

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING FOR THE
ALASKA PIPELINE PROJECT

Inupiat Heritage Center
Barrow, Alaska
February 6th, 2012
7:05 p.m.

1

2 DAVE SWEARINGEN: Well, good evening and
3 welcome. My name is Dave Swearingen and I'm on
4 staff for the Federal Energy Regulatory
5 Commission, or FERC. To my right is John
6 Peconom, also on staff with the FERC. Also here
7 with me tonight is Mike Boyle and Ellen Saint
8 Onge. Rob McWhorter's at the table at the back.
9 He's with Argonne National Labs, that's a
10 contract group that's helping us prepare the
11 environmental impact statement.

12 To my left there's a court reporter
13 and she's going to be taking a transcript of the
14 meeting so it will entered into the public
15 record.

16 So let the record show that the
17 Barrow scoping meeting began at 7:05 p.m. on
18 February 6th, 2012.

19 The purpose of this meeting is to
20 give you the opportunity to provide environmental
21 comments specifically on the Alaska Pipeline
22 Project. The Alaska Pipeline Project is being
23 advanced jointly by TransCanada Alaska Company
24 and ExxonMobil Alaska which I'll often refer to
25 as the project proponents. TransCanada and

1 ExxonMobil jointly entered in the FERC prefiling
2 process on May 1st, 2009, to which we began our
3 review of the facilities that we refer to as the
4 Alaska Pipeline Project.

5 The FERC is being assisted in our
6 environmental review by our contractor, Argonne
7 National Labs as well as a number of federal and
8 state agencies working with us in cooperation,
9 namely the office of the Federal Coordinator. We
10 have representatives here from that office here
11 tonight. The U.S. Bureau of Land Management. We
12 have Ralph Eluska who's with the Alaska Native
13 Claims Settlement Act liaison and is also
14 assisting us as adviser on Native issues. Also
15 with the BLM is Earl Williams who is the Alaska
16 Gasline project manager. Other cooperating
17 agencies include the U.S. Army Corps of
18 Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wild Life Service, U.S.
19 Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S.
20 Department of Transportation's Pipeline and
21 Hazardous Material Safety Administration, the
22 U.S. Geological Survey, the U.S. Coast Guardian,
23 Eilson Air Force Base and Alaska State Pipeline
24 Coordinator's office.

25 The project would involve conduction

1 and operation of a new pipeline system to
2 transport up to 4.5 billion cubic feet of natural
3 gas per day from Point Thomson to Prudhoe Bay and
4 then down to the Alaska/Yukon border. At the
5 border the pipeline will interconnect to new
6 pipeline in Canada to deliver gas to North
7 American markets in the Lower 48. There'd also
8 be a number of compressor stations, in-state
9 delivery points and various other facilities.
10 The project also consists of associated
11 infrastructure such as access roads, helipads,
12 construction camps, pipe storage yards,
13 contracting yards, borrow areas and stuff like
14 that. Also there will be some dock modification
15 and dredging at Prudhoe Bay.

16 In a few moments I'll ask a
17 representative from TransCanada to take the floor
18 to present a more detailed project description.
19 He'll also be able to answer some of your
20 questions. And you can catch him in the back of
21 the room for more one-on-one talking after the
22 formal part of the meeting is over.

23 Right now I'm going to talk a little
24 bit about a FERC scoping process and public
25 involvement with the project. The main FERC

1 docket number for the Alaska Pipeline Project is
2 PF09-11. The PF means that we're in the
3 pre-filing stage of the process. Once the
4 proponents file a formal application, a new
5 docket number will be assigned.

6 The National Environmental Policy Act
7 or NEPA requires that the FERC commission take
8 into account the environmental impacts associated
9 with new natural gas facilities. Scoping is the
10 general term that we use for soliciting input
11 from the public before the environmental analysis
12 is completed. The idea is to get information
13 from the public, Alaska Native groups, agencies,
14 organizations and anybody else who's interested
15 so we can incorporate issues of your concern into
16 our environmental analysis.

17 The scoping period started last
18 August when we issued our notice of intent to
19 prepare an environmental impact statement for the
20 Alaska Pipeline Project, what we'll be calling
21 NOI. In that NOI we described the environmental
22 review process and also some already identified
23 environmental issues that we know that are of
24 concern.

25 If you didn't receive a copy of the

1 NOI and you're afraid that you're not on our
2 mailing list, you can add your name to our
3 mailing list at that sign-in table.

4 We have an ending date of February
5 27th, 2012, for this scoping period. However,
6 the end of the scoping period is not the end of
7 public involvement for this project. There'll be
8 a comment period including additional public
9 meetings once we issue the draft environmental
10 impact statement.

11 An important step in the
12 environmental review process and the preparation
13 of an EIS is to determine which environmental
14 resource issues are most important to you. Your
15 comments and concerns, along with those of other
16 people and agencies participating in the process,
17 will be used to focus on environmental analysis.
18 Your comments tonight together with any written
19 comments that you have already sent or may intend
20 to send will be added to the record as comments
21 on the environmental proceedings. Last month the
22 project proponents filed draft environmental
23 resource reports which contained information on
24 which the public may wish to comment.

25 Because the project sponsors are

1 still developing the FERC application, your
2 comments will also help the company address all
3 the issues and potential impacts. After
4 receiving a copy of the application, if we
5 consider it complete, the FERC staff will prepare
6 our independent analysis of the project's
7 potential impacts. We'll publish those findings
8 in the draft EIS which will be mailed out to all
9 the people on the environmental mailing list.
10 And as I mentioned before, we publicly noticed
11 for additional comment meetings. We will then
12 continue our analysis and incorporate the public
13 comments into a final EIS which will also be
14 mailed to all interested parties.

15 Now our mailing list for this project
16 is over 2,000 names. That includes people,
17 Native organizations -- Native groups or
18 organizations, agencies and such. So that means
19 that what we've decided to do is send out copies
20 of the EIS on a CD. So if you go out to your
21 mailbox and you open it up, there'll be a CD of
22 it. Now you can opt to get a paper copy if you
23 want, but we need to know that. So if you
24 haven't already signed the check box on the NOI
25 that you received, you can let us know in the

1 back of the room by putting your name down that
2 you would prefer a paper copy, otherwise you'll
3 be getting a CD copy.

4 Now I need to differentiate between
5 the roles of the FERC environmental staff, that's
6 me and my team, and what the FERC commission
7 does. The Commission is responsible for making a
8 determination on whether to issue the project
9 proponents a certificate of public convenience
10 and necessity, otherwise known as approving the
11 project. So the Commission will decide whether
12 or not to approve the project. The FERC
13 environmental staff and the EIS does not make
14 that decision.

15 What the EIS does is it describes the
16 environmental impacts, it describes the project
17 facilities, alternatives to the project,
18 mitigation to avoid or reduce impacts, and the
19 staff's conclusions and recommendations. So then
20 the EIS is used to advise our Commission and to
21 disclose to the public the environmental impact
22 of constructing and operating a proposed project.
23 The Commission will consider the environmental
24 information from the EIS, public comments, as
25 well as a host of non-environmental issues such

1 as engineering, markets, rates, tariffs, finances
2 and design and cost in making an informed
3 decision on whether or not to approve the Alaska
4 Pipeline Project.

5 Now this particular project is unique
6 in that it was addressed by Congress in the
7 Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act of 2004,
8 otherwise known as ANGPA. The objective of that
9 Act was to facilitate the timely development of
10 an Alaska natural gas transportation project to
11 bring Alaska natural gas to markets in both
12 Alaska and the Lower 48 states. That legislation
13 designates to FERC as the lead federal agency for
14 purposes of complying with NEPA and specifies
15 that all federal agencies that have a permitting
16 role in the project use this single EIS to meet
17 the required environmental reviews.

18 Are there any questions about the
19 FERC scoping process or the FERC role in these
20 proceedings? I'll be glad to answer any
21 questions you have about what I just brought up.

22 You'll notice there's kind of a
23 schematic of a time line over there to the side
24 of the room. After the meeting I'll be glad to
25 walk you through that and discuss where we are in

1 the process and where we're going. So I'll be
2 glad to do that after the formal part of the
3 meeting's over.

4 Okay. The next thing on the agenda
5 is a project overview by TransCanada. So I think
6 Myron Fedak with TransCanada's going to come up
7 and talk a bit more about the project.

8 MYRON FEDAK: Unless I changed companies,
9 I actually work for ExxonMobil.

10 Does everybody have the slide
11 presentation in hand? If not, there are extra
12 copies up there. Wanted to leave you a little
13 something here.

14 Again, my name is Myron Fedak, I'm
15 the environment, regulatory and land manager for
16 the Alaska Pipeline Project. I head up our
17 Anchorage office. And I've been asked in a very
18 short time frame to give you a high level
19 overview of the various parts that we call the
20 Alaska Pipeline Project. And we use this
21 presentation to give you a little bit of a tour.

22 On page 2 most of these points have
23 been already provided by FERC staff. APP -- this
24 is a joint undertaking between TransCanada and
25 ExxonMobil. The project's goal is to get gas to

1 the Lower 48 via pipeline system that connects to
2 existing facilities in Alberta, Canada, that
3 continue to flow on down to the Lower 48.

4 FERC is our lead agency. They have
5 the permit that will allow the project to move
6 forward. This project is also moving forward
7 under the Alaska Gasline Inducement Act, AGIA in
8 the state of Alaska.

9 So let me walk you through the key
10 components. On slide 3 is a one page overview of
11 the three key project components. And I'll go
12 over all three of those components on the next
13 set of slides.

14 We begin with the Point Thomson gas
15 transmission line. It is approximately 58 miles
16 long. And it'll take raw gas coming out of the
17 Point Thomson Unit and bring it to a brand new
18 gas treatment plant that we intend to build on
19 Prudhoe Bay Unit lands. So the gas treatment
20 plant takes the gas from Point Thomson Unit and
21 gas from the Prudhoe Bay Unit and treats it to
22 sales-quality natural gas. Once the gas
23 treatment plant cleans up, compresses the gas, it
24 goes into an Alaska mainline approximately
25 1,700 miles long to get to Alberta. 745 miles of

1 that are in the state of Alaska. There are 19
2 total compressor stations and eight of those are
3 in our state. Consistent with our AGIA
4 commitment, we have committed to install a
5 minimum of five in-state natural gas delivery
6 points from which other distributors could take
7 the gas.

8 At the bottom, trying to give you a
9 bit of a perspective, wanted to provide -- when
10 we say total land affected, it's land that we
11 would physically touch in one way, shape, form or
12 another. And during construction when we need
13 extra space for storage yards or construction
14 camps, temporary access roads and other
15 facilities, we will approximately touch
16 32,000 acres in the state of Alaska. Once
17 construction is complete and we begin operations
18 then we'll only -- we'll let two-thirds of it go
19 back to prior uses.

20 So let me walk through the individual
21 components beginning on slide 4. As I said, the
22 Point Thomson gas pipeline hugs the coast. Goes
23 from the east to the west, approximately
24 58 miles. It'll handle over one billion standard
25 cubic feet a day of raw gas coming out of Point

1 Thomson at a pressure of 1,130 pounds per square
2 inch. Nominal wall thickness of that steel is
3 over a third of inch. And it'll be thicker in
4 certain spots. And because we are a buried
5 pipeline because of permafrost tundra issues,
6 that natural gas will be cooled so the
7 temperature is below freezing before entering the
8 pipeline.

9 So that gas, along with Prudhoe Bay
10 gas, goes to the gas treatment plant. And an
11 overview of that is on slide 5. The map on the
12 left is color coded so that what you see in
13 yellow are existing Prudhoe Bay Unit facilities.
14 What you see in orange are the new facilities
15 that we would intend to build. So you see at the
16 bottom left, that's a gas treatment plant.
17 There's some new access roads that need to be
18 built. And then in red are existing facilities
19 that'll have modifications made. So certain
20 roads will be widened and other facilities will
21 be made larger.

22 The gas treatment plant between --
23 gas flowing from Point Thomson and gas flowing
24 from Prudhoe Bay will be able to handle over
25 five billion standard cubic feet a day of raw gas

1 and then treat it to approximately 4.5 billion
2 standard cubic feet a day of sale-quality gas.
3 And it'll recompress it to 2,500-pounds per
4 square inch. A very high pressure to help move
5 that amount of gas forward.

6 The small subtext there give you a
7 very high level perspective of what the gas plant
8 does. In simple terms it removes the impurities,
9 pulls out the extra water, takes the pressure and
10 brings it up to 2,500, chills the gas again so
11 that we keep it cold going into the ground. And
12 there is a significant amount of carbon dioxide,
13 CO₂, that'll be pulled out of the gas and sent
14 back to the producers for reinjection.

15 It's a fairly large plant. About
16 one million total horsepower installed. Almost
17 all of it is powered by natural gas. That's why
18 we see up to over five billion a day coming in
19 and 4.5 billion going out.

20 The construction of the gas treatment
21 plant will be very similar to the large Prudhoe
22 Bay facilities with the modules coming in on
23 barges. And given the size of these modules,
24 which will be the biggest ones ever brought into
25 the Slope, we're going to need to make

1 improvements to the West Dock on Dock Head 2.
2 We're also going to have to do some amount of
3 dredging to bring in bigger barges and bigger
4 modules.

5 Slide 6 gives you a picture on the
6 left of existing Prudhoe Bay facilities. The
7 central compressor plant's in the foreground, the
8 central gas facility in the background. On the
9 right-hand side is a computer-generated picture
10 of what our facilities are envisioned to look
11 like. And when it is all built out it'll look
12 very similar to the facilities you see on the
13 left.

14 So the gas treatment plant will treat
15 the gas and put it into a long pipeline. So on
16 slide 7 on one page you've got a -- also a map
17 here, it shows the route from the GTP to the
18 Canadian border. 745 miles of a four-foot
19 diameter pipeline. It'll be almost completely
20 buried. It'll pop above the ground in a few
21 spots. We've identified certain faults and we're
22 actively considering one or two aerial crossings
23 of certain rivers.

24 Similar to Point Thomson, the natural
25 gas will be cooled. The operating pressure is

1 2,500 psi, fairly high. And you'll see on this
2 page the minimum wall thickness is almost one
3 inch thick steel because of the high pressures.
4 The route follows TAPS and roadway systems for
5 the most part. So it stays close to existing
6 infrastructure. Above ground we will have meter
7 stations and install major block valves
8 approximately 20 miles apart. The other
9 facilities and the compressor station which I'll
10 talk about on the next slide will be
11 approximately 90 miles apart. As I said, the
12 five offtake points will be decided by the State
13 and by the producers.

14 On slide 8, as the gas goes down the
15 pipeline, it loses pressure and then it gets
16 warmer. And so the compressor stations are meant
17 to decompress the gas back up to 2,500 and cool
18 discharged gas down so it drops its temperature
19 below freezing.

20 We'll have eight stations. Each site
21 will be about 25 acres per site. Approximately
22 45,000 horsepower of gas turbine compression at
23 each of these stations. Six stations will have
24 just one big turbine running compressors. And on
25 the bottom right you have a picture of an actual

1 compressor station that TransCanada is running to
2 northern Alberta. And up at the top you see
3 again, a computer rendering of what that station
4 will look like the way we have it currently
5 designed.

6 Two of the stations will have
7 multiple turbines. And, again, that's just to
8 provide operating flexibility and to keep the
9 pipeline flowing gas under the larger sets of
10 conditions. What you don't see in the picture
11 below, but you see up at the top, are something
12 called gas aerial coolers. So we'll be using
13 those to cool the gas back down below 32. We'll
14 have on-site power generation using natural gas
15 as a fuel source. The system is being designed
16 for remote operation. The compressor stations
17 will be operated by a central control facility in
18 another location. But we are installing limited
19 permanent living quarters on the site.

20 On slide 9, gives a project schedule.
21 We've been using that since 2008 and meeting all
22 of our deadlines. And the next major deadline
23 for us is to file our certificate of public
24 convenience and necessity with FERC in October of
25 this year. In terms of timing beyond that and

1 the timing at the start of construction, that's
2 dependent on a large number of decisions
3 including the regulatory approvals, commercial
4 support for this project by the natural gas
5 shippers. And in the end the project sponsors
6 will have to approve spending tens of billions of
7 dollars.

8 So to wrap up on slide 10, I want to
9 thank you for coming to this scoping session. As
10 FERC staff has stated, you have multiple ways of
11 providing comments including their comment sheet
12 which they made available. And this is our Web
13 site so there's an opportunity to pick up even
14 more information.

15 And at the end of the hearing -- we
16 have brought our current routing for the pipeline
17 system. So if you'd like to chat with us about
18 that, please come by. Thank you.

19 DAVE SWEARINGEN: Okay. Thank you, Myron.

20 Like Myron said, after our meeting
21 here is adjourned you can go back to the back and
22 look at the maps and talk with the project
23 proponents, if you have any specific project
24 related questions, he'll be glad to help you out.

25 Okay. Now we move to the part of the

1 meeting when we'll hear comments from audience
2 members. As I said before, we're in the scoping
3 period right now so if you want to speak tonight
4 and leave your comments, that's great. That's
5 why we're here. If you'd rather write them down,
6 there's a sheet of paper in the back, you can
7 write your comments down. You can file them with
8 the FERC either electronically or through the
9 mail. There's various ways for you to get
10 comments to us. So if you go home tonight and
11 you think, oh, man, I forgot to give my comment
12 or I changed my mind, I have something else to
13 say, don't worry about it. You can file them
14 tomorrow or the next week. So we're still in the
15 scoping period until February 27th.

16 So with that, we actually have one
17 person who signed up to give comments tonight.
18 So I'm going to call her up. And then after
19 she's done, anybody else who feels like they want
20 to say something or let me know about your
21 environmental concerns, that's when you can have
22 the opportunity to come up as well.

23 As I said the meeting's being
24 recorded by a court reporter. So what I would
25 ask when you come is to state your name clearly

1 and also spell it for the record. And if you're
2 representing a particular group or agency that
3 you also would let us know that as well.

4 Okay. Rosemary, you're up.

5 ROSEMARY AHTUANGARUAK: I want to thank
6 everyone for giving us a chance to comment. It's
7 really important that we get the federal agencies
8 involved in this process. We have a lot of
9 concerns. As Native people we went through a
10 tremendous amount of change getting TAPS in
11 place.

12 DAVE SWEARINGEN: Can we get your name for
13 the record?

14 ROSEMARY AHTUANGARUAK: Rosemary
15 Ahtuanguak, A-H-T-U-A-N-G-A-R-U-A-K.

16 We expressed a lot of our concerns
17 related to the TAPS and the haul roads. And the
18 comments that were given to give us protection of
19 our traditional and cultural uses were not
20 honored with expanding the usage of the TAPS to
21 other uses. With those activities, the increase
22 in activities were causing increase disruption to
23 already disrupted migratory patterns. I'm very
24 concerned with the efforts to put the pipeline
25 near the coastline. That's a long distance. As

1 Native people when we're out doing our summer
2 activities, the coastline is very important, that
3 biological diversity in that coastline is
4 important for sustainability of the ecosystem.
5 And if you disrupt that near-shore environment of
6 the coastline there's a lot more damage that
7 occurs. We've seen that with existing oil and
8 gas infrastructure.

9 We've got deflections that have
10 increased with additional activities disrupting
11 caribou migrations with the Teshekpuk Herd, the
12 Central Herd and the Porcupine Herd. In Nuiqsut
13 we used to see all three herds go through the
14 community, but now that's already changes.
15 Increasing activities along the Dalton caused
16 disruption of the Teshekpuk Herd, they had gone
17 across all the way through to Canada. And with
18 those disruptions those animals did not get back
19 across the Dalton Highway. With the increased
20 activity that was associated with multiple
21 projects on the Dalton Highway those disruptions
22 affected our hunting.

23 We also have other activities that
24 are associated with this, with the research and
25 monitoring, that cause a lot of impacts also. We

1 have no control over your efforts to do research
2 and monitoring but if you're doing them during
3 our shortened seasons of approved harvesting,
4 such as during our moose hunting seasons, you can
5 cause a tremendous amount of impacts. We had to
6 deal with plans to build additional roads and
7 infrastructure and previous development
8 activities that disrupted our harvesting from the
9 animals that used to come from the east.

10 With these activities there's all
11 sorts of other things that happen. With
12 increased activity on the road you're causing a
13 lot of dust. And there have been areas that were
14 upgraded. But some of your routing efforts are
15 very concerning because it doesn't stay near the
16 road or existing infrastructure -- efforts were
17 within 15 miles or more on some of the mapping
18 that I saw with other activities associated with
19 this pipeline. It's really important to try to
20 keep those impacts to a minimum. Us Native
21 people, what are we supposed to understand with
22 the needs to go through the right-of-way? Which
23 right-of-way is it going to be, the Dalton
24 Highway right-of-way, the TAPS right-of-way and
25 now the natural gas right-of-way. With those

1 increased distances that could be a tremendous
2 amount of area that we're restricted from in
3 those processes.

4 With your processes you have
5 restrictions that occur with your regulations.
6 We've been told by your -- your
7 industries/companies that come in and say that
8 they're going to do these activities, that
9 they're not going to cause us restrictions. But
10 we already see with your efforts to -- some of
11 your mapping that there's a lot of cumulative
12 effects that are associated with this process.
13 It's not well understood what those cumulative
14 effects are going to be.

15 We've expressed tremendous concern
16 with the increase of emissions into the air that
17 respiratory illnesses have increased. In Nuiqsut
18 I saw it myself with the amount of people that
19 are having to use inhalers to help them breathe.
20 We ask for a lot of help in trying to restrict in
21 some of the flaring of the gas and some of the
22 emissions associated with oil and gas industry,
23 but still we see vehicles running 24 hours a day
24 with these developments. So you got emissions
25 from the vehicles, you got emissions from your

1 infrastructure, you got emissions from the
2 development of the process. All these things
3 lead to cumulative effects of our people.

4 And when you have the cost of having
5 to take the families out of the community to go
6 and get health care, that's a lot of cost on the
7 community. And those kinds of things need to be
8 understood in this process because you cannot
9 allow exemptions to occur, we cannot allow the
10 piecemeal process of the development to allow
11 emissions to exceed health safety standards
12 within these development processes.

13 Heath standards are important for us
14 for the continuous process throughout our
15 generations because we keep coming to these
16 meetings in hopes that not all of your children
17 will need to use inhalers. Some of my
18 grandchildren are already using inhalers. Two of
19 my kids have to use inhalers. These are
20 tremendous concerns. I have one young son -- one
21 grandson that's not able to come up because he
22 has severe respiratory illness and the doctors
23 say coming up to the North Slope may be a factor.
24 Those should not be allowed to occur. We've had
25 other children that have had restriction in this

1 process.

2 When you're dealing with the amount
3 of activities that you're talking about here you
4 have to really break it down into a process that
5 allows us to really assess what's going on with
6 this process because the cumulative process is
7 not well understood. We have to go through many
8 other studies to try to identify what some of
9 those cumulative effects are because it's not
10 well understood or accepted. But we have talked
11 tremendously about how this is important to us.

12 We've got impacts onshore, we've got
13 impacts offshore and yet your process has gone
14 into a process where your -- what's the word I'm
15 looking for? You're dealing with the compounding
16 of the activities at Point Thomson. You're
17 bringing in cumulative effects from near shore
18 activities, offshore activities coming into Point
19 Thomson, you're deal with the expanding
20 activities of the Point Thomson side expanding
21 itself, and you're dealing with getting the
22 pipeline into Prudhoe Bay. Those are all sorts
23 of impacts.

24 Noise associated with those things
25 can really be a detrimental process for our

1 traditional whaling activities. And
2 understanding what those impacts are and
3 restricting those activities are very important
4 to support our whaling activities.

5 Activities with placement of gravel
6 can affect technology and impacts to our fishing.
7 We never got the support to go and make the
8 corrections that are necessary along the Dalton
9 that are causing impacts. And industry gets to
10 decide whether or not there are corrections that
11 are made. If you're not doing adequate
12 assessments with whether or not it should even be
13 a culvert or the right size of a culvert, or
14 whether or not there should be fish passages or
15 whether or not there should be causeways. Those
16 kinds of questions need to be well understood
17 because our communities go without our foods when
18 those things are not well understood and when
19 they're not enforced to be maintained in your
20 mitigating measures.

21 Without making sure that you're
22 putting words on paper that are going to be
23 enforced, then we're suffering the consequences,
24 and we have to keep coming to meetings over and
25 over and over say there's a problem with our

1 fishing, there's a problem with our caribou
2 huntings, there's a problem with our whaling.
3 And it shouldn't have to be upon our shoulders
4 when we're continuing our traditional cultural
5 uses in our traditional and cultural ways with
6 our hopes of feeding our families into the future
7 generations. These kinds of things have caused
8 tremendous -- a lot of concern and we continue to
9 come and present these concerns.

10 We're very concerned with the efforts
11 to build your additional facilities. 25 acres,
12 that's a lot of acreage. We already have a
13 tremendous amount of activity changing our North
14 Slope with the expansion of the foothills, we've
15 got expansion into the -- along the Dalton
16 Highway up through Franklin Bluffs. We've got a
17 lot of activity up through Umiat in efforts to
18 get the roads to resources. And yet when we say
19 in our meetings that we don't support this kind
20 of activity because it's going to impact the
21 migratory routes, yet we're still facing these
22 continuous repeated efforts to develop this
23 process.

24 So I hope that we're not just coming
25 to these meetings on dead ears and continuing to

1 express concerns because we have a lot of issues
2 that have already impacted our traditional and
3 cultural ways. We have a lot of issues that have
4 expressed concerns related to these things. But
5 we need the support to get some enforcement to
6 the mitigating measures. We need to have this
7 process done not on the guise of industry's best
8 practices because industry can decide whether or
9 not it's best practices when you're deciding if
10 you're at the table for the profitability of
11 company or if you're at the table for the welfare
12 of the community and our traditional and cultural
13 uses and the sustainability of our lives in our
14 traditional areas, being able to feed our
15 families with the foods that our grandparents
16 taught us how to eat.

17 We've already seen changes in Nuiqsut
18 with multiple species being impacted with these
19 activities. And we've seen impacts across the
20 North Slope with these concerns. And we're
21 hoping that we're going to get a process that's
22 not just controlled by industry deciding whether
23 or not it's profitability in this process because
24 we have longevity of trying to maintain our
25 communities. We can't afford the cost of a lot

1 of these foods that come up the Dalton Highway.
2 They may be a little bit cheaper in Nuiqsut but
3 they're still very expensive here in Barrow. And
4 they're definitely a heck of a lot more expensive
5 the further inland you go. And these costs are
6 astronomical.

7 It's very important that we get the
8 access points so that communities that can get
9 the access on the North Slope need to have that
10 access because we -- the cost of living in these
11 villages are very difficult. And we've already
12 had a lot of out-migration that has occurred. If
13 we're going to keep our survivability of our
14 communities we need to decrease the cost.

15 The development should not be allowed
16 to go with natural gas consumption. It should be
17 done in a way that the development has utilizing
18 renewable resources for the energy development of
19 this, not just the planning and development of
20 these facilities with the consumption of the gas.
21 We've already seen that on the Dalton with the
22 pipeline and the various pump stations that you
23 have and lack of upgrading them to decrease the
24 amount of consumptions that's going on with these
25 facilities.

1 We have newer technologies that can
2 decrease the amount of consumptions that's
3 occurring with these things. But if we let
4 industry decide how it's going to be, it's their
5 gas that they're going to get paid off in the
6 process to help with their development of this
7 process, and they benefit from it. But we know
8 that there's lots of technologies that can be
9 incorporated into the design of these facilities
10 that do not allow just the consumption of the
11 gas. You can be using winds, solar, water in
12 different ways and reduce the amount of
13 consumption at these facilities and make the
14 emissions less for our communities.

15 We hope that the process goes on in a
16 good way. We're very concerned. We worked on
17 this process for generations and generations.
18 You know our grandchildren are now coming to
19 these meetings in this process and yet the issues
20 that our Elders presented from these first
21 processes have still never been addressed. So we
22 hope we get the support to address these concerns
23 because we've brought tremendous amount of
24 concerns in this process.

25 Now I have to ask questions that came

1 up. Within the process that the FERC's process
2 could achieve consensus in route planning in
3 issue, identification and resolution at the
4 earliest possible point before the filing of the
5 application. This has to do with your ideas for
6 better state corridor involvement in the
7 interstate natural gas pipelines planning. But
8 if you're going to be doing this, what steps is
9 FERC taking to achieve this consensus?

10 DAVE SWEARINGEN: Okay. What you've
11 described there at the last was part of our
12 pre-filing process which started in 2009. And
13 what happens is that a company will come and
14 they'll say, well, we want to build a pipeline
15 from point A to point B, but they won't exactly
16 have the exact route mapped out at that time.
17 What the pre-filing process does is during -- the
18 companies, they have open houses and, you know,
19 the FERC attends those open houses as well. And
20 the company receives feedback from the
21 communities, either agencies, landowners,
22 organization, Native groups about the routing of
23 the pipeline. And then they take that
24 information in order to refine where that route's
25 going to go.

1 And the company is actually still
2 doing that. They're not planning on filing an
3 application until later this year. So right now
4 they're in kind of the middle stages of getting
5 where the exact location of the route.

6 Now they might know in general where
7 the route's going to go. But if you're talking
8 about, you know, feet or, your know, this
9 particular land, exactly this direction here or
10 maybe they can shift it over a little bit and go
11 on this part. That's what they're talking about
12 refining the route. They can only do that well
13 if they get feedback from the various people that
14 are involved.

15 So that's what -- they came out last
16 year and had open-house meetings and they hope to
17 get that kind of input to help them develop that
18 route.

19 ROSEMARY AHTUANGARUAK: So what steps does
20 FERC take to help achieve the consensus? If the
21 stakeholders are in conflict with the routing,
22 what steps do you take?

23 DAVE SWEARINGEN: Well, what we do is we
24 take a look and when the company files an
25 application they say, okay, we've decided this is

1 where the route's going to go. Well, we don't
2 just rubber stamp that. We have what we call an
3 alternatives analysis. So we can look at
4 alternate ways. Either alternate sites for
5 facility locations, alternate routes, alternate
6 ways to build the project or decide the project.
7 And those are basically resource driven and
8 comment driven.

9 So if the company comes in and does a
10 route and nobody -- you know, doesn't seem to be
11 any issues with it, we do the -- we take a look
12 at environmental impacts and disclose those. If
13 somebody comes and says, you know, I have a real
14 issue with this portion of the route, we don't
15 think that's the best way, we say, okay, what's
16 an alternative of that? And then we do a
17 side-by-side comparison of the alternative versus
18 the proposed route. And then we'll decide
19 whether or not we're going to recommend that the
20 proposed route be authorized or if we think that
21 the alternative is actually better. We may
22 recommend that the alternative route be the one
23 for authorization.

24 We do that in consultation with
25 agencies and, you know, meetings such as this.

1 This is one of the purposes of these meetings is
2 to get that type of information.

3 ROSEMARY AHTUANGARUAK: Pipeline companies
4 have the most current and accurate information
5 about a proposed site. And take this into
6 consideration -- take into consideration the
7 comments of these. Will the stakeholders have
8 some of these basic information?

9 DAVE SWEARINGEN: Well, the stakeholders
10 should have -- I mean, the stakeholders should've
11 been approached by the company. I mean, they're
12 talking about -- especially if the stakeholder is
13 a landowner. If the landowner -- the company has
14 to get permission from the landowner before they
15 can go onto the land and do surveys. And then if
16 they have to get an easement, that's a
17 negotiation between the company and the
18 landowner. If it's state land, then they have to
19 talk with the state agency. If it's federal
20 land, it's the federal agency. If it's, you
21 know, corporation land, then it would be with the
22 people that are leading that corporation.

23 So the people -- part of what the
24 open-houses do, as well as these meetings here,
25 is that let's say you don't own the land but

1 you're in the community. Well, that involves
2 people from the community come out and have their
3 say as well. So, you know, that's the way that
4 we try to hit, you know, as wide a net as we can
5 with, you know, our meetings and also the
6 company. It's in their best interest to cast
7 that net wide to get as many people involved so
8 that when they file an application if all -- you
9 know, if most of the issues have been addressed
10 on the front end, that's less issues they have to
11 worry about on the back end and that's good for
12 everybody.

13 ROSEMARY AHTUANGARUAK: It's very
14 important that this process is crystal clear and
15 that the information that is being used to guide
16 the decision-making process is available to those
17 that are living with the decisions that are being
18 made.

19 DAVE SWEARINGEN: I agree.

20 ROSEMARY AHTUANGARUAK: FERC receives not
21 only the comments from stakeholders as part of
22 the pre-filing process but also statements from
23 the pipeline companies as to what steps they have
24 taken to seek a resolution on issues raised.
25 This information should be readily accessible to

1 the public for review and comment.

2 DAVE SWEARINGEN: That's true. When we
3 have these meetings or when we ask the company
4 for information, we put that into the public
5 record. And their responses are also in the
6 public record. So that's where that docket
7 number comes in. That docket number will
8 actually enable anybody to go into the FERC Web
9 site and view or download the information that's
10 on the public record.

11 Now some information is filed
12 privileged so you can't view it from the Web
13 site, but you can see that it's there, that the
14 information is in our hands even if you can't see
15 it. But most of the information is made
16 available to the public. There's just some
17 information that's not. And even if that
18 information that's not available to the public,
19 if it's directly related to you and your
20 concerns, you can, you know, talk to the company
21 and have them provide that directly to you.

22 ROSEMARY AHTUANGARUAK: There is going to
23 be cumulative impacts with the OCS development
24 and Point Thomson on the North Slope. It's very
25 important that the local people that are going to

1 be living through the changes that are going to
2 come through this project, especially Nuiqsut and
3 Kaktovik, are involved in the process and that
4 their concerns are adequately addressed. It's
5 very important for our villages to do their
6 whaling season because it's a very different
7 person that comes to the table when you're
8 feeding your village for a year first than it is
9 when you're taking the decision makers to the
10 table that have profitability on their
11 decision-making process. And we've gone through
12 impacts before in Nuiqsut. And the process was
13 very bad. When you -- if you want to disrupt the
14 social life of a community, you impact their
15 ways. And these processes that are coming before
16 us have the risks for impacting whaling, and
17 those are very concerning. There's a lot of
18 activity associated with this. And we're hoping
19 that you really listen to our leaders in these
20 processes with the whalers in these communities
21 that prevent continued impacts and to prevent
22 disruption of our traditional and cultural uses.

23 The health impacts for disrupting
24 traditional and cultural foods is not well
25 understood. But the health costs of obesity,

1 hypertension and heart disease are increasing.
2 And those are well known throughout the Lower 48
3 of what it costs. And it's not something that
4 we're going to be able to deal with up here. But
5 we're already seeing an increase in these health
6 concerns.

7 The existing health impact assessment
8 and what's being proposed by the State is very
9 bad. That health impact assessment is a very
10 weak process that's only going to say that, yeah,
11 there's a little bit of impact. It's not going
12 to say what are the impacts from this process.
13 We don't have the databases to look at the
14 information. We haven't had the stability of
15 staffing to give us a good look at this
16 information.

17 So it's going to be very important
18 that we do a good process, not just look at the
19 existing databases. Because what the State is
20 proposing is a devastation to the health of the
21 North Slope. If we don't support -- if we don't
22 get support for the North Slope Borough's health
23 impact assessment you're really doing a bad
24 process. And I hope to God nothing comes up --
25 what the State is going to put forward.

1 And you take a better look at what
2 the real health impacts are because we can't deal
3 with having to have respiratory illnesses where
4 we're putting babies on ventilators and having to
5 deal with those costs of having those babies come
6 home to the Arctic where we have no resources, no
7 respiratory health care, we've got very limited
8 ability to even do nebulizer treatments in the
9 villages. You have tremendous costs when you
10 take the families out for the amount of time.
11 And the repetitive process that it causes for
12 that child for the rest of their life. We saw
13 that in Nuiqsut before. We had 20 babies
14 medevaced out. Ten of them were put on
15 ventilators. Never looked at what's the
16 difference between all the North Slope villages
17 when we're having cases throughout the North
18 Slope. The biggest difference was Nuiqsut was
19 the closest to Prudhoe Bay. Kuparuk, Alpine and
20 all of the other infrastructures that is already
21 existent on the North Slope.

22 So we hope that there's some better
23 processes that are looking at the real cost
24 because we're going to see it as we already are
25 seeing it. We've got a tremendous amount of

1 documentation now that show we have a severe
2 amount of COPD on the North Slope. And we have a
3 lot of information that's going to be developed,
4 but it's not in the depth that's going to give us
5 the good information because we never had the
6 data points in them -- in our health care system
7 to really give us a good look at what the health
8 effects are.

9 And we need to get the hospital and
10 up and running to give us a better process
11 because that new hospital is going to make a
12 difference in what we have for resources if we
13 can get the adequate staffing that's going to be
14 needed for it.

15 Thank you.

16 DAVE SWEARINGEN: Thank you, Rosemary.
17 Appreciate it. I'm glad you came out and
18 provided those comments. You mentioned the
19 villages of Nuiqsut and Kaktovik. We're actually
20 going there this week and I hope we have a good
21 turnout. If you know anybody up there, give them
22 a call and encourage them to come out and give
23 their comments.

24 That was the only person who signed
25 up to speak. If anybody else has some comments,

1 then now's the time.

2 Yes, please step up.

3 VERA WILLIAMS: My name is Vera Williams.
4 I work over at the Inupiat Community of the
5 Arctic Slope.

6 My concerns I want to express today
7 are what I've kind of expressed earlier today at
8 the ICAS office, but I'd like to also state it
9 for today, here also this evening.

10 The oil and gas section where you're
11 expecting to build your 58-mile long from Point
12 Thomson to Prudhoe, that section there, I wanted
13 to emphasize and make sure that the companies
14 that are going to be building the pipeline if
15 it's going to be aboveground or if it's going to
16 be all underground, that caribou crossings are
17 something of very importance to the subsistence
18 users. And that it be noted for the area
19 specific where there's going to be pipeline
20 visible aboveground. I had heard also that there
21 is possibly going to be some pipeline aboveground
22 in some areas, and if there is, that the caribou
23 crossing sections be a big factor for them to be
24 able to cross so there wouldn't be no stress for
25 the animals themselves.

1 And on your spurs that you mentioned
2 earlier, I forgot who was talking, but he was
3 talking about the spurs. He mentioned five
4 spurs. I think that the spurs are a very big
5 positive thing for the state of Alaska, not
6 because -- in Barrow here we have natural gas and
7 we have our natural gas, you know, we have our
8 own co-op here. And those spurs would make
9 different areas of the state of Alaska be able to
10 go into co-ops like we have here to expand and
11 get natural gas. Where right now diesel and
12 fuel, they're having shortages throughout the
13 whole state of Alaska, not just in the Nome area
14 where they had the ice breaker and, you know, the
15 Russian tanker come in to go do some fuel. These
16 spurs are going to be very helpful for any
17 community that is going to be hooked up toward
18 these spurs in the future.

19 And also we discussed earlier was the
20 Ilisagvik College. Ilisagvik College has
21 training facilities. And native hire; we talked
22 about native hire, local hire preferences. And
23 there's training that will be needed for their
24 future for this section of natural gas because
25 right now we have existing oil that's going

1 through the pipe TAPS. And this is going to be a
2 different section on natural gas which is a big
3 factor for training that could come from the
4 North Slope and also the residents of Alaska.

5 And economic development I kind of
6 touched on that a little bit today also which --
7 where local areas, local communities, businesses
8 can arise from these activities that are coming
9 up. You know, if you're going to be getting your
10 supplies, we have all our businesses all around
11 Alaska, different sections of Alaska which are in
12 dire need of expansion or possibly, you know,
13 socioeconomic and economically to help out within
14 the communities.

15 And the restoration vegetation, the
16 native flora I think is very important for site
17 specific. And that should be also considered. I
18 know in some areas where revegetation took place
19 where, you know, seeding was used but it was a
20 different type of seeding. And if they used the
21 natural native flora from the area it would be a
22 lot better for it to grow instead of either
23 overgrow or undergrow. And I think those should
24 be areas that should be looked at.

25 And if there's going to be

1 inspections, you know, this section on
2 inspections, I think it would be a great thing
3 for -- on the inspection aspect where you include
4 the Natives of the areas, not just, you know,
5 anyone that's out there that's Native, but from
6 site specific, you know, asking the communities
7 to have an inspector come out with your
8 inspectors that are going to be checking on these
9 pipelines. I think that would be a great
10 benefit. And also building trust with the local
11 areas. I think the inspectors -- if you were to
12 incorporate such things as those into your
13 implementations I think would be a great asset
14 for your businesses and to get the trust from the
15 local people.

16 On government-to-government section,
17 I know there's a lot of times when the tribes
18 don't have enough funding capacity to have such
19 meetings to hold meetings that, you know, oil
20 industries coming. And those kind of factors
21 need to be brought to the table so they could
22 have duly noted attention. Or when your offices
23 come, to come to meetings, those kind of things
24 need to be thought of so that everyone could be
25 present, especially if you're having a council

1 come to a meeting. And those kind of things need
2 to be addressed for funding sources for them to
3 be able to attend as tribal council members or
4 any type of council that you're requesting for
5 meetings with.

6 And I know this is -- you guys are
7 looking for the best for our nation, to protect
8 for the natural gas and to -- I'd like you guys
9 to review all the concerns and what would be the
10 best for the constituents, the residents, the
11 local areas. Those need to be looked at. And
12 the thing about this is what is the best interest
13 for all of us, the whole United States, not just
14 Alaska, but I know the Lower 48 is where you guys
15 are going to be sending the natural gas to. We
16 need it here too, not just the Lower 48. And
17 that's what I would like to see is for these
18 spurs, for these other natural gases, them to
19 start coming up in Alaska so that the struggles
20 within the interior or the Arctic, especially the
21 Arctic, we see it. We're the ones that pay the
22 most money up here. And we send them oil down,
23 the natural gas down, it's going to be cheap for
24 them. But for us because we don't have any thing
25 here, no facilities, infrastructures for those,

1 it's very expensive. And those things need to be
2 looked at also. Thank you.

3 DAVE SWEARINGEN: Okay. Thank you, Vera.

4 Anybody else? Now's your chance.

5 ELLA BROWER: I'm Ella Brower. And thank
6 you, Rosemary and Vera. I don't sound as
7 professional. I am young. But I do -- it is
8 very expensive. You know, I'm growing up a
9 little bit and I do have a young one. And our
10 food -- it sounds like there's going to be a lot
11 more transportation and more ongoing in the state
12 of Alaska. And our prices at the grocery -- you
13 know, our hunting is very important to us, too.
14 But, you know, there's things that you need at
15 the store. And just increasing, really
16 increasing. Just like, I work at the store and
17 it's just ridiculous.

18 There's more activity going in
19 Alaska. I think that -- Vera was saying, you
20 know, more opportunities to build things for
21 less. That's what I'm trying to say is like
22 grocery shopping and more, like, what can we
23 have, you know? If this is going to continue and
24 make the gas line, like, how -- what -- do we get
25 benefits out of it? I live in Barrow and it's

1 very expensive. It's very expensive. That's all
2 I have to say.

3 And, you know, what are the benefits
4 for me, too. You know, what -- you know, the
5 lower costs. More activities going in and out of
6 Barrow and the North Slope Borough, you know,
7 there's going to be a lot more. And I just want
8 to see it more increasing. You know it would be
9 less -- nice to see less expensive things here.
10 The activities increasing a lot more here, the
11 more attention because of the pipeline and more
12 roads access would be really nice. But it's
13 really spendy and I'd like to see a little bit of
14 change. And thank you.

15 DAVE SWEARINGEN: All right. Thank you,
16 Ella.

17 Anyone else?

18 ROSEMARY AHTUANGARUAK: Is there any
19 effort to get the Regional Citizens Advisory
20 Council?

21 DAVE SWEARINGEN: Mike, do you want to --

22 MIKE BOYLE: The subsistency advisory
23 council?

24 ROSEMARY AHTUANGARUAK: No, for the
25 pipelines. And there's been processes in this

1 regard, the regional citizens advisory, we really
2 need a process on the North Slope. Federal
3 government failed on their promises saying there
4 wouldn't be more spills, but yet we had the GS2
5 spill as well as other sites that spilled within
6 that same time period. So is there going to be a
7 regional citizens advisory committee created to
8 help assess this process?

9 DAVE SWEARINGEN: I'm not familiar with
10 that, but talk to me afterwards, I can get some
11 information.

12 Okay. What I'm going to do now is
13 close the formal part of the meeting. And like I
14 said before, if you want me to talk about some of
15 the FERC process or you want to talk to the
16 company and look at their maps or something,
17 we'll stay around and you can do that.

18 So anyone wishing to purchase a copy
19 of the transcript, make those arrangements with
20 the court reporter.

21 Within the FERC Web site which is
22 www.FERC.gov, there's a link called eLibrary. If
23 you type in the docket number, which is PF09-11,
24 you can use eLibrary to gain access to everything
25 on the public file concerning this project. That

1 includes the filings and information submitted by
2 the project proponents and anything that FERC
3 staff has issued as well.

4 So on behalf of the Federal
5 Regulatory Commission I want to thank you all for
6 coming here tonight.

7 Let the record show that the Barrow
8 meeting concluded at 8:05 p.m.

9 Thank you.

10 (Scoping meeting concluded at 8:05 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25