions during
43 the open house about that, please feel free to ask me.
44 Thanks.

45

46 MS. ROMERO: Thank you. So although
47 the Corps is the lead agency -- and the way we were
48 selected to be the lead agency is.....

49

50 MAYOR HOPKINS: Mary. So, Mary, you

1 said EPA is also part of this, but is not here.....

2

3 MS. ROMERO: Just one second because we
4 need you to speak in the.....

5

6 MAYOR HOPKINS: So, as you get started,
7 is it correct that the EPA is not represented here
8 tonight in Fairbanks?

9

10 MS. ROMERO: They are not.

11

12 MAYOR HOPKINS: Do you have a reason
13 why they're not?

14

15 MS. ROMERO: Budget. It's the end of
16 their year and they ran out of money is what they told
17 me, so they weren't going to be here tonight.

18

19 So, as I was saying, the way the lead
20 agency is selected when working on an environmental
21 impact is all the different agencies that would have a
22 permitting or authorization role within the project get
23 together and whoever has the most jurisdictional
24 authority ends up being the lead. I drew the short
25 straw.

26

27 So while the Corps does not write their
28 own EIS, we do work with a third-party contractor. As
29 Anne explained, ERM is the third-party contractor. So
30 all the different agencies that are cooperating will be
31 looking at it to make sure that it addresses all the
32 questions that are provided, comments that are provided
33 and to make sure that it has legal sufficiency so that
34 they can go through their permitting and authorization
35 processes as well.

36

37 So the Corps actually has two different
38 roles within this project. The first one is under
39 NEPA, which is the National Environmental Policy Act.
40 Under that we are required to provide an opportunity
41 for communities along the proposed project to provide
42 comment. There are three different times that that
43 happens.

44

45 The first one during scoping and that's
46 what we're doing here. After we've received all the
47 scoping comments and ERM goes through them and writes
48 up a report and we address the effects and how the
49 comments need to be addressed within it as far as
50 people have said things need to be moved, what needs to be

1 adjusted. We're also working on cultural resources as
2 well. Then they will start to write the draft
3 supplemental EIS.

4
5 Once that is completed and published,
6 there will be a second comment period and that one will
7 be 60 days long. After we go through those comments
8 and respond to them, we'll end up with a final
9 supplemental EIS and there will be a 30-day comment
10 period after that.

11
12 So that's the NEPA part. Then the
13 Corps also has a permitting part to this project and we
14 have three different jurisdictions for this project.
15 The first one is Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and
16 that's for dredged or fill materials that's placed into
17 waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Also Section
18 10 of the River and Harbors Act for any structures that
19 might be placed in navigable waters. Then finally
20 Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research and
21 Sanctuaries Act of 1972, which is for the transport of
22 dredged materials and ocean dumping.

23
24 The other thing that ERM gets to do as
25 the third-party contractor is give the presentation of
26 the project and I'm going to turn it over to Anne at
27 this time.

28
29 MS. SOUTHAM: Thanks, Mary. So for
30 every NEPA project the purpose and need is what sets
31 the foundation of the EIS project. The project purpose
32 in this case stems from an Alaska statute that was
33 passed by the State Legislature to make North Slope
34 natural gas available to residents of Fairbanks, the
35 Southcentral region and other communities in the state
36 as directed by the Alaska State Legislature. So this
37 project is to provide gas to residents of Alaska.

38
39 Just to clear up some of the confusion
40 you may have, there are, as we were saying earlier,
41 there are two pipeline projects that are currently
42 being talked about right now. This one is the ASAP
43 project or Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline. The other
44 project is referred to as Alaska LNG. Alaska Gasline
45 Development Corporation is progressing both of those
46 projects. This meeting tonight is only focused on the
47 ASAP project. The comments that we take we encourage
48 you to kind of focus on that project.

49
50 Again, just to clear up I think some of

1 the basic information about the two. There are some
2 proponents of the LNG project that include private
3 companies, BP, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil and Trans-
4 Canada.

5
6 This project is utility-grade gas,
7 referred to as lean gas, whereas the other one is
8 liquified natural gas. That project includes a
9 component that would potentially export gas as well.
10 There is only one gas conditioning facility proposed as
11 part of this project. There could be a potential to
12 have eight compressor stations for the other project,
13 so that's also a key difference.

14
15 This pipeline is slightly shorter at
16 about 727 miles versus 800-mile pipe that would be
17 proposed for the LNG project. This obviously also
18 includes the 29-mile lateral line to Fairbanks, which
19 is probably why many of you are here tonight. The
20 other project would not include a lateral line.

21
22 The terminus of the ASAP project is
23 near Big Lake versus Nikiski for the LNG project.
24 There are some other sort of design capacity
25 differences; 500 million cubic feet per day versus 3.5
26 billion and then the costs are also quite different as
27 well as the projected construction timeframe and
28 overall work force that would be required. All this
29 information is also on the project website, so I'd
30 encourage each of you if you want to go back and
31 review, this will all be available.

32
33 So we're here tonight as part of this
34 supplemental environmental impact statement. In 2012
35 this project has produced a final EIS and at that point
36 AGDC had decided that some design changes were
37 necessary and at that point had pulled back and the
38 Corps of Engineers did not issue what's called a record
39 of decision at that time because they knew that a
40 supplemental EIS would be required. Any time you have
41 significant differences in project design you're
42 required under NEPA to produce a supplemental EIS.
43 That allows stakeholders like yourselves to have
44 another opportunity to look at the new differences in
45 the proposed project and comment on that before the
46 project gets further along with alternative design.

47
48 So the foundation of this EIS is still
49 a lot of the information that was produced as part of
50 the 2012 document, but focusing in on those key

1 differences. There have been some routing changes and
2 some work that's being done up at West Dock and I'll
3 describe that in just a bit.

4

5 So the kick-off of this NEPA process
6 was when the notice of intent was published on August
7 1st of this year. So that officially kicks off the
8 scoping period. This will continue through October
9 14th. As Mary said, there are three other times where
10 you can make comments. The scoping period, which is a
11 total of 75 days right now. The draft EIS, when that's
12 published, which is tentatively spring of 2015 and then
13 again after the final is published, which is scheduled
14 for approximately fall of 2015. There will be updates
15 to this schedule on a regular basis as needed on the
16 project website, so you can always go back to that site
17 for more information. The record of decision is
18 scheduled for early 2016.

19

20 So more about this project. This is,
21 again utility-grade natural gas. A key difference
22 between the previous version and now is that most of
23 the pipeline will be buried. The only exceptions are
24 at fault crossings, some of the major stream crossings
25 and the pigging and valve facilities. So there would
26 be a valve facility that would be for the Fairbanks
27 lateral line.

28

29 Again there is only one gas
30 conditioning facility. As part of that there will be
31 some pretty large modules that will be brought in
32 through West Dock, which will require some work up
33 there. Again, the line is a little bit shorter than
34 proposed before. It's been straightened a bit and I'll
35 show you a map.

36

37 The pipeline generally parallels the
38 TAPS pipeline and the Dalton Highway just to northwest
39 of here and at Livengood it will continue to the west
40 side of Fairbanks and Nenana, down to where it would
41 bypass Denali National Park and Preserve on the east
42 side. Again, the terminus is around Big Lake where it
43 will tie into ENSTAR's existing system.

44

45 Generally the right-of-way for
46 construction is about 120 feet. It may be slightly
47 wider than that for some of the facilities but only
48 during construction. During general operation it will
49 be about 53 feet wide.

50

1 Open-cut trenching will be used in
2 order to bury the pipe and we have some engineering
3 drawings to show what that looks like and how it's
4 done. There will be horizontal directional drilling
5 for some of these major stream crossings, including the
6 Yukon, so that basically reduces some of the in-water
7 work, which is a good thing. There would be some
8 mobile construction camps ranging from eight to ten
9 acres just during construction and then some material
10 sites also along the route.

11
12 This is a depiction of general
13 alignment. Again it follows TAPS and then will go west
14 of Fairbanks and then east of Denali National Park and
15 Preserve. Here's a blow-up of the Fairbanks lateral
16 line. This is a depiction of the proposed gas
17 conditioning facility up at Prudhoe. So for those of
18 you that might be familiar with that area up there,
19 these are the existing existing facilities, this is the
20 central compressor pad, gas facility here. This pad
21 right here will be about 72-acres. This is a 20-acre
22 lay-down area and then another lay-down area over here.
23 West Dock is generally up in this direction up here.

24
25 So the work at West Dock is because of
26 bringing in pre-built modules. There would be about 23
27 barges that would be required in order to bring these
28 large modules in to West Dock. As part of that there
29 will be some winter dredging of material there. We
30 also will need to widen parts of West Dock because of
31 the size of these modules. This section right here
32 would be widened and then this breach and the dock
33 right here would also be bolstered by some temporary
34 barges that would be ballasted and then removed after
35 construction. The project would also work closely
36 with Fish and Game to make sure fish passage would not
37 be impacted in the area. Here is a view of what it
38 would look like on a barge coming in.

39
40 Again, some of the benefits of these
41 changes are generally reduced cost because you're
42 looking at less pipeline overall. It's shorter and
43 straighter pipeline. It's lower pressure than was
44 previously proposed, so you only need one gas
45 conditioning facility. We're also using as much of the
46 existing railroad and DOT right-of-way and maximizing
47 some of the existing fire breaks and utility corridors.
48 Then again the new design change involves now bringing
49 these modules in at West Dock, so that's the other
50 major component that's new.

1 So tonight we are going to break for 30
2 minutes and have an informal open house where you can
3 ask some of the folks from AGDC and the other agencies
4 here some questions, look more closely at some of the
5 posters, then after that we'll go into the comment
6 period, which will be recorded. We'll be bringing a
7 microphone around and people will be able to make
8 comments in the order that they signed in. If you
9 haven't signed in, I'd encourage each of you to do
10 that. That will also make sure that you're part of any
11 future communication about the project.

12
13 So you have an opportunity to provide
14 verbal comments tonight that will be recorded and then
15 you can also mail in comments. We have some forms on
16 the back table that you can mail in to Mary. We also
17 have an email on the project website, asapeis.com and
18 the comment email is also shown here. You can also
19 just mail your own letter to Mary via snail mail if you
20 choose. As long as we receive those or they're
21 postmarked by October 14th they will be part of the
22 project record.

23
24 These are the other meetings that we're
25 having. We're sort of in the middle at the moment in
26 Fairbanks. We've also added Trapper Creek on September
27 15th and then Evansville, Bettles will be on the 11th,
28 next week.

29
30 Again, the comment period closes the
31 14th of October and then after that we will have a
32 scoping report that will be put on the project website
33 sometime this fall in advance of the SEIS. So you'll
34 be able to see some of the other stakeholder comments
35 that were submitted on the project. Then we'll go into
36 preparing the draft SEIS and publish that likely in the
37 spring and then another comment period after that.

38
39 I really appreciate everybody, we all
40 do, who has come tonight. At this point I think we'll
41 break for 30 minutes. Yes.

42
43 MAYOR HOPKINS: (Indiscernible - away
44 from microphone).

45
46 MS. SOUTHAM: Yes, you can comment now
47 if you'd like.

48
49 MAYOR HOPKINS: Thank you very much.
50 I'm Luke Hopkins, Fairbanks North Star Borough mayor.

1 On July 24th I had submitted a letter to both the
2 project team and to the community advisory council,
3 also copied Dan Fauske on a request that our community
4 needs to have the lateral line extended from its end
5 point onto our industrial area in the community, that
6 being the North Pole area where Golden Valley has
7 turbines. The two refineries are also located there.

8
9 One of your points -- and I'm not
10 technical, so I don't know what size it has to be, but
11 it's fine to have the regulator depressurization point
12 as you have it now, but I would like a second one to be
13 located in the North Pole area.

14
15 So since the EIS has been done, new
16 information is relevant at this point. A municipal gas
17 utility has been stood up and it has the horseshoe area
18 around the existing service area. So when the lateral
19 line was proposed, it was terminated at the corner of
20 the existing at that time service area for gas
21 distribution, understand that, but now we have also a
22 second one, this municipal gas utility that was stood
23 up. It is starting in phase one and two in the North
24 Pole area.

25
26 Why I made a question about why EPA
27 wasn't here tonight, we're the only non-attainment area
28 for PM 2.5 in the state of Alaska and EPA is not here
29 to hear our scoping comments and the issues that are
30 quite relevant. This is the area in phase one and two
31 of the Municipal Gas Utility expansion area where a
32 lateral line would be able to serve at a much reduced
33 cost per MCF, which is the critical point in having
34 customers convert to get rid of and stop competing with
35 the high cost of energy that we have to be able to
36 offer low cost energy and not have to burn wood and
37 coal.

38
39 So I am very concerned that EPA is not
40 here to be able to even discuss these things. Region
41 10 has been a participant with our borough in the
42 various aspects of getting a SIP put forward and this
43 is, again, a critical point.

44
45 Having a lateral line run the rest of
46 the way through Fairbanks, there's plenty of DOT right-
47 of-way along the national highway, that being called
48 the Richardson Highway. It has very wide right-of-
49 ways. I would like to have as new information that
50 this project include the extension of the lateral line,

1 not at the cost of Fairbanks but at the cost of the
2 project. The project has millions and millions of
3 dollars of funding and I want to have this added into
4 this supplemental EIS as new information and a
5 requirement for this community.

6

7 I understand that when you talk about
8 the utility-grade gas that's a good word because we
9 have a lot of utilities and they're critical to our
10 economy here and it must be stood up to have a
11 pressure-regulating station in that area of North Pole.
12 It's unacceptable not to have it for our community.

13

14 I will submit the letter that I
15 submitted on July 24th and I certainly look forward to
16 having some response to it because I haven't had any
17 response yet since July 24th.

18

19 Thank you very much for letting me make
20 this comment ahead of time.

21

22 I'd be glad to answer any questions if
23 you have them.

24

25 (No comments)

26

27 MS. SOUTHAM: So thank you. I think we
28 will break for 30 minutes for the open house portion so
29 folks can ask some more questions of AGDC and other
30 agencies and look at some maps and then we'll have
31 another comment period after that.

32

33 (Off record)

34

35 (On record)

36 MS. SOUTHAM: After Mayor Hopkins'
37 comment there were no other further scoping comments at
38 the Fairbanks scoping meeting September 2nd.

39

40 (Off record)

41

42 (On record)

43

44 If I could have everyone's attention,
45 we do have one commentor, so I'd like to reopen our
46 meeting for a scoping comment. The recorder is on. If
47 I could ask you to state and spell your name, please.

48

49 MR. GUTTENBERG: If I thought you were
50 waiting for me, I would have said something when the

1 mayor spoke up. My name is David Guttenberg, G-U-T-T-
2 E-N-B-E-R-G. I'm a State Representative in District
3 38.

4
5 Seeing as you don't have a time limit,
6 I will tell you about my district. My district goes
7 from Goldstream and Ester within about a quarter mile
8 of where this pipeline starts. It goes to Minto,
9 Manley, Tanana, Ruby, jumps down the Yukon to Marshall,
10 continues on to Pilot Station -- I never get it in
11 right order -- St. Mary's, Mountain Village is another
12 one and all the way down to the coast, Emmonak,
13 Alakanuk, Nunam Iqua, up to Kotlik, down to Scammon
14 Bay, Hooper Bay, Chevak, back around, no part of the
15 Kuskokwim, McGrath, a bunch of communities that are
16 mostly known as stopping points on the Iditarod and the
17 Denali Borough and Nenana.

18
19 So I have a considerable piece of this
20 and one of my major concerns is how actually gas is
21 going to be delivered in an economical way to people
22 that don't live along the railbelt. That's one of the
23 considerable things that the state is facing as its
24 challenges. It's an environmental issue, it's an
25 economic issue, it's about building the state issue.
26 Many of my villages have almost no cash economy.
27 They're spending money to fly food in, diesel and the
28 things they need in the winter. Whatever cash they
29 have goes towards those things.

30
31 I'm also concerned about the gap -- or
32 the transit it makes across the Yukon -- the Minto
33 Flats instead of using the highway system and routes
34 along the rail. Those are major considerations and I
35 don't know where those take-off points are for those
36 communities. You know, if there's going to be a take-
37 off point along the Yukon, if there's going to be one
38 there, or if the economics of bringing gas into
39 Fairbanks, getting it back out to the Yukon, down the
40 river, down to villages, wherever they may be, how that
41 happens. How this project benefits people that suffer
42 from exorbitant utility bills across the state.

43
44 When I travel out there, people would
45 love, in those communities, to pay what we pay here in
46 Fairbanks, just like Fairbanks would love to pay for
47 gas what Anchorage pays for. You know, six, eight
48 bucks a gallon is common for gasoline.

49
50 The route change that happened in -- I

1 guess it was in January, instead of coming out of Minto
2 Flats down to Yukon -- I mean down the Alaska Railroad
3 grade into Fairbanks, from that route over the top of
4 Murphy Dome Road, down Murphy Dome Road, down through
5 some subdivisions, is also problematic for me. And how
6 the public process happened for those people to
7 understand what was happening and what the impacts were
8 for them. That was problematic.

9

10 But I don't understand, just like the
11 mayor said, why we're ending this line at an arbitrary
12 place. Why doesn't it go to a place where it hooks up
13 where it's going to be needed at the end of the day.
14 Who pays for the route and why? You know, some of
15 these questions are legislative, state policy, but how
16 does that happen? How does that rate get made? I'm
17 not sure I'm up on that now. I should be more aware
18 actually of the rate making process.

19

20 Clearly getting gas into the state,
21 getting lower cost, cleaner gas to people in the state
22 is a priority for all of us, but how it gets here, how
23 it impacts us and what the price is is something that
24 people here are very concerned about.

25

26 The IGU project to doing gas
27 distribution in Fairbanks is based upon cutting the
28 rate of a BTU in half. If you don't do that, there's
29 no economy here for gas because you have to -- because
30 the rate payers are going to be paying for the built
31 out at some point.

32

33 They're going to be paying for a
34 conversion of that product of their homes, different
35 types of boilers, different types of furnaces, getting
36 rid of wood stoves, coal burners. They're all
37 concerned about that and what that's going to be.
38 They're very positive about gas, but they're concerned
39 about the timing and the cost and all those other
40 impacts are significant for them.

41

42 They're looking forward to it, but the
43 impacts they have and the route are other issues that I
44 hear a lot about. And why is it not using the road
45 system and why is it ending at this arbitrary point.

46

47 So I ask those questions for you to put
48 them in your documents and get answers to that. That's
49 it for today.

50

1 MS. SOUTHAM: So I think we'll
2 officially close the scoping meeting now.

3

4 Thanks for coming.

5

6 (Off record)

7

8 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 16 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Fairbanks Scoping Meeting on September 2, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Wiseman, Alaska
September 3, 2014

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Wiseman, Alaska - 9/3/2014)

(On record)

MS. SOUTHAM: Thank you for coming. This is the Wiseman scoping meeting for the ASAP supplemental EIS. My name is Anne Southam. I work for ERM, Environmental Resources Management. We are the third party contractor preparing the supplemental EIS. I'll give the presentation tonight.

I'll run through some introductions. Obviously Mary Romero is here from the Corps and Don Perrin from SPCO and Kalb Stevenson. I'm sorry, I'm sort of cutting into your part of the presentation. We'll go through the differences between this pipeline project and the Alaska LNG because there's two pipelines being discussed and it's a little confusing sometimes. The steps in the whole NEPA process and why we're doing the supplemental after the 2012 FEIS was already published.

More about the project description and some of the key changes between 2012 and now. The scoping comment period and just how long that goes and some of the ways that you can make comments. The scoping meeting schedule. This is one of 16 meetings that we're doing. Then some of the next steps just within specifically about six months from now.

With that, I will hand it over to Mary.

MS. ROMERO: I'm Mary Romero, Corps of Engineers. We are the lead agency on the supplemental EIS as well. There are six cooperating agencies. Five of them are Federal and one is State. State Pipeline Coordinator's Office with Don Perrin is here. Do you want to just state briefly what your authorities are.

MR. PERRIN: This is Don Perrin with the DNR State Pipeline Coordinator's Office and we would be issuing a right-of-way for the project just for the portion that's on State lands and we know that there's two pipeline projects, but the Commissioner's Office and the Governor acknowledged that there's likely to only be one built. In the meantime, we're getting behind both of them from the permitting standpoint.

1 MS. ROMERO: So then additionally
2 there's five Federal agencies, BLM for right-of-way
3 that would go across their lands, Park Service for the
4 alternate route that would go through Denali National
5 Park and they are a proponent of this project. They
6 would like to get gas off of it. Then we have PHMSA,
7 the Pipeline Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.
8 They would review the safety of the pipeline. U.S.
9 Fish and Wildlife Service is involved for endangered
10 species and overseeing migratory bird and making
11 comments on wetland for habitat. Then EPA is also
12 involved over the Clean Water Act as well as air
13 quality.

14
15 The Corps is neither an opponent or a
16 proponent. There are
17 two responsibilities that we have. One is for NEPA and
18 under NEPA we are required to have three different
19 comment periods where people can provide comments to
20 affect how this project will go forward. Scoping is
21 one time, that's now, and we'll have another one after
22 the draft supplemental EIS has been written. That will
23 be 60 days long. Then at the very end when we do a
24 final supplemental there will be a 30-day comment
25 period.

26
27 Additionally, we have permitting
28 authorities and there are three different authorities
29 that the Corps has for this project and for the
30 original final EIS there are just two, but there's been
31 one added. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for any
32 dredged or fill materials that would be placed into
33 waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Section 10 for
34 any structures that might be placed in navigable
35 waters. Then Section 103 of the Marine Protection,
36 Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, which is for
37 transport of dredged materials and dumping in the
38 ocean. That one has been added because there's a new
39 component in the West Dock area in Prudhoe Bay and
40 there will be dredging and potentially it could be
41 disposed in the ocean.

42
43 I think I've covered everything. We
44 are being recorded so that your comments can be taken
45 succinctly if you choose to do them orally tonight.
46 Anne is with the third-party contractor. They're the
47 ones who get to actually write the environmental impact
48 statement and all the cooperating agencies will be
49 reviewing it for legal sufficiency and to make sure
50 that all the comments are addressed and that the

1 agencies have everything they need to make a permitting
2 decision.

3

4 MS. SOUTHAM: Thank you, Mary. Every
5 supplemental or every NEPA project, including this
6 supplemental EIS is based on a project purpose and
7 need, so this is really the foundation of the project.
8 We will evaluate the environmental and social and
9 economic impacts associates with the proposed
10 alternatives that would be prepared in order to try to
11 address the project purpose.

12

13 So the purpose of this project stems
14 from an Alaska statute that was passed by the
15 Legislature to make North Slope natural gas available
16 to residents of Fairbanks, the Southcentral region and
17 other communities in the state as directed by the
18 Legislature. So it's to provide gas to Alaska.

19

20 Some of the key differences between the
21 ASAP project and the Alaska LNG, they are both being
22 progressed by Alaska Gasline Development Corporation,
23 AGDC, but some of the key differences are that the LNG
24 project does include several other big companies that
25 are forwarding the project; BP, ConocoPhillips,
26 ExxonMobil and Trans-Canada.

27

28 This project is utility-grade gas, so
29 essentially there could be off-take valves for
30 communities that can go straight into communities to
31 serve residents there. The other project would be
32 liquified natural gas, so that's another key
33 difference. There is one compressor station now
34 proposed for this project. Alaska LNG could include up
35 to eight compressor stations. This pipeline is shorter
36 by about 75 miles or so, 727 miles total. There's been
37 a reduction of about 10 miles for this project.

38

39 There's this 29-mile lateral line to
40 Fairbanks from the main pipeline. The other project
41 currently does not have a lateral line. It also
42 includes export as part of that project purpose and
43 that's another key difference. The terminus of the
44 ASAP project is near Big Lake versus Nikiski for the
45 LNG project. Just overall there's less capacity with
46 this pipeline, 500 million cubic feet per day versus
47 3.6 billion for Alaska LNG. So you're looking at a
48 pretty big difference in cost as well as work force
49 that would be involved in order to build each of the
50 pipelines.

1 So the supplemental is obviously coming
2 after a final EIS was published in 2012. The reason
3 for that is that there are some pretty significant
4 design changes now. NEPA requires that if you have
5 already gotten to the stage of a final EIS, you've got
6 to go back and analyze those key differences in project
7 design in order to be able to give the public and
8 stakeholders an opportunity to make comments on those
9 changes.

10
11 So this document that we will prepare,
12 this supplemental EIS, will be based heavily on the
13 2012 document with the exception of those key
14 differences and then any new information that has
15 become available since October of 2012. That will now
16 be analyzed as part of this SEIS.

17
18 So the notice of intent was published
19 on August 1st and that officially kicked off the formal
20 comment period for scoping and that will run through
21 October 14th. So any comments you want to make we
22 encourage you to please submit those by that deadline
23 so that they can be part of the formal project record.
24 So we're in this 75-day scoping comment period. As
25 Mary explained earlier, there will be a 60-day comment
26 period after the draft is published in the spring as
27 well as another comment period after the final is
28 published tentatively scheduled for fall of 2015 with
29 the record of decision likely in the beginning of 2016.

30
31 The project again is utility-grade
32 natural gas. A key difference between the previous
33 version design was that this pipeline will now be
34 buried for most of the route with the exception of some
35 of the fault crossings or all of the fault crossings.
36 The elevated bridge stream crossings, some of the
37 pigging and valve facilities will also be above ground.

38
39 There is only now one gas conditioning
40 facility at Prudhoe Bay. It is shorter and it has less
41 pressure, so the 29-mile lateral line is also, I think,
42 about five miles shorter than previous design.
43 Generally it will parallel TAPS along the Dalton
44 Highway, northwest of Fairbanks, and at Livengood it
45 will go on the west side of Fairbanks and Nenana, then
46 bypass Denali National Park and Preserve on the east.
47 Again it terminates close to Big Lake where it will tie
48 into the existing ENSTAR system.

49
50 Generally the construction right-of-way

1 will be about 120 feet. It may be wider than that in
2 some areas where they're proposing to do horizontal
3 directional drilling. After construction, generally
4 about 53-feet wide for the permanent right-of-way for
5 maintenance and operations.

6
7 So the open-cut trenching techniques
8 are going to be used to lay the pipe. Again there will
9 be horizontal directional drilling for the major rivers
10 and streams, including the Yukon, so that minimizes a
11 lot of the in-water work. There will be some mobile
12 construction camps, of course, and then material sites
13 along the pipeline as well.

14
15 So this is the general alignment.
16 There are some maps as we were saying earlier. If you
17 go into the project website, you can go to each
18 specific community where we're having scoping meetings
19 and that will give you blow-ups of 40 miles, is that
20 right, on either side of.....

21
22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Everything that
23 you see here.

24
25 MS. SOUTHAM: Yes. So you'll also see
26 a comparison of the last version of the route with what
27 they're proposing now, so that provides some additional
28 detail. This is the lateral line to Fairbanks. It now
29 generally parallels Murphy Dome Road, which is another
30 key difference this time.

31
32 For those of you familiar with the
33 Prudhoe Bay area, these are the existing facilities
34 there. The central compressor station. So this is the
35 proposed 72-acre compressor gas conditioning facility.
36 This would be about a 20-acre lay-down area and then
37 another lay-down area up there. West Dock is generally
38 up in this direction.

39
40 West Dock is now a new component, so
41 there will be some work up there because the modules
42 that will be used to build the gas conditioning
43 facility will be pre-made and they will bring them in
44 on about 23 barges, the proposal. In order to do that,
45 these modules are pretty large, several thousand tons,
46 so some widening of the existing dock is necessary in
47 order to bring them on shore. The current breach will
48 also need to be bolstered so that there will be some
49 temporary barges that will be ballasted with water and
50 then removed after the modules are brought on shore.

1 This is an example of what a barge would look like with
2 a module on it.

3
4 So again I think some of the benefits
5 of the new design is it is a shorter pipeline overall.
6 It's a slightly straighter pipeline. It does avoid the
7 Alaska Railroad and DOT right-of-way so it's also
8 maximizing some of the existing fire breaks and utility
9 corridors that are already there. There will be
10 improved safety and reliability in general or reduced
11 footprint, less pressure overall. Then again the work
12 at West Dock is also a new component. I didn't mention
13 that will involve some winter dredging and, as Mary was
14 saying earlier, some disposal of that dredged material,
15 so that triggers Section 10.

16
17 MS. ROMERO: 103.

18
19 MS. SOUTHAM: 103. Thank you, Mary.
20 So in order to submit comments, of course we'd love to
21 hear from you tonight if you'd like to give comment
22 tonight. We are being recorded. Or you can also fill
23 out a comment form that we have available on the table
24 or visit the project website asapeis.com. There is a
25 lot of information about the project there. Then this
26 link to an email that will go straight to Mary. Lucky
27 Mary. She will also happily accept snail mail if you'd
28 like to send a letter as long as it's postmarked before
29 October 14, 2014.

30
31 These are our meetings. Right now,
32 obviously, we're in Wiseman, so we're getting closer to
33 over halfway done. We added two meetings. One in
34 Trapper Creek on September 15th and then another one in
35 Evansville on the 11th next week, so we've got a few
36 more to do still.

37
38 Again, the comment period closes the
39 14th of October, so please get those comments in. We'd
40 love to get specific information from you.

41
42 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For example how
43 come you can't just lie -- Murphy Dome, for example.
44 Why do you have to come across there? Why can't you
45 just parallel the pipeline down there, you know?

46
47 MS. SOUTHAM: I think we're going to do
48 some questions.

49
50 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. It's not

1 time for that yet?

2

3 MS. SOUTHAM: We can break. I'm pretty
4 much done. Basically we'll publish the draft in 2015
5 and then comment period after that.

6

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

8

9 MS. SOUTHAM: We're happy to answer
10 some questions now if you'd like. I'll probably turn
11 this off.

12

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You may not know
14 either. It's okay.

15

16 MS. SOUTHAM: No, no. It's not me. I
17 think I will -- I'll officially end the presentation
18 now.....

19

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

21

22 MS. SOUTHAM:and stop the
23 recording and then we can do some question and answer.

24

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's fine. It's
26 not a big deal. I was just asking.

27

28 MR. REAKOFF: So you're off record now?

29

30 MS. SOUTHAM: Yes. Unless you want to
31 comment.

32

33 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If Jack needs to
34 go, could you take his comment?

35

36 MS. SOUTHAM: Yeah, would you like to
37 comment?

38

39 MR. REAKOFF: I was just wondering if
40 we can get this audio as a CD that I can pass around
41 here so that the people here can listen to this
42 presentation.

43

44 MS. SOUTHAM: We could probably do
45 that.

46

47 MR. REAKOFF: Just burn one and send it
48 to me to my address. Do you have my address?

49

50 MS. ROMERO: I'm sure I still have your

1 email.

2

3 MR. REAKOFF: I'll sign in and you can
4 get that. So I've just got a couple 10 minutes here
5 and I wanted to make a few comments on.....

6

7 MS. SOUTHAM: Please.

8

9 MR. REAKOFF:the project. The
10 mic is on?

11

12 MS. SOUTHAM: State your name and spell
13 your last name.

14

15 MR. REAKOFF: My name is Jack Reakoff,
16 R-E-A-K-O-F-F. I live here in Wiseman. Because we
17 live within the area that's going to be highly affected
18 by the construction crews, people here are concerned
19 about construction crews having impacts during certain
20 times of the year when we're doing subsistence
21 activities like moose hunting and stuff. We're
22 concerned -- when I looked at some of the maps, I'm
23 concerned about the selection for some of the material
24 sites.

25

26 I feel that I'm going to have to make
27 some comments, especially this quarrying site that's
28 directly across from the community here in high
29 elevation. I would not want to see that. We went
30 through a scenic byway plan which protects the view
31 shed. That's right on the side of this mountain over
32 here. There's already a pit. In lower elevation,
33 extension of that pit material would be fine, but going
34 up to 2,000 feet above the valley floor the schematic
35 is showing, that would be unacceptable for myself and
36 probably the majority of the community.

37

38 So my concern is that this project --
39 is it in a similar alignment to the LNG project or is
40 the LNG project going to have a completely different
41 alignment or is anybody aware of the.....

42

43 MS. ROMERO: No.

44

45 MR. REAKOFF: There's no proposals so
46 far on where the LNG.....

47

48 MS. ROMERO: Unh-unh.

49

50 MR. REAKOFF: So I can see why the

1 State would be doing this because we have no clue if
2 BP, Exxon or Phillips is actually going to go through
3 with the LNG, so I do think this is the fall-back plan,
4 so this is probably real necessary to have this in
5 place. So I don't think it's futile at all.

6
7 We've discussed other aspects. So the
8 compressor sites not being near the community. I think
9 that was a big issue here. I'll have to go through
10 your website, look at all of the mapping and see what
11 has now been engineered. There's a lot of stuff that
12 popped up that I haven't seen yet.

13
14 So I appreciate you coming to visit us
15 and talk about this issue, but I would like to get
16 recordings for the community and that can be passed out
17 and then people can listen to the presentation. It's
18 real short and sweet. At this time, I would have no
19 further comments until I can look through your website
20 and look at all the schematics. Thank you.

21
22 Anybody else?

23
24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where is the -- I
25 was just asking where is the line going to go across to
26 here from Wiseman? Where is it going, across the
27 river, across the highway?

28
29 MS. ROMERO: So we can stop and we can
30 look at maps, you can ask questions and then if you
31 want to comment you can do that.

32
33 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I don't
34 care. I just want to know where it's going.

35
36 MS. SOUTHAM: Let's do that. Let's do
37 that. Let's stop.

38
39 (Off record)

40
41 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 11 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Wiseman Scoping Meeting on September 3, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Minto, Alaska
September 4, 2014

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Minto, Alaska - 9/4/2014)

(On record)

MS. SOUTHAM: Today is September 4th
and this is the Minto scoping meeting for the ASAP
Project.

(Off record)

(On record)

MS. SOUTHAM: This is the Minto scoping
meeting for our ASAP Project. We had no one show up,
so the meeting is officially closed.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 03 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Minto Scoping Meeting on September 4, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Evansville, Alaska
September 11, 2014

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Evansville, Alaska - 9/11/2014)

4
5 (On record - 5:30 p.m.)

6
7 MS. SOUTHAM: Good evening. I'm going
8 to use this microphone because our meeting is being
9 recorded tonight and that's the best way to get a good
10 recording. My name is Anne Southam. This is the
11 scoping meeting for the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline
12 Project. We are right now in Evansville and it is
13 September 11th, 2014. Again, thanks for coming.

14
15 Tonight we've got several maps around
16 the room that show a blow-up of this particular area
17 and then sort of some overall maps that show the entire
18 pipeline route, some engineering drawings about
19 particular components of the proposed project. So I
20 encourage everybody after the presentation to look
21 around.

22
23 The presentation itself will go through
24 the lead agency, which is the U.S. Army Corps of
25 Engineers and the cooperating agencies that are
26 currently listed as cooperators. The difference
27 between this pipeline project and the Alaska LNG
28 pipeline because, as we all know, there are two
29 pipelines that are being talked about right now, so we
30 want to discuss a few details that differentiate the
31 two.

32
33 The steps in what's called the National
34 Environmental Policy Act process or NEPA, and that's
35 really why we're here tonight. Why we're doing a
36 supplemental EIS. There was a 2012 document, a final
37 environmental impact statement that was published, so
38 this is a follow on to that document. We'll go through
39 the project description in a little more detail and
40 then compare this new proposed project versus what had
41 been proposed in 2012. Some details about the comment
42 period and how you can comment and when it closes and
43 then some next steps within the next six months or so.

44
45 So, with that, I will -- as I said,
46 we're being recorded, so I will give this presentation
47 and then we might close or turn off the recording and
48 if you have some informal question and answers,
49 questions that you'd like to ask some of us, we can do
50 that and then officially open back up the comment

1 period to take official comments that would be
2 recorded.

3

4 So tonight, unfortunately, the Corps of
5 Engineers lead project manager, Mary Romero, was sick
6 this week, so she's not able to be here tonight, but,
7 as I said, I'm Anne Southam with ERM. We're the third-
8 party contractor that's been hired to do the
9 supplemental EIS process. Mary is the project manager
10 and, as such, she has asked that I read this during the
11 meeting tonight. This is usually what she does. So I
12 will just read this to you to explain the Corps of
13 Engineers' role as well as the cooperating agencies.

14

15 The Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline is the
16 project we'll be talking about tonight. The Alaska
17 Gasline Development Corporation is the applicant and
18 proponent of ASAP. The Corps of Engineers is neither a
19 proponent nor opponent of the proposed project.

20

21 There are six other cooperating
22 agencies that are listed here including EPA, BLM,
23 National Park Service, Pipeline Hazardous Materials
24 Safety Administration or PHMSA, the State Pipeline
25 Coordinator's Office and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

26

27 We do have two folks here that I'd like
28 to also introduce or have them introduce themselves and
29 say where they are from.

30

31 MR. THOMPSON: Hello. I'm Mike
32 Thompson. I'm with the Alaska Gasline Development
33 Corporation. The Alaska Gasline Development
34 Corporation is an entity that was created by the State
35 Legislature. So what we're doing here, we're actually
36 working the project as defined by the State
37 Legislature. Just recently AGDC, the acronym, has
38 joined forces with the other project, so it's really
39 sort of an interesting dynamic because AGDC now has a
40 role in the large Alaska LNG Project, which Anne will
41 talk about a little later, and also the project I'm
42 working on. The project I'm working on is ASAP, the
43 Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline. I do all the
44 environmental regulatory and land work. So we'll be
45 here to answer any questions you might have later.

46

47 MR. MORONES: Hi. My name is Mark
48 Morones, so I'm with the State of Alaska, Department of
49 Natural Resources, so I actually work at the Office of
50 Project Management and Permitting. We coordinate

1 primarily with Federal agencies on large energy and
2 infrastructure projects within the state, but within
3 DNR we are in close partnership with the State Pipeline
4 Coordinator's Office, so Shannon Miller is like a
5 counterpart, so I'm here tonight, but I have cards for
6 both of us on the table. So the State Pipeline
7 Coordinator's Office is actually doing the right-of-way
8 work for the State on the project. We will be
9 coordinating from the State perspective, permitting for
10 both ASAP and the big Alaska LNG project.

11

12 Thanks.

13

14 MS. SOUTHAM: Thank you. So, as I
15 said, ERM, the company I am with, is going to be
16 actually writing the supplemental EIS. The Corps of
17 Engineers just oversees that process. We gather
18 information from the cooperating agencies and from AGDC
19 as well as scoping comments and public comments that we
20 get. It all contributes to what goes into the
21 supplemental EIS document.

22

23 So the Corps is responsible for, as I
24 said, overseeing the EIS, but also the permitting
25 authorities that they have over the activities that
26 would be involved. Those would include work in or
27 affecting navigable waters of the U.S., which is
28 Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899,
29 discharged, dredged or fill materials into waters of
30 the United States, which is Section 404 of the Clean
31 Water Act. So, therefore, the Corps' public interest
32 review will consider guidelines set forth under Section
33 404 of the Clean Water Act. And then transport dredged
34 materials for the purpose of dumping into oceans, which
35 is also Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research
36 and Sanctuaries Act of 1972.
37 So those are sort of the three key permitting nexus for
38 the Corps of Engineers, which is why they're the lead
39 agency on this.

40

41 So the pipeline project was really --
42 stems from the Alaska statute passed by the Legislature
43 a few years ago, which is to make North Slope natural
44 gas available to residents in Fairbanks, the
45 Southcentral region and other communities in the state
46 as directed by the Legislature. So it's to provide gas
47 to residents of Alaska.

48

49 As we said, there are two pipelines
50 being discussed and I think it's helpful to kind of

1 review some of the key differences between these.
2 Again, this is the ASAP or Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline,
3 the one in the left column here. The other one is
4 Alaska LNG. So, as Mike said, AGDC is forwarding both
5 of these projects, but, as you can see, the other
6 project, the bigger pipeline, also includes BP,
7 ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil and Trans-Canada. Some of
8 the big oil and gas companies are involved in that one.
9

10 This project is utility-grade lean gas
11 for in-state markets. The other project would be
12 liquified natural gas for export and potentially in-
13 state service as well. The gas conditioning facility
14 at Prudhoe, there would only be one for this project.
15 There would be potentially eight associated with the
16 other project, so it's a much larger potential
17 footprint on the Slope there.

18
19 This pipeline is a little bit shorter
20 at about 730 miles versus 800 for the other and you can
21 see the difference in the pipeline diameter as well.
22 There is a 29-mile lateral line to Fairbanks that is
23 part of this project that would parallel Murphy Dome
24 Road for much of it to provide Fairbanks with natural
25 gas. The terminus of this project is near Big Lake.
26 The other one would end in Nikiski, where it would have
27 an export out to external markets there.

28
29 The design capacity of this project is
30 limited at about 500 million cubic feet per day. The
31 other pipeline is 3.5 billion cubic feet, so there's a
32 pretty big difference there as well. There's also
33 associated with this obviously a pretty big difference
34 in potential cost as well as a workforce that would be
35 engaged in constructing both of those as well. All
36 this information is on the project website, so you can
37 pull it up any time and look back on it.

38
39 So we are in what's called a
40 supplemental EIS and the reason the National
41 Environmental Policy Act requires that you do a
42 supplemental EIS is if you've got significant changes
43 in your project design and that's what has occurred in
44 this case. So at the end of 2012, when the previous
45 project had gone through the final EIS stage, there
46 were some changes that we made to the route and
47 there's now some work that will be involved at West
48 Dock to bring some pre-fab modules in to create the gas
49 conditioning facility. So, because of that we've got
50 to go back and make sure that the public can make

1 comments on those changes and then look at any kind of
2 environmental, social or economic impacts that would be
3 associated with those new components.

4

5 So really this document will be based
6 heavily on the 2012 final EIS for a lot of the
7 information because it's still valid, but if there has
8 been anything new that we've learned about the
9 socioeconomic conditions or environment, we would
10 include those as well.

11

12 So this is an overview of the NEPA
13 process. The notice of intent was published on August
14 1st and that officially kicked off the scoping period,
15 which is what we're in now, which will go through
16 October 14th, so you have a 75-day comment period for
17 scoping and can submit official comments as part of
18 scoping until that date of October 14th.

19

20 There are a couple other periods where
21 public comments are taken, but just to run through
22 this, after we go back and look at all the comments
23 that we receive, we'll start looking at the different
24 alternatives that we're going to evaluate in the
25 document, start putting the actual document together.
26 That tentatively will be published in the spring of
27 2015 and there will be a 60-day comment period at that
28 point and we'll come around and do all these meetings
29 again where we describe some of the findings that we
30 have.

31

32 After that there will be a comment
33 report so you'll be able to see what other people said
34 in different communities and other agencies may have
35 commented as well. That will be summarized and then
36 made available on the project website.

37

38 After that we'll go into preparing the
39 final supplemental EIS and that is anticipated to be
40 published in the fall of 2015 and after that there will
41 be a 120-day -- what's called a cooling off period or a
42 time for public and stakeholders to make additional
43 comments on the final document before they issue a
44 record of decision.

45

46 So more about this project. As I said,
47 it's utility-grade natural gas, so it has one
48 compressor station at the Slope and then it's available
49 for markets or for communities from that point down the
50 line. The pipeline is now going to be buried, so

1 that's a pretty big change from last time, except for
2 at fault crossings, some of the bigger stream
3 crossings. The pigging and valve facilities would also
4 be above ground.

5
6 As I said, there is only one gas
7 conditioning facility at Prudhoe Bay. This is now a
8 36-inch pipe, so it has lower pressure than the
9 previous pipeline that was proposed. Both of these
10 lines, the overall line and then the lateral line have
11 also been shortened a bit from the previous proposal.
12 In general it will parallel TAPS along the Dalton
13 Highway, just northwest of Fairbanks, and then at
14 Livengood it will go west of Fairbanks and Nenana, then
15 actually bypass Denali National Park and Preserve on
16 the east. It will tie in close to Big Lake into the
17 existing ENSTAR distribution system, Milepost 39 of the
18 Beluga pipeline.

19
20 In general, the construction right-of-
21 way will be approximately 120 feet. It may be slightly
22 wider in some areas where they've got to do horizontal
23 directional drilling, but in general after that the
24 permanent right-of-way would be about 53 feet that
25 would be maintained.

26
27 Open-cut trenching techniques will be
28 used to install the pipeline underground. We do, I
29 think, have some typicals of what that would look like.
30 As I mentioned earlier, horizontal directional drilling
31 will be used for some of the big river crossings like
32 the Yukon. Mobile construction camps will also be
33 involved, of course, during construction and then there
34 will be several material sites along the route.

35
36 This is an overview of just the general
37 pipeline route. We have this online as well as several
38 hundred blow-ups of different sections that you can
39 look at at your leisure. This is the lateral line to
40 Fairbanks that parallels Murphy Dome Road. For those
41 of you that may be familiar with Prudhoe Bay, these are
42 existing facilities up there. So this is the proposed
43 gas conditioning facility. It would be about 70 or 72
44 acres. This is a lay-down area that's about 20 acres
45 and then another area of about 20 acres as well.

46
47 West Dock is generally up this
48 direction. So, as I mentioned, West Dock is a newer
49 component for this EIS or for this proposed project.
50 The reason is to bring 23 barges into the area that

1 would have these -- I think 9,000-ton module
2 pre-fab.....

3

4 MR. THOMPSON: 5,500-ton.

5

6 MS. SOUTHAM: 5,500-ton. That's
7 different. Into West Dock. So because of the size of
8 these -- well, there will be some winter dredging of
9 the area. Due to their size, widening of this part of
10 West Dock will be required and then bolstering of the
11 current bridge right here is also required in order to
12 bring those on shore.

13

14 In order to bolster this, there are
15 some temporary barges that would be ballasted, so they
16 would be sunk and then they would be removed after the
17 modules are brought on shore. That would help minimize
18 some of the work in water, but we would, of course,
19 work with Fish and Game to make sure there would be
20 adequate fish passage through the area. Most of the
21 rehab work would occur during the winter as well. This
22 is a photo or a depiction of what a module would look
23 like on a barge.

24

25 So some of the benefits or the
26 rationale for these new changes. Overall it reduces
27 some of the costs and risks associated with
28 construction and operation of the line. It's shorter
29 and a little bit straighter overall and it's lower
30 pressure. It does avoid Alaska Railroad and DOT right-
31 of-way and it also maximizes some of the existing fire
32 breaks that are already within the area. There's
33 improved safety and reliability because of these other
34 reasons, reduced footprint as we mentioned. And then
35 there is, I think, summer barging of materials in and
36 offsite modular construction is also one of the big
37 changes.

38

39 So tonight, as I mentioned, we're
40 accepting public comments, so if you'd like to make a
41 comment, please let us know and we're happy to hand
42 over this mic and have it recorded so it's part of the
43 project record. You can also provide a written comment
44 if you'd like and either mail that in or you can give
45 it to us tonight. We're here till tomorrow morning if
46 you'd like to think about it some more.

47

48 We do have a project website,
49 asapeis.com. On that site you'll find several
50 different tabs of information. So if you go to the

1 scoping tab, all this information is there along with
2 lots of links to maps. Mary is happy to take snail
3 mail if you'd like to send her your own letter. Again,
4 those have to be postmarked by October 14, 2014 if you
5 do decide to send in a letter.

6

7 These are the other meetings that we
8 either have done or are in the process of doing next
9 week. Next week will be our last week. We did add
10 Bettles, which is not listed on here,
11 Bettles/Evansville, but we are here today. Then we're
12 also going to Trapper Creek which isn't listed. That
13 will be next Monday.

14

15 So in the next six months this scoping
16 period will close. We'll have a scoping report
17 available online. We will then start working on
18 preparing the draft EIS and get that out next spring
19 and then have another comment period.

20

21 Thank you again for coming.

22

23 I think for now I will pause the
24 recording and see if you guys have any questions you'd
25 like to ask.

26

27 MR. THORNE: This is Rich Thorne. I
28 was just going to ask how you all propose to cross the
29 faults. There's a thing that said you had something
30 there. I'm just wondering. It wasn't too long ago
31 there was a -- I think it was a magnitude of 5
32 earthquake just south of Cantwell. It opened up a 4-
33 foot-wide gap in the Parks Highway.

34

35 MR. THOMPSON: Thanks, Rich. This is
36 Mike Thompson. The engineers have been doing actual
37 trenching investigations along all the faults. So the
38 first thing they did was they flew the entire line with
39 LiDAR and they went in and they did their mapping
40 evaluations and I think they've identified most of the
41 faults. The second stage was to go out to those faults
42 and actually get into the ground and find out exactly
43 what the movement would be in the event of an
44 earthquake.

45

46 A lot of our engineers have Trans-
47 Alaska Pipeline experience and I don't know if you
48 follow that at all, but they went through some major
49 earthquakes over there and they survived them very
50 well. I think those techniques will be applied on this

1 pipeline.

2

3 Anne mentioned there's some locations
4 where the pipeline might come up above ground and those
5 faults or those locations, bridges, and I think they're
6 going to come above ground and use those sliders like
7 at -- is it Donley, down on TAPS. I don't know if
8 you've seen pictures of them, but the pipeline really
9 rests on these sliders. They're almost like Teflon
10 sliders and the movement is as much as 30 or 40 feet to
11 the side. So they feel they did have to come in above
12 ground at those locations though.

13

14 MR. THORNE: Okay. Thank you.

15

16 MR. FOX: Eric Fox, owner of Bettles
17 Lodge. Is there any chance of a lateral being run out
18 this way to Bettles?

19

20 MR. THOMPSON: Mike Thompson again. So
21 the one thing about this pipeline and one of the big
22 changes was -- in the past, it was a 2,500 psi pipeline
23 and it contained natural gas liquids. We have two
24 straddle plants associated with it. For Fairbanks to
25 get natural gas it was going to have to go through a
26 straddle plant and that was very expensive. I think
27 the price was estimated at \$250 million to take gas off
28 just to use. And there had to be another straddle
29 plant down at the terminus at Beluga.

30

31 So this new project that we mentioned,
32 this utility-grade gas, there's a single compressor.
33 The compression is actually part of the conditioning
34 process, so it comes out of the North Slope at 30
35 degrees at 1,480 psi, much less, but the big thing is
36 it comes out in a form that's usable right away. So
37 there is the possibility of off-takes at many different
38 locations along the pipeline.

39

40 We really aren't addressing what
41 happens after that, but I assume that at some point in
42 the future they have what they call a community
43 advisory council. I don't know if you've heard of
44 that, but a lot of the communities are represented in
45 this council and they'll probably have to work together
46 to define the type of gas that all the communities
47 would need and then how to go about the off-take
48 process.

49

50 That is a possible yes, but it will

1 take work and coordination amongst the communities, I
2 think. I think AGDC may at some point help with that
3 as an aggregator maybe.

4

5 MR. FOX: So we have a chance then.

6

7 MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

8

9 MR. THORNE: I was going to interject
10 in there along the same line is it possible to put some
11 kind of valve or device for a take-off after the pipe
12 is built or does that have to be part of the design in
13 initial construction?

14

15 MR. THOMPSON: So I'll give you the
16 easy answer to that question. Yes, it's entirely
17 possible to put that valve in at any point in time of
18 the operation. Although it would be much nicer to put
19 those valves in during construction. That's going to
20 take a lot of work. The communities again are going to
21 have to work together and they're going to have to be
22 represented in the open season process. Are you
23 familiar with that?

24

25 MR. THORNE: Not really.

26

27 MR. THOMPSON: Well, what happens with
28 a pipeline is once we get our design and everything,
29 we're going to go out and we're going to have an open
30 season. The open season really is when the shippers
31 come to us and say, yeah, by golly, you have an
32 economic pipeline there and we can afford to ship our
33 gas on it and we'll make a commitment to you to ship X
34 amount of gas for X amount of years and that forms the
35 basis of the financing of the project.

36

37 So I think what's envisioned and this
38 is just, you know, people talking at this point,
39 there's nothing solid, is that the communities would
40 get together and through an aggregator, maybe somebody
41 like AGDC or some organizer, work together to define
42 the amount of gas the communities would need and then
43 have somebody represent them in the open season
44 process. I don't know if that will be the State of
45 Alaska. I assume there will be a role in there for the
46 State.

47

48 So the easy answer was, yes, you can
49 put those valves in any time, but it probably would be
50 preferable and cheaper to do it during the regular

1 construction period.

2

3 MR. THORNE: This pipe going to
4 Fairbanks, that was going to be how big, 12 inch?

5

6 MR. THOMPSON: 12 inch.

7

8 MR. THORNE: With a 4-inch pipe from
9 Prospect to Bettles, we're not talking about a hundred
10 million dollar take-off.

11

12 MR. THOMPSON: So there will be some
13 work required, so you'll have a valve and you'll take
14 the gas off and then you're going to have to
15 depressurize it because you can't use it at 1,480. You
16 can use it at 40 or 60. You also have to, I think my
17 law, odorize it. So the communities have to work
18 through some of those details and figure out how that's
19 all going to come together. But, you're correct, it's
20 not going to be like a hundred million dollar project.
21 It could be as simple as a small diameter pipeline
22 coming across maybe adjacent to your ice road or
23 something like that, winter construction.

24

25 MR. THORNE: There might be some
26 interesting things with the rights-of-way on that, but
27 it's certainly worth talking about. While I'm one of
28 seven city council members, I think the city might be
29 very interested in seeing how we could contribute to
30 this.

31

32 MR. THOMPSON: Are you participating in
33 the community advisory council.....

34

35 MR. THORNE: I'm not.

36

37 MR. THOMPSON:with ASAP? Okay.
38 I will send you some information on how to get involved
39 in that.

40

41 MR. THORNE: Thank you.

42

43 MR. F. THOMPSON: Frank Thompson,
44 Evansville Tribal Council. I was wondering if the
45 supplemental environmental impact statement addressed
46 the area -- I tried looking it up online right now, but
47 there is talk about having to realign the pipeline at a
48 milepost that's further north from up here and I forget
49 the geological term, but where it's slumping onto the
50 road and they're talking about having to realign the

1 existing TAPS right now and is that covered and what
2 steps would be taken to ensure that it wouldn't affect
3 the pipeline that's buried along that section that's
4 moving?

5
6 MR. THOMPSON: I can't answer your
7 question specifically. They're fully aware of that
8 slumping and the Dalton Highway is between the slump
9 and the pipeline, so I think the Dalton Highway, the
10 DOT is going to be in trouble first. But the engineers
11 are fully aware of that. It is a buried pipeline. I
12 think TAPS is above ground there, right? It's by the
13 west fork of the Chandalar River up there, something
14 like that.

15
16 MR. F. THOMPSON: Yeah.

17
18 MR. THOMPSON: So I don't know if that
19 answered your question specifically, but I do know that
20 the engineers are aware of it and have probably taken
21 it into consideration.

22
23 MS. SOUTHAM: So I think we will
24 officially close the meeting here tonight. Thanks for
25 coming.

26
27 (Off record)

28
29 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 14 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Evansville Scoping Meeting on September 11, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Trapper Creek, Alaska
September 12, 2014

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Trapper Creek, Alaska - 9/12/2014)

4
5 (On record - 5:30 p.m.)

6
7 MS. SOUTHAM: Welcome to the Trapper
8 Creek scoping meeting for the Alaska Stand Alone
9 Pipeline Project. It is Monday, September 15th, 2014.
10 My name is Anne Southam. I'm with Environmental
11 Resources Management or ERM. We are the third-party
12 contractor that has been hired to help write the
13 supplemental environmental impact statement for the
14 Corps of Engineers.

15
16 I'll be giving the presentation
17 tonight. We'll do about a 20-minute presentation and
18 it will go through the roles of the project team. The
19 Corps of Engineers is currently the lead Federal agency
20 for this project. Mary Romero is here from the Corps
21 and she will explain a little bit more about that.
22 We're also going to describe a few key differences
23 between this pipeline project and the Alaska LNG
24 pipeline project. I'm sure that you have heard about
25 the other pipeline that's going on, so I want to clear
26 up some of the differences there.

27
28 The steps in the National Environmental
29 Policy Act process or NEPA, which is what we're doing
30 right now, requires the need for this environmental
31 impact statement. It's basically a documentation
32 disclosure document that runs through social and
33 economic and environmental impacts of the proposed
34 project. We'll explain why we're doing a supplemental
35 EIS. More about the actual project that's proposed and
36 how it's different from what had been proposed in 2012.

37
38 The comment period and the process for
39 submitting comments and then a list of the other
40 meetings that we've had just so you could see where
41 we've been and some next steps within the next six
42 months or so.

43
44 So, with that, I will give it to you.

45
46 MS. ROMERO: Like Anne said, my name is
47 Mary Romero. I work for the Corps of Engineers,
48 regulatory division. We are the lead Federal agency on
49 this project. There are actually six other agencies
50 that are going to be cooperating with us in reviewing

1 the writing that the third-party contractor will do.

2

3 AGDC, the Alaska Gasline Development
4 Corporation, is the proponent for the project, and Kalb
5 Stevenson is here. I'll let him introduce himself and
6 briefly say something about the project.

7

8 MR. STEVENSON: I'm Kalb Stevenson.
9 I'm with ASAP ERL, Environmental Regulatory and Lands.
10 So if there are any questions in regard to right-of-
11 ways or environmental regulations, the NEPA process,
12 anything like that, I'd be happy to answer those
13 questions as best as I can. I'm here from ASAP.

14

15 MS. ROMERO: Then we also have -- one
16 of the cooperating agencies is SPCO, the State Pipeline
17 Coordinator's Office, and Shannon Miller is here from
18 SPCO.

19

20 MS. MILLER: Hi. My name is Shannon
21 Miller. I work with the Department of Natural
22 Resources and specifically with the State Pipeline
23 Coordinator's Office. What our office does is we issue
24 the land use lease and that's only for the portion
25 located on general State lands. So if you have any
26 questions for me, I'm available to answer those for
27 you.

28

29 MS. ROMERO: Then we also have five
30 Federal agencies. We have BLM and their authority
31 would be for authorizing the right-of-way on their
32 lands where this project might cross. The National
33 Park Service, and they are also a proponent of the
34 project because they would like to get gas off of it.
35 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and their authorities
36 are for endangered species that might be impacted by
37 the project. EPA, and they actually have oversight
38 over the Clean Water Act. Then PHMSA, the Pipeline
39 Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, and they
40 oversee safety on the pipeline.

41

42 So like Anne had said, ERM has been
43 hired to write the supplemental environmental impact
44 statement. The Corps doesn't do the actual writing of
45 it, but all the cooperating agencies will review it to
46 make sure that it contains all the information needed
47 in order to do our jurisdictional authorities.

48

49 There are actually two separate things
50 that the Corps would be involved in on this project.

1 The first one is NEPA, which is the National
2 Environmental Policy Act as Anne said, which requires
3 full disclosure of all the impacts that this project
4 would have on the area it is proposed to go through.
5 Secondly, it's to provide opportunities for the
6 communities and any entity to comment.

7
8 The first opportunity is here at the
9 scoping meeting today. There will be another
10 opportunity once the draft supplemental EIS has been
11 written and then when the final is also published
12 there's one last time to comment on it.

13
14 Additionally the Corps has three
15 different authorities potentially for this project. I
16 have to say potentially because Section 103 of the
17 Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972
18 is for any transport of dredged materials or ocean
19 dumping. We are not sure whether that will happen or
20 not. Then also Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for
21 any dredged or fill materials that's placed into waters
22 of the U.S. or wetlands. Also Section 10 of the Rivers
23 and Harbors Act for any structures that might be built
24 in navigable waters.

25
26 At this time I'm going to turn it back
27 over to Anne to do the presentation.

28
29 MS. SOUTHAM: Thank you, Mary. So
30 the ASAP project actually stems from an Alaska statute
31 that was passed by the Legislature a couple years ago
32 in order to make North Slope natural gas available to
33 residents in Fairbanks, the Southcentral region and
34 other communities in the state as directed by the
35 Legislature. So this is to provide gas to residents of
36 Alaska.

37
38 As I said earlier, there are two big
39 pipeline project being discussed right now in the news.
40 One is this project, ASAP or Alaska Stand Alone
41 Pipeline, and the other one is the Alaska LNG project.
42 So there are some key differences and similarities that
43 I'd like to point out. Alaska Gasline Development
44 Corporation or AGDC is advancing both of these
45 projects, although the Alaska LNG Project also includes
46 some of these big oil and gas companies; BP,
47 ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil and Trans-Canada.

48
49 This project is to provide utility-
50 grade lean gas. The other project is liquified natural

1 gas. This project is primarily focused on in-state
2 markets. The other one does include export and that is
3 I would say the primary focus of that project, so
4 that's a key difference as well.

5
6 There is only one gas conditioning
7 facility proposed for the ASAP project and that would
8 be located up at Prudhoe. The other project would
9 potentially include up to eight compressor stations.
10 There's also a big difference in the amount of pipe.
11 This is about a 727-mile pipeline versus about 800 for
12 the other one and there's a difference in size as well
13 as you can see.

14
15 This project does include a 29-mile 12-
16 inch lateral line to Fairbanks to provide gas to those
17 communities around Fairbanks. There is no lateral line
18 planned for the other pipeline project at this time.
19 The terminus of this project is near Big Lake. The
20 other one would end at Nikiski, where it would then be
21 exported.

22
23 The capacity for the ASAP pipeline is
24 about 500 million cubic feet per day. The other
25 pipeline is much bigger, 3.5 billion cubic feet. The
26 overall costs are pretty different as you can see as
27 well as the workforce that would be required an the
28 constructing time.

29
30 So why are we doing the supplemental
31 EIS. In 2012 there was a final environmental impact
32 statement that was published, but at that time AGDC
33 realized that there were going to be some pretty
34 significant design changes that needed to happen. So
35 under NEPA, when you have that at that late of a stage
36 in a project you need to go back and basically
37 supplement the work that you've done so that you can
38 look at those specific changes and make sure that you
39 allow opportunity for stakeholders like yourselves and
40 agencies to then comment on those new components that
41 are being proposed. So that's what we're doing now.

42
43 So this supplemental EIS will be based
44 heavily on the 2012 document, but then focus on those
45 key differences that are new and I'll review those in a
46 little bit. So this process is -- here's an overview
47 of the various key milestones that we'll go through.

48
49 The notice of intent was published on
50 August 1st and that officially kicked off the scoping

1 period that we're in right now. We are going out to
2 communities like Trapper Creek and trying to get
3 comments on the proposed project and the different
4 components of it. This scoping process will go 75 days
5 through October 14th. At that time then we'll
6 officially close accepting comments. We'll look at all
7 the comments that we got and basically start writing
8 the draft SEIS. We're tentatively scheduled to publish
9 that in spring of 2015 and that will be another
10 opportunity for stakeholders to then review the
11 document.

12

13 We'll come back out to communities and
14 accept comments as well at that time for a 60-day
15 period and then review what we hear then and then go
16 back and make changes as needed based on those comments
17 and then produce the final SEIS. That will be
18 tentatively fall of 2015 and after that there will be a
19 120-day cooling off period they say. There will be
20 another opportunity to make comments on that final
21 document and then there will be a record of decision
22 and that will come from the Corps of Engineers about
23 what they're proposing to do with the project.

24

25 So the project itself, as I said, it's
26 utility-grade natural gas. The pipeline this time is
27 proposed to be buried, which is a pretty big difference
28 from the last iteration of the project. So with the
29 exception of fault crossings, some of the major stream
30 crossings, the pigging and valve facilities, the
31 pipeline will be buried for the entire route.

32

33 Again, there is only one gas
34 conditioning facility near Prudhoe Bay. It is a bit
35 shorter than what had been proposed in 2012. I think
36 it's about a 10-mile difference this time. It's a
37 shorter and slightly straighter line. It will generally
38 parallel TAPS along the Dalton Highway on the west side
39 of Fairbanks and Nenana, and then, when it bypasses
40 Denali National Park and Preserve, it will go to the
41 east and then eventually connect up with the ENSTAR
42 system that's already there just southwest of Big Lake,
43 Milepost 39 of the Beluga pipeline.

44

45 The construction right-of-way will be
46 approximately 120 feet. It may be slightly wider than
47 this where they'll do horizontal directional drilling,
48 but then for the permanent right-of-way that would be
49 maintained at about 53 feet wide.

50

1 Open-cut trenching techniques will be
2 used to lay the pipe and we do have some typicals
3 around the room so you can see exactly what that would
4 look like. There will be some horizontal directional
5 drilling at some of the major river and stream
6 crossings, like the Yukon for example. That will
7 minimize some of the in-water work and there will be
8 some mobile construction camps obviously, about 8 to 10
9 acres, during the construction phase and then, as some
10 of you are noticing, obviously some material sites
11 along the pipeline as well.

12
13 So this is generally the alignment and
14 we do have these maps on the website as well. We have
15 blow-ups of -- I forget the mileage or the distance.

16
17 MR. STEVENSON: Forty.

18
19 MS. SOUTHAM: Forty miles. So there
20 are several maps that you can pull up that are much
21 more detailed. Those specifically around the Trapper
22 Creek area as well are online so you can pull those up
23 and look at them on the project website as well.

24
25 This is the lateral line to Fairbanks.
26 It generally parallels Murphy Dome Road for those of
27 you that may be familiar with that area. This the
28 existing facilities up at Prudhoe Bay, the central gas
29 facility. This would be the proposed gas conditioning
30 facility for ASAP. It's about a 72-acre site. Here's
31 a lay-down area that's about 20 acres as well as
32 another one right here.

33
34 West Dock is generally up in this
35 direction. So there is some work being proposed at
36 West Dock, which is a change from the previous project
37 from 2012. The reason being in order to build the GCF,
38 the gas conditioning facility, they would bring in
39 pre-fabricated modules that are several thousand tons.
40 In order to do that, they would have to dredge some
41 around that area and that would allow them to bring
42 these barges in. Because of the size of the modules
43 they would also propose to widen part of West Dock a
44 bit in order to get them on shore.

45
46 This existing breach in the dock would
47 need to be bolstered and they're proposing to do that
48 with some temporary barges that would be ballasted and
49 then removed after the modules were brought on shore.
50 So there would be about 23 barges brought in with these

1 big modules. This is what it would look like
2 potentially, a module on a barge coming in.

3
4 So some of the benefits or the
5 rationale for these changes. There are some reduced
6 costs and risks because of less pipe, straighter pipe.
7 It does avoid Alaska Railroad and DOT right-of-way and
8 maximizes some of the existing utility corridors and
9 fire breaks, thereby also improving some of the
10 construction and maintenance access. There's improved
11 safety and reliability because of the overall footprint
12 is also smaller. Because of that we're reducing
13 potential impacts to wetlands.

14
15 Again, there's a single compressor
16 station, so you're looking at much less acreage in
17 order to get the fuel down the pipe. Again, the West
18 Dock facility does require some winter dredging and
19 these temporary barges bolstering the existing bridge.

20
21 So, as I said earlier, we're happy to
22 take comments tonight if you'd like to make them. We'd
23 love to hear from you. They would be recorded and that
24 would be part of the official public record and would
25 require us to consider those as part of the draft SEIS.

26
27
28 We also have again a project website,
29 asapeis.com, where you can find a lot of information
30 about the project and the maps. We'll continue to
31 update that as the project moves forward so that you
32 can see what's new and what new documents are available
33 for you to review. All comments go to Mary. She's the
34 lucky one. Then she bounces them to us at ERM. She
35 also accepts letters as well, so if you'd like to take
36 all this information in and digest it and then go
37 submit your own letter, we'd be happy to take that as
38 long as it's postmarked by the 14th of October.

39
40 So here is where we have been and I'm
41 sorry you guys are not listed on here. We made these
42 presentation, but we added Trapper Creek and.....

43
44 MS. ROMERO: Evansville.

45
46 MS. SOUTHAM: Evansville. Thank you.
47 Where we were last week. So we're nearly done. We've
48 got Barrow and Nuiqsut Wednesday and Thursday of this
49 week and actually we're going back to do Anaktuvuk Pass
50 in a couple weeks due to some scheduling changes. We

1 will likely come back to every one of these or most of
2 them once the draft is out.

3
4 Again, public comment period closes
5 the 14th and then we'll go write the EIS as well as an
6 actual scoping report that would summarize all the
7 comments that we heard and that will be available on
8 the website before the draft is available, then
9 publication of that draft and then another comment
10 period at that time.

11
12 Thank you all very much for coming. We
13 appreciate it. With that I will pause and see if
14 anyone would like to make a comment.

15
16 For the conversations that we did have
17 earlier about some of the material sites and property,
18 those would not be part of the record yet. So if you
19 do want those to be part of the official record, you
20 can either restate them right now or write them on the
21 comment form or send them in using the email address.

22
23 MR. DYKSTRA: I'll make one comment.

24
25 MS. SOUTHAM: If you can say your name.
26 In order to get it in the record, we have to.

27
28 Thank you.

29
30 MR. DYKSTRA: My name is Richard
31 Dykstra. I live at Mile 131, about a mile and a half
32 west. Right now there's some guys at 131 drilling and
33 I talked to one of them, probably an engineer, I'm not
34 sure. They said they're drilling test sites, test
35 holes for gravel to see what kind of gravel is in there
36 in case they have to establish a gravel pit.

37
38 Well, my question is why not use
39 existing gravel pits. Where they're drilling is out of
40 a gravel pit, where they're going in at, at Mile 131.
41 There's one at 128 and 129. I'm sure there's lots of
42 them up and down the highway. Who they belong to,
43 State, Borough, don't know, but there's no reason why
44 they shouldn't be using existing gravel pits. Expand
45 them if necessary. They're using one of them right now
46 for the work they're doing on the road.

47
48 MR. STEVENSON: Would you spell your
49 last name.

50

1 MR. DYKSTRA: Dykstra, D-Y-K-S-T-R-A.
2
3 MS. SOUTHAM: Thank you.
4
5 Anyone else.
6
7 (No comments)
8
9 MS. SOUTHAM: Thank you again for
10 coming. We will officially close the scoping meeting
11 for ASAP tonight. If you do want to make comments
12 later, please send them in. Thank you.
13
14 (Off record)
15
16 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 11 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Trapper Creek Scoping Meeting on September 12, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Nuiqsut, Alaska
September 17, 2014

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Nuiqsut, Alaska - 9/17/2014)

4
5 (On record - 5:30 p.m.)

6
7 MS. SOUTHAM: Hi. Welcome. My name is
8 Anne Southam. I'm with ERM and this is the Alaska
9 Stand Alone Pipeline Project scoping meeting for the
10 supplemental environmental impact statement. It is
11 September 17th.

12
13 Thank you all very much for coming.

14
15 Tonight we'll do about a 20 to 30-
16 minute presentation that describes the project and then
17 I think we'll have a 10-minute break. We do have some
18 maps around the room as well as some engineering
19 drawings that give everybody some more information.
20 We'll be able to answer questions if you want to ask
21 some informal questions, then we've got folks from the
22 Corps of Engineers here as well as the Gasline
23 Development Corporation. We'll bring everybody back
24 together and do a comment period. We are being
25 recorded tonight, so I want to give everybody an
26 opportunity to make comments tonight as well.

27
28 I'll go ahead and do the first slide
29 here. The presentation will go through who we all are
30 and then the project itself and what it is that is
31 being proposed as well as the difference between this
32 pipeline project and the Alaska LNG Project, liquid
33 natural gas pipeline, why we're doing the supplemental
34 environmental impact statement and why we want to get
35 input from you guys on the project itself and how we're
36 accepting those comments.

37
38 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

39
40 MS. SOUTHAM: So we have Birdie Budnik
41 here tonight with the Corps of Engineers. They are the
42 lead agency on this project and I will let Birdie talk
43 about their role.

44
45 MS. BUDNIK: Hi. As Anne said, my name
46 is Birdie Budnik. I'm with the Corps of Engineers,
47 regulatory division. The Corps is the lead Federal
48 agency for the project. As she explained, this meeting
49 is for the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline Project. The
50 applicant and proponent of the project is the Alaska

1 Gasline Development Corporation or AGDC. Today we have
2 Kalb Stevenson in the back from AGDC and Leah here.

3

4 So the Corps, along with six
5 cooperating agencies, their emblems there on the slide,
6 are cooperating to write a supplemental environmental
7 impact statement or SEIS based on each agencies'
8 separate authorities. These cooperating agencies are
9 the Environmental Protection Agency, the Bureau of Land
10 Management, National Park Service, the Pipeline
11 Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, the State
12 Pipeline Coordinator's Office and the U.S. Fish and
13 Wildlife Service. Today we have Shannon from the State
14 Pipeline Coordinator's Office or SPCO with us.

15

16 So you know the process, the Corps
17 doesn't actually do the writing of the supplemental
18 EIS. That's actually ERM who does that for us and ERM
19 will be doing the presentation today. You should also
20 know that most of the cooperating agencies at the end
21 of the process will identify what their preferred
22 alternative is. However, the way the Corps of
23 Engineers works is we cannot do that. We have to
24 complete the record of decision before identifying what
25 we call the least environmentally damaging practicable
26 alternative, the LEDPA. It's a mouthful. We can only
27 permit the LEDPA.

28

29 The Corps has two responsibilities in
30 this process. The first is under the National
31 Environmental Policy Act or NEPA, which is to
32 disclose the potential environmental effects that the
33 project may have and to provide an opportunity for
34 public comment, which is like today at this meeting.
35 We do this three times at scoping. This is considered
36 scoping. It's the first of the three. Again at the
37 draft supplemental EIS and lastly at the final
38 supplemental EIS.

39

40 The second responsibility we have is to
41 make a permitting decision. There are three different
42 authorities that may come into play for this project.
43 The first being Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors
44 Act and that applies to any work within or affecting
45 navigable waters of the U.S. The second authority is
46 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which applies to
47 the discharge of dredged or fill materials into waters
48 of the U.S., including wetlands. The last authority
49 that may come into play is Section 103 of the Marine
50 Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act, which applies

1 to the transport of dredged materials for purposes of
2 dumping it into the ocean.

3

4 With that, I will pass this back to
5 Anne and let Edward translate.

6

7 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

8

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (In Inupiaq)?

10

11 EDWARD: Are you guys going to put up a
12 pipeline somewhere in West Dock or are you guys going
13 to utilize that for transporting your modules? I think
14 that's his question.

15

16 MS. SOUTHAM: So there's no pipe at
17 West Dock, but I can go through the details right now.

18

19 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

20

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (In Inupiaq)?

22

23 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

24

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

26

27 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

28

29 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (In Inupiaq)?

30

31 EDWARD: He's just kind of curious
32 whether the pipelines would be built down there at West
33 Dock out in the ocean. That was his concern. Now he
34 has a better understanding to why part of West Dock is
35 being involved with ASAP.

36

37 MS. SOUTHAM: Yeah, thank you. So I
38 will talk about that in a couple slides in more detail.
39 So the project itself was part of the Alaska State
40 Legislature. They passed a statute to make North Slope
41 natural gas available to residents in Fairbanks, the
42 Southcentral region and other communities in the state
43 as directed by the Legislature. So it's to provide gas
44 to Alaska residents.

45

46 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

47

48 MS. SOUTHAM: So there are two big
49 pipeline projects being talked about in the news a lot
50 today. This one is the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline or

1 the ASAP Project. It's the one right here on the left.
2 There is another one that is referred to as Alaska LNG
3 and that's the liquified natural gas project.

4
5 So this one is to provide utility-grade
6 gas for in-state markets. The other one is mostly for
7 export. AGDC is part of both of these projects, but
8 Alaska LNG also includes BP, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil
9 and Trans-Canada.

10
11 There are some major differences just
12 in some of the components. This one only includes one
13 compressor station up at Prudhoe. The other one may
14 have up to eight. This one is a slightly shorter
15 pipeline, 727-miles, 36-inch pipe, with a lateral line
16 to Fairbanks. The other one is longer and a little bit
17 bigger and it does not have the lateral line that would
18 provide gas to Fairbanks.

19
20 This one ends around Big Lake. The
21 other one is for exporting out of Nikiski. This one
22 obviously is a bit smaller just in terms of the design
23 capacity compared to the bigger pipe. And then there's
24 some differences you can see just in the numbers in
25 terms of how much it might cost and how many people
26 would be involved in construction.

27
28 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

29
30 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (In Inupiaq).

31
32 EDWARD: Concern about how the pipeline
33 is going to be built and how it will be staged and how
34 deep is it going to be buried and where about is it
35 going to be exposed up on land so that it will not
36 affect the caribou migration and also the caribous that
37 he has concerns to. From the beginning of where
38 Prudhoe Bay will start the pipeline and from there how
39 far are you going to bury that until you come up to
40 your next stage? That's the question he has and the
41 concern about the caribous during the construction
42 peak.

43
44 MS. SOUTHAM: Thank you. So we have
45 this slide that talks about the pipeline will be buried
46 for most of the route except for where there are some
47 fault crossings and some of the bigger rivers and
48 streams. Let me backtrack. I'll go through this in a
49 little bit. I also have a slide about West Dock. So
50 let me go back and I'll cover this stuff real quick.

1 This project, just to be clear, so we
2 want to make sure we're getting comments on -- if I
3 backtrack one more slide -- on this ASAP project right
4 here. This is the one that we can address today and in
5 this document. This document is called a supplemental
6 EIS. It's basically a supplement to the one that was
7 produced in 2012. So there was a final environmental
8 impact statement on this project that was published,
9 but at that point AGDC realized that there needed to be
10 some changes to the project and I'll describe those
11 changes on the next slide. Because of those changes we
12 have to produce this supplemental and then give
13 everybody a chance to look at those changes and provide
14 some comments before they move forward. So that's what
15 this is.

16

17 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

18

19

20 MR. SOUTHAM: So the process started on
21 August 1st. The notice of intent was published in the
22 Federal Register and that opened up the official
23 comment period and that will go until October 14th. So
24 right now this is where we are in the process. As
25 Birdie said earlier, after this closes we'll have a
26 scoping report that will be available online and that
27 will summarize all the comments that we heard in the 16
28 communities that we've been visiting. Then we'll go
29 and produce this draft supplemental EIS and publish
30 that and then you guys will have another 60 days to
31 review that and look at it and we'll be back in the
32 spring to visit with you again and take your comments.

33

34 We'll take those into consideration as
35 we're preparing the final SEIS and that's tentatively
36 for fall 2015 and then after that there would be 120
37 days where you would have an opportunity to make
38 comments and the Corps evaluates all the information
39 and then issues a record of decision.

40

41 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

42

43 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (In Inupiaq).

44

45 EDWARD: Question. As a whaling
46 captain and also hunts at Cross Island, when you start,
47 like you say, August 1st of 2014 a notice of intent for
48 your SEIS, we have a deadline for our vessels from East
49 Dock going eastbound under Alaska Eskimo Whaling
50 Commission and also with NOAA. When your vessels start

1 bringing your modules, what part of the month will they
2 dock at West Dock and how is it going to be unloaded
3 and where the barges will be waiting to be unloaded?
4 Because the whales do migrate early and starting in
5 August.

6
7 We have a deadline for all the vessels
8 that have signed under conflict avoidance agreement
9 with AWC and NOAA. When you start bringing your
10 modules to West Dock, what part of the month will they
11 be transported before whaling season starts? That is
12 biggest concern because it will impact and have a very
13 direct impact to the marine mammals, especially the
14 bowheads that are real sensitive to noise.

15
16 We've dealt with these vessels before
17 in the past and recent time and those that have not
18 signed the CAA. The question is, when you guys start
19 hauling the modules, are those barges that's going to
20 be transporting the modules going to be part of the
21 CAA, assuming they go to West Dock in the heat of
22 whaling season? That is one of his questions also.

23
24 MS. SOUTHAM: Thank you. That's a
25 really important question. Just to make sure that I
26 make sense, that I'm clear, this August 1st deadline is
27 just that we've started looking at the paper part of
28 this project. So that isn't related to bringing
29 modules in or anything in the ocean or any
30 construction. So this schedule is just for the
31 document part and when we'll come out to talk to you
32 guys.

33
34 The question about when the barges
35 would be coming in, I don't know that we know that yet,
36 so that's part of why we want to talk to you, is to get
37 information and your input on when is a good time, when
38 is a bad time, so we can discuss that in the document
39 and work with that information.

40
41 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible -
42 away from microphone).

43
44 MS. SOUTHAM: I want to make sure I get
45 you recorded. Do you mind?

46
47 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As a whaling
48 captain, we work -- he can say it better than what I
49 can. He probably understood what I was saying.

50

1 (Discussion in Inupiaq)

2

3 EDWARD: I just wanted to clarify with
4 him and others that once you make your presentation
5 there will be a time for them to come forward and give
6 their comments, when the comment period starts. It's
7 kind of confusing when you talk about August 1st. That
8 is assuming that, you know, the barges will arrive West
9 Dock at that time, in the heat of the starting of the
10 whaling season. So that was one of his concerns. And
11 how West Dock is going to be utilized by the industry
12 that's going to build the gas line.

13

14 MS. SOUTHAM: Okay. So I'll go through
15 the rest of this and I'll talk a little bit more about
16 West Dock and then we can take public comments after
17 that. Just a couple more slides.

18

19 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

20

21 MS. SOUTHAM: So, as I was saying
22 earlier, the pipeline is utility-grade gas, so
23 basically it can be pulled right off the pipeline and
24 put into communities to be used right away. It will be
25 mostly buried except for the fault crossings and major
26 rivers.

27

28 There will be only one gas conditioning
29 facility, which is why they need those barges to come
30 in through West Dock. It's a 36-inch, 727 miles long
31 lateral line to Fairbanks as we described. It will
32 generally parallel TAPS right now. It will go
33 northwest and then west of Fairbanks and Nenana, and
34 then bypass Denali National Park and Preserve on the
35 east side and end in Big Lake where it will tap into
36 the existing ENSTAR system.

37

38 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

39

40 MS. SOUTHAM: So during construction,
41 the right-of-way, they will need about 120 feet to do
42 the construction. It may be a little bit wider than
43 that where they'll do horizontal directional drilling
44 underground. So like at the big stream crossings. But
45 then while it's operating, after construction is done,
46 it will be about 53 feet wide just to be maintained.

47

48 They'll use open-cut trenching to dig
49 the pipe and four to six feet deep. There are some
50 engineering drawings over there that show generally

1 what that looks like.

2

3 As I said, directional drilling will be
4 used at the big streams, like the Yukon. The Yukon is
5 not a stream. I guess it's more of a river. There
6 will be some construction camps just temporary during
7 construction, as well as material sites that will have
8 to be used during construction as well.

9

10 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

11

12 MS. SOUTHAM: So this is what the route
13 looks like generally. There are more maps online that
14 go into a lot more detail. You can pull those up.
15 This is the lateral line to Fairbanks. It generally
16 parallels Murphy Dome Road for those of you that might
17 know that area. So this is what Prudhoe Bay changes
18 might look like. Right here are the existing gas
19 facilities, the central compressor is right here. This
20 is the 70-acre area where they would like to put the
21 gas conditioning facility. There's a 20-acre lay-down
22 area right here as well as another 20-acre area right
23 here that would be potentially used.

24

25 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

26

27 MS. SOUTHAM: So West Dock. These are
28 generally the major activities that would happen that
29 would be proposed there. They want to bring 23 barges
30 in that would then have these pre-built modules that
31 would be used to build the gas conditioning facility.
32 They would be offloaded at Dock Head 3. Because of
33 their size, each of the modules is around 5,000.

34

35 MR. STEVENSON: Maximum of 5,500.

36

37 MS. SOUTHAM: Maximum 5,500 tons. So
38 because of their size there would be some winter
39 dredging around the area. The rehab work that is
40 needed because of the size of the modules would happen
41 during the wintertime. That would include basically
42 some widening of this part of West Dock right here and
43 then there would be some temporary barges placed right
44 here where the existing bridge is and they would be
45 ballasted with water and rested on the bottom so that
46 the modules could be brought on shore and then they
47 would be removed after the modules were brought on
48 shore.

49

50 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could you explain

1 where Dock 3 is.

2

3 MR. STEVENSON: On the map it's right
4 here and right here it's right there.

5

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

7

8 MR. STEVENSON: There's three barge
9 berths right there.

10

11 EDWARD: (In Inupiaq).

12

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go back to that
14 one. So all that in the perimeter of that yellow, is
15 that where -- I mean what is that line for?

16

17 MR. STEVENSON: This is Kalb Stevenson.
18 I'm the environmental lead for the project. To answer
19 your question, the yellow line, we're required to do a
20 biological assessment for National Marine Fisheries
21 Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and they
22 require us to define an action area, so the action area
23 is the area where we have activities occurring and
24 potential impacts.

25

26 So, as Anne will probably point out
27 here, you can see those small red squares on the
28 diagram within the yellow area. The one furthest down
29 to the right that she's pointing out now is the
30 preferred location for disposal of dredge material in
31 the nearshore habitat on bottom-fast ice. So she'll
32 explain that there will be some winter dredging and we
33 expect that the least amount of dredged material would
34 come from Dock Head 3 as opposed to another location
35 and that would be dredged in winter through the ice and
36 that material would be trucked over sea ice down to
37 that square and disposed and then at break-up it would
38 be washed away.

39

40 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you.

41

42 MS. SOUTHAM: This is what a module
43 might look like on a barge.

44

45 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So where are your
46 modules coming in from? Are they coming from Nikiski?

47

48 MS. SOUTHAM: Korea.

49

50 MR. STEVENSON: They're originally in

1 Korea, going to Dutch Harbor and up and around to
2 Barrow and they'll be arriving approximately at the
3 time of break-up. They'll come in two groups. So 23
4 barges in one year. We'd like to do it in one year.
5 The first group, about half of those 23, would arrive
6 right around Barrow right when the ice is just about to
7 move out there at the end of July or early July.

8

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that barge come
10 in a year or over years to come?

11

12 MR. STEVENSON: That's actually for the
13 construction period. So what happens is the dredging
14 and construction around West Dock happens in the winter
15 and then that coming summer the barges arrive and come
16 into West Dock and they'll anchor up in a staging area
17 around West Dock and be sort of shuttled by larger --
18 or, sorry, by smaller tugs, would push those into place
19 at Dock Head 3.

20

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What year are you
22 guys looking at that barging? What year is it going to
23 be?

24

25 MR. STEVENSON: It will be either 2017
26 or 2018, so we're a little ways away still.

27

28 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you mention
29 they're going to be built in Korea?

30

31 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

32

33 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why are we
34 building these in Korea when we've got Louisiana and
35 (indiscernible), so we've got Nikiski plants. That's
36 the exact same thing.

37

38 MR. STEVENSON: Sure. The engineers
39 have done a cost analysis and part of the -- the
40 project is directed by the Alaska State Legislature and
41 under its directive the project has to be done as cost
42 efficiently as possible and we're exploring a lot of
43 different options. If the price of gas is too high,
44 the project won't happen. It has to be a price of gas
45 to get it reasonable for market. Some of these changes
46 are attempting to look at different options for a lot
47 of different reasons. One, to make sure we're
48 minimizing impact where we can and also seeing where we
49 can be most efficient and producing gas to customers at
50 a price that's reasonable and where it could be sold.

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

2

3 MS. SOUTHAM: Good questions. I'll go
4 really quickly over this. I think I've said most of
5 what's on here. This is what was proposed in 2012 and
6 this is the new design and now that we're talking
7 about. So basically we're looking at 10 fewer miles
8 for the main line, 5 fewer miles for that lateral line
9 that goes to Fairbanks, so there's less pipe, which
10 reduces costs and some of the risks associated with
11 pipelines.

12

13 In general, it will avoid the Alaska
14 Railroad and DOT right-of-way, but maximizing some of
15 the existing utility corridors and fire breaks that are
16 already around. The footprint overall is greatly
17 reduced because of only having one single compressor
18 station up at Prudhoe versus the multiple that were
19 proposed before. Also the West Dock activities are
20 also new because of the new design, so winter dredging
21 and some of the changes to the dock itself.

22

23 So, tonight we do definitely -- we've
24 had a lot of really great comments and questions and I
25 want to just make sure that we get any others that you
26 want to talk about or the same ones if you'd like to
27 repeat them. Actually we do ask that you repeat them.
28 I want to make sure we get this all on record so that
29 will be part of what we have to respond to when we
30 prepare the document. So I'd like to ask if we can
31 call folks up or if you want to raise your hand if
32 you'd like to make a comment, if you can please state
33 your name and then make your comment. We'll make sure
34 that that gets recorded and we can have Edward
35 translate for anyone that needs that as well.

36

37 We accept verbal comments tonight. We
38 can also take comments on a comment form that we have
39 back there if you'd rather write it out. We also have
40 a project website, which is listed right here
41 (asapeis.com. There's an email if you'd rather email
42 your comments. It's listed on the website and you can
43 send those in as long as we get them before October
44 14th. If you want to write your own letter and you
45 don't want to use our form or our email, we'd love that
46 too. If you do that, just make sure that it gets to
47 Mary Romero at the Corps of Engineers postmarked before
48 the 14th.

49

50 This is where we've been. You guys are

1 best for last. We've got two other communities that
2 aren't listed on here, Trapper Creek and
3 Bettles/Evansville. We were also in those communities
4 as well. So we'll come back to all of these
5 communities or most of them anyway after we produce the
6 draft SEIS and get more comments at that point too when
7 we have a lot more information to share about what the
8 project would look like in terms of potential impacts.

9
10 I think I've already reviewed this
11 enough. Thanks again very much for coming. We really
12 want your input. Again, please continue to visit the
13 website because we'll keep it updated with more
14 information as we move forward and that will be the
15 best place to get the latest and greatest of what we're
16 doing and what we're up to. I will pause and ask if
17 anyone wants to make comments.

18
19 MR. AKPIK: Joseph Akpik, resident for
20 Nuiqsut. Why are we building two pipelines? That's a
21 very good one because it's -- I've been scoping out the
22 Legislature with (indiscernible) and I was thinking
23 they would build that one line, but here we are
24 building two lines.

25
26 On my comment before I -- on my comment
27 I mentioned that we have to develop north-northeast,
28 not north-northwest Alaska. This is where in my
29 comment, in my recommendation, I do believe that Nome
30 is getting close. I'd like to go have a dinner in
31 Nome, have a breakfast in Kotzebue and this kind of a
32 thing. Yeah, I'd like to see that where the
33 communication/transportation factor. This is what I'm
34 looking at.

35
36 So this would be a very good one if we
37 would ship that stand alone pipeline to Nome to be
38 exported to China. China really needs the gas. I
39 wanted to comment on that. We're catching up with the
40 international news. They just got an okay to -- China
41 can have our gas. So this would be a very good
42 advantage and it would pay off for itself in a matter
43 of 20 years. A stand alone 36-inch pipeline going to
44 Nome, Kotzebue, Red Dog Mine, all of these military
45 installations. That's what I'm looking at too. And
46 Galena and some of those major infrastructures that the
47 State has.

48
49 So my question, my main question is why
50 are we building two lines?

1 Thank you.

2

3 MR. STEVENSON: Thanks for your
4 question and comment. We've been told that it's very
5 unlikely that there would be two lines paralleling one
6 another. These are two projects being carried forward.
7 We don't know which one will happen. But I am
8 intrigued by your comment about going to Nome. That
9 would obviously be for the AK LNG Project to export it.
10 The ASAP Project is utility-grade gas for Alaskans.

11

12 In the Southcentral Region where you
13 have I guess the main populace 300,000-plus, in
14 Fairbanks where you've got 65 to 70,000-plus and lots
15 of small cities and town and villages along the line.
16 Those residents need gas and the Legislature
17 representing those people I think is concerned,
18 especially with Fairbanks who doesn't have gas, and
19 Southcentral Alaska, the reserves over the last 10
20 years have been depleting.

21

22 Now there's been some new activity in
23 Cook Inlet, but nothing proven or secure yet. It's
24 unlikely at this point that those reserves would
25 continue to meet demand in the major population centers
26 of the state, at least for Southcentral and, of course,
27 Interior doesn't have case there. So that's why it's
28 going straight down and not to Nome. But for export,
29 yes, that would make sense.

30

31 MR. AKPIK: What about if we change the
32 governor? Is that a good question? I thought I would
33 ask.

34

35 MS. SOUTHAM: I don't think we can
36 answer that one. Would anyone else like to make a
37 comment.

38

39 MR. AKPIK: I would like to see north-
40 northwest develop. That's in Nome. I'm looking at the
41 international security through the Bering Straits.
42 We've got a lot of shipping lanes going through the
43 Bering Straits and that security -- international
44 security, a sea port, needs gas and also our military
45 base.

46

47 They show some of the infrastructures
48 and some of the organizations that we've got to include
49 in. These are some of the vital things that we need.
50 That military support. We've got to support them in

1 some way. Another one too is opening up
2 north-northwest. I do believe we have to do it.
3 Instead of running two gas lines to Valdez, we run the
4 other one to Nome Port, which has been proposed for how
5 many years now. An international sea port. So there's
6 a lot more people that will be going. This way,
7 economic purposes, we need to look at north-northwest.

8

9 Thank you very much.

10

11 MS. SOUTHAM: So, as Kalb said, I would
12 definitely encourage you to make those comments when
13 the Alaska LNG Project comes to listen. Make that same
14 comment to them because they'll be able to address that
15 in their project document.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 Anyone else? Please.

20

21 MR. IPALOOK: Herbert Ipalook, whaling
22 captain. The way I see it, it's all coordinated to our
23 road. If there was a road to Nome, would things
24 change, like what Joe says? Because there is no road
25 to Nome. I know it's been up for grabs to build a road
26 from the Haul Road to Nome. Would that change a lot of
27 things on a pipeline from Prudhoe Bay?

28

29 MS. SOUTHAM: That's a good question.
30 I don't know that any of us can answer that one.
31 Again, this project is just the one that goes for in-
32 state markets. The other project is about export and
33 that's the one that you might make that same comment
34 for that project.

35

36 Any other comments tonight? If there
37 aren't any, if you do think of something.....

38

39 MR. NUKAPIGAK, JR.: Can I say
40 something here? I just want to elaborate on Joe
41 Akpik's comment. North Slope Borough will be here for
42 a Port Authority meeting. Barrow is thinking about
43 putting up a port because of so many vessels and also
44 cruise ships coming through Northwest Passage. There
45 will be a meeting next week in regards to North Slope
46 Borough's proposal for a Port Authority instead of
47 having to have it in Nome or Kotzebue. That's one
48 thing that they'll be here for that purpose.

49

50 The Borough is pushing for a Port

1 Authority in Barrow because we do not have a Coast
2 Guard presence. Not only in Chukchi Sea but also in
3 Beaufort Sea. They went northeast of Cross Island here
4 this past fall and that was one of their interference
5 and there's nothing on the east side of Beaufort Sea
6 that the Coast Guard have no -- being in presence,
7 other than if Shell was over at Sivulliq Prospect in
8 Camden Bay.

9

10 But I think the Port Authority to Nome
11 is uncalled for. We also need to look at our people up
12 here that are paying high price in fuel oil. We need
13 to look at our villages from Kaktovik to Point Hope,
14 Anaktuvuk to Barrow, Atqasuk, Wainwright, Point Lay.
15 We need to look at those villages that are in NPR-A
16 that are sitting on natural gas also and methane gas.
17 Not just looking at just one northeast corner of NPR-A.
18 We need to pressure the Federal government to expand
19 their exploration further west. Explore for natural
20 gas or methane gas for our villages for our people
21 because we are all in the remote village in the
22 roadless.

23

24 For Nuiqsut, it's the closest to Dalton
25 Highway. Right now we would have had a road if some of
26 our younger generation opposed to it rather than having
27 it connected to a spine road. They wanted the road
28 connected to 52 Mile south of Deadhorse. Today we
29 would have had a road if the village had agreed in 2003
30 when they had the two-day public hearing by Department
31 of Transportation. Since then DOT has gone the other
32 way for resource development and exploration phases
33 only, excluding the villages from being connected to
34 the nearest highway.

35

36 This village doesn't have no evacuation
37 plan. We're in the heart of a catastrophe to happen.
38 We need to focus on our area. That has been spoken for
39 so many years. In late '70s that's the first time when
40 we asked for a road to be connected to Dalton Highway
41 and this is what DOT said to us, in order for one
42 village to be connected all eight villages have to be
43 included, not just one village.

44

45 So it took so many years, so many
46 decades to try and convince DOT to connect our road to
47 their highway. As of today they won't. We're only
48 like 17 miles shy of connecting to Dalton Highway. For
49 that purpose that we've been pushing was for an
50 evacuation route. We talk about how much money this

1 project is going to cost. A little 17-mile road is
2 going to cost less than what this project is going to
3 cost.

4

5 So you have a couple of things that
6 we're looking at. One is a Port Authority. The other
7 one that we're looking at is how to evacuate our people
8 because it has happened before with Repsol's blowout.
9 That is an example as to why we need an evacuation
10 route so that we could safely evacuate our children and
11 our elders and that is one thing that this natural gas
12 pipeline is going to go through.

13

14 We're not just looking at Point
15 Thomson. We're looking at Prudhoe Bay, Kuparuk, all
16 those units that have been developed and the
17 infrastructures are already there. You guys are coming
18 further west and west knowing that there's not just
19 crude oil in our region, but we are sitting on big
20 natural gas also. That eventually will be transported
21 down in-state to Big Lake.

22

23 So whatever that's being exported,
24 developed in the name of the producers and the
25 operators these are being sent the other way instead of
26 legislators looking at our people up here first that
27 have been sitting and waiting for decades to get a
28 cheaper heating oil, a cheaper gas for them to heat
29 their homes and not having to run out of heating oil at
30 a high price.

31

32 We know that Fairbanks is paying 400
33 for 100 gallons of heating oil and that's a lot
34 compared to what our people are paying in our villages
35 and those have to be either flown or by Rologon Trail
36 during winter. So those are our only routes. Ice road
37 is our only highway during winter. When it's gone, we
38 have no other way around but go to Olitok to the
39 nearest road to drop off our people heading southbound.

40

41 So, with this project that's going to
42 go through and assuming it will go through. We know
43 that we're not just looking at one unit of natural gas
44 fuel. You're looking at multiple fuels that are out
45 there. Eventually that will expand westward coming
46 towards us and further west if it has to be, but I
47 think for now the State and ASAP are looking at Point
48 Thomson unit to be opened. That's been on hold for
49 nearly almost 40 years and that is the purpose of
50 getting ExxonMobil to get their leases going and start

1 developing Point Thomson for natural gas, at the same
2 time doing offshore exploration for crude oil.

3
4 That pipeline has already been
5 connected to Badami and right now it's just a matter of
6 building their natural gas line from Point Thomson to
7 Prudhoe and from there the project starts. But we have
8 a long ways to looking into this project that
9 eventually might happen or will go through. We're
10 looking at a good three more years to get that started.

11
12 Seeing your comment period ending and
13 so short in timeframe and very few, a handful of our
14 people here to listen and hear what your presentation
15 is being given to us. There may be people out there
16 that might have comments or concerns about these issues
17 that are not here for some reason. But we do the best
18 we can to provide an aggregate information for those
19 who come to our village to hear such issues like this.

20
21 Thank you.

22
23 I'm also a whaling captain. I'm Edward
24 Nukapigak, Jr. I'm one of the seven whaling captains
25 here.

26
27 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I've got a
28 question. Why talk about the other villages here.
29 We're just trying to go one line. Why don't we just
30 hook us up first and then go whichever way you guys
31 want to go to the other villages. That will be easier
32 instead of talking about it all the time. Line this up
33 and then hook it up to whoever want to be hooked up.

34
35 MR. STEVENSON: Thanks for your
36 comment. Yeah, that's the plan is to -- the scope of
37 the project is to just have the main line from North
38 Slope down and the lateral to Fairbanks and then any
39 community along the line could develop the
40 infrastructure to cut into the line. It's utility-
41 grade gas and ready to go. It doesn't have to have any
42 kind of large-scale conditioning and extraction.

43
44 So that's the plan, is Anaktuvuk or
45 Bettles or Talkeetna, if their community decided that
46 they would want to get gas and that was best, then they
47 could develop that infrastructure and distribution
48 system to get it to their homes and businesses.

49
50 MR. AKPIK: Joseph Akpik. I notice on

1 your agency's regulatory authority for Alaska Stand
2 Alone Pipe -- where is the Bureau of Indian Affairs?
3 Bureau of Indian Affairs affects Native allotments, our
4 land selections and whatever it is, Arctic Slope, have
5 we encountered with the three regional corporations
6 that involve Arctic Slope, Fairbanks Regional
7 Corporation and the rest of them on down. So I did not
8 notice agencies on the regional corporations because
9 they have a lot of land. What kind of negotiations did
10 we deal with with the corporations?

11

12 Thank you.

13

14 MS. BUDNIK: I'm Birdie with the Corps
15 of Engineers. Let me take a look again. Okay. I
16 think the regional corporations -- I don't know that
17 they were invited to be cooperating agencies. I'm
18 trying to remember if they were or not. But a lot of
19 these agencies listed here were provided the
20 opportunity to be cooperating agencies and that's up to
21 them to accept that role or not.

22

23 So the regional corporations can
24 comment on the projects, submit comments on the
25 project. I don't know how their land ownership, how
26 AGDC would be allowed or disallowed to construct
27 through corporation land, but I can tell you that they
28 are allowed to comment on the project just like anyone
29 else from the public.

30

31 I do know that they are involved in
32 some aspects of the project. Review aspects of the
33 project such as -- like reviewing effects to historic
34 properties, those types of issues that the regional
35 corporations are commenting and providing input on
36 those issues.

37

38 MS. SOUTHAM: This is Anne Southam with
39 ERM. The corporations -- government-to-government can
40 only be with Federally recognized tribes, so every
41 recognized tribe along the route has been invited to
42 cooperate as well as to consult for historic and
43 cultural resources. So those letters all went out in
44 July, I believe, and we're getting some response to
45 that.

46

47 I think Knik Tribe has been interested
48 in government-to-government and that process continues
49 through the project. Tribes and agencies can decide
50 they want to be a cooperating agency at any point in

1 time, so there's no timeframe where that decision has
2 to be made right away.

3

4 The other thing I wanted to mention was
5 the corporations can also provide input on Section 106,
6 the historic and cultural preservation. They've been
7 contacted to provide input in terms of any kind of land
8 that they would have along the route, so they can be
9 involved that way as well, which is more than just
10 commenting on the process but specifically about
11 historic and cultural resources that might be there
12 too.

13

14 MR. AKPIK: Joseph Akpik. The reason
15 why I asked, in Glennallen area the corporation down
16 there has really worked closely on monitoring that 48-
17 inch pipeline. So hopefully it affected the regional
18 corporation that they had. So these are some of the
19 questions that should be ironed out along with the
20 authority and the land, the landowners and Bureau of
21 Indian Affairs. They have to come in place too. And
22 Bureau of Land Management. All of these are government
23 agencies. A lot of us fall under the Bureau of Indian
24 Affairs.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 MS. SOUTHAM: Thank you. BLM is a
29 cooperating agency as well, so they are involved. All
30 of the landowners, any landowner along the route has
31 been specifically contacted about the project and
32 they'll be involved in coordinating -- communicating
33 back and forth with the agency about their land and any
34 impacts that might happen. We certainly want comments
35 from those people as well about where the route is and
36 where their lands are, any concerns they might have
37 about that.

38

39 Does anyone else have any more
40 comments, questions?

41

42 MR. AHNUPKANA: I'm Clarence Ahnupkana
43 for the record. Before they start this pipeline
44 servicing make sure they put tampons on the vehicles,
45 they call them. Make sure there's no oil dripping on
46 the roads. You know, caribou eat grass and we eat the
47 caribou at the same time. I don't want that disease
48 from the oil company.

49

50 Thank you.

1 MS. SOUTHAM: Any more comments?
2
3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Comments away
4 from microphone).
5
6 MS. SOUTHAM: So if there are no more
7 comments, I think we'll go ahead and close the meeting.
8 I just want to say thanks. We all want to thank you
9 again for coming.
10
11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I want one more.
12
13 MS. SOUTHAM: You want one more
14 comment, question.
15
16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On your modules,
17 are they all going to be created in lumber? If they
18 are, I would like you guys to save them for us for our
19 island because our islands got no lumber. It's very
20 scarce. Our crews are getting bigger and we'd like to
21 expand our houses.
22
23 Thank you.
24
25 MR. STEVENSON: It's interesting we
26 have some -- a project like this brings a lot of
27 opportunity. For instance, Barrow is very interested
28 in gravel and possibly backhauling gravel. An interest
29 here in lumber certainly -- thanks for making that
30 comment and we'll pass that along. With 23 barges
31 coming in with modules and probably some other
32 supplies, I'm sure there's a bit of lumber, so we can
33 look into that for you. Based on the picture, which is
34 really my only context, it would be a lot of lumber to
35 cover that big module.
36
37 I wanted to address your comment from
38 earlier too about the modules coming from Korea. They
39 would be manufactured there. There's a lot of
40 opportunity and potential for jobs. That big 20-acre
41 pad up by the gas conditioning facility that was there
42 that's for a 1,000-person camp. There would be a lot
43 of opportunity for jobs during the construction period,
44 which is a three-year-long construction period on the
45 North Slope. Even though those modules are being built
46 in Korea, there's prolonged job opportunities within
47 the North Slope Borough.
48
49 MS. SOUTHAM: Thank you again,
50 everybody.

1 We will officially close the meeting.
2
3 (Off record)
4
5 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 23 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Nuiqsut Scoping Meeting on September 17, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE, ASAP

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Barrow, Alaska
October 2, 2014

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2
3 (Barrow, Alaska - 10/2/2014)

4
5 (On record)

6
7 MS. SOUTHAM: My name is Anne Southam.
8 I'm with ERM. We are the third-party contractor that's
9 been hired by the Corps of Engineers to do the Alaska
10 Stand Alone Pipeline supplemental environmental impact
11 statement. That is the subject of this scoping meeting
12 tonight. We are going to do about a 20-25 minute
13 presentation that will run through what the project is
14 and then allow you all a chance to make public comments
15 that would be recorded. Right now I do have a recorder
16 right here, so we're being recorded now so that all of
17 this can be part of the official public record. So any
18 comments that you would make after the presentation
19 would be part of the public record that would be
20 evaluated in the supplemental EIS, so I encourage you
21 to do that. If you don't want to verbally make a
22 comment tonight, we do have comment forms and a website
23 as well, which I'll explain.

24
25 As I said, my name is Anne Southam.
26 I'm with ERM. We do have Birdie Budnik, who is with
27 the Corps of Engineers. She was not able to make it
28 tonight. She's on the phone and so I'm going to let
29 her explain what the Corps of Engineers role in this
30 project is, so hopefully you'll all be able to hear
31 her.

32
33 MS. BUDNIK: Okay. First of all, as
34 Anne explained, my name is Birdie Budnik. I'm with the
35 Corps of Engineers. I apologize I couldn't make it up
36 to the meeting in person and I also apologize I'm at
37 home, so if you hear my dogs barking or my kids
38 talking, I apologize.

39
40 So really quickly I just wanted to
41 explain that the Corps has two responsibilities to
42 fulfill for this project. The first of which is under
43 the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA, which
44 requires the disclosure of any potential effects of the
45 project to the environment and it also requires the
46 opportunity for public comment on the project three
47 times throughout the NEPA process. At scoping, which
48 is now, the scoping meeting, at the draft supplemental
49 environmental impact statement and at the final
50 supplemental environmental impact statement.

1 The Corps will make a permitting
2 decision on this proposed project and there are three
3 potential permitting authorities the Corps has that may
4 apply to this project, the first of which is Section 10
5 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, which applies to
6 any work performed in navigable waters of the U.S. The
7 second is Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which
8 applies to the discharge of dredged or fill material in
9 waters of the U.S., including wetlands. The last and
10 third authority that may apply to this project is
11 Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research and
12 Sanctuaries Act of 1972, which applies to the transport
13 of dredged material for the purpose of dumping it into
14 the ocean.

15
16 So those are the main responsibilities
17 the Corps has making that permitting decision and the
18 requirements under NEPA.

19
20 With that, I'm going to pass it back to
21 Anne and I want to thank you all for coming.

22
23 MS. SOUTHAM: Thank you, Birdie. The
24 presentation itself will go through the difference
25 between this in-state gas line being proposed and
26 another pipeline that I'm sure a lot of you have heard
27 about, the Alaska LNG Project, liquified natural gas
28 project. This steps in the NEPA process. Why we're
29 doing a supplemental. Some of you may recall or may be
30 aware that in 2012 there was a final EIS that was
31 published on this project, but at that point there were
32 going to be some changes to the proposed design, so a
33 record of decision wasn't published and so now we are
34 doing a supplemental to that work. We'll go through
35 the project description in a little more detail of
36 what's new with this new design and then how you all
37 can make comments on the project now and then later on.

38
39 As I explained earlier, the Corps of
40 Engineers is the lead agency. There are cooperating
41 agencies, including U.S. Bureau of Land Management,
42 National Park Service, Alaska Department of Natural
43 Resources or DNR, Fish and Wildlife Service, EPA and
44 the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety
45 Administration. There are opportunities for other
46 agencies if they so choose throughout the process to
47 become a cooperating agency. At any time that would
48 happen we would make that known on the project website
49 or any other communication that we'd have, but so far
50 these are the agencies that have decided to cooperate.

1 That gives them a role in the decision-making process
2 in terms of the alternatives that we look at and how we
3 evaluate those.

4

5 So the whole purpose of this project is
6 to provide -- it was actually born out of Alaska State
7 Legislature statute that was passed to make North Slope
8 natural gas available to residents in Fairbanks, the
9 Southcentral region and other communities in the state
10 as directed by the Legislature. So the purpose really
11 is to provide gas to Alaskan residents.

12

13 As I said, there is another pipeline
14 project that's being discussed and that's the Alaska
15 LNG. This is just a nice table that runs through some
16 of the differences between these two projects so that
17 it can be clear. What we're talking about tonight is
18 what's in this left-hand column. This is the ASAP or
19 Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline. Both projects are being
20 proposed or advanced by the State of Alaska, Alaska
21 Gasline Development Corporation. We do have Kalb
22 Stevenson here tonight from AGDC as well as Leah
23 Levinton. They're in the back there. If you have
24 questions for them, please don't hesitate.

25

26 I'm sorry, I forgot to also introduce
27 Chris Grundman, who is with the State Pipeline
28 Coordinator's Office, who is also here tonight.

29

30 So going back to the differences in
31 these projects. This is to provide utility-grade lean
32 gas primarily for in-state markets. The other pipeline
33 is primarily for export and that is liquified natural
34 gas. This project has one compressor station that's
35 being proposed up at Prudhoe. The other one would
36 propose up to eight compressor stations at this time.

37

38 The main line for this project is about
39 727 miles with a lateral line just under 30 miles to
40 Fairbanks. The other project is about 800 miles. It's
41 a bigger diameter, as you can see, and there is no
42 lateral line currently proposed for that. Again, it's
43 liquified natural gas, so because of that there would
44 be a plant that would be located in Nikiski and then it
45 would be exported from there and that would be for the
46 LNG project. This one would terminate near Big Lake
47 where it would tie into an existing ENSTAR system and
48 then be distributed from there.

49

50 There are obviously some differences

1 too just because of the size and the cost and the
2 amount of workforce that would be required as well as
3 the timeframe and how long it would take to construct.

4

5 Did you have a question?

6

7 MR. T. BROWER: Thomas Brower. Sorry
8 for being late. The question is, you have two projects
9 here, so what happened to the one that is moving way
10 faster than these two, which is LNG facilities that
11 would be stationed in Barrow and it goes through the
12 trucking process down to central Alaska? You're
13 talking about two pipelines, but there's also another
14 project of LNG facilities for A Dock and you're just
15 talking about the pipelines.

16

17 MR. STEVENSON: This is Kalb Stevenson
18 with AGDC. You're right, there is a trucking project
19 that's being moved forward, Fairbanks Natural Gas,
20 until a pipeline can be put in place for gas. The
21 trucking project would come up and start, I think Chris
22 said, as early as 2016.

23

24 MR. T. BROWER: Yeah, that's it.

25

26 MR. STEVENSON: Yeah, and Chris will
27 add to that as well, but Fairbanks is developing a
28 local distribution system right now so that some of the
29 residents there will have some temporary relief from
30 high fuel costs until a gas line can be built and then
31 there would be a distribution network in place in
32 Fairbanks already so that if a pipeline came in that
33 could be tied in. No one really knows at this point
34 what the future holds in terms of how well a pipeline
35 and a trucking project will continue to happen.

36

37 The common question is will there be
38 two gas lines. We seem to think that, no, there will
39 just be one -- in all likelihood there will just be one
40 gas line, but both projects, as Anne said, are being
41 carried forward until that decision is made.

42

43 MR. GRUNDMAN: Yeah, I'm Chris Grundman
44 with the Department of Natural Resources, State
45 Pipeline Coordinator's Office. Just to add to that is
46 that DNR has already issued a right-of-way lease for
47 that pad and pipeline for the LNG trucking project
48 there in Prudhoe. What we've seen of the most recent
49 developments is that they plan to have that in
50 operation by fall of 2016, so that project is underway.

1 Again it's dependent upon a lot of things. Still doing
2 some commercial type analysis as far as the economics
3 behind that project as well.

4

5 MR. T. BROWER: Again, I'm sorry for
6 being late. I don't know what I've missed. Have you
7 shown a timeline of these two projects as scheduled or
8 is that in the presentation?

9

10 MS. SOUTHAM: We just got started, so
11 you're good timing. Really, the presentation from here
12 forward will focus on just the ASAP Project, this one.
13 So details about this project we have less information
14 on. We do know some things that we can share depending
15 on what the question is, but I do have a timeline at
16 least for the environmental impact statement part.
17 I'll show you that in a second.

18

19 As I said earlier, in 2012 there was a
20 final EIS that was published on this that disclosed the
21 environmental and socioeconomic impacts of what was
22 proposed at that time. The State decided to make some
23 changes to that project design. Under the National
24 Environmental Policy Act, which is the law that is
25 requiring that we do this document in the first place,
26 if you have changes to a project that are after the
27 impact assessment has already been written, then you
28 have to go back and do a supplemental, so that's what
29 this whole process is. We're doing a supplemental to
30 that 2012 document.

31

32 Because of that also this supplemental
33 will be based heavily on the stuff that is still
34 relevant from that 2012 document and really try to
35 focus in on what is new and changed since then and
36 provide some information on the potential impacts of
37 those new and different things.

38

39 So this is the process. On August 1st
40 the Corps of Engineers published the notice of intent
41 for the impact statement and that is what officially
42 kicks off this process and the comment period. We're
43 towards the tail end of a 75-day comment period. The
44 comment period will end on October 14th. Once that
45 closes we will look at all the comments that we've
46 gotten and take those into consideration when we're
47 pulling together the draft EIS, which will tentatively
48 be published in the spring of 2015. Then we'll come
49 back out and do another series of public meetings where
50 we'll take more comments.

1 You'll have a lot more information to
2 look at at that point because we'll have done the
3 impact assessment part and we'll have some results of
4 that evaluation to comment on based on the
5 alternatives. Then we'll take those comments into
6 consideration and prepare the final supplemental EIS
7 and that will likely be published in the fall of 2015.

8
9

10 Then the record of decision would come
11 about 120 days after that. The Corps of Engineers
12 requires this 120-day cooling off period, so that's the
13 reason for this timeline towards the end. So this is
14 not for constructing the pipeline or anything. This is
15 just to evaluate the impacts of doing that.

16

17 So a little bit more about the actual
18 project. It is now utility-grade natural gas through
19 the whole line. As I said earlier, there will be one
20 gas conditioning facility near Prudhoe and then it will
21 be utility-grade gas from there down all the way to
22 where it terminates at Big Lake. The pipeline will be
23 buried except for at fault crossings, some of the major
24 bridges and stream crossings. The Yukon for example.

25

26 It will also be 727 miles. It's a bit
27 shorter than what was previously proposed. I think
28 about 10 miles shorter. In general it will parallel
29 the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System and the Dalton
30 Highway, just northwest of Fairbanks, and then it will
31 go west of Fairbanks and Nenana, then it will go east
32 of Denali National Park and Preserve, where it will
33 parallel the Parks Highway to Willow and then connect
34 in to the ENSTAR system near Big Lake.

35

36 The construction right-of-way will be
37 approximately 120 feet. It may be a little bit wider
38 than that in some areas where they need to do
39 horizontal directional drilling on some of these fault
40 crossings and major stream and river crossings. After
41 construction the permanent right-of-way would be
42 maintained about 53 feet.

43

44 Open-cut trenching is a technique that
45 is being proposed to install the pipeline at about 4-6
46 feet depth. There are some engineer drawings around
47 the room that show a little more detail about that, so
48 I'd encourage you to look around the room. If you have
49 questions about that, Kalb is here and can answer some
50 of those. Horizontal directional drilling will be used

1 at some of these big river crossings. Then there will
2 be some mobile construction camps, of course, 8-10
3 acres during construction and there will be several
4 material sites along the route as well.

5
6 Here is the general alignment. We do
7 have a lot of maps that show specific sections of the
8 pipeline from top to bottom that are on the project
9 website and those are a lot more detailed, so I'd
10 encourage you to go look at the website. It's
11 asapeis.com and that's on the materials that you guys
12 have there. It's also at the end of the presentation.

13
14 This is what the lateral line to
15 Fairbanks would look like generally. It follows Murphy
16 Dome Road in part and would terminate there in
17 Fairbanks. This is up at Prudhoe. For those of you
18 that are probably very familiar with the area, these
19 are existing facilities up there. West Dock is
20 generally up over this direction. So this would be
21 about a 72-acre pad for the proposed gas conditioning
22 facility. This is a 20-acre lay-down area and then
23 this is about another 20 acres that would be right
24 there.

25
26 So the specific activities that would
27 require some changes at West Dock. There would be pre-
28 built modules that would be brought in, about 23
29 barges, that's being proposed for one season. These
30 modules are essentially the gas conditioning facility
31 and they'll be built off-site and then loaded onshore
32 and put together to make the gas conditioning facility.
33 So they would be offloaded at Dock Head 3. Because of
34 the size of these modules, they're several thousand
35 tons, there would need to be some winter dredging
36 there, about 170,000 cubic yards of materia, that is
37 being proposed to be disposed of pretty near shore.
38 Kalb has a little more on that if you have some
39 questions about that.

40
41 So because of the size of the modules
42 there would need to be some widening of this part of
43 West Dock and this breach would be bolstered by some
44 temporary barges that would be ballasted and rest on
45 the floor until the modules are brought on shore and
46 then they would be removed after the modules are all
47 complete.

48
49 MR. T. BROWER: I have a question.
50 Isn't there a proposal also on this West Dock to

1 increase the pad size of the West Dock for offloading
2 barge and potentially increase the West Dock?
3 (Indiscernible) our stakeholders.

4
5 MS. SOUTHAM: Okay.

6
7 MR. STEVENSON: That would have been
8 for the other project.

9
10 MR. T. BROWER: (Away from microphone).

11
12 MR. STEVENSON: (Away from microphone).

13
14 MR. T. BROWER: A meeting with them
15 about four months ago, four or five months ago in
16 Anchorage. (Indiscernible) increase the West Dock pad
17 also along this widening of the road.

18
19 MR. STEVENSON: So see that top red
20 square?

21
22 MR. T. BROWER: Yep.

23
24 MR. STEVENSON: Below that is -- right
25 now the main staging area is below that and that would
26 have to be increased. It's already existing there, but
27 that's (away from microphone).

28
29 MR. T. BROWER: (Away from microphone)
30 increase of pads.

31
32 MS. SOUTHAM: Okay.

33
34 MR. T. BROWER: (Away from microphone).

35
36 MS. SOUTHAM: Okay. Yeah. There will
37 be -- we are still pretty early in the environmental
38 impact statement process and there will be more
39 information in detail about this and activities that
40 will be involved with West Dock when we look at the
41 impacts. If you have more questions, we're happy to
42 try to answer after also and try to get you some more
43 detail.

44
45 So this is a picture of what a module
46 might look like on a barge.

47
48 Again in 2012 there was a proposed
49 design and that is in this first column right here. So
50 now we've got utility-grade gas rather than enriched

1 natural gas, so this is lean gas. It's about 10 fewer
2 miles of pipe, a little bit lower pressure, so it is
3 shorter and straighter industry-standard pipe. The
4 lateral line to Fairbanks is about five miles shorter
5 and it's along Murphy Dome Road now, which is a bit
6 different from before. It does avoid Alaska Railroad
7 and DOT right-of-way and maximizes some of the existing
8 fire breaks and utility corridors that are already in
9 existence. There's also improved construction access
10 and for maintenance as well.

11
12 There would be one single compressor
13 station rather than several, so that really reduces the
14 overall footprint of the project and then reduces some
15 of the impacts to wetlands and carbon impacts as well.
16 Again there would be modifications at West Dock because
17 of the modules and needing to do some winter dredging.

18
19 So again tonight we're happy to take
20 more comments and questions if you have them. Again we
21 are being recorded so that those can all be part of the
22 official record and be part of the consideration when
23 we're doing the impact statement. There's also a
24 project website, asapeis.com where there's a link to
25 this email address so that you can submit emailed
26 comments if you'd like and then we do have comment
27 forms here that can be mailed or we can take them
28 tonight. You can also develop your own letter and mail
29 it by mail to Mary Romero at the Corps of Engineers.
30 As long as the comments and letters are postmarked by
31 October 14th they will be part of this official record.

32
33 So these are the series of other
34 meetings that we have had. As you can see we did
35 attempt to get up here on the 17th, but our plane broke
36 down in Fairbanks and we weren't able to get all the
37 way up, so we had to reschedule for tonight and doing
38 our best to try to get as much input from Barrow as we
39 can. We had to reschedule Anaktuvuk Pass and that will
40 be our last meeting next week, next Wednesday night,
41 October 8th. The comment period again closes on the
42 14th.

43
44 I think I've kind of run through this.
45 In the next six months we'll have this comment period
46 close and then shortly thereafter we'll have a scoping
47 report that will summarize all of what we heard and
48 that will be published on the project website so you
49 can see what other people said. We will prepare the
50 draft EIS and then come back out and do a series of

1 meeting and a comment period then and go back and start
2 writing the final.

3

4 So, with that, I really appreciate
5 everybody that's come tonight and we'd be happy to take
6 any more questions or comments if you'd like to make
7 them.

8

9 MR. T. BROWER: Thomas Brower, III.
10 Last name B-R-O-W-E-R. I do know the 2012 EIS was
11 done, but on the supplemental EIS you're indicating
12 which part of the route is the supplemental EIS taking
13 effect? Where the minor changes of the route was other
14 than just the overall, the whole length of the pipeline
15 route of your draft -- based on the draft Army Corps
16 permit that is out for comment? So it's just sections
17 of the supplemental. I don't think you were -- you
18 didn't indicate that.

19

20 MR. STEVENSON: So the reason for the
21 supplemental -- we have two major changes in conceptual
22 design of the project and those are the gas composition
23 is different now. We now have utility-grade gas. The
24 other is the West Dock component. West Dock is being
25 utilized in a very different way now. We also have
26 many different design refinements, some of which are a
27 result of those two major changes in conceptual design
28 and some are just additional refinements, like you
29 mentioned the route.

30

31 The major route refinements, there's a
32 shift on the North Slope a little bit to the west for
33 the first section of the pipe. There's another shift
34 around Nenana -- or, I'm sorry, Clear and Anderson
35 area. The last one is around the Nancy Lake area. All
36 of those will be -- maybe that just kind of helps to
37 paint a picture of maybe what's driving the EIS are
38 these two major changes, but what kind of comes along
39 with that is a lot of these other refinements and all
40 of those are evaluated in the SEIS.

41

42 MS. SOUTHAM: I was just going to add
43 too that we do have on the website much more detailed
44 maps that will show some of where the pipe route has
45 shifted a few miles west up here on the Slope, it has
46 shifted a bit, and there are some much more detailed
47 maps that you can look at there if you're interested in
48 where it's being proposed.

49

50 Anyone else. If you could say your

1 name, please.

2

3 MR. MERCIER: Bob Mercier, M-E-R-C-I-E-
4 R. You mentioned one of the changes was the gas is now
5 utility grade. What was it before and what are the
6 differences in the gas to be transmitted?

7

8 MR. STEVENSON: So previously it
9 contained natural gas liquids and you'd have to have a
10 higher compression gas line running about 2,500 pounds
11 per square inch gauge. When you remove the natural gas
12 liquids, things like butane and some propanes, you
13 don't have to maintain a dense phase of the gas. You
14 don't require a high-pressure line. The trade-off --
15 you can't sell those natural gas liquids at the end of
16 the line where you'd have to extract those, but the
17 trade off is the gas is more accessible for Alaskans.
18 Any community along the line could potentially cut into
19 the line, have an off-take, a depressurizing facility
20 just like you have here in Barrow, the utility shed out
21 there that has a meter and you'd put odor in the gas
22 and run it into a local distribution system.

23

24 When you have natural gas liquids in
25 the higher pressure line, that's a lot more
26 challenging, a lot more expensive to do. So the
27 conceptual design change to utility-grade gas makes the
28 gas much more accessible to Alaskans. That potentially
29 impacts the socioeconomics of a lot of communities up
30 and down the line and a lot of times in a positive way.

31

32 Just the straight composition of the
33 gas as it stands now, it's 89 percent mole methane.
34 The amount of butanes and propanes is very, very
35 minimal. It's ready to use. With those NGLs in there
36 in the previous design it would burn kind of a lot
37 higher. BTUs would just burn. It would be too hot.
38 You'd need an additional NGL extraction plant or NGL
39 straddle and off-take plant to pull those NGLs off and
40 it's just a lot more expensive. This is a lot more
41 accessible for people up and down the line now.

42

43 What's that? Leah says \$250 million
44 more expensive.

45

46 MR. MERCIER: You mentioned some of the
47 major crossings there would be directional drilling
48 involved. Are crossings of all the major waterways
49 then going to be subsurface?

50

1 MR. STEVENSON: There will be a variety
2 of crossing methods and we're still working out which
3 streams will be crossed and which method. Some
4 streams, like right now, for instance, the Yukon, our
5 design is the trenchless method, the HDD or horizontal
6 directional drilling to drill underneath the river and
7 minimize impact there. There's a handful of others
8 where we know that will be the case. Some will be an
9 open cut design or an isolated open cut and our
10 preference is to do as many of those as isolated open
11 cut as we can to minimize the impact and disturbance.

12
13 You go in a lot of these areas where
14 the ice would freeze to the bottom of the river in
15 winter. You could go in winter and trench through. Of
16 course this is done with a lot of assessments of fish
17 habitat. Is it rearing habitat or fish there or not.
18 Obviously if everything is frozen the fish aren't there
19 and you can go through in winter and it's frozen to the
20 bottom and you can trench through and lay down the pipe
21 and recover it. That's the preference. So it would be
22 like an isolated open cut.

23
24 An open cut is similar to that except
25 it's done in summer and trying to -- it would be done
26 for streams where maybe there isn't fish habitat or
27 there's no anadromous fish. Those crossing lists will
28 be evaluated in this process. There will be a variety
29 of techniques that we use and we're going to always try
30 to minimize disturbance where we can and there's a few
31 areas where we'll use a couple of existing bridges and
32 a couple of new bridges where we can hang the pipeline
33 onto the bridge.

34
35 MR. T. BROWER: Now that you're going
36 through the NEPA process and taking comments and you
37 have to do the final project report based on the
38 realignment of this route, is this NEPA trying to catch
39 up with the final report? You've got -- the final
40 project report is already out and it's already in the
41 website from draft to final. So if there's going to be
42 changes based on comments, so what's happened this
43 final report? Will that change and delay six, seven
44 months depending on the final report that's already
45 out?

46
47 MS. SOUTHAM: So by final report, there
48 are a couple things you might be looking at. There's a
49 plan of development. Is that.....
50

1 MR. T. BROWER: Yes.

2

3 MS. SOUTHAM: Okay. So the plan of
4 development is what AGDC is proposing to do and then
5 this SEIS will look at that and evaluate the potential
6 impacts. So what I was saying earlier about the 2012
7 document, there are a lot of things that haven't
8 changed that were fully evaluated or at least in some
9 form evaluated in the 2012 document and have been
10 published. We'll focus really on what's new and
11 different and then kind of reference and summarize what
12 had already been disclosed before in this new document.
13 Does that help? So we're not catching up. I would say
14 we're just starting to evaluate the full new plan of
15 development that's on the website. That will be in the
16 spring 2015 document.

17

18 (Question away from microphone)

19

20 MS. SOUTHAM: Sort of, yeah. I mean
21 the supplemental EIS will be enough of a stand-alone
22 document that you won't have to go back and dig through
23 the 2012 document, but they will be tied together, but
24 the supplemental should provide you with what you need
25 to know in order to make a -- to get a good
26 understanding of the impacts.

27

28 Anyone else.

29

30 (Question away from microphone)

31

32 MS. SOUTHAM: So tonight, because we're
33 still in the beginning of the whole process, I think
34 there will be more information when we come back after
35 the draft has been published in the spring and we'll
36 have information about the results of the analysis and
37 just generally more that will, I think, provide you
38 with additional stuff to comment on. This is really
39 just project design and what the process is for looking
40 at the impacts, so we'll have more in the spring.

41

42 MR. T. BROWER: After all this NEPA
43 process is done and then final issuance of the EIS by
44 Army Corps of Engineers, how quick is the project going
45 to be once the determination is done?

46

47 MR. STEVENSON: What's the timeline?

48

49 MR. T. BROWER: Yeah.

50

1 MR. STEVENSON: Right now, initially,
2 we're expecting first gas by 2020.

3
4 MS. WINALSKI: Dawn Winalski for the
5 record. The North Slope Borough will be submitting
6 written comments before the deadline, but I was just
7 curious, since we're at the scoping phase and there's
8 sort of not as much information as at the draft
9 environmental impact statement phase, are there
10 particular things that would be most helpful to you to
11 put in the scoping comments?

12
13 MS. SOUTHAM: I would say information
14 about alternatives or based on the location of where
15 the line is being proposed and certain engineering
16 aspects of it because at this stage we're deciding what
17 the alternatives are going to be and what we're going
18 to evaluate, so that would be a good suggestion. And
19 then anything in general we always consider, but that's
20 the stage that we're in.

21
22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This probably is
23 going to multiple property owners. Has there been any
24 opposition or support by all property owners of this
25 proposal? I think there's a pretty long list of
26 property owners, even private, corporation, whatnot,
27 you know, municipal governments.

28
29 MR. STEVENSON: The question was
30 there's going to be multiple property owners involved,
31 a combination of.....

32
33 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are multiple
34 property owners.

35
36 MR. STEVENSON: So in regard to the
37 private.....

38
39 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Anything about
40 this, are they opposing or supporting it?

41
42 MR. STEVENSON: The question is in
43 general are the property owners, the private parcels or
44 Native allotments the project crosses, how do they feel
45 about it, are they generally supportive. Maybe you
46 could speak to that.

47
48 MS. SOUTHAM: I'm not sure. I don't
49 know. So at this point all the property owners have
50 been notified if they will be impacted. Right now

1 we're taking those comments and those are being
2 provided to the Corps of Engineers and to us, the
3 supplemental EIS team, to address. I think it's still
4 so early. I'm not sure if we can make a summary
5 statement about general feelings about it, but we have
6 gotten some comments in terms of how people might
7 suggest to refine or move something one way or the
8 other because they are aware of local issues on land
9 somewhere, either on their land or someone else's land.
10 So that's helping to refine the alignment.

11
12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One major interest
13 holder is the State of Alaska, DNR and through the
14 initial phase with this project after the legislation
15 was passed DNR has issued a lease for the right-of-way
16 on state-owned lands, so that's one portion of the
17 project that's already been approved for the right-of-
18 way route itself. We're expecting to get an amendment
19 application to address those micro or macro alignment
20 changes here sometime in the coming month.

21
22 Any other questions or comments.

23
24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The northern
25 section of Coldfoot in an area called Atigun Pass, is
26 this either NEPA or the plan to bore through that
27 mountain other than going over the mountain or what?

28
29 MR. STEVENSON: So as I understood the
30 question is will the route go under or will it follow
31 Atigun Pass, the road. The answer to that is it's
32 going to generally parallel the highway. It will be
33 outside of the existing highway right-of-way, but it
34 will generally parallel it so it would be buried and
35 follow those elevation changes along with the road. It
36 will be a buried line.

37
38 The question whether the line is buried
39 or not, they're curious as to whether it might visually
40 affect wildlife, like caribou, and the answer to that
41 is it would be buried.

42
43 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The reason why I
44 asked the particular area, the Atigun Pass, when they
45 constructed the pipeline, that was the most costliest
46 area of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline due to the height and
47 steepness of that mountain. It goes almost 3,000 feet
48 up and it took a long time to go over that one. The
49 reason why I asked if there was any alternative to bore
50 through that mountain just like you're boring under the

1 major rivers.

2

3 MR. STEVENSON: In terms of horizontal
4 directional drilling, there are some areas, like for
5 instance around Healy, there's a land feature where
6 we're using HDD to go under a land feature, like a
7 really steep slope, but we're limited in terms of the
8 distance. You know, we can cross the Yukon River
9 through HDD, but the type of distance you're talking
10 about to bore through the Brooks Range, I guess it's
11 possible to go through maybe a part of -- maybe the
12 highest elevations of the Brooks Range, that area along
13 Atigun you may be able to. That's an engineering
14 question. I'm not an engineer, but your comment is on
15 record and so I'm sure it will be looked at.

16

17 MS. SOUTHAM: Any more? Anyone else?

18

19 (No comments)

20

21 MS. SOUTHAM: Okay. Well, I think
22 we'll officially close the meeting tonight. Thanks
23 again for coming, everybody. If you do have more
24 questions or comments, please go online -- maybe you
25 could put that website up again -- and submit comments.

26

27 Thanks again and hope you all have a
28 wonderful evening.

29

30 (Off record)

31

32 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 18 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of Barrow Scoping Meeting on October 2, 2014, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

DATE

SALENA A. HILE