

Appendix CC

Comments on the Draft EIS and Responses

Appendix CC: Comments on the Draft EIS and Responses

Index

INTRODUCTION.....	CC-1
COMMENT MEETINGS	CC-2
CM1 – Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik	CC-2
CM2 – Comment Meeting, Trapper Creek	CC-21
CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy	CC-32
CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski	CC-48
CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks	CC-108
CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage.....	CC-126
CM7 – Comment Meeting Written Comments.....	CC-161
FEDERAL AGENCIES.....	CC-209
FA1 – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.....	CC-209
FA2 – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	CC-233
FA3 – Department of the Interior	CC-240
STATE AGENCIES.....	CC-298
SA1 – Senator Cathy Giessel.....	CC-298
SA2 – Alaska Department of Natural Resources and Others	CC-301
SA3 – Senator Click Bishop	CC-374
SA4 – Representative Gary Knopp.....	CC-376
SA5 – Senator John Coghill.....	CC-378
LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.....	CC-380
LG1 – City of Valdez.....	CC-380
LG2 – Matanuska-Susitna Borough.....	CC-383
LG3 – Denali Borough.....	CC-395
LG4 – Kenai Peninsula Borough	CC-398
LG5 – City of Kenai	CC-403
LG6 – City of Soldotna.....	CC-409
LG7 – Matanuska-Susitna Borough.....	CC-413
LG8 – City of Valdez.....	CC-444
LG9 – City of Soldotna.....	CC-469
LG10 – Kenai Peninsula Borough	CC-473
LG11 – Matanuska-Susitna Borough.....	CC-485
ALASKA NATIVE CORPORATIONS (ANC)	CC-494
ANC1 – Ahtna, Incorporated.....	CC-494
ANC2 – Doyon	CC-500
ANC3 – Cook Inlet Region.....	CC-502
ANC4 – Tyonek Meeting.....	CC-507
COMPANIES AND ORGANIZATIONS (CO).....	CC-511
CO1 – Little Susitna Construction.....	CC-511
CO2 – Trustees for Alaska.....	CC-515
CO3 – Climate Writers	CC-518
CO4 – Climate Writers	CC-520
CO5 – Climate Writers	CC-522
CO6 – Trustees for Alaska.....	CC-524
CO7 – Kenai Peninsula Economic Development District	CC-526
CO8 – Cruz Construction.....	CC-528
CO9 – International Union of Operating Engineers	CC-530

CO10 – International Union of Operating Engineers	CC-533
CO11 – Greater Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce	CC-535
CO12 – Anchorage Chamber of Commerce	CC-538
CO13 – Alaska District Council of Laborers.....	CC-541
CO14 – Soldotna Chamber of Commerce	CC-544
CO15 – Resource Development Council	CC-547
CO16 – BP Exploration	CC-550
CO17 – ExxonMobil.....	CC-554
CO18 – Alyeska Pipeline.....	CC-558
CO19 – General Contractors of Alaska	CC-560
CO20 – The Alaska Support Industry Alliance	CC-562
CO21 – Denali Citizens Council.....	CC-565
CO22 – Trustees for Alaska.....	CC-570
CO23 – Friends of Animals	CC-596
CO24 – Sabin Center for Climate Change Law.....	CC-612
CO25 – Alaska Oil and Gas Association.....	CC-620
CO26 – Earth Justice	CC-635
CO27 – Center for Biological Diversity	CC-685
CO28 – Institute for Policy Integrity	CC-761
CO29 – Trustees for Alaska.....	CC-784
CO30 – Center for Biological Diversity	CC-794
INDIVIDUALS (IND).....	CC-796
IND1 – Sam Robert Brice.....	CC-796
IND2 – David Manzer	CC-799
IND3 – John Shively.....	CC-802
IND4 – Bob Hubbard.....	CC-805
IND5 – Genevieve Bell.....	CC-807
IND6 – Shawn Lowry	CC-809
IND7 – Jeff Fellas.....	CC-811
IND8 – Mike Huhndorf	CC-813
IND9 – Peter McKay	CC-815
IND10 – Barbara and Ross Njaa.....	CC-818
IND11 – Peter McKay	CC-821
IND12 – Peter McKay	CC-825
IND13 – Pamela Miller.....	CC-829
IND14 – William and Mary Bookout	CC-832
IND15 – Robert Stinson.....	CC-837
IND16 – Peter McKay	CC-840
IND17 – Debbie McKay	CC-843
IND18 – Kenneth Yockey	CC-846
IND19 – Scott T. Wieman	CC-849
IND20 – Croitiene ganMoryn.....	CC-854
IND21 – Debbie McKay.....	CC-856
IND22 – Thomas W. Hendrix Jr.....	CC-862
IND23 – John Reiss	CC-864
IND24 – Bill Madsen.....	CC-866
IND25 – Robert J. Breeden.....	CC-868
IND26 – Linda Huhndorf.....	CC-876
IND27 – Robert Breeden	CC-878
IND28 – John McDowell.....	CC-882
IND29 – Lisa Parker	CC-884

IND30 – Christopher Lish	CC-886
IND31 – Mark Anderson	CC-889
IND32 – Daniel Darnell.....	CC-891
IND33 – Dylan Soberay.....	CC-894
IND34 – Liv Frampton	CC-896
IND35 – Debbie McKay.....	CC-899
IND36 – Larry Engel	CC-902
IND37 – Hadassah Knight.....	CC-904
IND38 – Janice Knight	CC-907
IND39 – Jordan Engel	CC-910
IND40 – David W. Haugen	CC-912
IND41 – Scott Selzer	CC-914
IND42 – Dominic Canale	CC-916
IND43 – Ruth Colianni.....	CC-918
IND44 – Erica Watson.....	CC-920
IND45 – Barbara Brease.....	CC-923
IND46 – Mary Bookout.....	CC-925
IND47 – Anne Huhndorf	CC-927
IND48 – Joe Dubler	CC-930
IND49 – Peter McKay	CC-932
IND50 – Peter McKay	CC-935
IND51 – Peter McKay	CC-938
IND52 – Peter McKay	CC-940
IND53 – Peter McKay	CC-945
IND54 – Peter McKay	CC-948
IND55 – Peter McKay	CC-951
IND56 – Barbara and Ross Njaa.....	CC-954
IND57 – Robert Breeden	CC-957
IND58 – Debbie McKay.....	CC-961
IND59 – Peter McKay	CC-968
IND60 – Anne Huhndorf	CC-974
APPLICANT (A).....	CC-983
A1 – Alaska Gasline Development Corporation.....	CC-983
A2 – Alaska Gasline Development Corporation.....	CC-1086
A3 – Alaska Gasline Development Corporation.....	CC-1113

Alaska LNG Project

Comments on the Draft EIS and Responses

Introduction

Between the issuance of the Notice of Availability (NOA) for the draft Environmental Impact Statement (draft EIS) on June 28, 2019, and the close of the comment period on October 3, 2019, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) received 116 individual written letters commenting on the draft EIS, including 3 letters from federal agencies, 5 letters from state agencies and officials (including one combined letter from various Alaska state agencies); 11 letters from local government agencies and officials; 4 letters from Alaska Native Corporations; 30 letters from companies and organizations; 60 letters from individuals; and 3 letters from AGDC. We held eight public comment meetings to provide the public the opportunity to comment verbally on the draft EIS. A total of 35 people commented at the meetings. A number of the verbal comments were also provided as written comments. We received some comment letters filed after the close of the official comment period, which we have considered and included in the analysis to the extent possible.

This appendix presents our responses to relevant comments provided on the draft EIS. Comment letters are classified as follows:

- CM: Comment Meetings
- FA: Federal Agencies
- SA: State Agencies
- LG: Local Governments
- ANC: Alaska Native Corporations
- CO: Companies and Organizations
- IND: Individuals
- A: Applicant

An index is provided above that includes the comment code, name, and page number. Comments are provided in the following section, with our responses provided along the right margin. Some of the comment letters also contained attachments and appendices that were not direct comments on the draft EIS or the Project. These attachments have not been included in this final EIS appendix, but can be found on the FERC eLibrary filed under the applicable accession numbers shown in the flysheets at the end of the comment letter.

Comment Meetings

CM1 – Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

1

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 Office of Energy Projects

4 - - - - - x

5 Alaska Gasline Development

6 Corporation Project No. CP17-178-000

7 - - - - - x

8

9 ALASKA LNG PROJECT

10 Draft EIS

11

12 Inupiat Heritage Center

13 5421 North Star Street

14 Utqiagvik, Alaska 99723

15

16 Monday, September 9, 2019

17

18 The public scoping meeting, pursuant to notice, convened
19 at 5 p.m. Before a Panel:

20 JAMES MARTIN, Project Coordinator, Federal Energy
21 Regulatory Commission

22 JENNIFER LEE, Environmental Resources Management

23

24

25

CC-2

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

2

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

2 [6:03 p.m.]

3 MR. MARTIN: Okay, I think we're going to go
4 ahead and get started now. It's about three minutes after
5 six, thereabouts. The transcript for tonight will be
6 recorded by a court reporter, and all of the comments made
7 will be put into the FERC docket, which is a public docket.

8 So first of all, thank you; appreciate being able
9 to come here tonight and speak with you. First, I'd like to
10 introduce the folks that are here. To my right is Jennifer
11 Lee, and Jennifer is with ERM, this contractor supporting
12 FERC. To my left is Earl Williams from the Bureau of Land
13 Management. Earl's going to be talking a little bit later.
14 At the back table we have Patty Troche, she's also from ERM.

15 So while I'm talking about the back table, I'll
16 just go through some of the things that we have available
17 back there. First of all, there's a mailing list sign-up
18 sheet, and that mailing list sign-up sheet is if you would
19 like to receive a copy of the final EIS, and did not receive
20 a copy of the draft. If you received a copy of the draft,
21 then you don't need to add your name to that; but if you
22 didn't, and you'd like a copy of the final, please add your
23 name and address to that.

24 There's also a speaker sign-up sheet back there
25 that, if you'd like to give verbal comments tonight.

CC-3

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

3

1 There's a form for providing written comments, if you prefer
2 to provide written comments either tonight or at a later
3 date. There are instructions on how to provide written
4 comments, both in writing and electronically. There are
5 copies of the Notice of Availability that we issued for the
6 Draft Environmental Impact Statement that we're here tonight
7 to talk about.

8 And finally we have a summary that's tailored to
9 the region of the impacts that were disclosed in the Draft
10 EIS.

11 So the purpose of tonight's meeting is pretty
12 simple: We're here to get comments on the draft that we
13 issued. The draft was issued on June 28th, and we provided
14 a 90-day comment period, which expires on October 3rd.

15 Now, October 3rd is coming up pretty quick, and
16 we will take comments after October 3rd, but as we get
17 closer to the issuance of the final, it gives us less time
18 to respond to the comments; so I'm going to ask that you
19 provide those comments as close to October 3rd as possible.

20 So we issued the Draft EIS on June 28th, and it
21 was distributed to everyone that was on our mailing list.
22 We sent hard copies to folks that requested hard copies, to
23 the subsidence communities, and to libraries along the
24 pipeline corridor.

25 Moving forward, I'd like to give a little bit of

CC-4

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

4

1 background of the process so far. So the proponent for the
2 project first requested entry into our prefilling process
3 about five years ago, September of 2014. We worked on the
4 project for about two and a half years before it went into
5 application phase, and during that period we had a number
6 of outreach activities and a number of back and forth with
7 the Applicant; and those outreach activities included a
8 series of open house meetings sponsored by the project
9 proponent, and also scoping meetings sponsored by the
10 Commission. We did a total of 12 scoping meetings.

11 With regard to our review of the project, the big
12 part of the prefilling process is reviewing draft sections of
13 the application and providing comments back to the
14 applicant so that they can revise the document and provide a
15 more complete application to the Commission.

16 Some of those questions were generated by our
17 team and some of them came from stakeholders, and others
18 came from our cooperating agencies group, which included
19 BLM, Army Corps of Engineers, EPA, U.S. Coast Guard,
20 National Marine Fisheries Service, the Fish and Wildlife
21 Service, the National Park Service, Department of Energy and
22 the Department of Transportation.

23 In April of 2017, AGDC filed its formal
24 application for the Alaska LNG Project. Tonight we're
25 hoping to get comments on the Draft EIS, and there are two

CC-5

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

5

1 ways that you can do that: One is verbally, that would be
2 the easiest, if you just provide your comments tonight. I
3 would ask that you come to the podium, state your name. If
4 it's a name that we might have difficulty spelling, that you
5 spell it out for us; and if you have an affiliation, tell us
6 what that is.

7 Alternatively, as I mentioned earlier, we have a
8 form at the back where you can provide written comments, and
9 another form that tells you how to provide comments through
10 our web page. In all cases, it's important to make sure
11 that the docket number is referenced. The docket number is
12 like the name on a folder in a file cabinet someplace that
13 has way too many files, and the only way that we can make
14 sure that your comments get to the right place is by
15 including the docket number.

16 So this project's docket number is CP17-178.
17 That number is on the Notice of Availability at the back,
18 and it's on the cover of the Draft EIS and on every
19 issuance by the Commission.

20 As I mentioned earlier, we're hoping to get your
21 comments by October 3rd. So what happens next? After the
22 comment period ends, we'll begin preparing the Final
23 Environmental Impact Statement. We're planning on issuing
24 that in the spring of 2020; and when that is issued, it will
25 be forwarded to our commissioners. Right now we have three

CC-6

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

6

1 commissioners, and they will make the decisions on whether
2 or not to authorize the project, using not only the
3 environmental impact statements that we generate, but also
4 other factors.

5 And that's about all that I have. I'd like to
6 now turn it over to Earl Williams from the Bureau of Land
7 Management to talk about their role and process.

8 MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Jim. As Jim mentioned,
9 I'm with the BLM, and we are a cooperating agency with this
10 environmental impact statement. The BLM has received a
11 right-of-way application for a pipeline to cross federal
12 lands, and the BLM is authorized under the Mineral Leasing
13 Act to issue a grant of right-of-way for a pipeline for
14 natural gas or oil.

15 Our involvement with the EIS included providing
16 edits, or comments and edits to the administrative draft
17 document and producing an appendix, which is the
18 preliminary system analysis under Section 810 of ANILCA.
19 That preliminary analysis found there may be potential
20 impacts to subsistence resources, and accordingly we are
21 holding this hearing to ensure our full compliance under
22 Section 810 of ANILCA.

23 One of the things I have to do is read a
24 statement into the record, so if you'll bear with me, I'll
25 get that started. [reading:]

CC-7

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

7

1 My name is Earle Williams and I am a Project
2 Manager with the Bureau of Land Management. I am reading
3 this statement into the record to let you know that this
4 public meeting is also a subsistence hearing.

5 Section 810 of the Alaska National Interest Lands
6 Conservation Act, or ANILCA, requires the BLM to evaluate
7 the effects of its actions on subsistence uses and to hold
8 public hearings if it finds that subsistence use may be
9 significantly restricted.

10 The Alaska LNG project is seeking a right-of-way
11 from the BLM to allow for the construction and operation of
12 the buried pipeline across public lands. In reviewing this
13 application, the BLM must consider the potential effects to
14 the environment and the potential impacts to the subsistence
15 resources and uses on public lands. The ANILCA 810
16 evaluation done for this project assessed the potential
17 effects to the proposed alternatives and the cumulative case
18 on subsistence use, and is included as an appendix in the
19 Draft EIS.

20 In the evaluation, the BLM finds that the
21 cumulative case may result in a significant impact to
22 subsistence uses. These potential impacts may include
23 reductions in the availability or abundance of caribou.

24 This hearing is being held to provide you an
25 opportunity to make comments on the preliminary subsistence

CC-8

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

8

1 analysis for the Alaska LNG project. All comments are
2 welcome, but we especially would like to hear your thoughts
3 regarding mitigation measures that could be applied to
4 minimize impacts to your subsistence use.

5 The comments you provide will be considered in
6 the preparation of the final EIS and the BLM's Record of
7 Decision. You may provide your comments here tonight or
8 submit them in writing. Please submit any written comments
9 to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission by the close of
10 the comment period.

11 MR. MARTIN: Thank you, Earl.

12 Well, that's the end of the procedural part; now
13 is when we request comments. We had one person sign up;
14 Solomon?

15 I think he may have walked out.

16 So would anyone else in the audience like to
17 provide comments tonight?

18 Please come forward and state your name for the
19 record.

20 MR. BROWER: Good evening, my name is Gordon
21 Brower. I'm a resident and I'm also a Director of Planning
22 and Community Services for the North Slope Borough.

23 First of all, there's a huge conflict going on
24 right now. There's a whaling captain's meeting going on. A
25 lot of important people, you know, the whaling captains are

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

9

1 having a fall whaling captains meeting as we speak now.
2 That's beside the point, it's just important to note that
3 there probably would have been a few more interested folks
4 that would have provided some comments.

5 On the AK LNG, there was another project. I
6 don't know if it was called the bullet line or if this is
7 the bullet line project itself. It seems like there was two
8 competing natural gas projects a few years back. And I
9 think that both of them could not probably go forward and
10 try to compromise and do one of these gas line projects.
11 So, I don't know that the other one is still being reviewed
12 or not or if it's gone away.

13 So, that's just one of my questions I had before
14 I made some comments here. The comments, I'm just reading
15 parts of the outline about material sourcing and things like
16 that. I don't know how much new material sources you're
17 proposing to site within the North Slope Borough, but I just
18 want to comment that we are working with DNR with the North
19 Slope Borough in developing regional mining concepts to
20 limit the pot rolling and material sourcing along the haul
21 road. The Borough has selected sites along the haul road
22 and our concept of regionalizing material sources, has been
23 embraced by the Corps of Engineers.

24 So, it's important to note that when the project
25 siting for materials sourcing, think to work with the local

CM1-1

CM1-1

AGDC's Gravel Sourcing Plan and Reclamation Measures describes the material requirements, sources, extraction protocols, transportation logistics, and reclamation measures for gravel sourcing. Instructions for accessing this plan were provided in table 2.2-1 of the draft EIS and likewise are provided in table 2.2-1 of the final EIS. The plan identifies the permit requirements for use of existing sites or development of new sites for gravel sourcing, which includes the North Slope Borough's Industrial Development and Use Permit (Form 100). AGDC would file a final Gravel Sourcing Plan and Reclamation Measures prior to construction.

CC-10

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

10

1 government in looking at these along with DNR. It's a way
2 of adhering to North Slope Borough policies to consolidate
3 and minimize impacts to the environment, where you're not
4 just picking the site and saying, 'This is my material
5 source' when there are plans in the region to work to
6 minimize these types of material sourcing. I just, I
7 thought it was important to note that.

CM1-1

8 The other concerns I have, and I don't know
9 exactly what comments you're looking for, but it's important
10 to note that the North Slope Borough, many of the villages
11 are serviced by diesel, a very dirty home heating fuel often
12 spilled and contaminating areas, and it seems to me that
13 projects like this should look at the Arctic up here to help
14 supplement or provide alternative clean fuel like natural
15 gas. And to look at all of these resources and just to hear
16 a giant vacuum sucking sound coming out of the North Slope
17 without benefiting folks that could benefit.

CM1-2

18 There are times like communities, like Utqiagvik
19 Pass, where we've gone to emergency rationing because the
20 fuel is flown in. I think on a monthly basis for home
21 heating fuel throughout the winter season. And it would be
22 greatly beneficial to look at natural gas, which is not very
23 far off the way from these areas, and use these resources of
24 the state to benefit the residents. I think that's an
25 important feature to making sure projects like these look at

CM1-2

Section 4.11 of the final EIS describes the potential economic benefits of the Project to surrounding communities. To-date, AGDC has identified three locations along the Mainline Pipeline to allow for future interconnects with lateral pipelines to provide in-state deliveries of natural gas to third-party utility or industrial customers. Other future interconnections could be established during the life of the Project to accommodate other communities surrounding the pipeline.

CC-11

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

11

1 in-state use of the resource of the state. And if you were
2 to put all the communities combined in these subsidies that
3 the local government has to provide for even affordable
4 living, you're looking at about \$20 million annually to
5 subsidize fuels to our communities with home heating fuel.
6 It's important, when we live in the most extreme
7 climate up here, to have a level of energy security of fuel
8 that does not run out and able to be used locally. And I
9 think those are important. I don't think we're going to go
10 back in time and live off peat moss saturated in crude oil
11 that's just laying on the ground and at one point that's how
12 we lived up here, too. We used oil seeps to heat homes.
13 And most everybody has running water. Flush toilets. Not
14 everybody, but we're getting there, on the North Slope. I
15 think it's important to recognize those types of needs as
16 these mega projects move forward. And in terms of caribou
17 and other resources like that we are very heavily dependent
18 on subsistence resources. I want to encourage you to look
19 at the comprehensive plans for each community like Utqiagvik
20 Pass, their area of influence in these areas. They have
21 defined their subsistence use areas and the area of
22 influence is defined as the traditional and contemporary use
23 of the land immediately outside the village district
24 boundaries to provide for subsistence needs for communities.
25

CM1-2

CM1-3

CM1-3

Utqiagvik's subsistence resources are discussed in section 4.14.3.1 of the final EIS.

CC-12

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

12

1 And recognize the area of influence to make sure
2 adequate mitigation measures -- to continue the subsistence
3 life-style. The villages are more heavily dependent on
4 terrestrial resources from wolves, wolverines, caribou, for
5 everyday food on the table. I've been a, I am also a
6 regional advisor, federal regional advisor councilman. On
7 the federal RAC. I serve as a chairman of the Regional
8 Subsistence Advisor Council. And it's important because we
9 often hear of other uses of the lands that conflict with
10 traditional uses. It's been said more than once to make
11 sure we don't pass on arguments between competing users
12 because that's, we're trying to make sure we pass on a
13 healthy traditional subsistence experience to the next
14 generation, and not arguments. We want to make sure those
15 things are good to be passed on for the socioeconomic well-
16 being of our communities. They are very heavily dependent
17 on subsistence resources.

CM1-3

18 It's important to make sure these types of
19 projects address those in a way that is meaningful, and
20 including economic opportunities. North Slope Borough
21 policies in terms of economic opportunities, land use
22 policies include to where it's feasible and where it's
23 prudent to use the local businesses, regional corporations,
24 and village corporations to provide for economic
25 opportunities within their area of influence. Those are

CM1-4

CM1-4 Section 4.11.2.2 of the final EIS discusses general economic impacts on state and local economies as well as measures AGDC would take to ensure the use of Alaskan-based labor sources, when possible.

CC-13

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

13

1 important statements where it's prudent and where it's
2 feasible to do those things. So, it doesn't -- it's
3 important to recognize these things. They are ingrained in
4 North Slope Borough land use policies. And you will
5 encounter them when it comes time to permitting. If this
6 project ever makes it to a permitting application or a
7 regional or something like that, those policies should be
8 embraced.

9 It's the same as trying to make sure there's
10 affirmative action to minority groups and it's got to
11 recognize that we have an ICC up here; I think last year or
12 two years ago, a polar conference on the state of the Inuit
13 population, and they talked about it from Greenland to
14 Canada to Alaska through the circumpolar regions, a total
15 population of all Inuit combined is 169,000 people. And
16 after 10,000 years we've managed to make that many people up
17 here. So, it's important to recognize, I think, we're among
18 some of the most minority groups up here in the Arctic.

19 In any event, I just welcome you and just wanted
20 to provide for you little talking points, a few of my
21 comments and to where its these projects need to move
22 forward. It's important, I think, for applicants to visit
23 and dialogue with the North Slope Borough's mayor's office
24 as well.

25 I went to a meeting some time ago from a

CM1-4

CC-14

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

14

1 different mayor when I was still a director at the time. It
2 was 2009. Mayor asked me, "Why didn't you go to Utqiagvik
3 Pass and see what's the gap over there. What's going on?"
4 And it was a roads to resources meeting and the village was
5 in an uproar. Their, the mayor didn't really know what was
6 going on as well and said, "Why don't you go up to Utqiagvik
7 and find out?"

8 I think having open, meaningful dialogue with the
9 local government is very important. I'd just like to say
10 that meeting I saw, the tribe in an uproar about caribou
11 movement in a potential road in a very contentious area of
12 traditional land use activities in the Utqiagvik area of
13 influence. It went actually to a point where the community
14 tribe chief pointed out, "Why don't we end this meeting this
15 way? We'll get our biggest wrestler and you get your
16 biggest guy from DOT and you wrestle. Whoever wins. If our
17 big guy wins the meeting is over and the project goes away."

18
19 I don't think that's very meaningful when there
20 needs to be a lot more engagement and dialogue for these
21 kinds of things that have the potential to impact
22 communities in this way. Especially communication. Thank
23 you very much. If I have anything more to say I would
24 probably add more. I'm not fully prepared. I learned of
25 this meeting and thought I should make a chance to provide

CC-15

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

15

1 some comments. Thank you.

2 MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much for those
3 comments. If you have some other comments, you can pick up
4 one of the written comment forms and send it to us.

5 MR. BROWER: We work together for the North Slope
6 Borough Mayor and the law department, there's a wildlife
7 department, planning department and others. We try to
8 coalesce comments and put them together for the Mayor's
9 signature. But it's important to also provide additional
10 policy during comments as well. Thank you very much.

11 MR. MARTIN: Thank you.
12 Would anyone else like to provide comments
13 tonight?

14 AUDIENCE: We'd better wait.

15 MR. MARTIN: That's fine. I'm probably better at
16 reading than at speaking, too, as you can probably tell.

17 All right. Well, I guess that will close the
18 meeting, then, if any of you would like to talk, I'll stay
19 here at the table for a few more minutes, if you'd like to
20 come up and talk one-on-one, I'd be glad to listen.

21 And thank you so much for coming.

22 [Whereupon at 6:30 p.m., the verbal comment
23 session concluded.]

24

25

CC-16

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

16

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding

4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the

5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding: Alaska LNG Project

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 Docket No.: CP17-178-000

16 Place: Utqiagvik, Alaska

17 Date: Monday, September 9, 2019

18 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original

19 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy

20 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription

21 of the proceedings.

22

23

24 Dan Hawkins

25 Official Reporter

CC-17

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4000 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

Document Content(s)

090919AKProject.DOCX.....1-16

090919AKProject.TXT.....17-49

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4014 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

ERRATA SHEET

DEPOSITION OF:

DATE OF DEPOSITION: PAGE 1 of 1 pages

[illegible]

CM-1 Comment Meeting, Utqiagvik (cont'd)

20191017-4014 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

Document Content(s)

Errata Form for Utqiagvik_090919AKProject_Final.DOC.....1-1

CM2 – Comment Meeting, Trapper Creek

20191017-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

1

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

2

3 Alaska LNG Project

4 Docket No. CP17-178-000

5

6 Public Meeting

7

8 Monday, September 9, 2019

9

5:00 p.m.

10

11 Trapper Creek Elementary School

12

6742 Petersville Road

13

Trapper Creek, AK 99683

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CC-21

CM2 – Comment Meeting, Trapper Creek (cont'd)

20191017-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

2

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

2 MR. PECONOM: Good evening. My name is John
3 Peconom. I am a Project Manager with the Federal Energy
4 Regulatory Commission. I am the Deputy Project Manager for
5 the Alaska LNG Project. On behalf of the Commission, I
6 would like to thank all of you for being here this evening.

7 Tonight's meeting is being recorded. A
8 transcript of tonight's meeting will be placed in the
9 Commission's publicly available administrative record and
10 will be available for download. The Commission's
11 administrative record can be accessed through the
12 Commission's website at www.ferc.gov. For additional
13 information on how to access our website and obtain a copy
14 of the transcript, please talk to one of the ladies in the
15 back.

16 Hard copies of the transcript can also be
17 purchased. Please see the gentleman here if you are
18 interested in purchasing a hard copy of the transcript. Let
19 the record show that today is September 9th, 2019 and that
20 the Alaska LNG DEIS Comment Meeting began at 5:00 p.m.

21 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to receive
22 public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
23 for the Alaska LNG Project. The Alaska LNG Project involves
24 the construction and operation of new natural gas treatment
25 facilities on the north slope of Alaska, an approximately

CC-22

CM2 – Comment Meeting, Trapper Creek (cont'd)

20191017-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

3

1 800-mile long natural gas pipeline and associated
2 above-ground facilities spanning the State of Alaska to a
3 new LNG export terminal facility here on the Kenai
4 Peninsula.

5 Construction of the project will also require the
6 relocation of a portion of the Kenai Highway, and upgrades
7 to the City of Kenai Water System. The Draft Environmental
8 Impact Statement issued on June 28th, 2019 was independently
9 prepared by FERC staff in consultation and cooperation with
10 other federal agencies, including the Bureau of Land
11 Management, United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Coast
12 Guard, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine
13 Fishery Service and others to inform the Commission, the
14 public and permitted agencies about the potential adverse
15 and beneficial environmental impacts that would result from
16 constructing and operating the Alaska LNG Project.

17 In addition to a description of impacts, the
18 Draft Environmental Impact Statement contains an alternative
19 analysis, a cumulative impacts analysis, an impact
20 minimization and mitigation measures we are recommending to
21 the Commission to further avoid and reduce adverse impacts
22 on the environment.

23 In the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, FERC
24 staff concludes that constructing and operating the project
25 would result in temporary, long-term and permanent impacts

CC-23

CM2 – Comment Meeting, Trapper Creek (cont'd)

20191017-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

4

1 on the environment. Most impacts would not be significant
2 or would be reduced to less than significant levels with the
3 implementation of proposed or recommended avoidance,
4 minimization and mitigation measures.

5 However, some impacts would be adverse and
6 significant. A summary of impacts described in the Draft
7 Environmental Impact Statement is available in the back.
8 The Draft and Final Impact Statement can also be accessed
9 through the Commission's website again, at www.ferc.gov.

10 The comments on the Draft EIS that you provide
11 here this evening, whether given verbally or provided to us
12 in writing, will be considered in the preparation of the
13 Final Environmental Impact Statement.

14 Your comments will ensure that the Final
15 Environmental Impact Statement, which we expect to issue in
16 March of 2020, will be considered by the Commission when
17 deciding this matter -- excuse me. Your comments will
18 ensure that the Final Environmental Impact Statement
19 considered by the Commission when deciding this matter,
20 accurately reflects the impact to the environment that would
21 result from the construction and operation of the project.

22 I would like to remind you that all comments --
23 verbal, written, and those filed electronically, are treated
24 equally. If you choose not to speak this evening, you may
25 submit written and/or electronic comments. Written comment

CC-24

CM2 – Comment Meeting, Trapper Creek (cont'd)

20191017-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

5

1 forms are available in the back. You may leave comments
2 with us tonight or send them to the Commission via U.S.
3 mail.

4 If you are providing written comments, be sure to
5 include the FERC Docket Number CP17-178-000. Comments
6 should be sent so that they arrive in Washington, D.C. by
7 October 3rd, 2019. Alternatively, you can send -- you can
8 submit electronic comments. Instructions are available at
9 the front.

10 Again, verbal, written and electronically filed
11 comments will be considered equally as we prepare the Final
12 Environmental Impact Statement. When your name is called,
13 please come up to the podium. Please speak directly into
14 the microphone, state your name clearly and spell it so that
15 your comments can be accurately recorded in the transcript.

16 If you are speaking on behalf of a group or an
17 organization, please identify the group's name.

18 MR. KOWALKE: My name is Randall Kowalke, that's
19 K-o-w-a-l-k-e. I'm currently on the Matsu Borough Port
20 Commission, previously the Matsu Borough Assembly. I am
21 here tonight representing only myself.

22 My comments regarding the project is I'm 100%
23 supportive of the project. Alaska needs this project. I've
24 been involved through one capacity or another in the
25 process, probably for the last four years, including the AK

CM2-1

CM2-1

Comment noted.

CC-25

CM2 – Comment Meeting, Trapper Creek (cont'd)

20191017-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

6

1 LNG line when in fact, I was at a meeting for that project | CM2-1
2 in this facility.

3 So, I've been very much engaged, also attending |
4 the Citizens Advisory group meetings. And the process is | CM2-2
5 working. The Borough had at some point, some difficulties
6 with some of the information that was included in the FERC
7 filings -- that's been worked on, being corrected.

8 Primarily, the mistakes made put our situation
9 such that the port couldn't have even been used for a
10 staging facility because they had it located in the mud
11 flats off some other direction and all that.

12 I think that's been cleared up now. Our concern
13 was that people in London, New York and Tokyo are following
14 this process and we wanted to be at least considered as a
15 viable commodity port for this project, whether we were
16 named as terminus or not.

17 And I'm fully supportive and have nothing really | CM2-3
18 further to add. Thank you.

19 (Whereupon the meeting concluded at 6:15 p.m.)

20

21

22

23

24

25

CM2-2 Comment noted.

CM2-3 Comment noted.

CC-26

CM2 – Comment Meeting, Trapper Creek (cont'd)

20191017-4001 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

7

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding

4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the

5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding: Alaska LNG Project

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 Docket No.: CP17-178-000

16 Place: Trapper Creek, AK

17 Date: Monday, September 9, 2019

18 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original

19 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy

20 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription

21 of the proceedings.

22

23

24 Larry Flowers

25 Official Reporter

CC-27

CM2 – Comment Meeting, Trapper Creek (cont’d)

20191017-4001 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019	
Document	Content(s)
090919Alaska.DOCX.....	1-7
090919Alaska.TXT.....	8-22

CC-29

ERRATA SHEET

DATE OF DEPOSITION:

[illegible]

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

CM2 – Comment Meeting, Trapper Creek (cont’d)

20191017-4008 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019	
Document Content(s)	
Errata Form for Trapper Creek_090919_AKProject_Final.DOC.....	1-1

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy

20191017-4004 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

1

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 Office of Energy Projects

4 - - - - - x

5 Alaska Gasline Development

6 Corporation Project No. CP17-178-000

7 - - - - - x

8

9 ALASKA LNG PROJECT

10 Draft EIS

11

12 Healy Tri-Valley Community Center

13 Healy Spurt Road

14 Healy, Alaska 99743

15

16 Wednesday, September 11, 2019

17

18 The public scoping meeting, pursuant to notice, convened

19 at 5 p.m. Before a Panel:

20 HARRY JEUDY, Project Engineer, Federal Energy

21 Regulatory Commission

22

23

24

25

CC-32

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

2

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

2 [5:03 p.m.]

3 MR. JEUDY: Good evening, guys. It's 5 p.m. My
4 name is Harry Jeudy, I'm one of the Lead Engineers for the
5 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

6 Can everyone hear me? I don't have a mic. Can
7 you hear me in the back?

8 AUDIENCE: Yes.

9 MR. JEUDY: All right. Thank you.

10 Tonight with me I have Mr. Jason Vallancourt;
11 he's a consultant with the FERC and will work on behalf of
12 the Commission. I would like to thank you all for being
13 here this evening. Tonight's meeting is going to be
14 recorded. A transcript of tonight's meeting will be placed
15 in the Commission's publicly available administrative
16 record, and will be available to be downloaded.

17 This Commission's administrative record can be
18 accessed through the Commission's internet web page,
19 www.ferc.gov. Hard copies of the transcript can also be
20 purchased. Please see the gentleman here if you are
21 interested in purchasing a hard copy of the transcript.

22 Let the record show today is September 11, 2019,
23 and that the Alaska LNG DEIS comment meeting in Healy,
24 Alaska at the time of 5:01 has begun. The purpose of
25 tonight's meeting is to receive public comment on the Draft

CC-33

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

3

1 Environmental Impact Statement for the Alaska LNG Project.

2 The Alaska LNG Project involves the construction
3 and operation of new natural gas treatment facilities on the
4 North Slope of Alaska, an approximately 800-mile long
5 natural gas pipeline and associated above-ground facilities
6 spanning the State of Alaska to a new LNG export terminal
7 facility on the Kenai Peninsula.

8 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued
9 on June 28, 2019 was independently prepared by FERC Staff to
10 inform the Commission, the public and permitting agencies
11 about the potential adverse and beneficial environmental
12 impacts that would result from the construction and
13 operation of the Alaska LNG Project. In addition to a
14 description of impacts, the Draft EIS contains an
15 alternative analysis, a cumulative impact analysis, and
16 impact minimization and mitigation measures we are
17 recommending to the Commission to further avoid and reduce
18 adverse impacts to the environment.

19 In the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, we
20 conclude that the constructing and operating of the project
21 would result in temporary, long-term and permanent impacts
22 on the environment. Most impacts would not be significant
23 or would be reduced to less than significant levels with the
24 implementation of proposed or recommended avoidance,
25 minimization and mitigation measures; but some impacts would

CC-34

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

4

1 be adverse and significant.

2 Your comments on the Draft EIS, whether given
3 verbally here, this evening, or provided to us in writing
4 will be considered in the preparation of the Final
5 Environmental Impact Statement. Your comments will ensure
6 that the Final Environmental Impact Statement, which will be
7 considered by the Commission when deciding this matter,
8 accurately reflects the impacts to the environment resulting
9 from construction and operation of this project.

10 Before we hear from you, our first speaker, I
11 would like to remind you that all comments; verbal, written
12 or filed electronically are treated equally. If you choose
13 not to speak this evening, you may submit written comment.
14 Comment forms are available up front with Mr. Jason
15 Vallancourt. You may leave comments with us tonight or send
16 them to the Commission via U.S. Mail.

17 If you are providing written comments, be sure to
18 include FERC Docket No. CP17-178-000. Comments should be
19 sent so that they arrive in Washington, D.C. by October 3rd,
20 2019. We highly recommend electronic filing of comments.
21 Instructions are again at the front with Mr. Jason, if you
22 want to provide electronic comments.

23 Again, verbal, written or electronically filed
24 comments will be considered equally as we prepare for the
25 final environmental impact statement for the Alaska LNG

CC-35

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

5

1 Project.

2 When your name is called, please come up to the
3 chair up front. Please speak directly into the microphone,
4 state your name clearly and please spell your name so it can
5 be accurately recorded by the transcriber. If you are
6 speaking on behalf of a group or an organization, please
7 identify the name of the group. In order to ensure everyone
8 has time to speak, I ask that you limit your comments to no
9 more than several minutes. If this is insufficient, you
10 may supplement your verbal comments in writing or file them
11 electronically. Again, all comments will be considered
12 equally.

13 Written comment forms are available up front with
14 Mr. Vallancourt. Again verbal, written and electronically
15 filed comments are all considered equally.

16 MR. VALLANCOURT: So no one has signed up to
17 speak. If you would like to speak, this is your opportunity
18 to provide oral comments. Or, as Harry said, you can
19 provide written comments later tonight. This is everyone's
20 opportunity to comment to FERC about the DEIS.

21 MR. JEUDY: We'll be here until 6 or later, if
22 people come in later. I know there's another meeting going
23 on. You guys are welcome to look at the board, look
24 through the files, ask me questions, Jason questions.
25 Again, my name is Harry.

CC-36

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

6

1 So you're welcome to mingle amongst yourselves if
2 you guys want to -- we don't have any comments yet; but we
3 will be here until --.

4 MR. VALLANCOURT: You can take a copy of a
5 summary of the Draft EIS, if you haven't picked up one of
6 these. Please help yourself.

7 These are meetings where, this is your
8 opportunity to comment. So it's our chance to listen to
9 you, what your thoughts are on the Draft EIS.

10 [Pause]

11 AUDIENCE: This summary gives a rough map in the
12 corner here. Do we have a more accurate map for this region
13 to look at here?

14 AUDIENCE: Yes, I agree. We live in Gambell, and
15 we cannot find anything that shows where in proximity the
16 pipeline would actually go.

17 MR. JEUDY: Would any of you be willing to put
18 that on the record?

19 AUDIENCE: I'll put it on the record.

20 (Pause. Audience mingling.)

21 MR. JEUDY: Please state your name and then spell
22 it for the record.

23 MS. WATSON: My name is Erica Watson; E R I C A
24 W A T S O N. I have a question. If we could get
25 clarification on how this route was selected over alternate

CC-37

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

7

1 routes. I know there were issues a year or two ago; FERC
2 writing to the State, asking for reexamination of the TAPS
3 corridor consideration.

4 So I would like some more background on why this
5 route along the Parks Highway was being singularly
6 considered. And if it's not, what else, what that
7 procedural background was.

8 MR. JEUDY: Thank you for your comment.

9 MS. WATSON: So it was a question.

10 MR. JEUDY: Thank you for your question.

11 AUDIENCE: Do you have an answer?

12 MR. JEUDY: I don't have an answer for you
13 tonight, but it will be answered in the Final EIS.

14 MS. LAKE: My name is Kathleen Lake, and I'm from
15 Sperry.

16 MR. JEUDY: Would you spell your name, please?

17 MS. LAKE: My comment is basically on

18 organization of this meeting. And the fact there is very
19 little information available for us to view, and there have
20 been no comments made; basically you read a quick statement
21 about us making comments. That's all you did.

22 The only map I can find at this meeting is on my
23 phone, okay? And the accuracy of this map is poor at best.

24 We need more information.

25 MR. JEUDY: Thanks for your comment.

CM3-1

CM3-1

The draft EIS, issued on June 28, 2019, was made available to the public in several ways and contained detailed maps and analysis of the Project. The draft EIS was mailed to federal, state, and local government agencies; elected officials; Alaska Native tribal governments and ANCSA Corporations; local libraries and newspapers; property owners that could be affected by Project facilities; individuals requesting intervenor status in FERC's proceedings; and other interested parties (e.g., individuals and environmental and public interest groups who provided scoping comments or asked to remain on the mailing list). Copies of the draft EIS were made available to the public at public libraries along the route. The document was also available electronically via the FERC website at <http://www.ferc.gov>. The public was given 90 days after the date of the publication in the Federal Register to review and comment on the draft EIS either in the form of written comments and/or verbal comments at public comment meetings. To assist the public in its review, 2-page community summaries were provided at each of the public comment meetings to highlight the major findings of the draft EIS for that particular area.

Additional information on the outreach conducted for the Project and the opportunities for public review of and comment on the Project is provided in section 1.3 of the final EIS. Detailed mapping information is also available on AGDC's Project website (<https://alaska-lng.com/>).

CC-38

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

8

1 (Pause. Audience mingling.)

2 MR. JEUDY: This may help: We have some copies
3 of the Draft EIS in your local libraries. So that might
4 answer some of your questions in terms of the alternatives
5 and how --

6 MS. LAKE: But we don't have a copy here.

7 MR. JEUDY: It's like a 3,000-page --

8 MS. LAKE: Exactly. And I thought that would be
9 here, as part of the process.

10 (Pause)

11 AUDIENCE: [Off mic]

12 MR. JEUDY: Do you please want to make that
13 comment on the record?

14 AUDIENCE: I feel like I've made it a number of
15 times.

16 MR. JEUDY: Already.

17 [Off mic]

18 MR. JEUDY: Different agencies have their own
19 jurisdictions, and they put their own meetings together, I
20 guess. Maybe they need to coordinate that a little bit
21 better.

22 You don't have Internet on your laptop?

23 AUDIENCE: [Off mic]

24 MR. JEUDY: That's easier said than done.

25 MS. WATSON: Erica Watson.

CC-39

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

9

1 Following on what my neighbor just spoke to, I
2 would like it to be recognized that this has been a nebulous
3 and incoherent process from the start; that people have
4 shown up at these meetings, certainly there are some of the
5 same faces here -- and I'm never able to understand the
6 purpose of showing up and trying to be involved. And that
7 it seems really inappropriate for -- the benefit of going to
8 a meeting in person is to gain a little bit of insight maybe
9 from the professionals who have worked on this document and
10 can explain the process to those of us who are not getting
11 paid to read documents this thick [indicating]; for those of
12 us that are trying to follow the processes right now, there
13 are currently three or four major EISs available for
14 comment. A lot of reading for people who -- impossible
15 even if you're working full time reading the EISs. And a
16 lot of those projects, proposed projects, the Ambler Rose
17 Villa development and the Arctic development have impacts on
18 some of the same communities, same region.

19 And it seems really absurd to expect people who
20 also have their own work and their own families and their
21 own lives to spend the next three to six weeks doing nothing
22 but reading environmental impact statements without the
23 benefit of someone available to say, 'Oh, you're interested
24 in climate change. Check out this particular section,
25 You're interested in the public process, check out this.'

CM3-2

CM3-2

See the response to comment CM3-1.

CC-40

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

10

1 I'm not quite sure what we're doing here, and I
2 feel like you've been saying the same thing for years. And
3 I know that other communities feel the same way. And that
4 feels like a pretty broken promise.

CM3-2

5 MR. JEUDY: Thank you.

6 (Pause. Audience mingling.)

7 MR. JEUDY: Could you please state and spell your
8 name for the record.

9 MS. JOHNSTON: Sure. My name is Jennifer

10 Johnston; J E N N I F E R J O H N S T O N. And I have a
11 comment concerning the recreational impacts of the EIS
12 discussion. Everything that I've seen in the DEIS talks
13 about recreational impacts primarily from the construction
14 phase. Certainly there will be impacts in the construction
15 phase.

CM3-3

16 But I also think that, given that this has a
17 life-span in terms of decades, there could potentially be
18 long term impacts to recreation from this project. I think
19 the EIS A) doesn't really address both the longer term
20 impacts to recreation; and it also, given that the economy
21 here is so closely tied to the recreational industry and
22 recreation activities here, there could be a nexus between
23 those longer-term impacts to recreation and the economy of
24 this area. I don't believe that any of the socioeconomic
25 analyses in the EIS address those concerns, either; those

CM3-4

CM3-3

Section 4.9.4 of the final EIS addresses both construction and operational impacts on recreation, including longer-term impacts, where applicable.

CM3-4

Impacts on recreational land uses are addressed in section 4.9.4 of the final EIS and impacts on the recreational economy of the Project area are addressed in section 4.11.7 of the final EIS.

CC-41

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

11

1 longer-term recreational impacts that could follow from this
2 project.

3 So I think that's a gap in the analyses; that for
4 this specific area, perhaps in contrast to many other areas
5 of the project, but in this specific area that's potentially
6 very important. And I think it's something that the EIS
7 really needs to address, particularly given the visual
8 impacts that we know are going to be significant in this
9 area from this project.

10 So I would like to see any additional analyses
11 that draw the connection between long term recreational
12 impact and socioeconomic impact.

13 MR. JEUDY: Thank you for your comment.

14 (Pause. Audience mingling.)

15 MS. WATSON: The preferred alternative changed
16 two weeks after the release of the Draft EIS, and the public
17 comment period should reflect that window -- at least a two
18 week extension. So on the record, requesting, and still
19 recognizing that two weeks is not really adequate given the
20 cumulative time of trying to engage in multiple processes.

21 MR. JEUDY: Thank you.

22 (Pause. Audience mingling.)

23 MS. KELLER: Rose Keller, R O S E K E L L E R.

24 Tagging onto a comment made earlier about a large
25 gap in regard to the impact to recreation long-term on the

CM3-5

CM3-6

CM3-7

CM3-8

CM3-5

Impacts on visual resources are discussed in section 4.10 of the final EIS.

CM3-6

Impacts on recreational land uses are addressed in section 4.9.4 of the final EIS and impacts on the recreational economy of the Project area are addressed in section 4.11.7 of the final EIS.

CM3-7

On July 27, 2016, FERC issued a *Supplemental Notice Requesting Comments on the Denali National Park and Preserve Alternative for the Planned Alaska LNG Project*. On August 23, 2016, FERC held a public forum within the DNPP to discuss the route alternative through the DNPP. The official comment period for the supplemental notice closed on September 25, 2016, but FERC continued to accept comments after that date and through the publication of the draft EIS in June 2019. A detailed analysis of the Denali Alternative was provided in section 3.6.2 of the draft EIS. As indicated in section 3.6.2, we concluded that the selection of the proposed route or the selection of the Denali Alternative were both acceptable, without significant environmental advantages from either, and that the overall resource impacts resulting from the adoption of either route would not affect any of the significance determinations disclosed in section 4.0 and summarized in section 5.0 of the EIS. The supplemental information provided by AGDC as part of its formal adoption of the Denali Alternative into the proposed Project is largely the same as the information provided in its April 2017 application and responses to data requests filed well before the issuance of the draft EIS. It is that information that was used to prepare the analysis provided in section 3.6.2 and now used to update sections 4.0 and 5.0 of the final EIS to reflect the change in the proposed Project. The information provided during the draft EIS comment period did not change our overall analysis or conclusion that the route is acceptable.

CM3-8

Impacts on recreational land uses are addressed in section 4.9.4 of the final EIS and impacts on the recreational economy of the Project area are addressed in section 4.11.7 of the final EIS. A cost benefit analysis is not required to inform the impact significance determinations of the EIS.

CC-42

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

12

1 local economy and the state economy, there hasn't been
2 sufficient evidence or no evidence in the EIS that I could
3 see that really detail a cost-benefit analysis to developing
4 this, through the alternative, on what makes actual good
5 economic sense.

CM3-8

6 So what are the larger impacts to the state and
7 to the local economies? So really having a detailed cost-
8 benefit analysis where it really analyzes foregone
9 opportunity costs for economic development is really
10 important, and that is not something that has not been
11 presented, to my reading, in the environmental impact
12 statement. Again, that's connected to the impact, the long-
13 term impact to recreation and subsistence use in this area.

14 Additionally, I'm not quite sure how development
15 of this project actually adheres to some of the larger goals
16 in -- at least the Department of Interior aims to expand
17 recreational opportunities in public lands. So an analysis
18 that really points to that, how this project will actually
19 be supporting that goal, would be imperative.

CM3-9

20 MR. JEUDY: Thank you.

21 (Pause. Audience mingling.)

22 MR. JEUDY: Before we close up, does anyone have
23 any final comments?

24 (No response.)

25 All right. So I've got the last statement, and

CM3-9

Section 4.9.4 of the final EIS addresses consistency with federal recreation management policies.

CC-43

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

13

1 then we'll be closing out. I want to thank you all for
2 coming. If you're interested in staying informed and
3 receiving updates from the project, and if you have
4 Internet, you can keep on the project, we have the Final
5 Environmental Impact Statement coming out. If you have
6 Internet challenges, please get the information at the front
7 desk.

8 I want to remind you that we will be accepting
9 written and electronic comments until October 3rd, 2019.

10 In conclusion, the comments received here tonight
11 will be considered and addressed as appropriate in the Final
12 Environmental Impact Statement. With your assistance,
13 decision makers will make better and more informed
14 decisions.

15 Thank you again.

16 On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory
17 Commission, I thank you for coming tonight and participating
18 in the environmental review of the Alaska LNG Project.
19 Thank you for coming to the comment meeting for the Healy
20 DEIS comment period for September 11, 2019. Your
21 participation is essential to ensuring a fair and
22 comprehensive review.

23 Thank you again, have a good night, and drive
24 safe.

25 [Whereupon at 6:30 p.m., the public comment

CC-44

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

14

1 session concluded.]

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CC-45

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont'd)

20191017-4004 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

15

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding

4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the

5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding: Alaska LNG Project

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 Docket No.: CP17-178-000

16 Place: Healy, Alaska

17 Date: Wednesday, September 11, 2019

18 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original

19 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy

20 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription

21 of the proceedings.

22

23

24 Dan Hawkins

25 Official Reporter

CC-46

CM3 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Healy (cont’d)

20191017-4004 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019	
Document	Content(s)
091119AKProject.DOCX.....	1-15
091119AKProject.TXT.....	16-46

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

1

1 FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

2

3 Alaska LNG Project

4 Docket No. CP17-178-000

5

6 Public Meeting

7

8 Wednesday, September 11, 2019

9 5:00 p.m.

10

11 Nikiski Recreation Center

12 Mile 23.4 Kenai Spur Highway

13 Nikiski, Alaska 99611

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CC-48

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

2

1 SPEAKER LIST
2 John Peconom - Chair
3 Debbie McKay
4 Bill Warren
5 Bill Bookout
6 Linda Huhndorf
7 Mayor Charlie Pierce
8 Gene Palm
9 Bob Breeden
10 Wayne Ogal
11 Ross Njaa
12 Barbara Njaa
13 Ann Huhndorf
14 Byron Nalos
15 John Quick
16 Paul Huber
17 A.J. Ewing
18 Mayor Brian Gabriel
19 Constance Nicks
20
21
22
23
24
25

CC-49

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

3

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

2 MR. PECONOM: Good evening. My name is John
3 Peconom. I am a Project Manager with the Federal Energy
4 Regulatory Commission. I am the Deputy Project Manager for
5 the Alaska LNG Project. With me tonight is Nancy-Fox
6 Fernandez, Kara Hempy-Mayer, and Lisa DiNicolantonio.

7 On behalf of the Commission, I would like to
8 thank all of you for being here this evening. We are joined
9 here tonight by Dara Glass with the Bureau of Land
10 Management. Also present are Mark Jen with the
11 Environmental Protection Agency and Jennifer Morel with the
12 State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources.

13 Tonight's meeting is being recorded. A
14 transcript of tonight's meeting will be placed in the
15 Commission's publicly available administrative record and
16 will be available for download. The Commission's
17 administrative record can be accessed through the
18 Commission's website at www.ferc.gov. For additional
19 information on how to access our website and obtain a copy
20 of the transcript, please talk to one of the ladies in the
21 back.

22 Hard copies of the transcript can also be
23 purchased. Please see the gentleman here if you are
24 interested in purchasing a hard copy of the transcript. Let
25 the record show that today is September 11th, 2019 and that

CC-50

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

4

1 the Alaska LNG DEIS Comment Meeting in Nikiski, Alaska began
2 at 5:18 p.m.

3 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to receive
4 public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
5 for the Alaska LNG Project. The Alaska LNG Project involves
6 the construction and operation of new natural gas treatment
7 facilities on the north slope of Alaska, an approximately
8 800-mile long natural gas pipeline and associated
9 above-ground facilities spanning the State of Alaska to a
10 new LNG export terminal facility here on the Kenai
11 Peninsula.

12 Construction of the project will also require the
13 relocation of a portion of the Kenai Highway, and upgrades
14 to the City of Kenai Water System. The Draft Environmental
15 Impact Statement issued on June 28th, 2019 was independently
16 prepared by FERC staff in consultation and cooperation with
17 other federal agencies, including the Bureau of Land
18 Management, United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Coast
19 Guard, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine
20 Fishery Service and others to inform the Commission, the
21 public and permitted agencies about the potential adverse
22 and beneficial environmental impacts that would result from
23 constructing and operating the Alaska LNG Project.

24 In addition to a description of impacts, the
25 Draft Environmental Impact Statement contains an alternative

CC-51

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

5

1 analysis, a cumulative impacts analysis, an impact
2 minimization and mitigation measures we are recommending to
3 the Commission to further avoid and reduce adverse impacts
4 on the environment.

5 In the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, FERC
6 staff concludes that constructing and operating the project
7 would result in temporary, long-term and permanent impacts
8 on the environment. Most impacts would not be significant
9 or would be reduced to less than significant levels with the
10 implementation of proposed or recommended avoidance,
11 minimization and mitigation measures.

12 However, some impacts would be adverse and
13 significant. A summary of impacts described in the Draft
14 Environmental Impact Statement is available in the back.
15 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement can also be
16 accessed through the Commission's website again, at
17 www.ferc.gov.

18 The comments on the Draft EIS that you provide
19 here this evening, whether given verbally or provide to us
20 in writing, will be considered in the preparation of the
21 Final Environmental Impact Statement.

22 Your comments will ensure that the Final
23 Environmental Impact Statement, which we expect to issue in
24 March of 2020, will be considered by the Commission when
25 deciding this matter -- excuse me. Your comments will

CC-52

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

6

1 ensure that the Final Environmental Impact Statement
2 considered by the Commission when deciding this matter,
3 accurately reflects the impact to the environment that would
4 result from the construction and operation of the project.

5 Before we hear from our first speaker, I would
6 like to remind you all that comments -- verbal, written, and
7 those filed electronically, are treated equally. If you
8 choose not to speak this evening, you may submit written
9 and/or electronic comments. Written comment forms are
10 available in the back. You may leave comments with us
11 tonight or send them to the Commission via U.S. mail.

12 If you are providing written comments, be sure to
13 include the FERC Docket Number CP17-178-000. Comments
14 should be sent so that they arrive in Washington, D.C. by
15 October 3rd, 2019. Alternatively, you can send -- you can
16 submit electronic comments. Instructions are available at
17 the front.

18 Again, verbal, written and electronically filed
19 comments will be considered equally as we prepare the Final
20 Environmental Impact Statement. When your name is called,
21 please come up to the podium. Please speak directly into
22 the microphone, state your name clearly and spell it so that
23 your comments can be accurately recorded in the transcript.

24 If you are speaking on behalf of a group or an
25 organization, please identify the group's name. In order to

CC-53

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont’d)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

7

1 ensure that everyone has time to speak, I ask that you limit
2 your comments to no more than five minutes. There are about
3 20 speakers. If you need a little bit more time, I'm
4 certainly not going to cut you off. I just ask that you be
5 respectful of the time, and again, you can supplement your
6 comments -- written or electronic form, should you need more
7 time.

8 Lastly, please be respectful of your neighbors
9 and those with opinions that may be different than your own.
10 So, our first speaker this evening is Miss Heidi Cunny,
11 excuse me. I guess, no?

12 MS. CUNNY: I'm sorry, I thought that was the
13 sign-in sheet.

14 MR. PECONOM: That's okay. Bise Warren?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would you repeat that
16 please?

17 MR. PECONOM: Bise Warren, B-i-s-e W-a-r-r-e-n?

18 Okay, Miss Debbie McKay? Yes, I'm sorry I meant to turn on
19 that microphone.

20 MS. MCKAY: My name is Debbie McKay, and I live
21 in the Boulder Point neighborhood where the proposed
22 pipeline -- can everybody hear me?

23 MR. PECONOM: Maybe you can lean into it.

24 MS. MCKAY: Okay, so it would seem to make more
25 sense to bring the pipeline into the industrial area at

CM4-1

CM4-1

Comment noted.

CC-54

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

8

1 Arness

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Dock

9 where the existing pipelines already come in. The Boulder
10 Point area is a pristine forest with a diverse wildlife
11 population that includes brown and black bear, moose, lynx,
12 wolverine, wolves, fox and porcupine.

CM4-1

13 Disturbing this habitat will have a huge impact
14 for generations to come, especially on the black bears, not
15 just in this particular area, but from all of Nikiski, who
16 ever fall rely on the Devil's Club in this area to fatten up
17 for their winter hibernation.

CM4-2

18 The Devil's Club wrote the understory of the
19 cottonwood and alder trees. Without it, it will not renew
20 its growth as this area will be kept clear of any growth, so
21 to keep the road open for maintenance, et cetera, the
22 Devil's Club will not be able to bounce back, and the black
23 bear population will most likely dwindle.

24 A fish and wildlife study shows that black bears
25 can only produce young if they eat the Devil's Club berries.

CM4-2

Impacts on bear and moose are discussed in section 4.6.1.3 of the final EIS.

CC-55

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

9

1 This will negatively affect their numbers for decades. This
2 area is also a major moose camping range whose numbers will
3 also be reduced by the destruction and disturbance of their
4 long-time habitat.

CM4-2

5 This construction will surely have a negative
6 impact on our property values. Most of the people in our
7 neighborhood spent the last 25 or 30 years paying for and
8 maintaining what we have thought of as our permanent
9 residence and our retirement nest egg and our children's
10 inheritance.

CM4-3

11 The roads in our neighborhood were built by us,
12 they are not Borough maintained. We plow the snow in the
13 winter, maintaining grades, the roads, throughout the year.
14 Several of the neighbors have purchased heavy equipment for
15 this purpose. Suddenly, it's looking like our neighborhood
16 is not what we have cared for and maintained all these years
17 and will likely be worth much less after bringing a pipeline
18 through the middle of it.

19 We bought property up here because it is not an
20 industrial area, because it is pristine forest with a
21 diverse population of flora and fauna. We are located 3
22 miles from Captain Cook's State Park. Is there a plan to
23 compensate for this loss?

24 Three of the families in our neighborhood have
25 fishing sites here, one each, just on either side of the

CM4-3

Section 4.9.2.2 of the final EIS addresses easement negotiations and compensation for easements. Section 4.11.5.4 of the final EIS addresses potential impacts on property values.

CC-56

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

10

1 proposed pipeline. It has been proposed that these families | CM4-3

2 will be financially reimbursed for their loss of income.

3 Money cannot compensate for the productive

4 lifestyle that Byron and Maria Nalos's children are

5 experiencing. Some things can't be measured by money. We

6 are not looking for handouts, we are asking to be left in

7 peace.

8 My husband Peter and I chose the Boulder Point | CM4-4

9 location for our home because it is on the ocean with views

10 of Mount Vsevidof, Mount McKinley and the Spurr Mountain

11 Range and it's a short walk to the beach. We have clean air

12 with a fresh breeze coming in off the ocean.

13 It is our dream come true. We always joked that

14 we don't have to go on vacation because we already live in

15 paradise. With the exception of the younger Byron and Maria

16 Nalos family, all the folks impacted by this project are

17 either retired or will be soon.

18 The noise and air pollution that will accompany

19 this project which we have been told will take two to four

20 years, will undoubtedly be astronomical. None of us want to

21 be saddled with the type of air quality that this project

22 will bring.

23 I have chemical sensitivities with the main issue | CM4-5

24 being petroleum. So, for me, if this project comes through

25 our neighborhood as proposed, I will have to leave our

CM4-4

Sections 4.15 and 4.16 of the final EIS, respectively, describe the air quality and noise impacts associated with Project construction and operation. The Project would be in compliance with National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and FERC noise standards.

CM4-5

Comment noted.

CC-57

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

11

1 residence. I won't be able to tolerate the fumes that will
2 be generated just a couple hundred yards from our home.

CM4-5

3 As air quality goes, our neighborhood is as safe
4 as it gets. I don't want to move. I don't know where I
5 could find another place that I could tolerate like our
6 place on the ocean with the constant fresh air breezes. We
7 chose this location because it is not an industrial area.
8 It has clean air and is a great place to raise our children.
9 We'd like to keep it that way.

10 MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

11 MR. WARREN: Sir, the lady before -- I mean
12 before the name before was that Bill Warren?

13 MR. PECONOM: It was, I'm sorry I misread the
14 handwriting, so.

15 MR. WARREN: That because I scribbled, thank you.

16 MR. PECONOM: Mr. Bill Warren.

17 MR. WARREN: I'm Bill Warren and I live in the
18 proximity of this project on the bluff and we weren't
19 successful in the earlier property acquisitions. The house
20 I built for my mother right next to me, was bought but that
21 left us in a position. We have six acres and I've almost
22 given up and have my son -- he's building a place on the
23 north end and we have got a daughter.

24 We're wanting to move on, but I'll qualify that
25 by saying our family is very supportive of this project. It

CM4-6

CM4-6

Comment noted.

CC-58

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

12

1 will be a boom for Alaskans. I worked on the TAPS line as a
2 welder and the lady that sits behind me, she successfully
3 sold her home. I think she did quite well. I hope she did
4 but the whole thing was kind of fouled up during the early
5 acquisitions, so 600 acres.

6 It was kind of they came in the night and our
7 representatives wouldn't help us. We were on our own. And
8 I have always remembered you folks were here in town at one
9 of those meetings and you said you would be back and here
10 you are, and I'm glad that you are, sincerely.

11 Because we need to get some safeguards for those
12 people that live here. How long have I lived on that
13 property? You know, 50 years or so -- a long time and I got
14 children and grandchildren that want to reside here too.
15 So, this is a big step for us. And we're willingly -- AGDC
16 has been very supportive of us and I have nothing badly to
17 say about AGDC, but things are in a mix-up now, I don't know
18 if you guys know from way over the seaboard, but our state
19 is in a little bit of flux right now, and a different
20 Governor, different positions.

21 And so, I'm glad we have an opportunity to
22 testify here. My message is simple -- let's go with the
23 project and let's treat the people fairly. And that means
24 in all respects because we do have to relocate my whole
25 family after 50 years, we've got to relocate. And I know

CM4-6

CC-59

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont’d)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

13

1 from the lady here it's very hard to relocate when you've
2 been someplace for a long time. | CM4-6

3 But I do thank you for listening to me and I see
4 a lot of good people out here. We're all good people.

5 MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Warren. Our next
6 speaker is Mr. Bill Bookout.

7 MR. BOOKOUT: Thank you very much. Thank you for
8 the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact
9 Statement published June 9th, 2019, Docket Number
10 CP17-178-000. My name is Bill Bookout and I speak on behalf
11 of my wife Mary Bookout and I, who own the property at the
12 address that the Borough has assigned at 48622 Nikiski REM
13 Northwest.

14 Specifically, our property is located just to the
15 west of the property owned by Peter and Debbie McKay,
16 immediately adjacent to the proposed pipeline landfall from
17 the Cook Inlet into Boulder Point.

18 In summary, our property, our lives, our personal | CM4-7
19 rights will be significantly disrupted and infringed, along
20 with many of our friends and neighbors in the Boulder Point
21 residential area should this project as proposed be allowed
22 to continue.

23 For the record, I will also state that we are not | CM4-8
24 against responsible energy development, as various projects
25 do provide benefits to both our state and our nation. This

CM4-7 Comment noted.

CM4-8 Where applicable, the EIS has been revised to correct or add information to the analysis based on public comments.

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

14

1 project, however, does not fulfill these objectives and with
2 the published Draft EIS, not only significantly minimizes
3 the local impact this project will result in permanent and
4 unrecoverable damage to the environment, detrimentally
5 affecting Alaska wildlife, and also contains factual
6 inaccuracies.

CM4-8

7 Due to limited time, I will only list a few
8 examples. As documented on page 194 at minimum, black bear
9 and moose populations will be permanently impacted due to
10 the loss of both habitat and the permanent loss of forage as
11 Devil's Club requires shaded areas to thrive.

CM4-9

12 Even with the reclamation, cover would never be
13 fully restored. Further, on pages 466 to 470 of the Draft,
14 it is noted that among other things, impact on forest
15 communities "would be significant given the quantity and
16 additional forest vegetation that would require to be
17 removed through construction and clearing."

CM4-10

18 Two -- in addition the main line right-of-way of
19 AGBC is requiring an additional land in many areas. One of
20 these comprising more than 10 acres is located for
21 preparation staging and possible living quarters, helipads,
22 et cetera, immediately behind our specific property.

CM4-11

23 I call your attention to the example given in the
24 photo of the pipeline approach of the Cook inlet at Beluga,
25 Alaska. And I would ask Bob, if you could pass out the

CM4-9 Impacts on bear and moose are discussed in section 4.6.1.3 of the final EIS.

CM4-10 Comment noted.

CM4-11 Section 4.10.2 of the final EIS has been updated to address this comment.

CC-61

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

15

1 first photographs please. Okay, thank you very much.

CM4-11

2 Potentially, this is the view as seen in these
3 photographs that we would have from our bedroom window.

4 This is specifically in the EIS Draft on page 1192 noting

5 "operational traffic noise," which would be significant

6 during the project and continue for maintenance and

7 monitoring in perpetuity.

8 I also had the opportunity to accompany our

CM4-12

9 neighbor, Byron Nalos and his son Spur, while they fished

10 one day a few weeks ago. While compensation may be offered

11 for impact and loss of income due to disruption of fishing

12 operations, as Debbie McKay indicated, there is no financial

13 measurement that can adequately compensate the impact I

14 personally observed to families raising their kids,

15 teaching them about the values and lifestyles which is

16 uniquely Alaska.

17 These effects in the child's formative years

18 cannot be measured by money as Debbie indicated. The values

19 -- these values and heritage are among the reasons we chose

20 to live in this particular area. You passed out the same

21 picture as well Bob, yep, that's right.

22 Fourth -- the project as proposed requires

CM4-13

23 unneeded and unreasonable right-of-way of 145 feet, some of

24 which is noted in Table B-3, which are particularly

25 impactful to the residents in the area. In the Draft EIS,

CM4-12

Comment noted.

CM4-13

As discussed in section 2.1.4.1 of the final EIS, AGDC proposes to use construction right-of-way widths that vary from 65 to 185 feet for the onshore portion of the Mainline Pipeline depending on construction mode. See also Figures 2.2.2-1 through 2.2.2-6, which depict typical right-of-way configurations by pipeline construction mode.

CC-62

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

16

1 FERC has denied that request and stated the project will
2 remain within the 75 foot right-of-way.

3 However, this is simply not possible or
4 practical, due to the extremely steep conditions of the
5 terrain. Therefore, if the project were to go through in
6 our area, it would likely appear to be in the interstate
7 highway through pristine Alaskan terrain.

8 Comparatively, remaining within the Cook Inlet
9 for two additional miles with the proposed Western
10 alternative, over five miles -- would prevent over five
11 miles of permanent destruction -- five.

12 I call your attention to comments beginning on
13 page 874 where it stated, "The mainland facility would
14 primarily follow designated utility corridors and avoid
15 residential communities." I suggest for those of us who
16 live here, this statement is simply factually inaccurate,
17 and I assure you that if anyone lived in our community, you
18 would feel exactly the same way.

19 I also want to state for the record that the
20 location of our well, I request be specifically noted. I
21 don't believe that it is, as well as the specific location
22 of our residence as one of the family's most impacted in all
23 respects, including property values as well as the
24 infringement on our personal and peaceful right to
25 enjoyment.

CM4-13

CM4-14

CM4-15

CM4-16

CM4-14 The proposed Mainline Pipeline route generally follows existing corridors for most of its length. Additionally, as discussed in section 2.1.4.1 of the final EIS, approximately 20 percent of the route is parallel to and within 100 feet of an existing linear corridor facility (e.g., a pipeline, road, or electric transmission line) and another 16 percent is within designated utility corridors.

CM4-15 Prior to construction, AGDC would file an updated list of public water wells within 500 feet of the Project and private water wells and springs within 150 feet of construction workspace based on the survey results. As discussed in section 4.3.1.5 of the final EIS, AGDC would conduct pre-construction private and public water well surveys within 150 feet on construction workspace where the Mainline Facilities cross the Interior and South-Central Hydrologic Regions and in the Liquefaction Facilities area, contingent on landowner approval. The residence associated with the private well mentioned in this comment is greater than 500 feet from the Mainline Pipeline.

CM4-16 See the response to comment CM4-3.

CC-63

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

17

1 In summary and conclusion, this is emotional for
2 me and I apologize, okay. When we first came to Nikiski, we
3 looked for over two years for property here, it's our
4 retirement home, okay. We looked from Homer to Nikiski,
5 this was the last property we looked at.

6 We drove from Kenai, came around the corner, I
7 saw the Agrium plant. I looked at my wife and I said this
8 doesn't look too good to me. We continued, and it's a
9 highly -- you know, it's a pretty industrialized area with
10 oil fields in Sepor. When we got to Nikiski, and we
11 proceeded on towards Captain Cook State Park, this was
12 Alaska.

13 So, I would suggest to you -- like I said this is CM4-17
14 very emotional and very personal to me. So, I would suggest
15 to you and everyone in this community, give serious
16 consideration to the alternative that has been proposed for
17 the western -- known as the Western alternative.

18 Because it seems to me that this proposed
19 alternative can accomplish all objectives, from all
20 stakeholders in this area, minimizing the impact, which is
21 significant and permanent, to the residents of the Boulder
22 Point area. I appreciate the opportunity to make comments.
23 Thank you.

24 MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Bookout. Just so I
25 can confirm for the record here, Bill, B-i-l-l Bookout,

CM4-17

See the updates to section 3.6.1.2 of the final EIS regarding the Cook Inlet West Alternative.

CC-64

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

18

1 B-o-o-k-o-u-t?

2 MR. BOOKOUT: That's correct. And I will be
3 submitting comments to the docket as well.

4 MR. PECONOM: Thank you very much. Just as a
5 reminder, when you come up please state your name and spell
6 it clearly for the record. I forgot to remind the past
7 couple folks. I have the names here for those who have
8 spoken previously but coming forward please remember to
9 spell your name. Our next speaker is Miss Linda Huhndorf.

10 MS. HUHDORF: My name is Linda Huhndorf, and its
11 spelled L-i-n-d-a H-u-h-n-d-o-r-f. And you know we've seen
12 the presentations, the emotional feelings about those of us
13 who live in the area, and I am one of them.

14 There's a lot of practical things too that could
15 be done to mitigate what is assured to be destruction of the
16 land that we live on. And that alternate is simply a
17 different route -- I'm getting ahead of myself, so let me
18 calm down a minute. And I know you're probably used to
19 people who have the NIMBY point of view, you probably hear
20 it every single time.

21 The old "not in my backyard syndrome." Well, all
22 of us here, even some folks who live in the neighborhood
23 affected -- we are not anti-oil and gas. Many of us have
24 had families that worked in the industry and that's what
25 supported us, helped us raise kids.

CM4-18

CM4-18

See the updates to section 3.6.1.2 of the final EIS regarding the Cook Inlet West Alternative.

CC-65

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

19

1 What we do object to is where this is going to be
2 punched through. It doesn't even make sense. There is
3 another alternative called the West alternative, instead of
4 the C2 Boulder Point alternative, and -- okay.

CM4-18

5 Before I go into the alternative, I'd like to say
6 one thing. I read the 2018-2022 fiscal year FERC Strategic
7 Planning Manual and it outlines a lot of the
8 responsibilities of FERC. And one of them being, "In
9 exercising its authority, FERC ensures the development and
10 operation of safe, secure and reliable infrastructure, while
11 ensuring that impacts are mitigated."

CM4-19

12 Keeping those -- this is FERC's own duty and
13 responsibility here, not as many, but this is one, and
14 simply put you can't uphold even that duty and
15 responsibility given the route that's been chosen.

16 And a lot of people are not objecting. Oh, God,
17 there's a gas pipeline coming through somewhere, it's not
18 about the gas and oil development, it's about the horrible
19 selection of how that's going to be put in place. Yeah, and
20 I'd like to mention just three of the ways -- three ways
21 that would make it impossible for FERC to hold up that
22 responsibility.

23 Number one -- this is Seneva Lake Dam and I do
24 see somewhere in the paperwork that it either has been or
25 will be addressed to ameliorate the chances of that dam

CM4-20

CM4-19

As discussed in section 1.1 of the final EIS, the Commission's purpose for reviewing the Project is based on its obligations under Section 3 of the NGA, which requires the Commission to consider as part of its decision to authorize natural gas facilities, all factors bearing on the public interest. Specifically, regarding whether to authorize natural gas facilities used for export, the Commission would authorize the proposal unless it finds that the proposed facilities would not be consistent with the public interest. The Commission's environmental staff prepared the EIS in compliance with NEPA to assess the anticipated environmental impacts from construction and operation of the Project. The Commission will consider the findings in the EIS during its decision-making process.

CM4-20

Potential impacts from a breach of Suneva Lake Dam are discussed in section 4.1.3.10 of the final EIS.

CC-66

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

20

1 breaking yet again, and putting up with lands, it's pretty
2 darn close to the gas pipeline where it comes on to the
3 beach from the inlet. That's smart.

CM4-20

4 You'd think there'd be another place to choose
5 and that place is the West route -- very simple. The second
6 way that FERC cannot live up to its responsibilities, as
7 they themselves describe, is because of the destruction of
8 17 acres. And I bet by the time it's said and done, it will
9 be more than 17 acres.

CM4-21

10 That's 17 acres of destruction of habitat for
11 bear, moose, and I'm sure you've read this is a known caving
12 area for moose. The Environmental Impact Statement noted
13 the following -- I think like Mr. Bookout said, there would
14 be a significant loss of forestation, right.

15 Moose populations have been in decline because of
16 loss of habitat quality. Well guess what? This project is
17 not going to improve that, it's going to destroy what's
18 left. Okay, so the moose and the bears will be losing
19 habitat, and a further decline in the quality of habitat.
20 And moose would decline in population which would ensure the
21 bear would go down in population because moose, Devil's
22 Club, that moose are also on the menu for bear -- the whole
23 thing goes downhill simply because the wrong route is going
24 to be chosen, or it seems to be. We're hoping to affect
25 that.

CM4-21 Impacts on bear and moose are discussed in section 4.6.1.3 of the final EIS.

CC-67

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

21

1 The third one -- this is kind of a glaring
2 unsuitability of the C2 Boulder Point route. Let me digress
3 just for a second. A long time ago I went to New Zealand,
4 rented a little tiny place on the bay. It was called
5 Maunganui Bay. I swam in that bay every day we were there
6 for two or three times a day. I noticed nobody else swam
7 there.

8 I asked a couple of the neighbors what's with the
9 no swimming thing? She said well do you know what Maunganui
10 means. I said no. She said it means great white shark.
11 It's Great White Shark Bay. Now, if I had known that, I
12 wouldn't have rented that house. I wouldn't have gone for
13 twice daily swims in the bay and I have all my limbs, thank
14 goodness, but to me that kind of correlates to Boulder
15 Point.

16 It's called that for a reason. There are lots of
17 boulders in Boulder Point, and that is where the proposed
18 line is going to go, theoretically. My dad, on board, a
19 deep sea diver, commercial diver for 40 years. The inlet
20 was where he worked. It was his office -- 200 feet down.
21 That's what he did for 40 years, he laid pipelines, he
22 repaired pipelines. He repaired the legs of platforms and
23 the things that fall off of platforms like cranes.

24 He knows the tides. He knows it uniquely -- the
25 whole area. I went to visit him, and I said -- I didn't

CM4-22

CM4-22

Sections 3.6.1.2 and 4.3.3.3 of the final EIS have been updated to address this comment. Also, see the updated discussion in section 2.2.2.2 of the final EIS regarding the status of PHMSA's review of the offshore pipeline.

CC-68

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

22

1 want to tell him why I was asking him this, so I just began CM4-22

2 talking about his diving and the inlet and how that went,
3 his 40 years-worth. And I said, "Where do most of the gas
4 pipeline go that are in the inlet? You know, ones that you
5 said, "Well they go to Nikiski Bay."

6 And I said, "Well, what about laying a gas
7 pipeline say at Boulder Point." And he looked at me like I
8 had all my IQ points fall out of my head, and he said,
9 "Well, no, you wouldn't want to do that." I said, "why?"
10 And he said, "Well, the big, big boulders you don't have to
11 worry about."

12 And then I thought oh, man, that's not what I
13 want to hear. But he meant the ones that are the size of
14 large buildings. They don't move anywhere. Anything
15 smaller than that, it's like they migrate, they're moved by
16 the tide and the current which is the second highest in the
17 world except for the Bay of Fundy in Canada.

18 Those boulders are not going to stay put and
19 they're going to impair and endanger any pipeline that's put
20 down there. And somebody might say well, your dad quit
21 diving when he was 73, that was about 20 years ago, and
22 there's new technology now. We can map out where every
23 single boulder is in Boulder Point.

24 My dad, he was real quick on his feet, he said,
25 "Well that might be." He said, "But you would know at that

CC-69

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

23

1 point in time when you took that study or technology where
2 every boulder was. The big ones will stay put, but those
3 less than the size of a house are going to be different if
4 you took the same imaging again, a year later." This is not
5 the place to put a gas pipeline. Even, if I were the Agency
6 doing it, I'd say wait a minute, no, that won't work, we're
7 going to go where all the other gas pipelines go, where
8 there's a right-of-way.

9 And it's just very frustrating, because it seems
10 so common sense to me. But remember FERC's manual --
11 strategic planning. One of the responsibilities as I just
12 read -- it is required to be upheld. And nobody in their
13 right mind can authorize the Boulder Point route and uphold
14 any sort of standard. It's okay, I better stop.

15 Alright, well I thank you very much for your
16 attention.

17 MR. PECONOM: Thank you. Our next speaker is Mr.
18 Charlie Pierce. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

19 MR. PIERCE: Thank you and I'd like to extend a
20 warm welcome to each of you that have traveled here to hold
21 this hearing before the residents here in Nikiski and
22 specifically, on the Kenai Peninsula.

23 I speak for the record, my last name is spelled
24 P-i-e-r-c-e. I come to you and I speak to you as the
25 Borough Mayor, and I wanted to start by saying you drove out

CM4-22

CC-70

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

24

1 here this evening. You drove past Fire Station 1, and I
2 think that the display that was there should remind us all
3 of the 911 event.

4 I've got several points that I would like to make
5 and extrapolate tonight. I would say that I'm familiar with
6 the FERC Agency. I worked for a company for 39 years,
7 managed the gas operations on the Kenai Peninsula for 28
8 years. I've been in Alaska for 45 years and I would say
9 that I am familiar with a number of industry-related
10 development-type projects.

11 I would say that by and large, the comments that CM4-23
12 I have received and the discussions in the meetings that
13 I've participated in, the support for this project is
14 clearly a voice of yes, let's build this project.

15 The existing industry development in Nikiski, I
16 think, provides for many supporting reasons for the terminus
17 and location of this project to be in Nikiski. Look around
18 you when you drive in and out of this town this evening.
19 You will see that there are a number of buildings -- vacant
20 buildings, along the roadway as you drive out to Nikiski
21 that at one time housed many workers that you could say
22 worked in the supporting industries for many of the
23 platforms that you see out in Cook Inlet today, that many
24 still operate.

25 A number of pipelines that have been installed in

CM4-23 Comment noted.

CC-71

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

25

1 Cook Inlet, across Cook Inlet, that have operated for the
2 better part of 50 plus years and have done so in a very safe
3 manner. I would say that this project -- a favorable aspect
4 of this project is that it will provide the access to over
5 30 trillion cubic feet of natural gas reserves.

6 This important resource will lower the energy
7 cost throughout Alaska. One of the things we experience in
8 Alaska, throughout Alaska, is very, very high energy costs.
9 It really prevents us from doing many of the things and
10 applying much of the capital that we have as individuals
11 towards other things.

12 We buy fuel oil, propane, pay electric bills with
13 it. If you have the blessing of having natural gas service,
14 you pay for that as well. But I'd also say that this
15 project would not only benefit Alaska and lower the energy
16 costs for Alaska, but it would also lower the energy costs
17 for other parts of the world that are trying to have a
18 resource or a predictable long-term availability to this
19 resource.

20 The environmental benefits are endless -- clean
21 burning natural gas. I think that we could all say that
22 there's a number of options, many, many options in the
23 hydrocarbon environment where natural gas can be utilized to
24 produce many services and goods.

25 While there have been a number of environmental

CM4-23

CC-72

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

26

1 impacts or design questions that have been placed before you
2 and that will be placed before you and, in your review, you
3 cite a number of those. My experience working in the
4 industry is that many of these challenges are just that --
5 they're design challenges that can be addressed.

6 I think that's an important part. There are
7 folks that perhaps are not as familiar with what
8 technologies are used today for the installation of a
9 facility like this, and the various options and decisions
10 that can be made, that would reduce and minimize many of
11 these questions that would be raised as to "not in my
12 backyard."

13 I would also strongly encourage you to consider
14 the many industry developments that are currently operating
15 in Alaska. We have over 50-60 years in the hydrocarbon
16 industry environment in Alaska, and I think that if you were
17 to go back and evaluate the report card and compare it to
18 other regions in the world within the world, and within the
19 United States, you would see that Alaska is kind of a role
20 model I think, for the industry in the development of new
21 technologies and clean ways to operate.

22 I think we have a good track record in Alaska.
23 I'd ask you to look at that and consider that. You know
24 Alaska -- we say it's a natural resource extraction state
25 and yet in my 45 years of living in Alaska, I've watched

CM4-23

CC-73

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

27

1 numerous projects develop, the plans be discussed and
2 cancelled only because of the risk. We talk about the risk
3 -- the management of risk.

4 And I think that -- and we shy away from many
5 good projects because of the risk that they potentially
6 present. And again, I just have to go back to my own
7 personal experiences in managing many of these risks that we
8 talked about. And I think that the industry -- if you look
9 at the industry in Alaska, and the companies that have
10 operated in Alaska, you would find that they operate
11 responsibly.

12 They select the best methods. If you ever go to
13 the north slope, or you go into a facility even down the
14 street and you walk into the facility, you'll find that many
15 of these have very, very good safety records, they maintain
16 good safety records for a reason. And I think it's because
17 the people that operate these companies care.

18 They're responsible and they have been
19 responsible and what that does for me is it gives me a
20 higher level of confidence of the results that we will
21 produce when we build this gas line and this facility here
22 in Nikiski, is that it will be operated safely.

23 The design concerns that have been raised will be
24 addressed when we have a project. And I believe that it
25 will be a long-term, very beneficial resource to Alaskans

CM4-23

CC-74

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

28

1 and to the United States, as well as the world. It's a
2 major project.

3 This project is very much needed in Alaska today.
4 Over 50 years ago we built an oil pipeline and we turned it
5 on, and we've operated it for over 50 years. It's provided
6 a lot of good development, stable living conditions in
7 Alaska. You know there was a period of time in Alaska where
8 we had over two million barrels a day of oil flowing in that
9 line.

10 And today, it's two-thirds empty, and Alaska is
11 challenged with ways to pay their bills and yet we're also
12 tied through regulations and we again, look at the risk of
13 things. And yet, out of the other side of many of our
14 mouths, we sit back, and we're challenged with the
15 conversation when we prepare our budgets. I'm the Mayor
16 here. I understand the needs, fund to the cap, educational
17 funding for our children. Where many would say fund to the
18 cap, fund that, make sure the government can provide that.

19 The same individuals talk out of the other side
20 of their mouth and say, "But don't do it because it presents
21 a high level of risk." You know what? I'm an Alaskan. I'm
22 your Mayor. I had one of the best jobs I've ever had in my
23 life and I worked with some of the greatest people that I've
24 ever worked with in my life and I live in a community with
25 doers. We're doers.

CM4-23

CC-75

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

29

1 We work together as individuals. We solve
2 problems together, problems together -- these design plans
3 you're concerned about, there's an interest with the people
4 that want to build this line to solve those concerns. I'll
5 assure you of that.

6 You know in 2018, shortly after I became Mayor,
7 we established an advisory group. It was a community group
8 that we pulled together and we charged them with the duties
9 of monitoring Alaska Gas Line Development Corporation's
10 plans, looking at the local impacts of this project as it
11 related to the residents, to homeowners, landowners,
12 property owners, value, standards of living, routings of
13 road, water sources.

14 We looked at a lot of different issues and we've
15 catalogued many of those. And I think many of those
16 concerns have been also addressed to you in writing. Some
17 of them have been addressed to you in writing, but we do
18 have a catalogue of concerns that would need to be addressed
19 at some point. We plan to bring those comments to the
20 offering and make suggestions with those when and if there
21 is a permit issued and we have a project. We'll talk about
22 those things with Alaska Gas Line Development Corporation
23 and we'll advocate for the voice of the people that live in
24 this community, that live on the Kenai Peninsula.

25 Keep in mind with this group is looking at the

CM4-23

CC-76

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

30

1 entire Kenai Peninsula, Seward, Palmer, Anchorage -- going
2 to Anchorage, the road system, the transportation systems,
3 the availability of just resources in general and the
4 impacts to our communities.

5 And with that I'll close my comments. I would
6 say that I believe that this is a very needed project in
7 Alaska. I understand the magnitude of this project -- it's
8 a very, very large project. It will have a lot of
9 challenges, it will have a lot of good and bad that comes
10 with it, but I overall believe that if you take the
11 environmental concerns and the environmental group, and you
12 put the very best of those individuals with the very best in
13 industry, and you partner those two, we can do this project.

14 We can make -- build a project that is beneficial
15 to all that will pay dividends to Alaskans and to the United
16 States for many, many years to come and so with that I'll
17 close and I'll say thank you again for coming to Alaska to
18 talk with us and to allow us to have an opportunity to speak
19 with you tonight, thank you.

20 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. The next
21 speaker is Gene Palm.

22 MR. PALM: I've got some throat issues, but I'll
23 try to speak up so I can be heard. My name is Gene Palm,
24 I'm part of the neighborhood and I just want to -- want you
25 to look at Boulder Point neighborhood report that I just

CM4-23

CC-77

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

31

1 flipped through. And so, I'm not going to discuss that at
2 all, I just thought one -- I just wanted to show my wife,
3 just to tell you that my wife and I are supportive of that.

4 And I actually have a letter I'll send. I'll
5 give you and in there both of us echo our support for the
6 project as well. What seemingly maybe a small problem is
7 that if you wanted to go visit that area where it makes
8 landfall, you go out north, you go past Nikiski, mile 32,
9 and you get to Kiska.

10 You'll climb a hill and it will be about a
11 quarter a mile of Borough maintained property. Then there
12 will be a big change after that. For the next mile in, it's
13 basically maintained, Debbie McKay talked about that. It's
14 a narrow road, it's basically been developed from basically
15 a cat track to where we actually have to walk in at the --
16 you talk, you look around the neighbors here know what I'm
17 talking about.

18 Walking in for several weeks a year. Over time
19 we've basically pooled our resources as we can and we fill
20 potholes with gravel and sand and all sorts of things, and
21 right now we have basically a semi-suitable road, you know
22 Bob Breeden came in and he brought in some heavy equipment
23 and it really did make a difference.

24 But right now, it's a skinny road, and it's got
25 -- basically it's marginally a two-lane road and there have

CM4-24

CM4-24 Comment noted.

CM4-25

CM4-25 Comment noted. Sections 4.6.1.2, 4.9.1.2, 4.11.7.3, and 4.14 of the final EIS discuss impacts from hunting due to the increased access to remote areas that would be provided by the Mainline Pipeline and access roads.

CC-78

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

32

1 already been several accidents just among the neighbors of
2 people bumping into each other.

3 So, most of us try to comply with the 15 miles
4 per hour, so you can drink a cup of coffee rule, and you
5 could avoid that. But if this project goes through where
6 basically it's said to go, there's going to be brand new
7 access to our little neighborhood. The only access from
8 that highway is Kiska, and it will be multiples of what it
9 is now.

10 And so, frankly Kiska won't be able to stand it.
11 It needs to be built into your plan. I looked at the
12 traffic. I didn't see that noted once. If you're going to
13 also go that route, you're going to have the new pipeline
14 corridor. Now I have to admit, I plead guilty. I take
15 advantage of those for my own use, but there's going to be
16 dozens and maybe hundreds of people taking advantage of
17 those corridors, doing the same kind of thing that I do to
18 get access to hunting and resources.

19 It's really going to change the character of that
20 neighborhood and that area, and so I just wanted to just
21 bring that point up. I just don't -- at some point, at some
22 level, there should be some item that says well what about
23 access if they're going to put that in?

24 And again, I thank you very much for everything
25 you guys have done.

CM4-25

CC-79

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

33

1 MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Palm. Our next
2 speaker is Mr. Bob Breeden.

3 MR. BREEDEN: Good evening, my name is Bob
4 Breeden and I have a home on Boulder Point seven miles
5 northeast of here. John Peconom and Nancy Fox Fernandez,
6 thank you for coming here all the way I presume, from D.C.
7 to be with us.

8 Thank you for preparing the near 1500 page Draft
9 Environmental Impact Statement and the nearly 2300 page
10 appendices. A lot of work went into this on your part.
11 Thank you now for coming to Nikiski, Alaska to meet the
12 residents who have chosen to live on this land.

13 And thank you for hearing us and creating and CM4-26
14 considering the West alternative route. I have to say it
15 was very much appreciated in the Draft EIS, the route, the
16 West alternative route that avoids the Boulder Point
17 neighborhood.

18 FERC, please recommend to AGDC to utilize the
19 West alternative route as depicted on page 198 of the Draft
20 Environmental Impact Statement, a copy of which you've been
21 given there.

22 Permitting it now so it is time to get the route
23 corrected now. Paramount is our concern for many reasons,
24 each carefully specified in this letter we are going to give
25 you. I have here a letter of -- it's created by the

CM4-26

See the updates to section 3.6.1.2 of the final EIS regarding the Cook Inlet West Alternative.

CC-80

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

34

1 neighborhood of Boulder Point. I'll give you this this
2 evening, it's been signed as have two other letters that
3 have been submitted to FERC previously.

4 Again, paramount is our concern for many reasons,
5 each carefully specified in this letter that we are going to
6 give you that the West alternative is the best routing for
7 the main line to cross the Cook Inlet.

8 There's an upside to using the West alternative,
9 upside for the project including miles of sand waves, which
10 could undermine the line leading to, as is stated in the
11 Draft EIS, vortex oscillation and pipeline overstressing or
12 rupture, upside for the habitat of many species, upside for
13 the moose caving concentration that is yet to be recognized
14 on Boulder Point in the Environmental Impact Statement .

15 Upside for the pristine forest that you so well
16 defined in your Draft Environmental Impact Statement and
17 upside for the families that live on Boulder Point. There
18 is no downside. The pipeline and the West alternative will
19 come ashore into a Kenai Peninsula Borough parcel that is
20 already proposed to be bisected by the pipeline in the
21 original proposed routing.

22 I'm going to do better with these glasses on.
23 The first scoping meeting of the Federal Energy Regulatory
24 Commission in the Nikiski was held October 27th, 2015, for
25 Cook Inlet, alternate routes were being considered then by

CM4-26

CC-81

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

35

1 AK LNG. In April of 2017, the fifth revision, C-2 route,
2 bisecting Boulder Point was submitted to FERC by the
3 project.

4 Word circulated of AGDC's proposal to route the
5 pipeline on this route through our neighborhood on Boulder
6 Point. The first meeting expressed the concerns of the
7 Boulder Point neighborhood where AGDC's offices in Anchorage
8 on January 2018.

9 The Boulder Point neighborhood then sent letters
10 to FERC dated September 10th, 2018 and December 3rd, 2018,
11 recommending that Nikiski Bay underwater route to avoid
12 significant disturbances upon over five miles of natural
13 land.

14 The C-2 proposed routing would be installed upon
15 the Salamatof Native Association's largest, most pristine
16 contiguous piece of Kenai Peninsula land, which is on
17 Boulder Point. The President and CEO of the Salamatof
18 Native Association, Chris Monfor, today signed this letter
19 and stated his consistent support for a route that does not
20 bisect the Salamatof land.

21 Chris Monfor also stated that the Salamatof Board
22 of Directors unanimously support the West alternative to
23 protect their property. The Draft Environmental Impact
24 Statement now details and considers the commendable new
25 sixth route, the West alternative.

CM4-26

CC-82

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

36

1 The benefits of the route are, and I'll hit these
2 bullet points: Habitat protection -- unsubstantiated claims
3 of knowledge of what lies below the bottom of the Cook
4 Inlet, by AGDC found incapability of trenchless tunneling
5 and outside boulders.

6 Avoidance of laying pipelines through sand waves,
7 a potential rupture and loss -- from future loss of support
8 and protection from a strong current, avoidance of impact on
9 Boulder Point fishing families, allowing them to continue
10 uninterrupted with their way of life.

11 Preservation of forest to which loss has already
12 been deemed "significant" in the Draft EIS, noise impacts
13 avoided in a residential area moves pipeline safety risks
14 from a residential area. Avoidance of a moose caving
15 concentration area, perhaps the best remaining moose
16 nurtured on the Kenai Peninsula, and avoidance of
17 disturbance to moose natural protective cover and changes to
18 moose feeding grounds.

19 Marine mammal impacts of the pipeline under the
20 Cook Inlet are insignificant -- are deemed insignificant in
21 the Draft EIS, miles of human visual impacts are avoided,
22 avoidance of pipeline vulnerabilities from the future --
23 from any future significant dam washout, as occurred in
24 1972.

25 Avoidance of residential area that keeps the main

CM4-26

CC-83

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

37

1 line in industrial areas as the Draft EIS states. The West
2 alternative is an entirely new route, clear of boulders, and
3 the West alternative arrives at a known location of multiple
4 successfully operated pipelines.

CM4-26

5 And from a big picture point of view, if the
6 reason for coming ashore at Boulder Point is to use the
7 trenchless method, to avoid an open cut through a few feet
8 of phosphate, is that worth trading what is essentially an 8
9 lane highway through five miles of pristine forest?

CM4-27

10 The Draft EIS allows for an open cut, if
11 necessary, and a couple of title swings will refill that
12 trench, and this is cheaper to the oil companies that will
13 ultimately pay for this project. An industry has informed
14 me that trenchless methods are ten times as costly as open
15 cut.

16 A level laid down area of 10 acres is depicted
17 for connecting pipe sections. In any event, trenchless
18 methods are selected to succeed in Nikiski Bay as at Boulder
19 Point. FERC, for all the reasons stated, please direct AGDC
20 to route the main line along the West alternative.

21 The Boulder Point neighborhood awaits
22 confirmation that the West alternative will be the permitted
23 alignment in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for
24 the Alaska LNG Project. Thank you.

CM4-28

25 MR. PECONOM: Thanks Mr. Breeden. Our next

CM4-27

See the updates to section 3.6.1.2 of the final EIS regarding the Cook Inlet West Alternative.

CM4-28

Comment noted.

CC-84

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

38

1 speaker is Mr. Wayne Ogal.

2 MR. OGAL: My name is Wayne Ogal. I'm a Nikiski
3 resident and I'm very much in favor of the project. I
4 believe it's something that Alaska desperately needs in our
5 present economic situation.

6 90% of our government expenditures are based on
7 oil revenue of some kind and we're trying to do something
8 about that but at the present moment that is where we're at.
9 I think that we -- in needing this project, I used to live
10 out in Bethel, and that's 400 miles west of here. I was the
11 public work's director out there and the expenses for
12 villages and communities out there are just astronomical --
13 7 dollars a gallon for gasoline and milk 8 dollars a gallon
14 and that type of thing, and it's very hard for those
15 communities to survive.

16 This particular project would be, I think, a boom
17 for their particular economic development and their ability
18 to continue living out there in that particular environment.
19 I do believe in the EIS process. I've been involved with
20 that in my previous careers as far as on the regulatory
21 side.

22 I think it is -- especially with this
23 administration, this national administration in place, I
24 think it's a fair -- has the potential of being a very fair
25 process. If you can't answer the questions like our friends

CM4-29

CM4-29

Comment noted.

CM4-30

CM4-30

Comment noted.

CC-85

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

39

1 from Boulder Point are making about development, then the
2 project should not go forward. CM4-30

3 That doesn't mean that there are -- I believe
4 most of these problems can be, are not insurmountable and as
5 far as the design and that type of thing. There are some
6 issues, as I mentioned, Boulder Point has I think, some very
7 well opened issues that need to be looked at.

8 The water for this particular project is -- the CM4-31
9 concept is basically to have it piped up from Kenai, which
10 is the 4 or 5 mile run up the road. I believe the water
11 supply can be found here in Nikiski. I think the 4 or 5
12 mile pipeline creates what I would say a security risk to an
13 LNG facility which I think is not really something we'd want
14 to have.

15 Also, something that hasn't been mentioned CM4-32
16 tonight and it's not really a FERC process, or a part of it,
17 but it's PILOT, it's a payment in lieu of taxes. The
18 previous AGDC project manager said and I think there's some
19 truth to it, that Nikiski will have sustained about 50% of
20 the impact of this project and I think that is something
21 that we need to really kind of focus on emphasize.

22 The payment in lieu of taxes for construction as
23 well as the project costs are a reality that we -- I think
24 we need to look at and make sure that is taken care of as
25 far as the project development is concerned.

CM4-31 Comment noted.

CM4-32 In some cases, local government entities may receive impact payments in lieu of oil and gas property taxes; however, no formal agreements on impact payments have been reached between AGDC and state or local entities at this time. See the updates to section 4.11.6.2 of the final EIS regarding this issue.

CC-86

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

40

1 We have a road reroute within the road here, the
2 Kenai Spur Highway is an extremely important part of our
3 community, it's how we get around -- the only way we can get
4 around. And I think instead of just having an "as is" type
5 of route, we need to think in terms of increased traffic and
6 that type of thing.

7 So, a two-way road, I think, is not a
8 satisfactory solution. And I think we need to do something
9 better than that. On the -- I can say from the AGDC side, I
10 think as an organization I think they have been very
11 responsive and sympathetic and involved with the process.

12 They've held numerous public meetings and I think
13 have been valuable for the community. The -- our Borough
14 Mayor, Mayor Pierce, had mentioned the fact that he
15 established an advisory group, which I think was a very,
16 very good thing. We've been meeting on a fairly regular
17 basis and have identified many different aspects that may
18 impact the community and concerns, and that has been through
19 our Open Meetings Act, and that type of thing.

20 And people can come and listen and participate in
21 that and a lot of those specific concerns will be brought to
22 you in comments to the FERC process. And finally, there is
23 risk to the project, there always is, but we've done this
24 before. We've done the Alaska Pipeline and there was a lot
25 of concern about migration of animals back and forth and so

CM4-33

CM4-33

The Kenai Spur Highway Relocation Project is discussed in section 4.19.2.3 of the final EIS.

CM4-34

CM4-34

Comment noted.

CC-87

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

41

1 on and so forth, and the tundra being thawed out and all
2 sorts of other different concerns.

3 Those concerns were addressed, and I think a lot
4 of lessons were learned from that and I think those were not
5 newbie's as far as being able to build a trans-Alaska type
6 of pipeline, and I think we can do it here.

7 But we do need to listen to points -- hard
8 points, which the Boulder Point people have brought up and
9 they need to be addressed. There is something I think also
10 is important in projects is good will. I think project
11 people, project managers for projects need to have that in
12 mind.

13 In other words, they don't have to do something,
14 but sometimes it is the right thing to do as far as building
15 something that they don't have to and I think that brings
16 about a lot of positive feelings in the community back and
17 forth about the project.

18 And with that, thank you very much for coming
19 here and having people be able to testify.

20 MR. PECONOM: Thank you Mr. Ogal. Our next
21 speaker is Mr. Ross Njaa and Barbara.

22 MR. NJAA: My name is Ross Njaa, Jr. I'm one of
23 the Boulder Point residents.

24 MR. PECONOM: Can I ask you to spell that for me.

25 MR. NJAA: Oh, N-j-a-a is how you spell the last

CM4-34

CC-88

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

42

1 name.

2 MR. PECONOM: Thank you.

3 MR. NJAA: And my concern is where the pipeline
4 is supposed to come out of the inlet at the Boulder Point
5 area and that would just disrupt the whole neighborhood and
6 I am for the Western alternative as a lot of the reasons
7 that Bob Breeden and Bill Bookout and Linda Huhndorf, Mary
8 McKay and or Debbie McKay and the rest of the people are
9 going to speak.

10 I'm one of the signees of the letter that Bob
11 gave, and I've lived in that area for 40 years and my wife
12 and I were the first ones that moved back there. We let the
13 road go in the wintertime, we just stay back there for like
14 six months without ever coming out, and it's changed quite a
15 bit since we've moved in there.

16 And I hate to see it change even more, so thank
17 you very much.

18 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir.

19 MS. NJAA: And I'm Barbara Njaa, N-j-a-a, and I
20 don't know if you all would have the time to get to come out
21 and look, because sometimes just seeing for yourself can
22 make a huge difference. It's rugged, Devil's Clubs are
23 anyone who likes to crawl through the woods, a nightmare.
24 The alders are equally so, and yet I moved out there in 1967
25 when I was just 13 and we bought it from Mike Timinoff. He

CM4-35

CM4-35

See the updates to section 3.6.1.2 of the final EIS regarding the Cook Inlet West Alternative.

CC-89

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

43

1 was a veteran, he had a home site, there was not even a
2 north road.

3 So, it was his trapping trail and it's so
4 beautiful, country back there when you get to know it and
5 learn to forage for all the different plants. There's a lot
6 of unique vegetation and I think right now my husband I
7 probably do forage foods, we put up maybe 50% or more of
8 what we eat throughout the year just things that I blanch
9 and freeze and put in the freezer or dry from.

10 So, it's land that is like an onion. As I've
11 gotten older and peeled back the layers, I love it more. I
12 think when I was 13 I wanted to move anywhere away from
13 mending nests and Devil's Clubs, I love it now.

14 And so, I just wanted to say again, our concern
15 is not to hold up the project and I don't know the pro's and
16 con's of the project, but I do know that it's an industrial
17 area that Arness Bay or Nakiska Bay has been you know, is a
18 point where pipelines come in.

19 If it could just stay there and as the Mayor
20 pointed out, there is empty buildings all along the way from
21 a service company that used to be occupied when the oil was
22 a bigger concern in the inlet. Now, there's a lot of places
23 and things that have already been -- that could be used
24 again or, you know, a better route.

25 But this is remote and wild, and it has remained

CM4-36

CM4-36

Comment noted.

CC-90

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

44

1 that way because of the boulders, the fast tide, and the
2 hills. It's glaciated and extremely rough, and I'd just
3 like to see, you know, keep it the way it is and go ahead
4 and take the western route and everybody's happen, so
5 anyway, thank you.

CM4-36

6 MR. PECONOM: Thank you ma'am. Our next speaker
7 is Miss Ann Huhndorf.

8 MS. HUHDORF: Hello, my name is Ann Huhndorf,
9 last name is spelled H-u-h-n-d-o-r-f. I forgot to bring my
10 phone because I was going to give you the parcel numbers of
11 where I live. I live pretty much adjacent to where this
12 proposed site is wanting to be built.

13 And I wanted to give some -- I need my glasses.

14 I wanted to give a little history, family history. My
15 husband isn't here today. He's Duncan Nikolski and that's
16 on the Aleutian Chain, and I would have loved if he would
17 have been here because he's a great speaker. I am not.

18 But I really didn't prepare anything because like
19 I said, I didn't think I had signed-up, but I definitely
20 want to say something. So, my husband's family has -- they
21 homesteaded on Seneva Lake and that lake is the dam that
22 people have been -- the neighbors have been talking about
23 that is very pristine, very -- how don't know how to
24 describe -- the dam is very sensitive.

25 I live right below that dam and my husband I own

CC-91

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

45

1 8 acres there. My husband, to give you a little history,
2 like I said his parents homesteaded on Geneva Lake and as
3 Barb mentioned that she had bought property from Mike
4 Dementiv, that was my uncle or my husband's uncle.

5 And my husband's dad had purchased the -- so
6 fishing sites, back in the '40's, '50's, and we have been
7 fishing there since -- well, since my husband was a child
8 and now, we have grandchildren, and our kids fished there.
9 They made money working on the sites out there.

10 And now we have our grandkids that are learning
11 this way of life that has been in my husband's family for
12 over -- almost 60 years now, and I drive the Southside
13 Avenue. Every day I pass that site where this proposal site
14 is -- that you're wanting to build -- LNG wanting to build.

15 The thought of having the path, or helipad or a
16 man camp and all these people, and I just know that that
17 road will not be able to sustain the pristine that my
18 neighbors are -- have come to love over all these years.

19 Also, I'm getting ahead of myself here. I have
20 so much to say. Also, the -- for 25 years, we've lived on
21 this property, but my husband can go way back where Mike
22 Dementiv was you know, going there on a cat trail. And you
23 know, to lose that and you know, this property that we
24 purchased back in '95, right -- it's right on the water and
25 it's like I said, just adjacent to the proposed site.

CM4-37

CM4-37

Comment noted.

CC-92

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

46

1 I was -- 25 years ago when we purchased this
2 property, this was our retirement. This is where I want my
3 future generations to enjoy just like the rest of our
4 neighbor's family and generations to come.

5 I would have to say I hope that the alternative
6 is the way that LNG is going to go with this. But I just
7 hate to see this project come right like my backyard. I
8 guess that's all I want to say right now but I will be able
9 to go online and submit some more information because I do
10 have pictures and I definitely want my husband to go online
11 and voice his opinion as well, so, I'm going to keep it at
12 that for now, so.

13 Oh, one more thing -- several years ago there was
14 a local excavating company that wanted to take some boulders
15 off of Boulder Point, and there was a public meeting at the
16 Kenai Peninsula Borough in Soldotona. And of course, we all
17 got together, went to the meeting and gave our two cents and
18 there was a marine biologist that did go to this meeting,
19 and he gave a crucial study of the impact it would have on
20 Boulder Point.

21 So, I just want that for the record that that --
22 that there is a study on Boulder Point, so. That's it for
23 now, thank you.

24 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Our next speaker
25 is Mr. Bryon, excuse me, Byron Nalos.

CM4-38

CM4-38

Comment noted.

CC-93

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

47

1 MR. NALOS: Thanks for coming. My name is Byron
2 Nalos, B-y-r-o-n N-a-l-o-s. I'm representing myself. I'm
3 representing the Marthadoll family. They are fisherman
4 also, so we fish right where this proposed route -- I
5 believe its mile 793 falls ashore. It goes through one of
6 our sets. The -- I'm speaking to the construction phase
7 right now that would inhibit our operation and also the
8 Marthadoll family from being able to access their site from
9 the private property where we launch.

10 It would have a significant impact on our ability
11 to launch our boat in the water, considering there's not
12 public access for miles and also where we launch our boat
13 comes from the Seneva Lake washout area, which is -- I'm
14 sure you're familiar with that.

15 I took some notes, yeah, so that would be during
16 the construction phase. During the finished phase, I'm not
17 totally sure of how it works but I think one of our sets
18 would be unusable, there's a beach there, or not a beach but
19 it's close enough to the beach where that's where the pipe
20 comes ashore.

21 As for -- I'm also a landowner in the area and
22 all that's in the Boulder Point neighbor's community, so I
23 don't think I have anything to add there. I guess I will
24 add one thing, being very familiar with that specific area,
25 right between Mr. Bookout and Ann Huhndorf's property, and

CM4-39

CM4-39

Section 4.9.1.2 of the final EIS has been updated to acknowledge this comment.

CM4-40

CM4-40

Comment noted.

CC-94

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

48

1 their houses are close to the edge of their property and the
2 height of the bluff there, and the amount of bluff that
3 would be moved, and the taper of that bluff coming down and
4 the scope of the project that you want to do to build pipe
5 and launch it from there, I think someone more knowledgeable
6 from me can give you the right answers, but I think it
7 doesn't pass the eyeball test for me and the massive impact
8 it would have on the Huhndorf's and Mr. Bookout.

CM4-40

9 And then for everything as far as the Boulder
10 Point community, my signature is on the neighbor's stuff, so
11 that's all I have to say.

12 MR. PECONOM: Thank you very much. Our next
13 speaker is Mr. John Quick.

14 MR. QUICK: John Quick, I live in Nikiski,
15 Alaska. And first of all, I just want to say thanks to
16 everybody for you all to come up here. I know that you're
17 probably in a different city or town every week, and I bet
18 that that's cumbersome on your all's family and so I
19 appreciate the fact that you all came up here.

20 I had the privilege of coming to a FERC meeting
21 last year on this topic and it was fun to be a part of. I
22 really speak in favor of this project. The State of Alaska
23 -- we are the highest unemployment rate in the entire United
24 States. I think we're sitting at 6.3% and that's a big deal
25 for us.

CM4-41

CM4-41

Comment noted.

CC-95

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

49

1 We see people leaving these communities, leaving
2 boroughs, leaving the state, every day and that's sad for
3 us. And I do think there's valid concerns, whether it's
4 with Boulder Point or with other fishing communities, I do
5 think there are valid concerns, but at the end of the day I
6 want to speak in favor for this project.

CM4-41

7 You could be a big part of helping save Alaska's
8 community and economy and I think that's a cool thing to be
9 a part of. So, thank you for your time and I just want to
10 be very, very favorable for this project, thank you.

11 MR. PECONOM: Thank you very much. Our next
12 speaker is Mr. Paul Huber.

13 MR. HUBER: Hi, I'm Paul Huber, H-u-b-e-r and I'm
14 from Nikiski. Now, I spent 25 years in the Coast Guard all
15 over, from the east coast to the west coast, from the
16 Midwest to Alaska, and one of the things that I learned is
17 that change is inevitable.

18 I saw it in all the communities I was in. But I
19 moved to Alaska because of its pristine nature. I also
20 support the project. But I only support the project and ask
21 that you ensure the oversight is applied so that it is
22 correctly and safely done.

CM4-42

23 When the state took over this project, AGDC had a
24 Community Advisory Council that did not have one
25 representative of this community. It wasn't until Mayor

CM4-42

Comment noted.

CC-96

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

50

1 Pierce was elected, and he and his Chief of Staff, John
2 Quick, were informed of the ignoring of our community that
3 they formed a Project Advisory Council that included the
4 people of Nikiski.

5 The proposed bypass for the highway will create
6 additional hazards and increased travel times. This highway
7 is our lifeline. Just this summer, the Sterling Highway was
8 closed to a fire. The peninsula was dramatically affected,
9 and if there was any mishap, this community will be likely
10 impacted.

11 This highway is presently dangerous as it is.
12 Just last week we had a fatality. How is this bypass and
13 construction traffic and other increased industrial traffic
14 going to make our transit safer?

15 Lastly, this proposed route will destroy hopes
16 and dreams, especially finances of those whose property is
17 between the proposed bypass and the fence of the facility.
18 There's also a proposed water source from Kenai, I'm
19 adamantly against this. Nikiski has viable water sources
20 that will meet the requirements for this project.

21 Also, this will now provide a foot in the door to
22 a possible annexation by the City of Kenai. Am I
23 far-fetched? Well, just ask the neighborhoods being forced
24 in annexation by Soldotna. Lastly, Nikiski has many areas
25 that are industrial. Alaska private property ownership is

CM4-43

CM4-43

The Kenai Spur Highway Relocation Project is discussed in section 4.19.2.3 of the final EIS.

CM4-44

CM4-44

Comment noted.

CM4-45

CM4-45

The Kenai Municipal Water System Upgrades Project is discussed in section 4.19.2.4 of the final EIS.

CM4-46

CM4-46

Comment noted.

CC-97

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

51

1 less than 1% of all Alaska lands -- why? Why? Why are you
2 willing to destroy more dreams and futures of people by
3 allowing a pipeline to be placed through a pristine
4 neighborhood around Boulder Point?

CM4-46

5 We have many other industrial areas, many other
6 state lands. Don't take more of our privately owned lands
7 and destroy it. Thank you.

8 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. So, at this point
9 we've gone through the list of speakers who signed-up. Is
10 anyone else interested in speaking? You would like to
11 speak, yeah absolutely, that's what I was going to say, if
12 folks are interested in speaking, just go ahead and raise
13 your hand. Be sure to state your name, spell it out for the
14 record.

15 MR. EWING: My name is A.J. Ewing, E-w-i-n-g.
16 I'm a landowner in the Boulder Point neighborhood also. My
17 parcel number is 01301015. And because I'm a landowner, Mr.
18 Breeden has been diligent in giving me all the emails that
19 have been in the train around in association with this
20 project.

21 I've read all of them, I've done all the research
22 on my own as well. And I didn't have anything prepared for
23 this, so I wasn't planning on speaking, but since I heard
24 all the other objections and they're all valid, they're all
25 good, but I haven't heard anything about what I was going to

CC-98

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

52

1 submit which is throughout all those emails and all the
2 research that I've done, I haven't seen anything that
3 addresses the pipeline operational standards.

CM4-47

CM4-47

Project operations are discussed in section 2.5 of the final EIS. Reliability and safety of the Project are discussed in section 4.18 of the final EIS.

4 Like, I work in the oil field, so I support the
5 oil field. It supports me, I support it. But -- and I
6 support the project, I just don't support the route. I
7 would -- I support the Western suggestion. So, I haven't
8 seen any noting of how deep the pipeline is going to be
9 buried.

CM4-48

CM4-48

Comment noted.

CM4-49

CM4-49

Trench depth and depth of cover for the Mainline Pipeline are discussed in section 2.2.2.1 of the final EIS.

10 My water well is 32 feet and I have good clean
11 water and every pipeline that I've ever worked around has
12 failed before in one spot or another. It will fail. If
13 it's metal, it's going to fail. I don't know where the gas
14 is coming from, or what kind of H2S levels that's in the
15 gas.

CM4-50

CM4-50

Impacts on groundwater and water wells are addressed in section 4.3.1 of the final EIS.

16 And if the pipeline fails that H2S, well H2S is
17 dangerous and it will kill you, that's not my primary
18 concern, it's massively corrosive to metals especially. So,
19 if it's in the pipeline eventually it's going to fail. Even
20 if it's clean, sweet gas, gas itself is corrosive, not as
21 corrosive as H2S, but if it leaks, if the pipeline is buried
22 10 feet underground and the water well is 32 feet, there's
23 not a lot of room for error for any type of liquid will fall
24 out.

CM4-51

CM4-51

See the response to comment CM4-50.

25 And while natural gas in its gas form is much

CC-99

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

53

1 lighter than air, and H2S also, being mostly methane, is
2 also lighter than air, but the liquid will seep and
3 potentially hurt water wells.

CM4-51

4 And also, as far as the Mayor's comments of
5 doers, I agree with that. Everybody around here are doers
6 and everybody in the Boulder Point area are doers. I'm a
7 doer. Mr. Breeden's a doer, you have to be. If you're in
8 the Boulder Point area you have to be. And if you're not a
9 doer, you're not going to go to the Boulder Point area.

10 You're not going to choose to live there. So, I
11 do support the project. I do not support the route. I am
12 in favor of the Western movement. Another thing -- the
13 natural gas, like the Mayor said, everybody that can use
14 natural gas to heat their homes as a utility and things like
15 that, nobody in the Boulder Point area uses natural gas to
16 heat their homes, it's not available there.

CM4-52

17 So, it's -- there's not a lot in it for the
18 people that live there. There's a lot of negativity in it
19 for the people that live there. So, the end goal is the
20 same, just construction projects, moving the pipeline to the
21 Western suggestion, thanks.

22 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Would anybody else
23 like to speak this evening? Yes, sir? Again, just a
24 reminder, name for the record please.

25 MR. GABRIEL: Good evening, my name is Brian

CM4-52

Comment noted.

CC-100

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

54

1 Gabriel, B-r-i-a-n G-a-b-r-i-e-l, and I'm the Mayor of the
2 City of Kenai. I wasn't planning on testifying this
3 evening. I just wanted to come here to listen to the
4 different folks, but after listening to some of the
5 testimony, I would just like to say that we are -- our city
6 planner has been tasked with analyzing the EIS and will have
7 any comments, if necessary, before City Council in the first
8 meeting in October which is before the comment period, so
9 we'd have something and possibly a resolution.

10 I will say that our Council Administration does
11 support this project. If you go back to when the
12 Trans-Alaska Pipeline was built, there were concerns that
13 you know, a lot of caribou, environmental concerns that were
14 looked at, issues resolved, and we've enjoyed the quality of
15 life we do today because of the construction of that
16 pipeline.

17 So, it's also a national security issue. We,
18 it's not only going to boost our economy, but I think add to
19 the level of energy independence that the United States
20 would realize, and therefore move forward to a more secure
21 nation. So, there's a ripple effect that this project would
22 move forward.

23 Addressing Mr. Huber's concern, I did hear that
24 the worries about the City of Kenai annexing north Kenai
25 because the water pipeline -- I'm just here to say that, and

CM4-53

CM4-53

Comment noted.

CC-101

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

55

1 I've heard this from other people and I'll tell Mr. Huber
2 what I tell those people, you should be more worried about
3 Savana than Kenai.

4 There's no need for that. We were approached by
5 AK LNG to look at the feasibility of doing that which we
6 have, so anyway, I just want to -- like I said, I wasn't
7 planning on testifying this evening, but we do support that
8 project and comments will be coming forward, thank you, and
9 thank you for coming here.

10 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Would anybody else
11 like to speak this evening, ma'am?

12 MS. NICKS: My name is Constance Nicks,
13 C-o-n-s-t-a-n-c-e last name Nicks, N (as in Nancy)-i-c-k-s.
14 I live right off of South Miller Loop and that is where the
15 road is going to be rerouted. That is a huge community
16 there that has a lot of kids, so just to have a road that is
17 a two-lane going through a community is not really the
18 safest for kids. So, I suggest that it should be widened
19 for the safety factor alone for the community.

20 Because the speed going through the different
21 curves and it is a high accident area right there as it is,
22 so just rerouting something around as is, is not going to be
23 as beneficial as if you would improve it a little bit
24 better, even just by adding a turn lane or adding lighter
25 sidewalks or wider lanes on the side, but just make it a

CM4-54

CM4-54

The Kenai Spur Highway Relocation Project is discussed in section 4.19.2.3 of the final EIS.

CC-102

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

56

1 little bit wider for the kids in that community to be able
2 to be safe. Thank you very much. | CM4-54

3 MR. PECONOM: Thank you. Would anyone else like
4 to speak this evening? Sure.

5

6

7

8

9

10 MR. WARREN: Bill Warren, and I've previously
11 been on here of course. But one thing we have a huge state | CM4-55
12 and a lot of our income is industrial oil and gas. And I
13 want you folks to really keep that in mind that one
14 industrial area in south central Alaska is enough, if it's
15 done right.

16 If it's engineered right and we get the markets
17 right, we don't have to have an industrial complex in Palmer
18 or anyplace else. Right here is where it's established, and
19 I am in true agreement with what the Boulder Point people
20 are saying. That's why I'm urging again here that we have
21 to do this right and I'm depending upon you folks to do
22 this.

23 And then we could have a project that would last
24 for 100 years and we'll have other industrial needs, just
25 not this LNG plant. It will be probably 50 others, you

CM4-55 Comment noted.

CC-103

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

57

1 know, look at Port Arthur, Texas. We don't want to be that, CM4-55
2 of course, but anyway, let's keep it all in one area and
3 we've got a good area here and we've got a good start on it,
4 thank you.

5 MR. PECONOM: Thank you very much. As a reminder,
6 the DEIS comment period will close on October 3rd, so if you
7 are planning on submitting a written or electronic comment
8 please do so by then. If you are interested in staying
9 informed and receiving updates on this project, including a
10 Final Environmental Impact Statement, please talk to someone
11 at the back table.

12 In conclusion, the comments received here tonight
13 will be considered and addressed in the Final Environmental
14 Impact Statement. With your assistance, decision makers
15 will be better informed. On behalf of the Commission, I
16 thank you for coming tonight to participate in the
17 environmental review of the Alaska LNG Project.

18 Your participation is essential to ensuring that
19 thorough an environmental review. Thank you again and drive
20 safely and if you'd like to ask any questions, we'll be
21 around here for as long as folks want to talk. Thank you
22 very much.

23 (Whereupon, the meeting concluded at 6:45 p.m.)

24

25

CC-104

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4005 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

58

1 CERTIFICATE OF OFFICIAL REPORTER

2

3 This is to certify that the attached proceeding

4 before the FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION in the

5 Matter of:

6 Name of Proceeding: Alaska LNG Project

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 Docket No.: CP17-178-000

16 Place: Nikiski, Alaska

17 Date: Wednesday, September 11, 2019

18 were held as herein appears, and that this is the original

19 transcript thereof for the file of the Federal Energy

20 Regulatory Commission, and is a full correct transcription

21 of the proceedings.

22

23

24 Larry Flowers

25 Official Reporter

CC-105

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont’d)

20191017-4005 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019	
Document	Content (s)
091119Alaska.DOCX.....	1-58
091119Alaska.TXT.....	59-175

CC-107

ERRATA SHEET

DATE OF DEPOSITION:

[illegible]

CM4 – Comment Meeting, Nikiski (cont'd)

20191017-4012 PERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

Document Content(s)

Errata Form for Nikiski_091119_AKProject_Final.DOC.....1-1