Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Proposals (North Slope to Market) Chronology of Events: 1959-1976 by Betty Galbraith 7/15/09

June 15, 1959	The Alaska Development Board released a report on the potential of bringing natural gas down from the Gubik fields to the Alaska Railroad right-of-way an then along the right-of-way to deliver gas to market. The Gubik oil field had been discovered by the Navy in 1951, in the in the Colville River area.
March 15, 1960	Colorado Oil and Gas Corporation proposed to build a 400 mile pipeline from the Gubik gas field to Fairbanks.
Sept 1967	The Northwest Project Group (Trans-Canada Pipeline Limited, Michigan Wisconsin Pipeline, and Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America) was set up to conduct engineering and feasibility studies for a natural gas pipeline to transport gas from the Northwest Territories to southern Canada and U.S. markets.
March 12, 1968	A wildcat rig drilling in Prudhoe Bay struck the Sadlerochit formation which was estimated to total over 9 billion barrels of oil and over 20 trillion cubic feet of saleable natural gas.
1969	The Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Research Limited was formed to determine the technological and economic feasibility of Constructing a large diameter crude oil pipeline from Prudhoe Bay and the Mackenzie Delta to Edmonton, there to connect with existing pipelines.
1969	The Northwest Project Study Group was formed by a merger of Northwest Project Group & Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Research Limited to study a pipeline to bring natural gas from Alaska and the Mackenzie Delta to markets in the Midwestern U.S. and eastern Canada.
1969	The Mountain Pacific Project (Westcoast Transmission Co. Limited, Canadian Bechtel Limited, El Paso Natural Gas Co., Pacific Lighting Corporation, and Southern California Edison Co.) formed to study methods of transporting arctic and Alaskan gas to U.S. markets.
Feb 1969	Atlantic Pipeline Co., BP Pipeline Co., and Humble Pipeline Company announced their plan to transport Prudhoe Bay oil to market in the continental U.S.

June 1969	Within a week of each other Northwest Project Study Group and Mountain Pacific Project announced that they were conducting studies on pipelines to bring natural gas to market from the Arctic.
Sept. 2, 1969	The icebreaker tanker Manhattan reached Barrow Alaska, proving that tankers could be used to deliver oil from the North Slope of Alaska. The tanker immediately began the return voyage, arriving in New York City on November 12th. This test was undertaken by Humble Oil, Atlantic Richfield, and B.P. Exploration, to test the feasibility of shipping oil from the North Slope to eastern markets. Although this and further tests indicated that this method of transportation would work, pipeline transportation proved to be more cost effective.
Dec 1969	Alberta Gas Trunk Line Co. Ltd. approached Northwest Project Study Group wishing to participate in their project, but were not accepted. As a result they initiated a competing project in 1970.
1970	Imperial Oil Limited struck gas and oil at Atkinson Point in the Mackenzie Delta.
June 29, 1970	Bob Blair of Alberta Trunk Line announced the Trunk North Project, to deliver gas from Alaska's North Slope to the their facilities in Alberta.
July 1970	Northwest Project Study Group invited Atlantic Oil, Sohio and Humble Oil to join the effort to study the methods to deliver natural gas from Prudhoe Bay to the continental United States.
Aug 1970	Alyeska Pipeline Service Company was formed by owner companies to function as the company responsible for the Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline Project.
Aug 13, 1970	Canada's Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources jointly announced guidelines for the building of northern pipelines. These guidelines established requirements related to environmental protection, pollution control, Canadian ownership and participation, and the training and employment of northern residents.
Nov 1970	Gas Arctic Systems Study Group. was formed to study the feasibility of transporting Alaska natural gas to market through the Yukon Territory, British Columbia, and Alberta.
Feb 2, 1971	SCR 8 was introduced into the Alaska Senate. It would have requested the Governor to have state agencies provide a comparative analysis of the economic impact of a pipeline from the North Slope through Canada. The resolution did not get out of committee.

Feb 26, 1971 Williams Brothers Canada Ltd released its preliminary engineering study of a natural gas pipeline to transport natural gas from Prudhoe Bay to Fairbanks, Alaska. This study was done for the Northwest Project Study Group. March 1970 The Arctic Test Site began operation. This test site was built for Northwest Project Study Group to test pipeline construction and operation in the Arctic. April 1971 Northwest Project Study Group's Project Geomet began operation. This project recorded temperatures at ground surface and at intervals to 20 feet in depth. Ten sites were selected for the 2 year study. March 3, 1971 The Alaska Legislature's Joint Pipeline Impact Committee was appointed. Governor Egan had requested that a select legislative committee be created to work with existing state agencies to study pipeline impacts on the state. March 12, 1971 Alaska House Resolution 8 was introduced. It requested that the Governor introduce legislation in the first session of the seventh Alaska State Legislature to prohibit by law the use of any land area for construction of oil and gas pipelines originating above 67 degrees north latitude, except for a well defined single transportation corridor at least as far south as the bank of the Yukon River. The resolution passed. (HR 8, HR 8 am) July 27, 1971 Gas Arctic Systems Study Group testified before the Alaska Legislature's Pipeline Impact Committee about their studies of a natural gas pipeline to deliver North Slope natural gas to market. Sept 29, 1971 The Northwest Project Study Group made a presentation to Alaska State Legislature's Pipeline Impact Committee. They stated that they had studied the following options for delivering gas to market: pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez then transporting LNG by ship, gas liquefaction at the North Slope and tanker or barge shipment, pipeline transportation across Alaska to Canada and down the Mackenzie Valley and into the United States. Dec 1971 The Environmental Protection Board released Interim Report 1 of its environmental impact assessment of the Arctic Gas Route 1972 El Paso Natural Gas Co. announced that it was conducting feasibility

continental U.S. markets.

studies for the delivery of liquefied natural gas by tanker from Alaska to

Jan 1, 1972	A Memorandum of Agreement was signed between Alberta Gas Trunk Line Co. Limited and Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation amending and extending the November 1970 agreement which formed Gas Arctic Systems Study Group. The agreement covered membership, access to documentation, financing and research objectives. Alberta Gas Trunk Line was the operating member of this consortium.
Feb 1, 1972	Alaska Senate bill 314 was introduced. This bill was originally a an act concerning safety standards for transportation of oil and gas. April 13th it was revised to become an act creating an Alaska Pipeline Commission. HCS CSSB 314 became law on June 20, 1972.
Feb 1, 1972	Alaska Senate Bill 315 was introduced. The act was to create an Alaska Oil and Gas Transportation Commission. The bill never made it out of committee. FCC CSSB 315.
March 1972	The government of Canada announced its objectives, priorities, and strategies for the Canadian north in the 1970s in the following terms: "The needs of the people in the North are more important than resource development and the maintenance of ecological balance is essential."
March 6-10, 1972	Joint hearings were held on the proposed pipeline legislation. Alaska Senate Bills under consideration were, SB 313 the Governor's right-of-way leasing bill, SB 314 concerning safety standards for transportation of oil and gas, SB 315 creating an Alaska Oil and Gas Transportation Commission, SB 294 the Joint Pipeline Impact Committee's right-of-way leasing bill, HB 578 governing authority to issue general obligation bonds.
March 30, 1972	House Bill 769 was introduced in the Alaska State Legislature to create an Alaska Oil and Gas Commission with jurisdiction over pipeline carriers. The bill never made it out of committee.
May 19, 1972	The Alaska State Legislature passed The Right-of-Way Leasing Act of 1972, which covered right-of-way over state land for transportation of oil and gas. (SB 294, CSSB 294, CSSB 294 am. HCS CS SB 294, FCCS HCS SCS SB 294, FCCS HCS CSSB 294))
June 1972	The Environmental Protection Board issued Interim Report 2 of its environmental study of the Arctic Gas Route. This report looked at the environmental implications of the engineering design.
June 7-22, 1972	The Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress held hearings on the gas crisis in the U.S It looked at natural gas supply, demand and pricing. It also questioned the wisdom of building the oil pipeline first.

June 8, 1972

The Mountain Pacific Project, Gas Arctic Systems Study Group, and Northwest Project Group merged to form Canadian Arctic Gas Studies Limited This group proposed to build a gas pipeline from Prudhoe Bay across the northern Yukon to the Mackenzie Delta, then south along the Mackenzie Valley and across Alberta to the continental United States. Canadian Arctic Gas Study Limited was responsible for the Canadian portion of this proposal. A sister company, Alaska Arctic Gas Study Limited, was responsible for the Alaskan segment. Together they formed the Arctic Gas Project. The Project was also known as Gas Arctic-Northwest Project Study Group.

June 20, 1972

Alaska Senate Bill 314 was signed into law. This Bill established the Alaska Pipeline Commission to regulate oil and gas pipeline facilities and pipeline carriers. Alaska Pipeline Commission Act. (SSB 314, CSSB 314, HCS CSSB 314, FCCS HCS CSSB 314)

June 28, 1972

The Government of Canada provided further direction to companies engaged in research and planning for northern pipelines. These expanded guidelines described the corridors along which pipelines could be built, and addressed their environmental and social implications.

Aug 2, 1972

Canadian Arctic Gas Study Limited was incorporated in Canada. Later, in 1974, they proposed to build a 48" pipeline carrying both Canadian and Alaskan gas to southern markets, following the Mackenzie Valley.

Nov 15, 1972

Alaskan Arctic Gas Study Company applied to the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for approval to do test soil boring in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The Alaska Area Director of Fish and Wildlife Service refused permission to do so. June 11, 1973 Alaskan Arctic filed an appeal. The permit was finally issued August 8, 1973

Feb 1973

Battelle published its report on 1971-72 environmental and ecological research at the Gas Arctic/ Northwest project study Group test facility at Prudhoe Bay. Engineering and environmental factors related to the design, construction, and operation of a natural gas pipeline in the Arctic region (based on the Prudhoe Bay, Alaska, research facility): final report.

July 1973

Purvin & Lee, Boeing Company, Air Products and Chemical Inc. and Transworld Gas systems Inc released their study of delivering LNG from the North Slope using Boeing 747s modified to carry LNG and LNG Tankers. The concept was have a LNG facility on the North Slope. Jets would deliver the LNG to a tidewater facility where it could be loaded on LNG Tankers and shipped south. They found the delivery system to be economically feasible.

Aug 8, 1973 U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife gave its approval for Alaskan Arctic Gas Study Company to the to do test soil boring in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Aug 8-Nov 23, 1973 Arctic Gas Co. conducted soil borehole studies in the Arctic Wildlife Range. Nov 1, 1973 Alaskan Arctic Gas Pipeline Co. was incorporated as an Alaska Corporation. Nov 13, 1973 The Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline Project received approval of Congress. The Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline Authorization Act (PL93-153) also directed the Secretary of Interior to investigate and report to Congress on the feasibility of one or more gas or oil pipelines traversing Canada, from Alaska's North Slope to the continental United States. This report was completed December 1975. The President of the U.S. signed the Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline Nov 16, 1973 Authorization Act. Nov 19, 1973 In special session, Alaska's legislature passed an act providing oil and gas exploration, production and pipeline transportation property taxes. The law did not become effective till Jan 1, 1974. AS 43.55 (FSS-FCSS SCS CSHB 1) Also on November 19 the legislature passed an appropriation to administer the new law. The law became effective Nov 20, 1973. (FSS-SCS CSHB 2 am FCC) In special session, Alaska's legislature revised multiple parts of the Nov 19, 1973 Alaska Code to include oil and gas pipelines. The effective date was November 10, 1973. (FSS-FCCS HCS CSSB 3) Nov 19, 1973 The Alaska State Legislature established an oil and gas properties production tax. The effective date was January 1, 1994. The law did not become effective till Jan 1, 1974. (FSS-FCCS HCS CSSB 4) Nov 19, 1973 In special session, Alaska's legislature levied an oil and gas regulation and conservation tax. The effective date was January 1, 1994. HB 5 (FSS-HB 5) Nov 19, 1973 In special session, Alaska's legislature passed legislation allowing the lease or sales of state lands for pipeline purposes. The effective date was November 20, 1973. (FSS-SCS CSHB 8) Nov 19, 1973 The Fairbanks Environmental Center announced its official position on the routing of a natural gas pipeline from the North Slope of Alaska to the lower 48 states.

Jan 1974 Alaska's Governor Egan gave his endorsement to the El Paso Pipeline Proposal. Jan 1974 Arctic Gas released its study on socioeconomic impact of their pipeline on Alaska. Jan 21, 1974 Alaska Legislature introduced legislation announcing it wanted a Trans-Alaska gas pipeline to be built following the construction of the Trans-Alaska oil pipeline, and urged the Governor to take steps to assure that a decision favorable to state needs. The resolution was passed in the second session. (HCR 21, CSHCR 21) Feb 15, 1974 HCR 51 was introduced in the Alaska House of Representatives. It requested that the Governor and concerned state agencies to provide a thorough comparative economic and environmental analysis of the competing pipeline proposals. The bill never made it out of committee. Feb 18-19, 1974 Alaska Legislature's House Resources Committee and Special Committee on Energy held a joint hearing on gas pipeline proposals of El Paso and Arctic Gas, gathering information for HCR 21 and HCR 51 Feb 19, 1974 Alberta Natural Gas Co. applied to the National Energy Board for a certificate to build a pipeline to connect with Alberta Gas Trunk Line Co. Limited in Alberta. This was intended to be phase I of the Arctic Gas Project. Phase II would connect with the pipeline built by the Arctic Gas Consortium. Formal application for phase II was made March 21, 1974. March 18, 1974 Pacific Gas Transmission Co. applied to Federal Power Commission to build a 42" pipeline to parallel its existing system and deliver gas from Kingsgate, BC to California/Oregon border near Malin, Oregon. This was to be part of the Arctic Gas Project (CP 74-241). They also filed for a Presidential Permit to import gas (CP 74-242) March 21, 1974 The Arctic Gas Consortium filed applications for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity with the Federal Power Commission (CP 74-239, CP 74-240) for right-of-way permits with the Department of the Interior, and for the necessary permits from Canada's National Energy Board (File #1555-C46-1) to deliver Alaska gas and Mackenzie Valley gas to the continental U.S. and Canada, through a main line and 2 delivery lines. These applications were for the Alaskan, Canadian, and Western Leg portions of a 48-inch system. The proposed system totaled approximately 3938 miles. Later Northern Border Pipeline Co. was

The Alaska Conservation Society issued a position paper on production

and transportation of natural from Prudhoe Bay.

December 1973

formed to carry gas from Kingsgate to midwest and eastern U.S. markets. Pacific Gas Transmission would build the western leg. The proposed system totaled approximately 3930 miles of pipeline. (CP 74-239) Supplements were filed Nov 15, 1974, Dec 30, 1974, Jan 21, 1975, March 3, 1975,

March 21, 1974

Alaskan Arctic Gas Pipeline Co. filed an Application for Presidential Permit for Construction and Operation of Pipeline across International Boundaries. (CP 74-240), and an application for Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity before the Federal Power Commission (CP 74-239) for a pipeline from Prudhoe Bay, across the Arctic Wildlife Range to the Border of the Yukon Territory. (5 supplements and 1 amendment were filed later)

March 21, 1974

The Canadian companies in the project filed applications for Grant of Interests in Necessary Lands in Northwest Territories and Yukon Territories, with the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

March 21, 1974

Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Limited filed a Land Use Application with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. It also filed and Application for Certificate of Convenience and Necessity with the National Energy Board. (2 amendments were filed later)

March 21, 1974

Alberta Natural Gas Co. Limited filed an application before the National Energy Board (File #1555-A2-10) for a two phased expansion of its facilities from the Alberta/British Columbia border to Kingsgate (105 miles of 42" pipeline). Three amendments were later filed, offering options for route, pipeline pressure, and pipe diameter.

March 21, 1974

Interstate Transmission Associates (Arctic) filed an application before the Federal Power Commission, to transport gas from the Alberta Natural Gas Co. Limited terminal near Kingsgate, Alberta to California, through a 30" pipeline (CP 74-292, CP 74-293). (6 amendments were filed through November 28, 1975)

March 21, 1974

Pacific Gas Transmission Co. filed an application before the Federal Power Commission to transport gas from Kingsgate, BC to Malin, Oregon, through a 42" pipeline constructed on the right-of-way of its existing pipelines. (CP 74-241). They also applied for a Presidential Permit to connect with pipelines at the international boarder (CP 74-242). (2 supplements and 2 amendments were filed later)

March 21, 1974

Pacific Gas Transmission Co. and Pacific Gas and Electric Co. filed an Application for Right of Way before Department of Interior for sections of line that would not be on their existing right of ways.

March 21, 1974 The Mackenzie Valley Inquiry was established by the Canada's Governor in Council. This inquiry was to assess the social, environmental, and economic impact of the Arctic Gas Proposal. Justice T. R. Berger was appointed as Commissioner of Inquiry. (P.C. 1974-641) March 22, 1974 Twenty-five U.S. senators sent a letter to the Secretary of the Interior in support of the trans-Canada pipeline route through the Mackenzie Valley. This letter was published in the Federal Register March 27, 1974. March 26, 1974 Fairbanks North Star Borough Assembly passed Resolution no. 74-14, supporting Construction of a Trans-Alaska Gas Pipeline, generally following the Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline. April 1974 Construction started on the Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline to carry crude oil from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez, Alaska. April 15, 1974 Northern Border Pipeline Co. was formed to build a eastern leg of the U.S. Arctic Gas pipeline system. A general partnership agreement was signed by American Natural Gas Arctic Co., Columbia Alaskan Gas Transmission Corporation, Northern Plains Natural Gas Co., Tetco Three Inc., NANBCO Inc., and Pan Border Gas Co. April 15, 1974 Ecology and Environmental Inc. completed its Environmental Assessment: Northern Border Project for Northern Border Pipeline Co. May 6, 1974 The State of Alaska intervened in Federal Power Commission CP74-239 and CP74-240, testifying that the State supported a natural gas pipeline following the Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline, Prudhoe Bay to tidewater in Alaska. May 14, 1974 Northern Border Pipeline Company filed with the Federal Power Commission for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to construct the 1619 mile eastern leg in the Arctic Gas Project, stretching from Monchy on the Saskatchewan/Montana border to a point near Delmont, Pennsylvania. (CP 74-290). Northern Border also applied for a Presidential Permit to Construct and Operate Pipeline Facilities Across an International Border(CP 74-291). (2 supplements and 2 amendments filed later) Interstate Transmission Associates (Arctic), Pacific Interstate May 14, 1974 Transmission Co., and Northwest Alaska Co. filed their application before the Federal Power Commission for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity to construct and operate a section of pipeline from Kingsgate. Canada to the Nevada/California Border (CP74-292). This was an extension of the Arctic Gas Proposal. They also filed an application for a

Presidential Permit to operate facilities on the international border (CP 74-293).

July 12, 1974

Northern Border Pipeline Co. filed with the Department of the Interior for right-of-way permits to construct the eastern leg of the Arctic Gas Project.

Sept 1974

Alberta Gas Trunk Line Co. withdrew from the Arctic Gas Consortium to join Westcoast Transmission Co. in forming Foothills Pipelines Limited. They began planning of the Maple Leaf Project. This was a 42" low pressure pipeline to bring only Mackenzie Delta Gas south.

Sept 17, 1974

The Western LNG Terminal Co. filed its application before the Federal Power Commission, to build deliquification plants in California, to receive LNG tankers from Alaska. The terminal locations were to be Los Angeles Harbor, Oxnard and Point Conception. (CP 75-83). Western LNG was not part of the El Paso Proposal, but would provide terminal services to them.

Sept 19, 1974

Western LNG Terminal Co. signed a letter of agreement to provide terminal and regasification services to El Paso Alaska Company, at Pt. Conception, California. This agreement was formalized February 27, 1975, and Western LNG filed a supplement to its application to reflect this commitment.

Sept 24, 1974

El Paso Alaska Company filed an application with the Federal Power Commission to construct a combined overland pipeline and tanker transportation system to deliver Alaska natural gas to the continental United States. This proposal involved about 810 miles of pipeline with a natural gas liquefaction plant at Point Gravina in Alaska, a 1900 mile sea route to California, and regasification plant in California. The gas would then be shipped through about 251 miles of connecting pipeline in California. An additional 540 miles of pipeline in Texas would have been required to complete the gas delivery system. However, El Paso never made a formal application to construct this portion of the system. (CP 75-96)

Nov 1974

Canada's Pipeline Application Assessment Group released its evaluation of the environmental and socioeconomic effects of the pipeline proposed by Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Ltd. on the Northwest Territories and the Yukon.

Nov 1974

The macroeconomic effects of an arctic pipeline on the Canadian economy, 1976-1985. by J.L. Carr, G.V. Jump, and J.A. Sawyer, Institute for Quantitative Analysis of Social and Economic Policy, for Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Ltd., was released. This report said that the changes in macroeconomic variables resulting from construction and operation of

period of years Nov 7, 1974 Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Limited placed on record, with the National Energy Board, its election to adopt a route change favored by the NEB. It proposed to relocate the Alaska supply line to cross the outer Mackenzie Delta. Nov 11, 1974 Pacific Alaska LNG Co. filed an application before the Federal Power Commission, to construct a gas liquefaction plant in Alaska, at the terminus of the El Paso Gas Pipeline, and to transport LNG by tanker to California. Nov 12, 1974 Interstate Transmission Associates (Arctic) applied to the Department of Interior for right-of-way permits for the western leg of the Arctic Gas Proposal. Nov 15, 1974 Alaskan Arctic Gas Pipeline Company filed a supplement to its March 21, 1974 Application for Certificate of Convenience and Necessity before the Federal Power Commission. This supplement proposed a tariff for shipping gas through the pipeline. Nov 15, 1974 Interstate Transmission Associates (Arctic), Pacific Interstate Transmission Company and Northwest Alaska Company filed a their supplement to their application for a certificate of convenience and necessity. CP74-292 Northern Border Pipeline Company filed a supplement to its May 14 Nov 15, 1974 Application for Certificate of Convenience and Necessity before the Federal Power Commission. Nov 15, 1974 Southern California Gas Company applied to the Department of Interior for a right-of-way in California, for the western delivery section of the Arctic Gas Proposal. Their intention was to connect with the Interstate Transmission Associates (Arctic) pipeline and receive Alaskan and Canadian gas. Nov 22-24, 1974 The Canada/United States Environmental Council held its first meeting. They discussed the proposed gas pipeline routing, in addition to other international environmental issues. Dec 2, 1974 Governor Hammond appointed Alaska's Attorney General Avrum Gross to chair the Cabinet level Gas Pipeline Task Force. It was made up of representatives from several involved state agencies. The main duty of the task force was to review the alternative gas pipeline proposals and

the pipeline were small because the construction would be spread over a

recommend a State position on the issue. In They issued their

recommendation that Alaska should support an all-Alaska route over the trans-Canada route, on April 2, 1975.

Dec 3&17, 1974

The Federal Power Commission and Department of Interior held a joint meeting with Alaskan Arctic Gas Pipeline Company, Northern Border Pipeline Company, Interstate Transmission Associates Arctic, and Pacific Gas Transmission Company to discuss the deficiencies in their applications to build the Arctic Gas Pipeline.

Dec 12, 1974

The Outer Continental Shelf and Gas Pipeline Task Force was formed to study the State of Alaska's posture on the alternative routes for a gas pipeline.

Dec 13, 1974

Pacific Gas Transmission Company and Pacific Gas and Electric Company filed a consolidated application with both the Department of the Interior and Federal Power Commission for right-of-way to construct the Western Leg of the Arctic Gas delivery system. This proposal called for 917 miles of pipeline through the states of Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California.

Dec 17, 1974

The Interim Legislative Committee on Natural Gas Pipelines released its report to the Alaska Legislature. The Committee found no reason for the Legislature to change its support for the all-Alaska route for the pipeline. It recommended that a legislative committee be established to continue studying the alternative proposals.

Dec 30, 1974

Alaskan Arctic Gas Pipeline Company filed its second supplement to its March 21, 1974 Application for Certificate of Convenience and Necessity before the Federal Power Commission. This supplement contained it proposed financing plan, and other financial concerns.

1975

The North Slope Borough established a working relationship with the Committee for Original Peoples' Entitlement (COPE) in Inuvik, Canada. They shared concerns about building a pipeline through their lands.

Jan 6-10, 1975

The Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management held public information meetings to gain input for its draft environmental impact statement. Juneau on the 6th, Washington D.C. on the 7th, Fairbanks on the 8th, Anchorage on the 10th.

Jan 21, 1975

Alaskan Arctic Gas Pipeline Company filed its third supplement to its March 21, 1974 Application for Certificate of Convenience and Necessity before the Federal Power Commission. The supplement covered proven and potential gas supplies from Prudhoe Bay and the Mackenzie Delta.

Jan 23, 1975	The Federal Power Commission issued an order consolidating the Arctic Gas Proposal and El Paso Proposal hearings (CP 75-96). The same order denied the Department of Interior request to require that the companies begin proceedings to acquire right-of-way across Federal lands before applying for Certificate of Convenience and Necessity. FPC also divided the evidentiary presentation into two phases. Phase I would cover gas supply, markets, cost of facilities, financing, reserves, expenses, income, tariff, system design, and company environmental reports. Hearings on Phase 1 were to resume May 5, 1975. Phase two would be concerned only with issues raised by the FPC final environmental impact statement.
Feb 4, 1975	Northern Border Pipeline Co. filed a supplement to its application before the Federal Power Commission, offering an alternative 42" looped pipeline in the place of a 48" pipeline.
Feb 15, 1975	El Paso Alaska Co. signed a <u>Definitive Agreement of Service</u> to deliver LNG to Western LNG Terminal Co. in California.
Feb 21, 1975	Pacific Gas Transmission Co. filed an application before Federal Power Commission for authorization to export gas from Alaska and re-import it at Kingsgate, B.C. (CP 71-182, CP 75-252).
Feb 25, 1975	Pacific Interstate Transmission Company filed an application before Federal Power Commission for authorization to export gas from Alaska and re-import it at Kingsgate, B.C. and part of the Arctic Gas Route. (CP 75-248, CP 75-249)
Feb 25, 1975	El Paso Alaska and Pacific Alaska LNG Co. agreed on principles whereby Pacific Alaska would operate as shipper of LNG from Pt. Gravina, Alaska to Pt. Conception, California.
Feb 26, 1974	Interstate Transmission Associates (Arctic), Pacific Interstate Transmission Company and Northwest Alaska Company filed their second supplement to their application for a certificate of convenience and necessity. CP74-292.
Feb 27, 1975	El Paso Alaska Co. and Western LNG Terminal Co. signed an engineering agreement.
Feb 27, 1975	Northwest Alaska Company applied for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity authorizing sale of natural gas in interstate commerce.
Feb 27, 1975	Western LNG Terminal Co. signed an agreement to provide terminal and regasification services to El Paso Alaska at Pt. Conception, California.

Feb 28, 1975 Natural Gas Corporation of California and Pacific Gas Transmission Co. filed concurrent applications before Federal Power Commission for authorization to export gas from Alaska and re-import it at Kingsgate, B.C. (CP 75-247).

March 1975 Work began on laying of pipe for the Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline.

> Foothills Pipe Lines Limited applied to Canada's National Energy Board to construct a 42" pipeline for transporting gas from the Mackenzie Valley to Northwest Territories and Alberta markets. (file #1555-F2-3) This was followed by applications by Westcoast and Alberta Gas Trunk Lines to form the Maple Leaf Project (also known as the Foothills Project). (file #1555-W5-49, file #1555-A34-1) No provision was made to connect this project with Alaskan Gas fields. This proposal was then consolidated into the Mackenzie Valley Inquiry.

March 3, 1975 Alaskan Arctic Gas Pipeline Company filed its fourth and fifth supplements to its March 21, 1974 Application for Certificate of Convenience and Necessity before the Federal Power Commission. The supplements covered the alternatives of 42" and 48" diameter pipe, and the projected effects of the pipeline on the U.S. economy.

March 3, 1975 El Paso Alaska filed its first supplement to its application for public convenience and necessity before the Federal Power Commission.

> Northwest Alaska Company, a subsidiary of Northwest Pipeline Co., filed an application before the Federal Power Commission to purchase gas from the Prudhoe Bay, Alaska, and Mackenzie Valley, Canada producers for resale in the continental United States. They planned to ship the gas through the Arctic Gas Pipeline. (CP 75-250) They also filed an application before the Federal Power Commission for a certificate to sell natural gas in interstate commerce. (CP75-251)

According to the Anchorage Sunday Times (12/14/75 C1-C3) The Department of Interior backed out of the joint environmental impact statement with the Federal Power Commission. The Department of Interior proceeded to study only the Arctic Gas route proposal, while the FPC reviewed both the Arctic Gas and El Paso proposals.

Northern Border Pipeline Co., a partnership, was succeeded by Northern Border Pipeline Corporation.

Northern Border Pipeline Co. applied to the Federal Power Commission for authorization to export and import gas. They also filed the second supplement to their Application for Certificate of Convenience and

March 1975

March 3, 1975

March 3, 1975

March 3, 1975

March 3, 1975

Necessity, before the Federal Power Commission, in order to request a change to a 36" pipeline.

March 3, 1975

Pacific Gas Transmission Co. filed an amended application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (replacing its March 21, 1974 application). Major changes included alternative pipeline design and change from a phased construction project to building the entire section at one time. (CP 74-241)

March 3, 1975

El Paso Alaska Company filed its first supplement to its application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to build the Alaska gas pipeline.

March 3, 1975

The Berger Hearings began on the Mackenzie Valley Inquiry. The Berger Inquiry was to assess the environmental and regional impacts of northern pipelines.

March 3-5, 1975

The Canada/United States Environmental Council, in its second meeting, established its position as being opposed to the Arctic Gas Pipeline Proposal, due to its alignment through the Arctic Wildlife Range.

March 12, 1975

The Federal Power Commission consolidated the following applications to export Alaska gas to Canada or import Alaska gas from Canada into the joint Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System hearings (CP 75-96): El Paso Alaska Company, et al. (CP 75-96, et al.), Pacific Gas Transmission Company (CP 71-182, CP 75-252), Natural Gas Corporation of California (CP 75-247), Pacific Interstate Transmission Company (CP 75-248, CP 75-249), Northwest Alaska Company (CP 75-250, CP 75-251), Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation, Michigan Wisconsin Pipe Line Company of America, Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America, Northern Natural Gas Company, Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company, and Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation (CP 75-257)

March 14, 1975

Federal Power Commission Administrative Law Judge Nahum Litt issued an order for parties in the proceeding (CP 75-96 *et al.*) to consider organizing into groups of proposed systems, and types of interested interveners.

March 19, 1975

The Federal Power Commission consolidated the Western LNG Terminal Company application (CP 75-83-1) into the ANGTS Hearing. (CP 75-96)

March 19, 1975

The Fairbanks North Star Borough Pipeline Impact Information Center issued an overview of projected social and economic impacts of the Arctic Gas pipeline construction on the community of Fairbanks, Alaska.

March 20, 1975 Foothills Pipe Lines Limited filed applications with the National Energy Board and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, to construct the portion of the Maple Leaf Project within Northwest Territories. Companion applications were filed by Westcoast Transmission Co. Limited and Alberta Gas Trunk Lines Co. Limited, for expansion of their systems to implement the project. March 20, 1975 Westcoast Transmission Co. Ltd. filed applications with the National Energy Board and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to construct and operate a portion of the Maple Leaf Project in Northwest Territories. March 25, 1975 Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 was introduced. The resolution requested information on the proposed gas pipeline routes and status of negotiations with Canada. March 26, 1975 A bill was introduced in the Alaska House of Representatives to establish an Alaska Oil and Gas Pipeline Authority, and directing formation of a profit corporation for oil and gas pipelines. The bill never made it out of committee. HB 347 March 31, 1975 The Institute of Social, Economic and Governmental Research issued a report to the State of Alaska Office of the Attorney General, entitled Analysis of Transportation Proposals for North Slope Natural Gas. The report did not find either system economically viable. It stated that the cost of natural gas for local communities would be comparable to current fuels. It also noted that other issues would have to be the basis of the State's decision to back one of the proposed pipeline systems. **April** 1975 Purvin & Gertz Inc. published its Analysis of the proposed LNG transportation system for northern Alaskan natural gas. They had been retained by Alaskan Arctic to make an independent analysis of the El Paso Alaska proposed LNG pipeline proposal. April 1, 1975 Westcoast Transmission Company Limited joined the Foothills Project by applying to Canada's National Energy Board for certification to construct a 30" pipeline to connect with the Foothills line in Northwest Territories and extend into British Columbia. (file #1555-W5-49) Alaska's Gas Pipeline Task Force, chaired by Avrum Gross (the State April 2, 1975 Attorney General) issued its recommendation that Governor Hammond continue to support the El Paso Proposal. (CP75-96 exhibit EP-109) April 7, 1975 Federal Power Commission Administrative Law Judge, Nahum Litt, began hearings to thoroughly explore all of the issues relevant to the proposed El

Paso Alaska Project and Arctic Gas Project. After Alcan Pipeline

Company submitted its application to Federal Power Commission and the National Energy Board in 1976, it was included in these hearings. (Hearings ended November 12, 1976)

April 7, 1975 The State of Alaska went on record before the Federal Power Commission as being in support of the El Paso Proposal.

April 17, 1975

The National Energy Board appointed a 3-member panel to hear the applications of Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Limited and Foothills Pipe Lines Limited. M. A. Crowe was appointed Chairman. However, objections were raised due to the fact that he had been Chairman of Canada Development Corporation, which was a former member of Canadian Arctic Gas Study Limited. The court cases took them through March 1976, when Mr. Crowe resigned and was replaced by J. G. Stabback. New hearings were then set to commence April 12, 1976.

April 18, 1975 The State of Alaska filed a motion before the Federal Power Commission requesting that local hearings be convened in Fairbanks or Anchorage Alaska, and that the Administrative Law Judge visit the areas that the pipeline could impact to get a better understanding of the impacts of the proposals. On May 9th, FPC denied the motion.

April 21, 1975 Interstate Transmission Associates (Arctic), Pacific Interstate
Transmission Company and Northwest Alaska Company filed their third
supplement to their application for a certificate of convenience and
necessity. CP74-292

April 24, 1975 OMAR (Organization for the Management of Alaska's Resources) came into existence. The function of this organization was to promote the construction of the gas pipeline through Alaska, rather than Canada.

May, 1975

Alberta Gas Trunk Line (Canada) Limited joined the Foothills Project, and applied to the National Energy Board to construct a 40" gas pipeline connecting Foothills in Northwest Territories to their trunk line in Alberta.

May 5, 1975 The Federal Power Commission began Phase I of formal hearings on the competing proposals for the gas pipeline. This phase dealt mainly with gas supplies, markets, cost findings, reserves, expenses, income, tariff, system design and environmental reports.

May 5 1975 The Montana Congressional Delegation went on record as supporting the Arctic Gas Proposal.

May 8, 1975 The Alaska State Legislature passed a resolution endorsing construction of a gas pipeline parallel to the Trans-Alaska Oil pipeline. They were

reluctant to endorse the El Paso proposal explicitly. It was sent to the Governor May 6th. HCR 31

June 1975

The Department of the Interior's draft environmental impact statement on the Arctic Gas System was released for public review and comment.

June 1975

The draft report, <u>Alaskan Natural Gas Transportation Systems: Economic and Risk Analysis</u> done by Aerospace Corporation for the Department of Interior, was released. The report evaluated the net economic benefits to the U. S. from Alaska North Slope gas. The El Paso and Arctic Gas proposals were evaluated in detail. The report concluded that it was to the nation's advantage to get the gas to market, but did not favor either system.

June 1975

Alberta Natural Gas Company Limited applied to the National Energy Board to construct a pipeline to connect with the Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Project, and transport gas through Alberta.

June 2, 1975

Canada's National Energy Board ordered a joint hearing on applications to carry gas from the western arctic and Mackenzie Valley to southern markets in Canada and the United States. Included in this order were Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Ltd. (File #1555-C46-1), Foothills Pipe Lines Ltd. (file #1555-F2-3), Westcoast Transmission Co. (File 1555-W5-49), Alberta Gas Trunk Line (Canada) Ltd. (File #1555-A34-1) for new pipeline construction, and Alberta Natural Gas Co. Ltd. (File #1555-A2-10) to extend its existing pipeline, and Alberta Gas Trunk Line Co. Ltd. (File #1555-A5-2) for extensions to its existing pipelines. (Order GH-2-75)

June 2, 1975

Alaska's oil and gas reserves advalorem tax was established. (HB 297, FCCS SCS CSSSHB 297

July 4, 1975

The Canadian Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development asked Justice Berger to examine those aspects of the Maple Leaf Project that differed from the Arctic Gas Project.

July 8, 1975

Alaska's Governor Hammond signed into law an act creating the Gas Pipeline Impact Committee. The law became effective June 26 and was to expire January 1, 1977. The act created a special interim committee to delve into policy issues surrounding natural gas development in Alaska, including feasibility of state ownership of all or part of the system. (HB 258, CSHB 258 am S) HB 257. He also signed the bill making an appropriation to the committee. (HB 257 am S)

July 11, 1975

A House resolution urging the U.S. Congress to reject any legislation allowing the federal government to set prices for natural gas produced and sold in the same state. Copies of the resolution were sent to the President, Vice-President and Congressional leaders. HJR 32

June 26, 1975	The City of Cordova filed before the Federal Power Commission in support of the El Paso Route
July 28, 1975	The U.S. Department of Interior released its draft environmental impact statement on the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System proposals.
Aug 7, 1975	Northern Natural Gas Co. filed an application before the Federal Power Commission to connect their existing pipeline to the Arctic Gas System eastern leg, to be built by the Northern Border Pipeline Co. Applications for gas taps on the Northern Border Pipeline were also filed. (CP76-44)
Aug 7, 1975	Northern Natural Gas Co. filed applications for gas taps near Aberdeen, South Dakota, Welcome, Minn., Ventura, Iowa, and Waterloo, Iowa.
Aug 7, 1975	Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation, Michigan Wisconsin Pipe Line Co., Natural Gas Pipe Line Co. of America, Northern Natural Gas Co., Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. and Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation filed a joint application before the Federal Power Commission for an export-import authorization to import gas from Canada through the proposed Arctic Gas Pipeline System. (CP 75-257) On August 22 the Federal Power Commission approved the consolidation. The numbers attached before the Federal Power Commission consolidation order was given were CP 76-42, CP 76-43, CP 76-44, CP 76-45, CP 76-48, and CP 76-54.
Aug 7, 1975	Columbia Gas Transmission Corporation filed an application before the Federal Power Commission to connect its existing pipeline to the one to be constructed by the Northern Border Pipeline Co., as the eastern delivery system of the Arctic Gas Project. They planned to take of their Prudhoe Bay gas at Treat, Ohio, and Tannehill, Penn., and Delmont, Penn. (CP 76-42)
Aug 18, 1975	The National Energy Board issued Order AO-1-GH-2-75 establishing the Mackenzie Valley Gas Pipeline Hearing, on the Arctic Gas Project.
Aug 27, 1975	El Paso Alaska Company issued an update to its socioeconomic analysis that had been submitted to the Federal Power Commission in 1974. <u>Mid 1975 Socioeconomic Report: Trans-Alaska Gas Project.</u>
Aug 29, 1975	The State of Alaska again filed a motion before the Federal Power Commission requesting that local hearings be convened in Fairbanks or Anchorage Alaska, and that the Administrative Law Judge visit the areas that the pipeline might impact, in order to get a better understanding of the impacts of the proposals. Later the Fairbanks Town and Village Association for Development, and the Municipality of Anchorage filed in

Sept 5, 1975 The Western Conference of the Council of State Governments passed a resolution supporting the all-Alaska Route (the El Paso Proposal). They preferred keeping the project and its benefits in U.S. hands. Sept 25-Oct 3, 1975 The Department of the Interior held public hearings, in Alaska on its draft environmental impact statement. Hearings were held in Fairbanks September 29-30, in Juneau October 2-3, and in Anchorage September 25-26. Oct 2, 1975 Oceanographic Institute of Washington published its report to the Federal Power Commission on alternative sites for LNG Facilities in the Cook Inlet area of Alaska. The report focused on sites not submitted by El Paso Alaska Co. Oct 7, 1975 The Anchorage Assembly (Alaska) unanimously approved Resolution 5-75, supporting the El Paso Proposal. Oct 8-10, 1975 The Alaska Joint Gas Pipeline Committee held meetings in Washington DC. Oct 9, 1975 The U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Subcommittee on Public Lands held oversight hearings on the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System. Oct 16, 1975 The Department of Interior, Bureau of Mines issued a news release stating that a gas pipeline through Alaska would not have much impact on other energy or mineral development in the state. Nov 9, 1975 Canada's National Liberal Party passed a resolution that the government should give first priority to an all-Canadian pipeline. This caused a slight setback for the Arctic Gas Proposal. Nov 13, 1975 The City and Borough of Juneau Alaska passed Resolution 343 supporting the Trans-Alaska Gas Pipeline route. The El Paso Proposal was not mentioned. The resolution was introduced into the Federal Power Commission Hearings. Nov 13, 1975 A coalition of spokespersons from a number of national and Alaska environmental organizations met with the Federal Energy Administration Chairman to explain their opposition to any natural gas pipeline crossing the Arctic National Wildlife Range.

support of the State motion. The FPC once again denied the motion on

September 29, 1975.

Nov 17, 1975	Atlantic Richfield Co. withdrew from the Gas Arctic Study Group. They stated that they had joined the Project Group to study the viability of such a pipeline, and the study had been successfully completed.
Nov 21, 1975	The Federal Power Commission released its draft environmental impact statement on the proposed Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System Projects for public review and comment.
Nov 26, 1975	Northwest Pipeline Corporation filed an application before the Federal Power Commission for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity, to construct a pipeline connecting to the Interstate Transmission Associates (Arctic) portion of the western delivery system for the Arctic Gas Project. On December 17, the Federal Power Commission consolidated this application with the ANGTS hearings. (CP 76-174)
Dec 1975	The University of Alaska Institute of Social and Economic Research published a report entitled <u>Analysis Of Economic And Social Impact Of Alternative Routes To The Alaska Arctic Gas Pipeline.</u> The report was done for the Bureau of Land Management, Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Task Force.
Dec 5, 1975	Phase I of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Hearing was completed. Phase I with matters relating to future gas requirements in Canada and the United States, and prospective supply from the Mackenzie Delta and Alaska's North Slope.
Dec 9, 1975	Rural Alaska Community Acton Program Inc. (RurAL CAP) passed Resolution No. 75-53 supporting the "All Alaska" route for the gas pipeline. The Resolution did not name the El Paso Proposal. This resolution was introduced into the Federal Power Commission Hearings.
Dec 10, 1975	The Alaska Royalty Oil and Gas Development Advisory Board announced that any transportation of North Slope Gas through a trans-Canada pipeline was inconsistent with the basic objectives for use of State royalty gas. They also felt that any pipeline project must allow development of proposals for use of gas in Alaska.
Dec 11, 1975	The City of Skagway, Alaska passed Resolution no. 75-23R supporting a "Trans-Alaska" route for the gas pipeline. The resolution did not name the El Paso Proposal. This resolution was introduced into the Federal Power Commission Hearings.
Dec 12, 1975	Alaska's Senator Ted Stevens introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate mandating an all-American route to deliver Prudhoe Bay gas to market.

Dec 15, 1975	The Department of the Interior submitted a report to Congress on the feasibility of the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Systems, as required by the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System Authorization Act (PL 93-153). The report was titled <u>Alaskan Natural Gas Transportation Systems: A Report to Congress Pursuant to Public Law 93-153</u> . Their preliminary evaluation found both proposals workable from the design standpoint, but recommended waiting till the final environmental impact statements were out to make any commitments.
Jan 1, 1976	HB 583 which allowed municipalities to levy property tax on oil and gas properties at the same rate of taxation as property in the municipality. (HB 583, SCS CSHB 583)
Jan 2, 1976	Alaska's Governor Hammond reconfirmed the State's support of the El Paso Route, before the Federal Power Commission.
Jan 2, 1976	The City Council of Ketchikan Alaska passed Resolution number 1043, supporting a "Trans-Alaska" gas pipeline route. They did not mention the El Paso proposal. This resolution was introduced into the Federal Power Commission Hearings.
Jan 6, 1976	The Assembly of the Matanuska-Susitna Borough passed Resolution 75-20, in support of a "Trans-Alaska" gas pipeline route. They did not mention the El Paso proposal. This resolution was introduced into the Federal Power Commission Hearings.
Jan 6, 1976	Alaskan Arctic Gas Pipeline Company filed an amendment to its application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity before the Federal Power Commission. This amendment reflected its decision to use satellite communications and for remote control of facilities.
Jan 29, 1976	The U.S. and Canada formally initialed a draft bilateral pipeline treaty. This treaty provided for uninterrupted flow of natural gas over pipelines, and for nondiscrimination in rate charges and taxes.
Jan 29, 1976	Alaska's Governor Hammond testified at Federal Power Commission hearings on Docket CP 75-96 Phase I, that the State of Alaska strongly favored the trans-Alaska natural gas pipeline route from Prudhoe Bay to tidewater. Prepared Direct Testimony and Exhibits of the State of Alaska
Feb 6, 1976	U.S. Senator Mondale introduced legislation to mandate the Arctic Gas Route.
Feb 17-20, 1976	Alaska's Joint Gas Pipeline Committee held public hearings. As a result of these hearings and staff investigations, the Committee reported that the trans-Canada pipeline was inimical to the State's interests, and that an all-

Alaska route would best serve the people of Alaska. They felt that Alaska's royalty gas was a tool that should be used effectively to achieve this. The committee recommended that that the Commissioner of Natural Resources and the State Royalty Board negotiate with gas suppliers and potential out-of-state gas purchasers. Contracts should be issued and incorporated into the Federal Power Commission hearings. They also recommended that the Legislature adopt SCR 66 and seek active cooperation of all owners of North Slope gas in support of the All-Alaska pipeline route.

Feb 17-19 1976

Alaska State Legislature's Joint House/Senate Gas Pipeline Impact Committee held hearings on the states legal limits in regulating the natural gas industry.

Feb 17, 1976

The U.S. Senate Committees on Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings on the economic viability and feasibility of the proposed Alaska pipeline from the Prudhoe Bay area for the transportation of natural gas into the United States. These hearings were followed by more hearings March 24 and 25. The Transportation of Alaskan natural Gas

March 1976

The U.S. Department of Interior released its <u>Alaska Natural Gas</u> <u>Transportation System: Final Environmental Impact Statement.</u>

March 1, 1976

Three Bills were introduced in the Alaska State Senate at the request of the Joint Gas Pipeline Committee. SB 685 would appropriate money for the Alaska Department of Natural Resources to conduct negotiations with prospective purchasers of North Slope gas. SB 686 would allow the State to maximize the economics of production of natural gas. SB 687 would allow state to defer acceptance of royalty gas due from gas leases. Only SB 685 passed into law.

March 1, 1976

Interstate Transmission Associates (Arctic) and Pacific Gas Transmission Co. signed a letter of agreement to ship Alaskan North Slope gas to westcoast markets through the Pacific Gas Transmission pipeline system, with appropriate expansion of the system. Gas would be shipped to California through facilities of Pacific Gas Transmission and Pacific Gas and Electric, with construction of pipeline to connect to pipelines operated by Northwest Pipeline Corporation and El Paso Natural Gas Co.

March 1, 1976

Interstate Transmission Associates formally withdrew its application of March 21, 1974 to construct the western leg of the Arctic Gas Route in conjunction with Pacific Gas Transmission Company. This left Pacific

Gas Transmission Company and Pacific Gas and Electric Company as the sole applicants for the western delivery leg. (Exhibit PG-122)

March 1, 1976

Pacific Gas Transmission Co., Pacific Interstate Transmission Co., Alaska Northwest Co., and Northwest Pipeline Co. signed a letter of agreement for Pacific Gas Transmission Co. to transport North Slope gas for the other three companies, to connect with their existing pipelines.

March 2, 1976

HCR 107 was introduced to the Alaska House of Representatives. The resolution would have requested the Governor to request that the Federal Power Commission consider the impact of the Arctic Gas route on the Alaska tax base. The resolution never made it out of committee. A similar Senate resolution was passed. CSSCR 85.

March 2, 1976

HB 848 was introduced in Alaska House of Representatives. This act would have made a special appropriation to the Department of Natural Resources for the purpose of conducting negotiations with prospective purchasers of North Slope natural gas. The bill never made it out of committee.

March 10, 1976

President Ford sent legislation to the U.S. Congress, imposing a timetable for the Federal Power Commission hearings and decision on the pipeline route. It placed the final route selection in the Office of the President.

March 15, 1976

Northwest Pipeline Co. amended its application before the Federal Power Commission, to include delivery of Pacific Interstate gas from Stanfield, Oregon to Ignacio, Colorado, to El Paso Natural Gas Company. This filled the gap in the delivery system caused by the withdrawal of ITA (Arctic)

March 17, 1976

Alaska Senate Bill 706 was introduced. The act would have issued general obligation bonds for up to \$3,000,000,000 for transportation of natural gas from Prudhoe Bay. The bill never made it out of committee.

March 17, 1976

Alaska Senate Bill 707 was introduced. The act would have made a special appropriation to the Department of Natural Resources to negotiate and contract for maximum synergistic use and processing of Prudhoe Bay natural gas in the state of Alaska. The bill never made it out of committee.

March 17, 1976

Alaska Senate Bill 705 was introduced. The act would have established a Gas Transportation Authority to provide for construction, operation and maintenance of a gas pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Healy River-Suntrana coal fields or the Beluga coals fields, or other in-state locations, to provide for in-state consumption of natural gas. The bill never made it out of committee.

March 18, 1976	SJR 51 was introduced in the Alaska Senate. The resolution supported routing a natural gas pipeline route outside of the boundaries of the Arctic National Wildlife Range. The bill never made it out of committee.
March 19, 1976	Canada's National Energy Board began hearings into the construction of the gas transmission system to carry gas from Alaska and Northern Canada.
March 23-30, 1976	Alaska Legislature Joint House and Senate Resources Committee held hearings on gas and oil taxation.
March 24-25, 1976	The U.S. Senate Commerce and Interior Committees held joint hearings on the proposed gas pipeline routes, as follow-up to the February 17 hearings. They also considered several bills to mandate the selection of a particular route, and the President's proposed legislation.
March 26, 1976	Northwest Energy Co. approached the State of Alaska concerning royalty gas. They said they would build a pipeline along the Alaska Highway Route, if the State would commit 85% of its royalty gas to the pipeline. They later decided to file the Alcan Project without this commitment.
March 29,1976	The Department of the Interior released its final environmental impact statement on the proposed Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Systems. Alaska Natural Gas Transportation System: Final Environmental Impact Statement.
April 7, 1976	The Federal Power Commission released its final Environmental Impact Statements on the proposed Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Systems.
April 9, 1976	The Federal Power Commission issued its final environmental impact statement in connection with proposals to bring arctic gas from the Prudhoe bay field in Alaska and the Mackenzie Delta region of Canada to market in the United States.
April 12, 1976	The National Energy Board Hearings began in Ottawa, to consider the applications of the Arctic Gas Project and the Maple Leaf Project.
April 12, 1976	The Mackenzie Valley Gas Pipeline Hearing began.
April 14, 1976	Gulf Interstate Engineering delivered its report for the Northwest Pipeline Corporation evaluating the alternative of a Fairbanks corridor pipeline to deliver Prudhoe Bay gas to the continental U.S. <u>Environmental Overview Proposed Fairbanks Corridor Gas Pipeline</u> . They also produced a cost analysis, <u>Construction and Cost Analysis</u> : <u>Fairbanks Corridor Pipeline System</u> .

April 19-23 1976	Alaska State officials testified before the Federal Power Commission. Each stated that the El Paso Route was the better route
April 22, 1976	Senate Joint Resolution 68 was sent to Alaska's Governor. The resolution requested North Slope gas producers to make commitments in support of the Trans-Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline. The resolution was read by the Governor April 12th. SCR 66 CSSCR 66
April 23, 1976	Senate Bill 685 became law without approval of the governor. This act made a special appropriation to the Department of Natural Resources for the purpose of conducting negotiations with prospective purchasers of North Slope natural gas. The effective date was April 7, 1976.
May 5, 1976	Foothills Pipe Lines (Yukon) Ltd, Alberta Gas Trunkline Co., and Westcoast Transmission Company agreed to sponsor the Canadian portion of the Alcan Project. This group became known in Canada as the Foothills Pipe Lines (Yukon) Project. These companies signed a letter of agreement with Northwest Pipeline Corporation and Alcan Pipeline Company covering design, financing and construction of the Alcan Project. A Definitive Agreement was signed July 5, 1976.
May 5, 1976	Northern Border amended its application to shorten its proposed eastern leg by stopping the route near Kankakee, Illinois, omitting about 500 miles of pipeline through Indiana, Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania.
May 11, 1976	Northwest Pipeline Co. and Northwest Alaska Co. formally withdrew from the Pacific Gas Transmission agreement of March 1, and thus from the Arctic Gas Project. They announced their intention to support the new route alternative, the Alcan Project.
May 17, 1976	Alcan Pipeline Company filed a certificate of incorporation, and it was approved May 24. Alcan Pipeline Company was a wholly owned subsidiary of Northwest Pipeline Corporation
May 17-Aug 6	Hearings were held by U.S. House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power on a group of bills designed to expedite delivery of North Slope gas to the continental United States.
May 24-26, 1976	Northwest Energy Company appeared before the Federal Power Commission (by invitation) to provide information on its activities on the competing pipeline route, and its intentions.
May 26, 1976	Northwest Energy Company (parent Co. of Alcan Pipeline Co.) announced that it would file on the Alaska Highway Route despite the lack of a royalty gas commitment from the State of Alaska.

May 26, 1976	Arlon Tussing submitted his evaluation of the merits of competing proposals for a transportation system to carry natural gas for Alaska's North Slope to the Alaska State Senate.
May 27, 1976	Pacific Gas Transmission Co. and Pacific Interstate Transmission Co. reaffirmed their intention to develop the western leg delivery for the Arctic Gas Project.
June 1976	North Slope Borough provided prepared testimony before the Berger Commission in Yellowknife in support of Inuvialuit opposition to the Mackenzie Valley Arctic Gas Route. Mayor Eben Hopson presented testimony.
June 1, 1976	SCR 85, an Alaska Senate resolution requested the Governor to ask that the Federal Power Commission consider the impact of trans-Canada gas pipeline route on the Alaska tax base. It also requested that Alaska's attorney general submit the resolution to the FPC for inclusion in the official record of FPC docket CP 75-96.
June 18, 1976	The powers of the Alaska Pipeline Commission were revised by CSHB 705.
July 1, 1976	The U.S. Senate passed Senate Bill 3521, which established procedures and subjects for consideration by the Federal Power Commission, for selection of the Alaska Gas Pipeline route. The Bill then moved to the House.
July 1, 1976	Westcoast Transmission Co. Limited amended its application before the National Energy Board to connect with the Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline, if it were approved.
July 5, 1976	Foothills Pipe Lines Limited, Alberta Gas Trunk Line Co. Limited and Alberta Gas Trunk Line Limited, Westcoast Transmission Co. Limited, Northwest Pipeline Corp, and Alcan Pipeline Co. entered into a formal agreement relating to the design, financing and construction of the Alcan Pipeline Project. This agreement was amended on October 1976.
July 6,1976	The State of Alaska once again suggested that the FPC presiding Law Judge visit Alaska. This was in response to the notice that other FPC staff would be conducting an on-the-scene survey of Alaska sites of the ANGTS proposals. The Administrative Law Judge and FPC staff members did so July 31-Aug 5 1976.
July 9,1976	Alcan Pipeline Company (later renamed Northwest Alaskan Pipeline Co.) filed an application with the Federal Power Commission and Canada's

National Energy Board to construct an overland pipeline transportation system generally paralleling the TAPS line and then the Alcan Highway through Alaska and Canada. The Alaskan and Canadian portions totaled approximately 3931 miles of 42-inch pipeline. No application for a system in the lower 48 states was filed. (CP 76-433.) At the same time they filed for a Presidential Permit to Construct and Operate Facilities at the Canadian Border (CP 76-434.) Alcan Pipeline Company was a wholly owned subsidiary of Northwest Energy Co.

July 9,1976

Foothills Pipe Lines Limited filed before the Federal Power Commission in support of the Alcan Pipeline Co. Application for Certificate of Convenience and Necessity. They noted in their filing that they were also participants in the Maple Leaf Project (with Westcoast Transmission and Alberta Gas Trunk Line Limited.)

July 9,1976

Alberta Gas Trunk Line (Canada) Limited filed before the Federal Power Commission, in support of the Alcan Project. It proposed to build a new pipeline to run parallel of its existing pipeline, from an interconnection with Westcoast Transmission's pipeline in Northern Alberta, to border stations at Coleman and Express in Southern Alberta.

July 9, 1976

Alcan Pipeline Co. filed a motion before the Federal Power Commission to combine the Alcan route application with the hearings on the Arctic Gas route and the El Paso route.

July 9,1976

Northwest Pipeline Corporation filed an application before the Federal Power Commission to construct 359 miles of 30" pipeline paralleling its existing facilities from the Canadian border near Sumas, Washington to Kent, Oregon, where it would connect with the facilities of Pacific Gas Transmission Company. This was the lower leg of the Alcan Project. (CP 76-435) At the same time Northwest Pipeline filed an application for a Presidential Permit to import gas (CP76-437), and an application for a Presidential Permit to operate and construct facilities at the international border (CP 76-436).

July 12, 1976

The Federal Power Commission issued a notice that it was considering consolidation of the Alcan proposal with the Arctic Gas and El Paso proposal hearings. Alaskan Arctic Gas Pipeline opposed this action. El Paso Alaska Co. did not oppose the action. FPC staff recommended that the hearings be consolidated.

July 23, 1976

The Federal Power Commission issued and order consolidating the hearings on the three pipeline routes. The FPC staff were directed to file a final supplemental environmental impact statement by September 15, 1976

July 29, 1976	The addition of a third pipeline route this late in the proceedings required a change in procedures as related to the environmental impact statements. There was not enough time to develop a draft environmental impact statement without delaying the proceedings significantly. In a modified environmental procedure, all parties were requested to submit their views on the Alcan proposal with 30 days. All comments received would be attached to the supplemental final environmental impact statement. The FPC staff were directed to file a final supplemental environmental impact statement by September 15, 1976. After it was published all parties would have an opportunity to analyze and comment on the final environmental impact statement. Further Order Following Consolidation of Proceedings.
Aug 1976	The Alaska Highway Pipeline Panel was established to study and report on the physical, biological and human environmental implications of building the Alaska Highway gas pipeline in Yukon Territory. The panel was sponsored by Foothills Pipe Lines, but was autonomous.
Aug 30, 1976	Foothills Pipe Lines (Yukon) Limited made application to the National Energy Board for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to construct a 42" natural gas pipeline through the southern Yukon, as part of the Alcan system which would run through Alaska, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and northern United States.
Aug 30, 1976	Foothills Pipe Lines (Yukon) Limited made application to the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs for a Grant of Interest in Lands in Yukon Territory for a right-of-way to construct the proposed pipeline.
Aug 30, 1976	Westcoast Transmission Co. Ltd. filed an application before the National Energy Board for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to construct a portion of the Alcan project pipeline in British Columbia.
Sept 1976	The Federal Power Commission released a supplemental environmental impact statement on the Alcan system.
Sept 1976	The State of Alaska Office of the Pipeline Coordinator completed its Preliminary Assessment of Three Competing Gas Line Proposals In Alaska: Arctic, Alcan, El Paso.
Sept 1976	Governor Hammond released North Slope Haul Road Policy Statement & Background which announced that when the Haul Road was turned over to the State of Alaska it would be opened to local miners and landowners, and Arctic oil field personnel and contractors.
Sept 30, 1976	The U.S. House of Representatives passed the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act, and forwarded it to the White House.

Oct 5, 1976	The El Paso Alaska Office ordered LNG Barge Transportation studies for Southeastern Alaska. Two alternative studies were requested, one in the event that their pipeline was built, and one if the Alcan pipeline was built. The first was for barge shipping LNG from the El Paso LNG plant at Gravina Point. The second was for a spur pipeline connected to the Alcan Pipeline to Haines Junction for delivery of gas to Klukwan and Haines Alaska and from there to Southeast Alaska.
Oct 8, 1976	The Alaska Department of Highways issued its <u>Comparative Analysis Of</u> <u>El Paso</u> , <u>Arctic And Northwest Gas Pipeline Proposals To Characterize</u> <u>The Impacts On The Alaska State Highway System</u> .
Oct 18, 1976	The National Energy Board incorporated the Foothills Pipe Lines (Yukon) Limited application (Alcan Route) into the ongoing hearings with Canadian Arctic Gas Pipeline Limited.
Oct 22, 1976	President Ford signed the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act (PL 94-586) into law. It outlined a procedure for a joint Presidential/Congressional decision on the selection of a transportation system. This Act also established specific time frames for the various phases of the decision process and made provisions for expeditious processing of the federal permits necessary for construction.
Nov 1976	David Knudson completed his <u>Net Economic Benefit Analysis of 3</u> <u>Competing Alaskan Prudhoe Bay Natural Gas Transmission Systems to the State of Alaska</u> . He concluded that the Alcan Route was most favorable to the State.
Nov 12, 1976	Federal Power Commission hearings before Administrative Law Judge Litt concluded. The hearings totaled 253 days, resulting in 44,458 pages of transcript.
Nov 12, 1975	In a statewide radio address, Alaska's Governor Hammond announced that the State would support the El Paso Proposal.
Nov 17, 1976	The State of Alaska filed a brief before the Federal Power Commission stating that based on environmental considerations the El Paso Proposal was preferable.
Nov 17, 1976	The Sierra Club, The Wilderness Society, National Audubon Society, Alaska Conservation Society told the Federal Power Commission that the Arctic Gas route unacceptable. El Paso proposal was less harmful. Alcan route would the least objectionable.
Nov 18, 1976	Justice Thomas Berger completed his 30 month inquiry into the construction of the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline.

Nov 19, 1976	The Federal Power Commission issued its initial environmental brief. The staff found the Arctic Gas proposal environmentally preferable.
Nov 23, 1976	The State of Alaska filed a brief before the Federal Power Commission stating that the El Paso Proposal was preferable based on socioeconomic considerations.
Dec 2. 1976	Alaska's Gas Pipeline Task Force forwarded its report on the merits of the three proposed pipelines to Governor Hammond. The report concluded that the El Paso proposal was the best from Alaska's standpoint. Comparative evaluation: Prudhoe Bay natural gas pipeline systems.
Dec 3, 1976	The state of Alaska filed a brief before the Federal Power Commission outlining their concerns about how the tariff would affect shipping of state royalty gas.
Dec 6, 1976	The state of Alaska filed a reply brief before the Federal Power Commission in response to the briefs of the FPC staff and Arctic gas concerning socioeconomic issues. Once again they stated that El Paso would maximize the possible in-state use of gas.
Dec 7, 1976	The state of Alaska filed a brief before the Federal Power Commission stating their overall position on the pipeline proposals. The state endorsed the El Paso pipeline proposal.
Dec 7, 1976	The final Position Brief of the Federal Power Commission staff was issued.
Dec 14, 1976	The Federal Power Commission issued Order No. 558 prescribing procedures pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976.
Dec 15, 1976	The state of Alaska filed a brief before the Federal Power Commission responding the FPC staff's initial environmental brief.