

## **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](http://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](http://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 long. 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](http://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 P R O C E E D I N G S

2  
3 (Willow, Alaska - 8/25/2014)

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

6  
7 MR. TRUDGEN: I'd like to welcome you  
8 all and thank you for coming this evening to our  
9 continuing public meetings associated with the Alaska  
10 Stand Alone Pipeline Project, the in-state gasline  
11 project. We certainly appreciate you spending some  
12 time coming out learning about the project. As I said  
13 before, the maps on the wall show differences between  
14 the line that was proposed in 2012 and the line now.  
15 Also some representative drawings of construction  
16 techniques and we'll talk about those.

17  
18 Tonight, what are we going to do, what  
19 are we going to cover this evening. We're going to  
20 cover some introductions and welcome. My name is Dave  
21 Trudgen. I work for ERM Alaska. We're the third-party  
22 contractor that will actually be writing the  
23 supplemental environmental impact statement for this  
24 project. The original EIS written for the in-state  
25 gasline was completed in 2012.

26  
27 Mary Romero is here from the Corps.  
28 They're the lead agency. She is going to introduce  
29 herself, tell you what the Corps' responsibilities are  
30 and some other folks that we have in the room as well.

31  
32 We're going to look at the differences  
33 between this project and another one, which I'm sure  
34 you've heard about, which is the Alaska LNG Project.  
35 We're going to look at where we are in the NEPA process  
36 for the supplemental EIS, we're going to see why it's  
37 needed in the first place, we're going to look at the  
38 current project description and some of the old versus  
39 new routes. We're going to then go over this scoping  
40 meeting, what we do with the comments, how it fits into  
41 the NEPA process and then some schedules and next  
42 steps.

43  
44 So with that actually I'd like to  
45 introduce you to Mary Romero from the Corps and she'll  
46 give you the Corps' perspective on what's going to  
47 happen.

48  
49 MS. ROMERO: Thank you, Dave. My name  
50 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](http://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

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.

9

10

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?

14

15

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?

22

23

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.

39

40

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.

49

50

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 [asapecs.com](http://asapecs.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](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://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