

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks

20191017-4006 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 Morris Thompson Cultural
13 & Visitors Center
14 101 Dunkel Street
15 Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
16
17 Thursday, September 12, 2019
18
19 The public scoping meeting, pursuant to notice, convened
20 at 5 p.m. Before a Panel:
21 JAMES MARTIN, Project Manager, Federal Energy
22 Regulatory Commission
23 MICHAEL J. BOYLE, Ecology and Environment, Inc.
24
25

CC-108

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

2

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

2 [5:11 p.m.]

3 MR. BOYLE: Okay folks, I think we'll go ahead
4 and get started. I want to thank you for coming out here on
5 this beautiful afternoon and spending it with us for this
6 meeting. Just so you know, this is a public comment meeting
7 on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the
8 Alaska LNG Project. If this isn't where you intended to be,
9 this is a good opportunity to go someplace else. Go enjoy
10 yourselves on this nice afternoon. But if it is, again,
11 thank you for being here. I would point out first for you
12 that this meeting is being recorded, and with that in mind,
13 let the record show that the Fairbanks Public Comment
14 meeting opened at 5:10 p.m.. The purpose of tonight's
15 meeting is to get your comments on the Draft Environmental
16 Impact Statement. This draft was issued by the Federal
17 Energy Regulatory Commission on June 28th, 2019. It was
18 distributed to stakeholders throughout the project area;
19 paper copies were mailed to subsistence communities, to
20 libraries throughout the project area, and to all those
21 individuals who requested one. The rest of the people who
22 had signed up on the mailing list received a CD. If you
23 didn't get a copy of it and you would like to, there's a
24 sign up sheet on the table outside the door where you can
25 put down your name and address and we'll make sure that you

CC-109

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

3

1 receive a copy of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

2

3 My name is Mike Boyle. I'm part of a team of
4 environmental consultants that are supporting FERC in the
5 preparation of this environmental impact statement. With
6 me at the table is Jim Martin. Jim works for the Federal
7 Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC. He's a Branch Chief
8 there and he's the project manager for FERC on this
9 environmental impact statement.

10 The FERC is the lead federal agency that prepared
11 this Draft EIS, and participating in the EIS there were
12 several cooperating agencies. These include the Bureau of
13 Land Management, The Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety
14 Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the
15 Army Corps of Engineers, the Coast Guard, the Fish and
16 Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, the Department
17 of Energy, and the National Marine Fisheries Service.

18 This draft EIS presents a summary of the project
19 and the agencies' evaluation of its impacts on the
20 environment. One of the placards on the stand here in
21 front of the stage shows a timeline of the EIS preparation
22 process and it indicates where we are in the process at this
23 time. What we see when we look through that is that FERC
24 has been conducting their evaluation of this project for
25 just about exactly five years.

CC-110

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

4

1 It began in September 2014 when the project
2 sponsors received authorization from the FERC to begin the
3 prefiling process. Soon afterward, from October 14 through
4 January 15, the FERC participated in 14 open houses that the
5 project sponsors held throughout the project area. And
6 March 15, FERC began their own 9 month NEPA scoping process
7 on the project. That began with the issuance of a Notice of
8 Intent to prepare an EIS. And it included 12 public scoping
9 meetings that FERC held throughout the project area.

10 Then in late 2016, FERC opened a second scoping
11 period just for consideration of the Denali alternative. As
12 part of that two month scoping process, they held a public
13 forum in the Denali National Park. It wasn't until April
14 17th, 2017 when the Alaska Gasline Development Corporation
15 filed its application with the FERC. Since the beginning of
16 that prefiling process until this point, FERC has been
17 reviewing the project, accessing the adequacy of the data,
18 working with the cooperating agencies to evaluate the
19 environmental impact of the project, and they've been
20 sending data requests to AGDC for more information. Many of
21 those data requests were generated in response to comments
22 and concerns filed from stakeholders in the area.

23 Now as I said earlier, the purpose of tonight's
24 meeting is to take your comments on the Draft EIS.
25 Commenting can occur in two main ways. Either in writing

CC-111

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

5

1 or verbally, which you would do tonight. There's three ways
2 that interested parties can submit written comments. One is
3 to write your comments and mail them in to the FERC offices
4 in Washington D.C. The second is, you can write your
5 comments and hand them to us here tonight, save you the
6 postage, we'll carry it back to Washington and submit them
7 into the public record on your behalf. A third way is to go
8 on to the FERC website, and you can submit your comments
9 electronically.

10 The table outside the door where Jason was
11 standing when you came in, there's some information to help
12 you in that. Not only, there's a green sheet that
13 describes how to submit those comments in each of those
14 three ways, and there's another form that will facilitate
15 you writing out your comments and handing them in here
16 tonight or sending them into the FERC offices.

17 I would emphasize that on those, that information
18 out there it identifies the docket number for the FERC
19 record in this case, which is CP17-178. It's very
20 important to use the correct docket number whether you're
21 submitting written comments or it's to make sure that we put
22 them into the proper record, or to use that docket number
23 when you go on to the FERC website and you're looking for
24 information on the project. If you don't have that, just
25 like with any other agency that handles lots of projects and

CC-112

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

6

1 permit applications, it can take you a long time to find the
2 right place to be.

3 Please note, though, that the comment period that
4 opened when FERC issued the draft EIS is due to close on
5 October 3rd. Although the FERC always does a great job
6 trying to address comments that come in after the close of
7 the comment period, you should be aware that the earlier
8 they receive those comments the better, because it gives
9 them more time to address them and hopefully gather enough
10 information to resolve the issues that you've raised in your
11 comments.

12 Now regarding the opportunity for submitting
13 comments verbally tonight. As I mentioned earlier, this
14 meeting is being recorded. That's so that there will be a
15 transcript that's accurate of what's said tonight, is
16 prepared and submitted into the public record as well.
17 These transcripts need to be accurate so that when FERC
18 reviews the comments they can treat them and analyze them
19 and respond to them as clearly as they can after receiving
20 written comments. And there was a speaker's list
21 when you came in. Jason at the table asked you if you would
22 like to sign up to speak; so in order, again, to be accurate
23 in the transcripts, I ask that when I call up someone who
24 signed up to speak to give a comment tonight that you state
25 your name, and spell it for us please, the last name, just

CC-113

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

7

1 so we can make sure it's accurate. If you are representing
2 a group or an affiliation, we also ask that you identify
3 that. Now, if you did not sign up to speak on the form and
4 you think of something during this meeting tonight where you
5 decide you would like to submit verbal comments, that's
6 fine. After we go through the list of people who did sign
7 up, I'll call -- you can let me know and we'll call you up
8 and we'll add you to the list, it's no problem.

9 Okay, are there any questions about the FERC
10 process or the NEPA process that we've been going through?

11 (No response.)

12 Okay then. Let's get started with the comments.
13 Herb Butler? Would you mind just to make sure that the
14 recorder picks up your statement you can speak into the
15 microphone there? It's already turned on.

16 MR BUTLER: My name is Herb Butler. Last name, B
17 U T L E R. I'm from Fairbanks, Alaska. I'm retired and
18 have worked 30 years in the Alaska oil industry. It was in
19 the 1980's when I worked for Arco at Prudhoe Bay as a Senior
20 Flow Measurement Technician. I became an expert in the
21 chemical makeup of the Prudhoe Field natural gas.

22 I am a member of the Community Advisory Council,
23 which is a group of volunteers that represent the Alaskan
24 citizen. CAC's motto is Gas for Alaskans. I am a member of
25 the Nenana Native Association Tribe. There are three topics

CC-114

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

8

1 from the draft EIS that I want to discuss.

2 Item one would be the Prudhoe Bay gas quality.

3 The PPU gas composition in molt percentage is carbon dioxide

4 at 12.1 percent. Methane at 76.1 percent. Ethane at 6.1

5 percent. Propane at 3.1 percent. Butane at 1.2 percent.

6 Nitrogen at 0.6 percent. And Pentane and heavier at 0.8

7 percent. The Prudhoe Bay unit, Deadhorse, and TAPS have

8 used this gas as a primary fuel source since field startup.

9 Upon combustion, the carbon dioxide passes through and the

10 methane produces additional carbon dioxide. There has been

11 an uncounted tonnage of CO2 dumped into the atmosphere at

12 Prudhoe Bay since startup. There are no plans to include

13 all of the Prudhoe Bay unit, Deadhorse and TAPS in the

14 distribution of the produced sales gas in the Alaska LNG

15 Project.

16 Item two. Liquefaction facilities alternatives.

17 I ask that the assessment in volume 1, section 3.10, that

18 supports the AGDC plan to locate the LNG plant at Nikiski

19 be reviewed. The conclusion declares that there's no

20 environmental advantage to choose the location of the LNG

21 plant at any of the other alternate sites. Please refer to

22 volume 1, section 3.8. The DEIS notes many of the AGDC

23 arguments in favor of the Nikiski location.

24 The DEIS notes very few, if any, of the cases of

25 those in favor of any of the alternatives. The primary

CM5-1

CM5-1

As discussed in section 2.0 of the final EIS, the natural gas would be transported from the PBU and PTU via pipeline to the proposed GTP. The feed gas produced from the PTU and the PBU contains carbon dioxide (CO₂), hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), water, and other impurities that require removal prior to liquefaction. The GTP would remove these byproducts from the natural gas; then chill, compress, and send out processed natural gas into the Mainline Pipeline.

CM5-2

CM5-2

See the updates to section 3.8.1.3 of the final EIS regarding the Port MacKenzie Alternative.

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

9

1 environmental advantage of the Point McKenzie Port and LNG
2 plant is that there would never be an underwater hazard in
3 Cook Inlet. The statement that whales are more apt to be
4 hit if the port were at Point McKenzie is weak. I have
5 never heard of a ship sailing to and from the Port of
6 Anchorage encountering a whale, for example.

CM5-2

7 Item three. Alaska native and other interested
8 party consultations. In volume 3, section 4.13.3, other
9 interested parties, Tanana Chief Conference met with FERC in
10 2015. Cook Inlet Region, Incorporated met with FERC in
11 2017. In 2018, Ahtna, Incorporated commented to FERC that
12 about 40 miles of the pipeline route would pass through
13 Ahtna land.

CM5-3

14 Alaska Federation of Natives and other native
15 regional corporations have not had the opportunity to meet
16 with FERC. Some time in the past, and the reason I say
17 this -- it wasn't stated in the Draft EIS AGDC sought
18 input from certified local governments. Cantwell, Willow,
19 Wasilla, and Palmer were not consulted, and they may be
20 certified governments. In my opinion, Alaska native
21 organizations and local governments must formally agree with
22 AGDC's Alaska LNG Project.

23 Finally, please allow me to make a final point
24 here. AGDC is now in a dormant state. AGDC now is down to
25 nine employees and they are only concerned with the review

CM5-4

CM5-3

The status of consultations with Alaska Native corporations and organizations and with other interested parties, including Certified Local Governments, is provided in sections 4.13.2 and 4.13.3 of the final EIS.

CM5-4

Comment noted.

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

10

1 process by FERC of the DEIS for the pipeline project.
2 According to AGDC, the joint development agreement, known as
3 JDA, met with Made With China has not been extended. The
4 JDA has expired at the end of 2018. China is no longer a
5 potential funding source.

6 AGDC, in conjunction with the state Governor has
7 decided that Alaska will no longer act as a sole operator,
8 owner of the pipeline project. Alaska has removed itself as
9 an active player in the project. AGDC hopes to receive an
10 approved EIS from the FERC in 2020 and then convince
11 investors and companies to take on the 35 to 40 billion
12 dollar project with the FERC EIS order as an incentive. In
13 that regard, there are no companies or investors lined up at
14 this date.

15 The Alaska stand-alone pipeline project, the
16 instate pipeline plan has been shelved and made inactive by
17 AGDC. The math is wrong for this project. There is no way
18 the project could become profitable or even break even, so
19 the State of Alaska would have to subsidize the system
20 forever if ASAF was activated. Are there any questions?

21 MR. BOYLE: No. Thank you, Mr. Butler. Thank you
22 very much.

23 Mr. Butler was the only one who signed up ahead
24 of time to present verbal comments. Is there anyone else
25 now who would like to come forward and provide comments?

CM5-4

CC-117

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

11

1 Yes, sir; come on up. just state your name,
2 spell it for the court reporter, please.
3 MR. CHRISTIAN: Hi, my name is Warren Christian.
4 That's C H R I S T I A N. I'm a long-time resident here in
5 Alaska. I live in North Pole. I am also President of North
6 Slope Contractors Association, and the Association and
7 myself do support this project as it is currently been
8 applied for.

9 I want to thank FERC for coming here to the
10 Interior. I know we don't have a real great turnout, but
11 moose hunting season terminates on Sunday in several
12 different districts here in the Interior, so everybody is
13 out hunting. But I know that there's a lot of people in the
14 Interior that do support this project.

15 Being from North Pole, our air is very good out
16 there. We've had issues with EPA and, you know, wood
17 burning and things like that and gas to the Interior would
18 be great for not only our air but also to promote new
19 industries for starting up here in the Interior; and not
20 only that but the mining industries. There's a lot of mines
21 that are, like, on the verge of being built that if gas was
22 here and available in the Interior they would be able to go
23 forward. The financials would look a lot better on them
24 than if they had to build their own power plants and power
25 them with fuel oil.

CM5-5

CM5-5

Comment noted.

CC-118

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

12

1 I do support Nikiski. I know that the Exxon,
2 when they were running this project, they went through an
3 extensive study on different locations, multiple locations.
4 It wasn't just the three boroughs. It was multiple
5 locations and Nikiski won out; and I do support that area
6 for the LNG plant. And then of course, there's the
7 jobs. I've built pipelines in Alaska my whole life. And I
8 know that we can build pipelines in Alaska with minimal
9 impact to the environmental. And if you go up to Prudhoe
10 Bay and you look at the industry up there and you go look at
11 other oil fields around the world and you would be amazed
12 how clean it is up there. You would have to look very hard
13 to find anything on the ground or anything like that. You
14 go to Central California and you'll see, the ground looks
15 black. Everything is black around Bakersfield and where
16 they've done some stuff down in there but in Prudhoe,
17 everything is very clean; and we're very responsible at
18 building these pipelines. So I hope we do get this permit
19 because this will be great for jobs for Alaskans, for the
20 industry, and definitely for the Interior. Thank you.

21 MR. BOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Christian.

22 Anyone else? It's a great opportunity.

23 Questions about what you read in the Draft EIS?

24 Well, if this is the last person, Mr. Christian
25 is the last person who wants to present verbal comments,

CM5-5

CC-119

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

13

1 then I'll just describe for you briefly what the process
2 will be going forward. After the close of the comment
3 period, the FERC staff and their environmental consultants
4 will begin working on the Final EIS. That will include
5 reviewing all the comments that came in, both written and
6 verbal. Some of those comments may lead to further data
7 requests to make sure that we're able to address any of the
8 issues that are new as a result of the comments, or
9 questions that come in as a result of the comments, or if
10 any of the comments identify inaccuracies in the Draft EIS
11 that we need to make sure that we get it right.

12 The final EIS will include a formal response to
13 each of the comments. So whether you submit your comments
14 in writing or verbally at one of these comment meetings, you
15 will see a specific response to the issues you raise in your
16 comment letters or what you speak in the meetings.

17 Once the final EIS is finished it will be
18 distributed just as the Draft EIS was. One difference might
19 be a few more people get hard copies of it because they
20 signed up to get on the mailing list as I suggested, and
21 they had not signed up prior. Copy of the Final EIS will
22 also be given to the FERC commissioners. The commissioners
23 use the environmental impact statements on the projects that
24 they're considering as part of their determination as to
25 whether or not they should authorize the project. In this

CC-120

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

14

1 case the FERC will be considering the impacts from the
2 Alaska LNG project and weigh those against the benefits that
3 come in the public interests determination for the LNG
4 export. If they determine that the public interest, that
5 the project is still in the public interest, then they would
6 move forward to authorize the project.

7 Any questions about that process?

8 AUDIENCE: Timing? Potential timing?

9 MR. MARTIN: We're scheduled to issue the final
10 in March of 2020, and the Commission has scheduled a
11 potential review and approval or denial in June.

12 And those are subject to change, but that's the
13 projection at this time.

14 MR. BOYLE: And interestingly, that's the type of
15 thing you can find out if you go into the public record with
16 the docket number that I gave you. Because one of the
17 things that FERC did was issue a Notice of Schedule for this
18 project, and those are the dates that are in there. It also
19 provides some other information, so I suggest that you go
20 into the record and search for information like that.

21 Well, if that's all, no other questions? Then we
22 will close the meeting. Let the record show that the
23 Fairbanks meeting closed at 5:35 p.m.. Thank you.

24 [Whereupon at 5:35 p.m., the verbal comment
25 session concluded.]

CC-121

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC 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: Fairbanks, Alaska

17 Date: Thursday, September 12, 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-122

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4006 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

Document Content(s)

091219AKProject.DOCX.....1-15

091219AKProject.TXT.....16-46

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4013 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

ERRATA SHEET

DEPOSITION OF:

DATE OF DEPOSITION:

PAGE 1 of 1 pages

Page	Line	Correction
1	19	Should state “public comment meeting” not “public scoping meeting”

CM5 – Comment Meeting Transcript, Fairbanks (cont'd)

20191017-4013 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

Document Content(s)

Errata Form for Fairbanks_091219_AKProject_Final.DOC.....1-1

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage

20191017-4007 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 Thursday, September 12, 2019

9 5:00 p.m.

10

11 Denai'ina Center Khatnu

12 600 West 7th Avenue

13 Anchorage, Alaska 99501

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CC-126

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

2

1 SPEAKER LIST
2 John Peconom - Chair
3 Dara Glass
4 Rebecca Logan
5 Tim Dillon
6 Carl Portman
7 Valerie Brown
8 Debi Harley
9 Wyche Ford
10 Pete Stokes
11 Jim Sykes
12 Eugene Carl Haberman
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CC-127

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 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. The FERC is the lead federal agency
5 responsible for siting the construction of interstate
6 natural gas pipeline projects, as well as LNG import and
7 export terminal projects. With me tonight is Nancy-Fox
8 Fernandez in the back, Kara Hempy-Mayer, also in the back,
9 and Lisa DiNicolantonio.

10 On behalf of the Commission, I would like to
11 thank all of you for being here this evening. We are joined
12 tonight by Dara Glass with the Bureau of Land Management.
13 Dara would like to say a few words.

14 MS. GLASS: I'll stand so those of you who are
15 hiding behind this can see me. So, I wanted to let you know
16 that next week on Tuesday, the BLM will be having an 810
17 hearing in Anaktuvuk Pass and it will be held at the
18 Community Center beginning at 6 o'clock and that's on
19 Tuesday.

20 And then on Thursday, the BLM will be having an
21 810 hearing in Kaktovik, and that will be at their Community
22 Center again, beginning at 6 o'clock. If you have any
23 questions on that, please feel free to speak with me after
24 the hearing or reach out to our Project Manager, Earl
25 Williams. Thank you.

CC-128

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

4

1 MR. PECONOM: Also present this evening are Mark
2 Jen with the Environmental Protection Agency, Shannon Morgan
3 with the United States Army Corps of Engineers, and Jennifer
4 Morel with the Alaska Department of Natural Resources.

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

13 Hard copies of the transcript can also be
14 purchased. Please see the gentleman here to my left, if you
15 are interested in purchasing a hard copy of the transcript.
16 Let the record show that today is September 12th, 2019 and
17 that the Alaska LNG DEIS Comment Meeting in Anchorage,
18 Alaska began at 5:12 p.m.

19 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to receive
20 public comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement
21 for the Alaska LNG Project. The Alaska LNG Project involves
22 the construction and operation of new natural gas treatment
23 facilities on the north slope of Alaska, an approximately
24 800-mile long natural gas pipeline and associated
25 above-ground facilities spanning the State of Alaska to a

CC-129

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

5

1 new LNG export terminal facility located on the Kenai
2 Peninsula.

3 The Draft Environmental Impact Statement issued
4 on June 28th, 2019 was independently prepared by FERC staff
5 in consultation and cooperation with other federal agencies,
6 including the BLM, United States Army Corps of Engineers,
7 the Coast Guard, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National
8 Marine Fishery Service and others to inform the Commission,
9 the public and permitting agencies about the potential
10 adverse and beneficial environmental impacts that would
11 result from constructing and operating the Alaska LNG
12 Project.

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

19 In the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, FERC
20 staff concludes that constructing and operating 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.

CC-130

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

6

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

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

11 Your comments will ensure that the Final
12 Environmental Impact Statement, which we expect to issue in
13 March of 2020, will be considered by the Commission when
14 deciding this matter in June of 2020, accurately reflects
15 the impact to the environment that would result from the
16 construction and operation of the project.

17 Public comments are an important part of the
18 review process. The Commission welcome public comment. The
19 public comment period closes on October 3rd, 2019. Before
20 we hear from our first speaker, I would like to remind you
21 all that comments -- verbal, written, and those filed
22 electronically, are treated equally. If you choose not to
23 speak this evening, you may submit written and/or
24 electronic comments. Written comment forms are available in
25 the back. You may leave comments with us tonight or send

CC-131

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

7

1 them to the Commission via U.S. mail.

2 If you are providing comments in writing, please
3 be sure to include the FERC Docket Number CP17-178-000.

4 Comments should be sent so that they arrive in Washington,
5 D.C. by October 3rd, 2019. Again, it's a 90-day comment
6 period for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement will end
7 on October 3rd, 2019. We also recommend the electronic
8 filing of comments. Instructions on how to file electronic
9 comments can be found in the back.

10 Again, verbal, written and electronically filed
11 comments will all be considered equally as we prepare the
12 Final Environmental Impact Statement. Tonight, there are
13 currently six speakers signed up to speak and provide
14 comments on the Draft EIS. When your name is called, please
15 come up to the podium. Please speak directly into the
16 microphone, state your name clearly and spell it so that
17 your comments can be accurately recorded in the transcript.

18 If you are speaking on behalf of an organization
19 or group, please identify the group's name. In order to
20 ensure that everyone has time to speak, I ask that you try
21 to limit your comments to than five minutes. If this is
22 insufficient, you may supplement your comments in writing or
23 file them electronically.

24 Again, written comment forms are available in the
25 back. So, with that we'll go ahead and begin with our

CC-132

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

8

1 speakers, our commenters. Tonight, our first speaker is
2 Miss Rebecca Logan.

3 MS. LOGAN: Good evening. My name is Rebecca
4 Logan. R-e-b-e-c-c-a L-o-g-a-n. I'm the CEO of the Alaska
5 Support Industry Alliance. The Alliance is a trade
6 association that represents the support companies for oil,
7 gas, and mining in Alaska.

8 And I am here testifying today on behalf of the
9 organization, its 500 plus members, and their 25,000
10 employees. Many Alliance contractors have worked on the
11 Alaska LNG Project, and with that in mind I offer the
12 following statements:

13 We support the recommendations that the project
14 proposed by AGDC in Nikiski be selected as the preferred
15 alternative for siting of the LNG plant and the marine
16 terminal. We support the recommendation by the National
17 Park Service and the EPA to install an interconnection
18 providing natural gas deliveries to Denali National Park and
19 the Denali Borough, allowing for the reduction of emissions
20 within the park, via the introduction of cleaner burning
21 fuel.

22 We highlight that the proposed liquefaction
23 facility in Nikiski, is an area that's been an industrial
24 area for the past 50 years. We also highlight that the
25 pipeline will follow the TAPS corridor, and the park's

CM6-1

CM6-1

Comment noted.

CC-133

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

9

1 highway right-of-way -- a pipeline route that's the same one
2 permitted by the Corps of Engineers in June 2019, for the
3 Alaska stand-alone pipeline.

CM6-1

4 And finally, we have hope in the economic
5 statistics. Over 8 years the project will provide more than
6 29,000 jobs with peak employment of more than 7,000 jobs in
7 year four. Thank you for your time and for the opportunity
8 to provide comments.

9 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Our next speaker
10 is Mr. Tim Dillon.

11 MR. DILLON: Good evening. My name is Tim,
12 T-i-m- Dillon, D-i-l-l-o-n. I'm the Executive Director for
13 the Kenai Peninsula Economic Development District. Our
14 organization is an organization that covers everywhere from
15 Hope all the way down to Nanwalek and Port Graham, Tyonek --
16 the entire Kenai Peninsula.

17 We assist small and large businesses with a
18 variety of different areas, and we are separate from the
19 Borough. We do not report to the Borough. We do not report
20 to the State and we do not report to the Fed's, but we have
21 contracts with each of those areas.

22 I'm speaking tonight on behalf of the
23 organization that the organization fully supports the
24 recommendation that the Alaska LNG Project, as proposed,
25 ends in Nikiski, Alaska, be selected as the preferred

CM6-2

CM6-2

Comment noted.

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

10

1 alternative for the siting of the LNG plant and marine
2 terminal.

3 We note that in Alaska, the project will reduce
4 greenhouse gas emissions through the use of natural gas
5 versus burning of wood and coal. The project will provide
6 Alaskans and Alaska companies with a variety of different
7 economic opportunities.

8 One of the biggest things is the number of jobs
9 that we'll be able to have. One of the things that I have
10 spoken to AGDC about over and over again, is local hire.
11 Starting with the Kenai Peninsula, and then making sure that
12 jobs are for Alaska. I'm very pleased to tell you at this
13 stage we just received another grant to be able to produce a
14 work force development plan specifically just for the Kenai
15 Peninsula, that will tie-in with all these different jobs,
16 so that we can start the training now, whether it be for --
17 we've recently opened up a CDL school on the peninsula.

18 We actually have two of them now, where there was
19 none of them here several years ago. The Construction
20 Academy is now up and running. The Petroleum Academy, so
21 there's a variety of those pieces that have been put into
22 place, and as I mentioned employment with all these
23 different jobs is very, very important.

24 We also support the gas for Alaskans, having the
25 connection to the interior gas utility will provide

CM6-2

CC-135

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

11

1 assurances of a long-term economic energy support for
2 Fairbanks and North Pole residents -- commercial and
3 industrial users.

4 The biggest thing, and I know this is something
5 that we've run the numbers over and over again and I know
6 folks will continue to do this, but the value add to the
7 Alaska economy. This is something that can continue to
8 assist with the State of Alaska being able to have our own
9 LNG project, and being able to take care of the people in
10 the State of Alaska. Thank you for your support.

11 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Our next speaker
12 is Mr. Carl Portman.

13 MR. PORTMAN: Good evening. My name is Carl
14 Portman and I'm the Deputy Director of the Resource
15 Development Council for Alaska. RDC is a state-wide
16 non-profit business association comprised of individuals and
17 companies from Alaska's oil and gas, mining, fishing, timber
18 and tourism industries.

19 Our membership also includes native regional
20 corporations, local governments, organized labor and
21 industry support firms. And our mission is to help grow
22 Alaska's economy through the responsible development of our
23 natural resources.

24 Should the Alaska LNG Project move forward, it
25 would be one of the most important projects ever to Alaska's

CM6-2

CM6-3

CM6-3

Comment noted.

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

12

1 economy. The 43 billion-dollar AK LNG Project would be the
2 largest integrated natural gas LNG project of its kind.
3 The project would provide significant economic
4 benefits to Alaskans from the Arctic coast to the southern
5 reaches of the state through the creation of thousands of
6 jobs and billions of dollars in new revenues to Alaska.
7 Other benefits include access to the generation
8 of domestically-produced clean, natural gas for homes and
9 businesses. The project is expected to generate 29,000 jobs
10 during construction and approximately 1,000 jobs during
11 operation.
12 Connection to the interior gas utility would
13 provide long-term economic energy supplies for Fairbanks and
14 interior communities. Interconnection of the main gas
15 pipeline to the existing south central pipeline network
16 would provide long-term energy supplies for residential,
17 commercial and industrial users.
18 In addition, in-state natural gas could also
19 support new resource development projects in need of
20 affordable energy, and most of these projects are in rural
21 areas and vitally important to the future of our economy and
22 they are looking for affordable clean energy.
23 The DEIS found that most project impacts would
24 not be significant and would be reduced to minor impacts
25 with the implementation of proposed avoidance minimization

CM6-3

CC-137

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

13

1 and mitigation measures.

CM6-3

2 Moreover, a 40 plus year track record in Alaska
3 has demonstrated that the oil and gas industry can co-exist
4 with traditional subsistence activities, cultural resources,
5 wildlife and the environment.

6 In Alaska, the project would reduce greenhouse
7 gas emissions through the use of clean natural gas. Through
8 potential sales, it would also help reduce greenhouse gas
9 emissions and provide clean energy to a significant portion
10 of the world population.

11 RDC encourages FERC to move expeditiously to the
12 FEIS in a positive record of decision. And we will submit
13 more substantial comments before the deadline and thank you
14 for the opportunity to comment.

15 MR. PECONOS: Thank you sir. Our next speaker is
16 Miss Valerie Brown.

17 MS. BROWN: Good evening. Thanks for the
18 opportunity to comment in person. I'm Valerie Brown,
19 V-a-l-e-r-i-e B-r-o-w-n, and I'm the Legal Director at
20 Trustees for Alaska, which is a public interest
21 environmental law firm based here in Anchorage.

22 Our concern at this point in the process is that
23 all project components are revealed, that all of the impacts
24 are disclosed and that the effectiveness of all the
25 mitigation measures is maximized. And the problem that I

CM6-4

CM6-4

Throughout the draft EIS, we included recommendations that required AGDC to provide updated information and/or documents prior to the end of the draft EIS comment period. While the information was requested in that timeframe, we did not expect that information to materially change any of the conclusions presented in the EIS. The applicable sections of the final EIS have been revised to reflect this information. Similarly, we referenced protective plans in the draft EIS that AGDC committed to finalize prior to construction. For those plans that had sufficient detail in their current state, we recognized the protection provided and incorporated the information into our analysis. For those that had either not been drafted or existed in a preliminary or outline condition, we did not rely on that protection to draw conclusions of impact. Our conclusions were made with the information in hand at the time of the analysis. Any additional protection measures identified in future plans would reduce the effects of the Project even more than currently disclosed. In addition, AGDC would file the finalized plans in FERC's public docket and the plans would be subject to our review and approval prior to their implementation. Other agencies may also need to review and approve these plans prior to construction. Regarding the comment period for the draft EIS, FERC's typical comment period is 45 days. The comment period for this Project was extended to 90 days. Also, FERC continued to accept comments throughout the review process up to preparation of the final EIS. Therefore, any substantive comments received after the close of the comment period on the draft EIS and before preparation of the final EIS were considered and incorporated into our analysis as applicable. See also the responses to comments CM3-1 and CM3-7.

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

14

1 see with the current DEIS is there's still a lot of missing
2 information. CM6-4

3 And I've previously submitted a letter that
4 highlights just some of the identified missing information
5 that's necessary to really review all of the impacts. And
6 there's mitigation plans still not made available yet for
7 comment. And it appears that there's going to be project
8 component changes after the close of the public review
9 period, so I just wanted to come tonight and ask in person
10 that that information all be disclosed as soon as possible
11 and the comment period be extended to the point where
12 people can review everything and review the recommendations
13 in light of all of the actual impacts and mitigation
14 measures.

15 And we will be submitting fuller written
16 comments. I'm not prepared to make any substantive comments
17 today. So, thank you for the opportunity.

18 MR. PECONOM: Thank you very much. Our next
19 speaker is Miss Debi Hartley.

20 MS. HARTLEY: Hello, my name is Debi Hartley,
21 D-e-b-i H-a-r-t-l-e-y, and I am an Operations Specialist
22 with Hawk Consultants. And I am -- thank you for allowing
23 us to comment. One of the comments that is really dear to
24 my heart is that construction of the gas pipeline will
25 supply Alaskans with gas and improve air quality. I don't CM6-5

CM6-5

Comments noted.

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

15

1 see how that can be wrong.

2 In Alaska, the project will reduce greenhouse gas
3 emissions through the use of natural gas versus burning of
4 wood and coal. That to me, seems very efficient. Also, the
5 Draft EIS notes impact to recreation areas during
6 construction would be temporary and minor.

7 It would provide Alaska with employment of in the
8 tens of thousands of construction jobs with increased
9 employment opportunities and most industries with particular
10 growth expected in oil and gas, mining support services,
11 transportation, professional, scientific, and technical
12 services.

13 The Alaska LNG will provide in-state delivery of
14 natural gas. It will improve air quality conditions
15 throughout the state. The Alaska LNG Project will create
16 jobs and provide significant economic opportunity for
17 businesses currently operating in Alaska -- trucking,
18 mining, marine pilots, tug operators, construction
19 companies, equipment suppliers, along with hotels, car
20 rental and in-state air carriers.

21 Parts in south central Alaska, Seward, Woodier,
22 Anchorage, Beluga and Nikiski will see increased revenues
23 and new jobs as primary points per entry for off boarding
24 equipment and materials and Dutch Harbor will serve as the
25 staging area for major sea lift modules, providing the

CM6-5

CC-140

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

16

1 community with economic benefit.

CM6-5

2 This has been in the making for several years and

3 I think after 40 years of studies that we're ready to

4 proceed and I am for the LNG project, thank you.

5 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, ma'am. Our next speaker

6 is Mr. Wyche Ford.

7 MR. FORD: Thank you. My name is Wyche Ford,

8 that's W-y-c-h-e, last name Ford, F-o-r-d. I want to thank

9 the FERC for this public hearing and opportunity to speak.

10 I'm a 40 year resident of Alaska. I've had the privilege of

11 working in the oil and gas industry here for that period

12 across all segments of the business.

13 From the north slope where my office at the time

14 was at this project's proposed GTP site, with the Alaska

15 pipeline where I was responsible for all the major

16 maintenance along the pipeline corridor and the Valdez

17 marine terminal and to Cook Inlet where I worked on

18 off-shore platforms as well as on onshore fabrication

19 facility and shop adjacent to this project LNG plant site.

20 So, I could say in my career I've worked on all

CM6-6

21 the locations affected by this project. I support the

22 recommendation that the Alaska LNG Project has proposed by

23 AGDC with LNG plant and terminal in Nikiski, Alaska be

24 selected.

25 The Nikiski LNG plant and terminal site in Cook

CM6-6

Comments noted.

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

17

1 Inlet, has a long history of safe LNG terminal and tanker
2 operations dating back to the '60's from the former
3 ConocoPhillips LNC facility there. The location of the
4 terminal in Nikiski was selected on the best technical basis
5 without political bias, so, please consider that in the
6 comments.

7 The huge traded resource on the north slope need
8 this project to provide market access. Fairbanks and the
9 interior desperately need access to this natural gas
10 resource. The pipeline routing making efficient use of the
11 existing TAPS pipeline corridor. On the north slope, the
12 availability of a gas export system will enable more
13 efficient development of both existing and potential
14 resources.

15 This is the right project for Alaska. The
16 ability to access and develop a natural resource with
17 economic benefit to the state is even more important today.
18 Timely permitting is key to project certainty. Again, I
19 support AGDC's proposed Alaska LNG Project with the LNG
20 plant and terminal in Nikiski and thank you again for the
21 opportunity to speak.

22 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Our next speaker
23 is Mr. Pete Stokes.

24 MR. STOKES: Good evening. My name is Pete
25 Stokes, P-e-t-e S-t-o-k-e-s and thanks to the FERC for the

CM6-6

CC-142

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

18

1 ability to speak publicly on this project. I'm here on
2 behalf of myself, my kids, my grandkids, who all live in
3 Alaska. I have worked over 35 years in Alaska, having grown
4 up down in Homer and in Cook Inlet area, the Kenai Peninsula
5 Borough area.

6 I went to school in Fairbanks and have worked 35
7 years as a consulting engineer. What I would like for my
8 six grandkids to be able to have a full career in Alaska
9 with good jobs and I feel strongly that this pipeline will
10 provide both jobs and clean, affordable energy for their
11 lifetimes.

12 I support the route to deliver gas to the LNG
13 --proposed LNG facility in Nikiski. As was stated, we have
14 been exporting gas out of Nikiski since the early '60's.
15 This pipeline route would allow for clean and affordable
16 energy throughout the pipeline corridor where it is
17 desperately needed in Fairbanks.

18 I spent four years there going to school and
19 living through ice fog that was generated from wood burning
20 stoves in Fairbanks and just held in place by an inversion
21 there. So, they could certainly use the clean energy. It
22 will also provide energy for Mat-Su Valley, the Anchorage
23 area, the Kenai Peninsula area for a longer period of time
24 than we probably have supplying Cook Inlet.

25 Siting at Valdez would not, in my opinion, be a

CM6-7

CM6-7

Comments noted.

CM6-8

CM6-8

Comment noted.

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

19

1 very good choice because of one -- the pipeline corridor
2 would have to go down through the notorious Thompson Pass,
3 which was very, very hard to construct the oil pipeline back
4 in the '70's.

5 Secondly, there would be potential tanker
6 conflicts between existing oil tankers and LNG tankers
7 coming in and out of that narrow Valdez Strait. Once again
8 I support AGDC's proposed route to have the pipeline sited
9 to Nikiski where it will be converted to LNG and exported.
10 Thank you very much.

11 MR. PECONOM: At this time, the individuals who
12 have elected to speak have done so. I will now open up the
13 meeting for other comments. Would anyone else like to speak
14 tonight on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the
15 Alaska LNG Project? As a reminder, please state your name
16 and spell it for the record.

17 MR. SYKES: Thank you very much. My name is Jim
18 Sykes, that's J-i-m, S (as in Superman)-y-k-e-s. And I have
19 a disclaimer that I want to make before I proceed. I am a
20 member of the Mat-Su Borough Assembly and have been for the
21 past 6 years. I'm not speaking for the Assembly, nor am I
22 speaking for the Mat-Su Borough.

23 I am speaking for myself as a citizen of Alaska
24 and of the country. I do support the project in concept.
25 I'm not sure about the destination however, because the

CM6-8

CC-144

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

20

1 alternative sites, which is what I came here to address, I
2 do believe have been deficient.

3 In the introduction you said that this accurately
4 reflects the data, and I would disagree with that. In terms
5 of how the site at Point McKenzie, or Port McKenzie, excuse
6 me, has been addressed, the inaccuracies asserted by AGDC
7 have been nothing less than stunning.

8 A few years ago, in fact it was 2017 in the
9 summertime, the site identified as Port McKenzie, was listed
10 as Point McKenzie, it was a couple of miles away, but it
11 described a wetland, a marsh, a mud flap actually, several
12 miles to the north. And so, when we found out about this,
13 we thought well this isn't good. A scout with a hand
14 compass, or anybody who bothered to go to Google Maps for 60
15 seconds could have figured this out.

16 This is a professional organization. I know
17 these people are capable of doing a lot of great stuff. So,
18 in any case, it turned out that a lot of inaccuracies were
19 developed over time and the Mat-Su Borough took these
20 comments, reviewed them, dug out the actual documentation
21 and corrected the record.

22 And so, I would invite you to actually read the
23 entire amount of filings that the Mat-Su Borough has made.
24 They're not terribly long, maybe 60-75 pages, but they
25 address some very absurd claims that AGDC has made and I do

CM6-9

CM6-9

See the updates to section 3.8.1.3 of the final EIS regarding the Port MacKenzie Alternative.

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

21

1 totally agree with you that the information that needs to be
2 considered in your role as deciding a project location, the
3 least environmentally impacted needs to be based on
4 accurate, verifiable information and that's what I have
5 insisted on, that's what all seven members of our Assembly
6 have insisted on.

7 So, I would draw your attention to the section
8 that begins at 3-36 on Volume 1. And it appears that the
9 Draft EIS, and I've helped write technical papers. I know
10 what deadlines are like, but there are several paragraphs
11 that end up with a phrase that's troubling to me. AGDC has
12 indicated -- and when the information follows, the
13 indication is that when we checked it out, by and large it
14 turned out not to be true, and yet there is no
15 acknowledgement that these corrections that the Mat-Su
16 Borough has made with verifiable evidence, has been
17 considered.

18 And so, it's -- in today's media environment,
19 it's so easy for anybody to make something up and have the
20 fiction that they may put out there gain more traction than
21 the facts. But I believe that you're responsible on behalf
22 of the project, on behalf of Alaskans and on behalf of
23 Americans, to make a decision that is based on facts.

24 So, I'll just run through a couple of them. Port
25 McKenzie AGDC has indicated Port McKenzie cannot accommodate

CM6-9

CC-146

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

22

1 LNG carrier vessels, the port would have to be demolished
2 and rebuilt. This is absurd. It's not only incorrect, it's
3 absurd.

4 The port has already had a world class vessel
5 fully loaded at the port which draws 60 feet of water. And
6 so, I'm not going to go through the other ones, but I would
7 think that it would have been a wiser choice in the Draft
8 EIS to say there are other facts that have been submitted
9 that indicate this might not be true.

10 It says that AGDC indicated, but it doesn't
11 necessarily mean what they indicated is actual fact. And
12 that's what I ask you to review. All of the filings that
13 the Borough has made, and I think it's fair, it's accurate,
14 and I don't -- I'm not opposed to people saying that they
15 think that Nikiski is the place.

16 The popular media has attempted to portray the
17 Borough as being in some sort of competition -- no. We've
18 always known that we were being considered for the
19 alternate, but we expect to be considered on a fair and
20 accurate basis. And that has not happened, and you know,
21 this is a Draft, I understand it's a Draft, but you know, it
22 took a Supplemental DEIS to do the smaller pipeline, ASAP
23 Pipeline, and I think that turned out well.

24 So, if you need more time to do this, I think it
25 needs to be done right, not by March. And that's my message

CM6-9

CC-147

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

23

1 because if anything, I think we hope we can agree on is that
2 it needs to be fair and accurate. And if the shoe had been
3 on the other foot, and the applicant had been saying that
4 Port McKenzie was their first choice, I can guarantee you
5 that we wouldn't have tried to file false information that
6 described inaccurately what exists at Port Nikiski.

7 And I want people to understand that because it's
8 not true that this is -- we're trying to grab at each other.
9 We just want the facts to be out there and to be fairly
10 considered. And that's it. And I can say that the Borough
11 will be filing their own comments before the deadline on
12 October 3rd.

13 Thank you for being here and please take my
14 comments seriously because I think I'm not the only one that
15 feels that way.

16 MR. PECONOM: Thank you sir. Would anyone else
17 like to speak this evening? Okay, seeing no other speaker,
18 oh -- one more.

19 MR. HABERMAN: My name is Eugene Carl Haberman
20 and I live in Mat-Su Valley. I follow the public process.
21 When the public process is done appropriate, the decision
22 made by the governing body is more like the public interest.
23 I audit the public process. People have known me to attend
24 a lot of meetings, but they also include the Board meetings
25 of Alaska Gas Line Development Corporation, the Board

CC-148

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

24

1 meetings of the Alaska Railroad and others, the Anchorage
2 Assembly, the Port Commission meetings for at both
3 Anchorage and the Mat-Su Borough.

4 I've been doing it for some time. Now, I also
5 have noted I am an Alaska resident for over 40 years, half
6 of those years approximately, a resident of Anchorage in the
7 beginning and the other half in the Valley. But in reality,
8 I don't look at myself as first a Valley resident or
9 Anchorage resident. I look first as an Alaskan, a resident
10 of the state.

11 So, when decisions are going before the
12 community, I look for it as the whole community and the
13 whole community and State of Alaska. I do see, from time to
14 time, that it goes the other way where people looking at
15 their own personal scenario, their own personal business.
16 But in my case, I look in that direction.

17 I also give up my right of my personal view to
18 ensure that the process is done appropriately, and the
19 decision made by the government body is more like the public
20 interest. And my first comments are regarding the host.
21 The host that presented it handled this meeting.

22 I'm concerned. Look at the attendance. We got
23 approximately 34 people here and that includes about a half
24 a dozen staff. Low attendance for the largest population in
25 the state, Anchorage, this part of Anchorage, which also

CM6-10

CM6-10

See the response to comment CM3-1. On July 26, 2019, FERC issued a *Notice of Dates and Locations for Public Comment Meetings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Alaska LNG Project*, which announced that the meetings would occur the week of September 9, 2019, at least 6 weeks after the notice was issued. The notice was sent to the entire environmental mailing list for the Project, which includes media outlets in the Project area.

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

25

1 could include the valley and you did have some valley
2 meetings, I noticed.

3 But why is that? It's not principal of reasons
4 that they're not here is they don't care. The principal
5 reason is you failed as a host to get the message out so
6 they could attend. Yes, there's conflicts in meetings, but
7 we're talking about the proposed biggest project in the
8 State of Alaska.

9 And what's happened? A few months ago, there was
10 a meeting at Anwar, in the same building. It was packed.
11 They're concerned about Anwar. And Alaskans are concerned
12 about this project being for or against.

13 But the fact is they have been disconnected by
14 the host that should be here tonight. That's what's
15 happened. Some don't care, but you create a situation that
16 how can they be here tonight, and how can they be at those
17 other meetings tonight?

18 And those other meetings. Now, in reference to
19 the notice, I was told prior to the meeting the host has
20 stated that you regularly do like a two to three week notice
21 of the public hearings and there's a 90-day timeframe for
22 comment period. So, you're doing a 90-day comment period,
23 and not carrying out the notice of these hearings, and you
24 allow this two and three week thing.

25 The end result there's a disconnect there. If

CM6-10

CC-150

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

26

1 you had connected the hearing date schedule in the beginning CM6-10
2 when you put out the notice of the comment period, the end
3 result is it would have been carried more likely by the
4 press, and the press would have been connected better, and
5 the public would be connected and there would be -- this
6 room would not be large enough to carry the people being
7 concerned.
8 There are a lot of people I've heard over the
9 course of time that are supporters of this project. Where
10 are they? I've attended Alaska Gas Line Development
11 Corporations, and generally they are sizably bigger than
12 this.
13 I also attended a Nikiski meeting handled by the
14 Alaska Development Corporation. I travelled round trip the
15 same day and evening -- the place was packed. But this was
16 a circumstance of the project and how they handled it.
17 The situation was the public was invited, it was
18 there they can question and hear what the proposed issue
19 was, but I asked my question to that body. It was a packed
20 audience. I'm not talking about the one you had the other
21 night in Nikiski. I said why don't you have enough faith in
22 your proposal to allow for the public to have the
23 information way in advance instead of having to come to the
24 meeting and get the information there.
25 And allow for the public to comment and restrict

CC-151

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

27

1 them in this question. That is the situation that goes on. CM6-10
2 Initially with the Kewai Alaska Gas Line Development
3 Corporation, the first meeting I attended, the packets were
4 out the day before.

5 And that was for both the public and the Board.
6 That was what I first saw at the first Board meeting. I was
7 pleased to see a response immediately by a Board member
8 toward the close of the meeting that said -- and they said
9 we need to do better.

10 I got a commitment of a week in advance. That's
11 a little bit better than I've seen from other commitments by
12 the Anchorage family, the Borough family and so forth, the
13 Port meetings and so forth. Notice of the Port meetings in
14 Anchorage where you don't even see a notice out there for.
15 No agenda for these meetings.

16 Remember, these are all tied together when I
17 describe these entities here. So, I would like to close on
18 the one key thing and concern, and I registered the concern
19 is that as this project develops, I've seen in Alaska,
20 different parties being involved with it and other parties
21 moving away, not totally, but moving away to their
22 commitments.

23 Alaska seems to be the state -- what I'm seeing,
24 and please correct me. I'm not perfect. I make mistakes.
25 But Alaska was in partnership with the oil companies in the

CC-152

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

28

1 moving of this project. That was a couple years ago. But
2 that is not to state of what has happened here.

CM6-10

3 We've also seen, remind you that we are in a
4 state budget crisis. Again, I'm not here to say I'm against
5 this project, but look at clearly with all the issues that
6 are going on in the state right now, and that's been
7 happening the last couple of years.

8 A shrinking of the Alaska Gas Line Development
9 Corporation employees. Funding by the state and commitment,
10 and there are entities moving away. Why are they moving
11 away? This is a good project, we shouldn't be moving away,
12 we should be more coming together. That doesn't make sense,
13 there's no logic.

14 And there's also a deep concern -- and I'll say
15 it now and I don't recall it being said really as a public
16 concern as I'm saying it tonight, that I see the entity of
17 China's involvement perhaps, investment in this project.
18 And I fear the situation of an investment by China. Their
19 record is not good in other parts of the world in developing
20 projects where they get involved and they're stuck, and
21 those other countries are stuck.

CM6-11

22 Are we not committed enough for this project that
23 we have to have other parties that perhaps China gets
24 involvement and lead a situation that we're being hung up to
25 try? And that's what happened. The commitment is not

CM6-11 Comment noted.

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

29

1 really there that I see yet. That's really showing here,
2 but then the people need to be back in and be brought in --
3 the oil companies, the parties that are major, have been
4 involved with the building of the Alaska Pipeline.

5 Where are they on this project? And I'll also
6 remind you of another element that happened recently. We're
7 talking right now of BP selling and leaving the state. That
8 wasn't mentioned tonight. That's a big deal. And it's
9 going into a regulatory situation which needs the approval
10 of who the buyer is, and let me remind you of that scenario.

11 It has to go before the feds, and it has to be
12 approved by the state, unless I don't know what this new
13 administration is doing, but I remember the situation with
14 ARCO. When ARCO was involved, and they had to sell because
15 dealing with a recession of barrels and all that back then.
16 The end result was when ARCO tried to sell, the end result
17 was BP wanted to come in, but the feds basically says it's
18 okay, but another deal.

19 So, they had to not take that big a share and
20 that's where ConocoPhillips came in and people are not
21 reminded about that as much because there are a few here
22 that address the public and are aware of the history of the
23 state as I am in my opinion.

24 And I go back over 40 years that I have been
25 involved. So, respectively, I would not close these public

CM6-11

CM6-12

CM6-12

See the responses to comments CM3-1 and CM6-10.

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

30

1 hearings tonight which you are going to be doing. And I'll
2 remind you, by the way, of the footnote that I was told
3 before the start of the meeting, you held these public
4 hearings in the state, and the biggest project in the
5 state, over a four day period.
6 Where's the fairness of connecting both the
7 press, the public and all that so they can be tied in and
8 get a chance? Yes, that document that you released in a
9 90-day window, and yes, there is a comment period still
10 allowed, but the public needs to be able to hear these other
11 people face to face and hear what this is all about and
12 discuss it and this has not happened tonight.
13 And thank you very much with my closing comment.
14 MR. PECONOM: Thank you, sir. Is there anyone
15 else who's interested in speaking this evening? Seeing
16 none, I'm going to conclude the meeting at this time, the
17 time being 5:52. FERC staff will remain here for as long as
18 anyone would like to ask questions or discuss the project.
19 If you are interested in staying informed and
20 receiving updates on this project, including the Final
21 Environmental Impact Statement, please talk to someone at
22 the back table. In conclusion, the comments received here
23 tonight will be considered and addressed in a Final
24 Environmental Impact Statement.
25 With your assistance, decision-makers will be

CM6-12

CC-155

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

31

1 better informed. Thank you very much for coming out this

2 evening. Good night and drive safely.

3 (Whereupon, the meeting concluded at 5:52 p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CC-156

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont'd)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019

32

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: Anchorage, Alaska

17 Date: Thursday, September 12, 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-157

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont’d)

20191017-4007 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019	
Document	Content(s)
091219Alaska.DOCX.....	1-32
091219Alaska.TXT.....	33-97

CC-159

ERRATA SHEET

DATE OF DEPOSITION: PAGE 1 of 1 pages

[illegible]

CM6 – Comment Meeting, Anchorage (cont’d)

20191017-4016 FERC PDF (Unofficial) 10/17/2019	
Document Content(s)	
Errata Form for Anchorage_091219_AKProject_Final.DOC.....	1-1