GREATER MOOSES TOOTH UNIT 1

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/ ANILCA §810 Hearing

Atqasuk, Alaska

March 11, 2014

ATTENDEES

Mary Ellen Ahmaogak, Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (ASRC)
Kate Aiken
Jennie Auogem (sp)
Paul Bodfish, Sr., ASRC
Chris Bordeaux
Carl E. Brower, Kuukpik Corporation
Ethel Burke, City of Atqasuk, Inupiat Community of the Arctic Slope (ICAS) Representative
Gary (sp) Comprats (sp)
Jeremy Curtis, Wright Air Service
Sharon Aikon File (sp)
Stacey Fritz, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Subsistence Specialist
Kurt Gunderson
John Hopson, Jr., ASRC
Della Ivanoff
Thomas Itta, Jr.
William Itta
Alicia Kanayurak
Amelia Kanayurak
Flossia (sp) Kanayurak
Fred V. Kanayurak
Patricia Kanayurak
Lon Kelly, BLM Arctic Field Office Manager / Authorized Officer
Roy M. Nageak, BLM Barrow Office/Inupiaq Translator
Isaac Nukapigak, Kuukpik Corporation

Lisa Pekich, ConocoPhillips
Laura Perry, ConocoPhillips
Bridget Psarianos, BLM, GMT1 Planner
Della Shugluk, Native Village of Atqasuk
Cora Simmonds (sp)
Roberta Simmonds (sp)
Miranda Studstill, Accu-Type Depositions
Michelle Turner, SLR
James Wallace (sp), Security Aviation
Jenna Wallis, SLR
Melvin Wong, Meade River School
Dave Yokel, BLM Wildlife Biologist

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m.

MR. NAGEAK: (Speaking Inupiaq). Why don't you introduce yourself, the way that you did in Point Lay?

MR. KELLY: Okay, my name's Lon Kelly. I'm the Field Manager for the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, which is the public lands, federally managed lands that surround Atqasuk and go from on the west, Icy Cape, on the south, the crest of the Brooks Range and on the east, the Colville River.

So it's a pretty big area and we're here tonight to talk about an Environmental Impact Statement and -- which Roy described, and I think

it's a pretty cool description, as an analysis of the way things are and the way things are going to change, and trying to put that in a book and what we're going to analyze in this book are the changes that would come from developing a oil production pad over by Nuiqsut. It's about 12 miles from Nuiqsut to the west.

The name of the project is the Greater Mooses Tooth 1 or the Greater Mooses Tooth Unit 1 Development Project and what it is, is a gravel pad from which oil wells would be drilled down and out to tap oil from a formation underground, below the permafrost level, so -- and we're really looking at what the impacts would be mainly on the surface and trying to write them down in this book.

MR. NAGEAK: Say the law, that's-- say the ANILCA 810 subsistence.

MR. KELLY: Right. So when we do something like this, at this level, we have a (noise of children playing) public involvement process and that's why we're here with all these people and the presentation is to try to get input on whether we're getting these impacts right and whether we're forgetting anything and one of the main reasons that we're here in this

village is that part of the process is the National Interest Lands Conservation Act requirement, which is that when the federal -- a federal agency takes on the task of just issuing a permit for some kind of use or development, we have to make an assessment of the impact of that use or development on subsistence resources and where that -- where that impact is thought to be significant, we are required to do federal hearings, formal hearings in the villages that have -- that will be impacted and we think that taken as a whole, this action, plus all the other actions that might happen, there will be significant impacts to subsistence uses in Atqasuk. So that's kind of why we're here.

INVOCATION

MR. KELLY: So I'm planning to start with an invocation.

Mr. Nageak gave an invocation.

INTRODUCTIONS/ ROLL CALL

MR. NAGEAK: Let me talk a little bit about what you said earlier.

MR. KELLY: Do you want -- do we need -- should we try to translate this meeting?

MR. NAGEAK: (speaking Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: All right, so we have an exit here. We have the exits that we came in and I'm sure you know those exits better than I do. I did check and that door opens and we can get in and out of it, if the place starts on fire or something. So we'll go through and introduce ourselves and then if you'd like, there's small enough people, maybe everybody -- small enough number of people, maybe everybody can introduce themselves.

I'm Lon Kelly and like I said, I'm the Field Office Manager. I'm the decision-maker for most of the day-to-day decisions that happen by the federal government in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska.

MS. FRITZ: Stacey Fritz and I work in the same field office, the Arctic Field Office, and I do the -- I'm a Subsistence Specialist, Cultural Anthropologist.

MR. YOKEL: Good evening, I'm Dave Yokel, and I work in the same office, as well, as a Wildlife Biologist.

MR. NAGEAK: Roy Nageak (speaking Inupiaq).

MS. PSARIANOS: I'm Bridget Psarianos. I work in BLM's Anchorage office and I'm the Project Manager for this document that Lon's going to be talking about.

MS. WALLIS: My name's Jenna Wallis, and I'm working with SLR in support of BLM in this meeting.

MS. STUDSTILL: I'm Miranda. I'm a Court Reporter.

MS. PERRY: I'm Laura Perry. I'm with ConocoPhillips.

MR. BROWER: Carl Brower, Kuukpik.

MR. NUKAPIGAK: Isaac Nukapigak, Kuukpik Corporation.

MS. PEKICH: Lisa Pekich with ConocoPhillips.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

MS. AIKEN: Kate Aiken (speaking Inupiaq).

MR. CURTIS: Jeremy Curtis, I'm with Wright Air Service.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A real good pilot right over here, our pilot.

MR. WALLACE: James Wallace, Security Aviation.

MR. COMPRATS: Gary Comprats, with security.

MS. FLOSSIA KANAYURAK: Flossia Kanayurak.

MS. ALICIA KANAYURAK: Alicia Kanayurak.

MR. NAGEAK: (speaking Inupiaq).

MR. THOMAS ITTA: Thomas Itta, Jr.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible - speaking Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: Okay, well, I really want to thank you all for having us here to your village and I know that there are other things to do and I really appreciate you coming and listening to this presentation and giving us your feedback.

Like I said, this presentation is on an Environmental Impact Statement that we're working on. The statement's in the draft form right now. It's printed up in two volumes of paperback book format. It's also available online and on CD.

We'll talk quite a bit about how that's written and how you can read it and what we're looking for in this meeting is comments on it, where we've got things wrong, where we left information out, where we -- the conclusions we do -- drew were right or wrong. We'd like those comments and so we'll talk about how to comment and throughout the meeting, we're trying to work this -- it's a little bit different than we've done in the past. We'll take -- we're going to put the whole meeting on the record and when you make comments or ask questions, if you can identify yourself for the record, we'll -- that will be part of the hearing and part of the public record

and we'll take all those comments into account when we move from the draft, which we have here, to a final.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inpuiat).

MR. KELLY: Talked too long.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay, I'll try to...

MR. YOKEL: SLR thinks they need to read this (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

MR. KELLY: Yeah (affirmative), we'll get -- that's the next slide.

MR. YOKEL: I didn't know.

MR. KELLY: Well, because if you were sitting here, you could see the next showing.

MR. YOKEL: Sorry.

MS. WALLIS: Would you like me to open it?

MR. KELLY: Yeah (affirmative).

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION / ANILCA 810 Hearing

MS. WALLIS: Okay, at this time, I'd like to officially start this public meeting, an ANILCA Section 810 hearing. This meeting is to support a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for

ConocoPhillips proposed Greater Mooses Tooth Unit 1 Project in the NPR-A.

You will have the opportunity to ask questions and provide public comment. If you'd like to speak, please use the microphone that's located here up front and state your name clearly so that we can get it on the public record.

The entire meeting will be recorded. It's being recorded now and the record -- and will be on the record to ensure that all public comments are received. Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Okay, so just real briefly, I'm going to go through the document and first of all, I'm going to tell the context, why we're doing it, what the law is and describe the project and the alternatives that we're looking at and talk about how you might read the document, one way to read it to find things that you're interested in.

Pretty much, no one is going to read a 1,000-page document from front to back. So I'm trying to give hints as to how you might look for the things that you're really interested in.

It says here that we'll talk about caribou and fish to kind of show

how the document analyzes impacts, but we're going to skip fish in the interest of time and talk about just caribou. Then we'll talk about how to comment on the plan.

Stacey will give a discussion of the subsistence issues that came up during this and then we'll wrap up with a period for public comments, if anybody would like to comment beyond questions or comments that you've made during the course of the presentation.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: Okay.

MR. NAGEAK: I told them not to talk too much, too.

MR. KELLY: Okay, so -- so let me just show this slide first. This project is, like I said, it's a production pad. It's a gravel pad, which would eventually add some oil wells and a pipeline connecting it back to the Alpine system and then back to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

It's just outside of Nuiqsut. It's about 12 miles from Nuiqsut. It's 140 miles or 145 miles from Atqasuk. So it's in the far eastern part of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska and it would be the first production that we'd expect from that area.

MR. NAGEAK: (speaking Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: So this just shows more in detail -- the project is right here. Prudhoe Bay is over here. Deadhorse is over here and the oil patch has expanded over here. There's a gap in the road system, but the Alpine development is right here on the Colville Delta.

So this expands to the west and into NPR-A, the National Petroleum Reserve, on federal lands, what has mostly taken place on state lands up until now.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: So I'm going to talk real briefly about the National Environmental Policy Act. It was passed in 1969. That's the year I graduated from high school and it changed everything in terms of the way the federal government manages the decisions that we make that affect land.

It's a law that's been copied a great deal around the world because it really works. In a way, it seems complicated. It takes a long time, but what it does is it requires the government to really analyze what the impacts are from a proposal, ask itself and the public whether there are any

alternatives or ways that this project could be done that would lead to less environmental impacts.

It involves the public at every step of the way and it discloses to the public the best guess or estimation that the government has about the impacts that would come from the proposal.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: You've got to tell me when you're done.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay.

MR. KELLY: All right, so here, there's a typo. I need to change that. It's still 1969, not 1960, but what we're doing here is taking a couple of decision documents that we had, one was the Integrated Activity Plan that we made to look at where we would lease on NPR-A, the National Petroleum Reserve, as a whole and that decision came out in 2013, in February and there was another document that was done earlier that looked at the development of that Alpine field, that field on the Colville Delta and what would happen next, and that was called the Alpine Satellite Development Plan Environmental Impact Statement, and the decision on that was in 2004.

That decision looked at a pad that was very similar to this one that we're addressing today, but it's slightly different in plan and it's been a long enough time, 10 years from that 2004 Environmental Impact Statement, that we need to evaluate new circumstances. We need to provide a new round of public participation and we need to address the minor changes in the proposal from ConocoPhillips.

So you probably have heard about the CD5 pad and the bridge over the Nigliq Channel that's being built right now on Kuukpik surface, land owned by Kuukpik Corporation, where the subsurface is ASRC and so this was originally called, this project that we're looking at tonight was originally called CD6, but at this point, it's slightly different and we're calling it GMT1, Greater Mooses Tooth, for the area of oil that we're looking to develop.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: Another thing that we're trying to do here is do something that's called Integrated Arctic Management. It's a policy of the White House to get everybody working together and avoid duplication of effort in this kind of task.

So our intent is that this process will suffice, will be the environmental analysis that all the cooperating agencies need and there are quite a few cooperating agencies. There's the Army Corps of Engineers, the Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, the U.S. Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, the state of Alaska, the tribal government - the Native Village of Nuiqsut, and the North Slope Borough are all cooperators on this.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq),

MR. KELLY: So right now, we're here to talk about this draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. It's -- will be in review and open for public comments through April 22nd. All of the comments that deal with things that we missed, conclusions that you don't agree with, that sort of thing, all those substantive comments will be addressed in the final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). Okay.

MR. KELLY: All right, we'll also, during this period that we're going through right now, we're also taking comments from all of our cooperators, now that they get to see the thing (sic) put together in a book

form. We've also identified some things that we call errata. There are mistakes that we've already identified and we've published a little sheet that captures what those are.

Once we get the comments or even as the comments are coming in, they'll be a process ongoing to select a preferred alternative. So the government, before we come out with our next version, which will be a final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, will come out -- in that document will be a preferred alternative and that's going to be before -- so when you read that final, you'll be able to see where the government's leaning, as far as the final decision they're likely to make, but once the final SEIS comes out, there will be a period for comment and a record of decision will be prepared and issued.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: Good?

MR. NAGEAK: Yes, sorry.

MR. KELLY: Okay, I already showed this slide. This just shows where the activity would be taking place and the distance to the other villages that we believe would be impacted.

Okay, so looking a little closer at the land ownership around this area, you'll see this hatched area here. This is Nuiqsut. This is the Colville River. So Nuiqsut sits in this hatched area, which is Kuukpik surface and generally, ASRC subsurface.

This right here is where that GMT1 pad will be. This is CD5. This is another pad that's being built this winter and with a bridge across the Nigliq Channel of the Colville. So they'll be a road from the Alpine development across the Nigliq Channel to CD5 before we start this project.

This project, as it's proposed, would have a road that runs -- and a pipeline that runs from GMT1 to near CD5. The pipeline ties into the pipelines coming from CD5 and will provide oil to the Alpine processing facility, where it will be processed and made suitable to be pumped down the Alaska Pipeline to Valdez.

So that's the proposal and you can see all this hatched area is Kuukpik. This area here will probably be Kuukpik. The development itself is right on the edge of Kuukpik land and the ASRC subsurface and most of the oil that would be developed would be in this area here on ASRC subsurface.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: So this map is really just blown up just a little bit. It shows that road. There are two bridges across -- I probably will mangle this, but this is the Tinmiaqsiugvik River and this is CUI (sp) Creek, we call it. It's not really named on the map and the GMT1 pad would be right here next door to Kuukpik surface and the ASRC subsurface.

One of the things on this map are these little diamond areas here. These are setbacks. There's a half-mile setback on both sides of this Tinmiaqsiugvik River and then there's quite a bit wider setback on Fish Creek, three miles on each side and you can see that in the proposed action, a bridge and a couple of miles of road and pipeline are actually just slightly inside the setback for Fish Creek.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: There's also, you know, this project will take a lot of gravel and there are two gravel pits that we propose to be used. The Clover material site has not been developed yet and that's right here on NPR-A, National Petroleum Reserve land. There's another gravel pit on ASRC land that could also be used.

The proposal is to use mostly gravel from Clover, but if there's not enough gravel at Clover, to take gravel from ASRC pit.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). Go ahead.

MR. KELLY: So one of the things that I -- remember I said that we do with the National Environmental Policy Act is look at alternatives like how could this action be accomplished and perhaps have less environmental impact and so the first thing we looked at is we call it Alternative B and basically that changes the alignment of the road and the pipeline to avoid that setback from Fish Creek.

The setback is mainly to avoid spills getting into the creek and the impacts on subsistence users that use that stream area. So under Alternative B, the main change -- about the only change is that the road, instead of running through here, now runs this way, along with the pipeline.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). I just want to point out why the road was a little bit further away from the pipeline because of...

MR. KELLY: (Indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

MR. NAGEAK: Because of the reason or the way that -- further

away from that area when the pipeline and the road are so close together, the impact of snow was so obvious and that's why going into NPR-A, the road and the pipeline are not right on top of each other.

MR. KELLY: Under both Alternative A and B.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: Okay, we looked at another alternative. This is an alternative that tries to route more traffic through Nuiqsut for possibly economic development potential for Nuiqsut. It was an alternative that was -- a similar alternative was part of the -- that Alpine satellite EIS, the 2004 Environmental Impact Statement and we brought it forward here, mainly for reference.

This alternative involves widening a spur road that is yet to be constructed between Nuiqsut and the airport at Nuiqsut and this project. It would require widening that, building a quite a bit different road to allow industrial use on that road, which is designed for subsistence access and it couldn't -- because the difference between the proposed action and Alternative C is all on private land, on Kuukpik land, this really is something that we wanted to look at and compare, but it's not something

that we could choose, at least we don't believe it is, as something that we could choose as our preferred alternative or decide because we don't have any ability to decide for this private land.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). That's a bit more closer to Fish Creek, too, that road.

MR. KELLY: Yeah (affirmative), well, this is the alignment, the same alignment that's in the proposal, so...

MR. NAGEAK: Okay.

MR. KELLY: Now this alternative, we're calling the limited access alternative or Alternative D, and it does away with the road between the CD5 area and the GMT1 pad and instead of a road, there's a big airstrip and a big road from the airstrip and a -- the idea would be that there'd be a winter ice road, but all summer access would be by the airstrip.

MR. NAGEAK: But the pipeline would be here?

MR. KELLY: But the pipeline would still be there and so that's another alternative that was addressed in the 2004 EIS that we brought forward and updated in this one.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. NUKAPIGAK: (Speaking Inupiaq). [Isaac corrects a word that Roy uses]

MR. NAGEAK: (Speaking Inupiaq). [Roy repeats the word provided by Isaac]

MR. NUKAPIGAK: There you go.

MR. NAGEAK: Quyanaq [thank you].

MR. KELLY: All right, we also have -- whenever you do an Environmental Impact Statement, generally, there's some exceptions, but you almost always have an action called the no-action alternative and that in this document itself turned into E. It basically sets a baseline and it looks at what would happen if you just continued existing management, which would include the CD5 development, into the future. So that's kind of the reference point that we have.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: Okay, so to sum up and -- this map kind of has the different alternatives all on one map. The proposed action has the road and pipeline that goes into this brown, it looks brown to me anyway, area a little bit here a couple miles. It's a setback from Fish Creek.

Alternative B reroutes the road and pipeline around that setback. Alternative C would widen this road. Alternative D would have an airstrip here and no road in the summer and an ice road in the winter coming from CD5, and Alternative E is the -- that no-action baseline.

MR. NUKAPIGAK: Lon, could you explain on Alternative D that the airport would have to be expanded.

MS. STUDSTILL: Could you please state your name for the record?

MR. NUKAPIGAK: At least, you know, -- Isaac Nukapigak for the record.

MS. STUDSTILL: Sorry.

MR. NUKAPIGAK: Okay, on the list Alternative C plan...

MR. KELLY: Yeah (affirmative).

MR. NUKAPIGAK: They would have to expand the airport and install a bridge on that creek.

MR. KELLY: Yeah (affirmative), because the kinds of planes that would be -- in order to fly more stuff into Nuiqsut and heavy stuff, because it's an industrial project, you need a longer runway than there is now and so what Isaac [Nukapigak] is saying is that would take -- that would be a big

construction project and it would require a bridge. There might be some other place it could be built, but that's what we're looking at here, a much longer -- a longer airstrip that requires a lot of fill.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq) Alternative D.

MR. NUKAPIGAK: C. [Providing correction]

MR. NAGEAK: C (Continued translating into Inupiaq).

MR. NUKAPIGAK: (Speaking Inupiaq). [Isaac corrects a word that Roy uses].

MR. NAGEAK: (Continued translating into Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: Okay, so we have those alternatives and that's the basic thing that we're comparing is the impacts of each one of those alternatives and we kind of pull the main impacts together in a table called 4.1-1.

These are the direct impacts on the ground from gravel fill and so on. So you would turn to this table to find how many acres of fill there are in a drill pad under the different alternatives, how many miles of road there are and sod.

All the basic things are summarized. So you can see here, if we want

to look at the total amount of cubic yards of gravel that we're going to put on the -- that we would put on the ground under these different alternatives, the proposed action has the least. Alternative B, moving the road a little bit could stay out of the Fish Creek setback has -- that would be 60,000 more cubic yards, so about 10% more cubic yards and then the other two alternatives have a lot more.

Alternative C, the alternative access where the spur road would be widened is the most and Alternative D, it's surprisingly because it doesn't have as much road, but does have these airstrips or an airstrip, it actually uses quite a bit more gravel than either Alternative A or B, 845,000-plus cubic yards.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq – describing table 4.1-1 of the SEIS).

MR. NUKAPIGAK: Alternative C Nuiqsut.

MR. NAGEAK: Nuiqsut.

MR. NUKAPIGAK: Alternative C.

MR. NAGEAK: Nuiqsut (continued translating into Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: Okay, so I'm going to talk just real briefly, I'm going

to skip some slides here, but I'm going to talk about how I would look at this document. First of all, if it were me, I'd look at it in digital form, because I can search for words and I can look for words like caribou and/or subsistence and find them quickly, but I would start by looking over the index to see how the document's organized and then I would go directly to Chapter Four, which contains the impacts of the different alternatives by resource, like caribou are part of terrestrial mammals. There's a terrestrial mammal section in Chapter Four that describes the impacts to caribou of all the different alternatives.

First, I'd go to that Table 4.1-1 that I showed you that tells what the direct impacts to the land are, how much -- how many miles of road, how much gravel, that sort of thing. Table 4.1.2 is another table and I'm just going to skip that discussion and then if you want to understand something specific about the -- a resource, you'd go -- you'd start with Chapter Four that describes the impacts to that resource and maybe you'd step back and look at the description of the resource to see how those impacts were developed, but they're pretty well described.

So the next section, Dave Yokel, our Wildlife Biologist, will talk

about the impacts to caribou from these different alternatives and how they're laid out in the document.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). We could say you're the tuttu [caribou] man.

MR. YOKEL: You can say it. It's not true. Well, thank you, Lon and Roy. So to repeat a little bit, the Environmental Impact Statement assesses the impacts of the action on many different resources and right now, I'm just going to talk about just one of those resources, caribou, as an example of how the impacts are analyzed and what some of the results are.

MR. NAGEAK: (Indiscernible).

MR. YOKEL: So the way -- the way any impacts are assessed, the impacts themselves were divided into four different categories. First, they talk about the intensity of the impact and that ranges from low to high, with low meaning it affects 5% or less of the resources.

In this case, this is for terrestrial mammals, so our species of mammals or 5% or less of the species' habitat, through medium to high intensity, meaning it affects more than 25% of the animals or more than 25% of the habitat.

The second impact -- you can stop me anytime you want, Roy.

MR. NAGEAK: Let me do the intensity.

MR. YOKEL: Okay.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). Okay.

MR. YOKEL: One thing I also want to add is you've all been really quiet so far. I want you to feel welcome to stop me at any time and ask questions right when you have them on your mind, okay, and if you speak up, I don't think you need to walk all the way up here to this microphone. I think it will pick you up from where you're sitting. So stop me any time with a question, please.

So the next category of impacts we'll talk about is...

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. YOKEL: What's that, what's that mean? So the next category of impact we're going to talk about is the duration, how long the impacts last and these range in this setting from temporary to long-term, with temporary being less than two breeding seasons, less than two years, to long-term meaning five breeding seasons or more.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). Yes.

MR. YOKEL: And the next impact category is referred to as the context and this ranges from common to unique, with common meaning, in the case of caribou, either the caribou species is common in the area or their habitat is common in the area, important meaning the species is protected by legislation or the impacts will occur in very special times of that species' life cycle or that they're unique, the resources are rare in the region, or actually, I got that wrong. Important is not in a special part of the life cycle. Unique, it is in a very important part of the life cycle. See if you can straighten that out for me.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). Okay.

MR. YOKEL: And the fourth and final impact category is referred to as geographic extent, how large of an area does it affect and this ranges in this scale from local to what is used as statewide here, local meaning right underneath the gravel footprint or within 300 feet of it, regional meaning beyond outside of the 300 feet and within the range of the caribou herds affected and it says statewide, it actually means within the entire Arctic coastal plain of the North Slope.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. YOKEL: Okay, so all of this was by way of explaining the rules that the analysts use when they assess the impacts of the -- this proposal on different mammal species and this example, caribou, and now we'll go to what they found the impacts to be using these rules and the yellow is the part that refers to caribou.

The others are other terrestrial mammal species and what these two tables show is that the results were the same in terms of caribou for Alternatives A, B, and C. Only Alternative D stood out as being different from the other three.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. YOKEL: You're getting a little ahead of me.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay. How do you know Inupiaq?

MR. YOKEL: Because the table's in English.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay, smart.

MR. YOKEL: So...

MR. NAGEAK: Okay.

MR. YOKEL: So looking at caribou habitat, the intensity of the impact on habitat is low for all three Alternatives A, B, and C. The duration

is long-term because that change to the habitat is going to be there for many, many years and this kind of habitat and this species are both common in this area of the North Slope and the impact will be local, in other words, within a rather short distance of the proposal.

Whereas disturbance to the caribou themselves, whether they're in the calving season or outside of the calving season, the intensity will be low because it's only going to affect 5% or less of each herd. It will be long-term, again, because it will last for a long time.

It is important because of the importance of caribou and the geographic extent, again, is just local. It will be within a short distance of the road.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. YOKEL: So when we get down to Alternative D and look at habitat loss or alteration, again, it's the same result as for Alternatives A, B, and C. The intensity will be low because it will only be 5% or less of the caribou habitat. It will still be long-term because those developments will be there for a long time. It's still common habitat in the area and it's still within the 300, you know, the habitat effects are still within 300 feet of the

gravel structures.

Disturbance is also the same for calving caribou, low, long-term, important and local, because calving occurs a long way from here. It's 25 or more miles away from this development.

MR. BODFISH: No way.

MR. YOKEL: I think you missed a little bit, Paul, but for non-calving caribou, this is where the only differences were found in this proposal. Alternative D had a higher level of intensity because -- and remember intensity is how many of the caribou would be affected. It's -- long-term is the same. Important is the same, but it would be regional because it would be affecting caribou more throughout their range.

The caribou -- I might have this a little bit messed up, but they're being disturbed beyond the 300-foot level of the road or airport.

MR. NAGEAK: That's the airport by itself for Nuiqsut?

MR. YOKEL: That's right. This is -- the Nuiqsut hub is Alternative C and that's up here.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay.

MR. YOKEL: This is the airport alternative.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay. (Translating into Inupiaq). Thank you.

MR. YOKEL: Thank you. Well, that was the hard part of my presentation. Now we're going to go to the pictures. This -- throughout -- since the Alpine Satellite Development Plan was completed, and even for a few years before, ConocoPhillips has hired a contractor to fly aerial surveys in this area to count caribou density in the area, count actual caribou and see their density in the area at different times of the year and so the data I'm going to show you in the next slide comes from aerial surveys within these blocks here, which we call the NPR-A study area for here.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq) [The caribou, when they studied where they were] 2005 to 2012.

MR. YOKEL: Yeah (affirmative), actually in this block, they surveyed all the way from 2001 to 2012.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay.

MR. YOKEL: Down here, it's '02 to '12, but up here, they added it in '05.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). ConocoPhillips did the study?

MR. YOKEL: Yes, well, their contractor did.

MR. NAGEAK: (Continued translating into Inupiaq).

MR. YOKEL: So what this graph shows is the density of caribou that they found during those aerial surveys during different dates of the year and across all the years of the study. The different little symbols in here tell you which year they counted that number of caribou and what you can see from this is almost every year throughout all the seasons of the year, the density of caribou in this study area was less than two per square kilometer, which is about the same as five caribou per square mile.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). Five every square mile?

MR. YOKEL: Square mile.

MR. NAGEAK: (Continuing translation into Inupiaq).

MR. YOKEL: And you can see in most of the times they are there, most of the data points fall down in here, meaning that the caribou density in that greater, you know, that large block I showed in the previous slide was less than or equal to one caribou per square kilometer or about two-and-a-half caribou per square mile.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq) …every square mile,

two-and-a-half caribou, how do you...

MR. YOKEL: What's half of a caribou in Inupiaq?

MR. NAGEAK: I like the lower half. Which one do you like?

MR. YOKEL: Okay, so this slide shows data from satellite-collared caribou. There's two different groups of pictures because this -- there are two different levels of technology in satellite collars and over the years, more of this type have been used.

So you see more data here than here and for each collar type there's eight seasons throughout the caribou's year and so we see their distribution in the study area changes somewhat from season to season, but remember the last slide where it showed the caribou density was down between one and two caribou per square kilometer, a lot of that was out away from where the actual project proposal is, which you can see right here.

It's in the same position in each map, but it's hidden by caribou tracks and some, very much hidden here, but the main picture here is that -- and I should say that these dark green tracks are from caribou that we believe are in the Teshekpuk Herd and the red tracks are from caribou that we believe are with the Central Arctic Herd.

So this project area just happens to be right where the two herd ranges come together and as a result, it has a relatively low use by caribou compared to surrounding areas.

MR. NAGEAK: And that's the collared caribou?

MR. YOKEL: These are -- they're collared and they're collars that use satellites, not just radios that people track from airplanes.

MR. NAGEAK: Right. (Translating into Inupiaq). And how many of -- these are the seasons, right? I can't see…

MR. YOKEL: Yeah (affirmative), there's -- see, okay, this is winter. They're not -- unfortunately, they're not in chronological order here. It goes from winter to spring migration, to calving, post-calving, to mosquito season, fly season, late summer, and a fall migration. So you can see that the most use in the project area was during the oestrid fly season...

MR. NAGEAK: Fly season.

MR. YOKEL: ...fly season and then fall migration.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). How many years, what did you say was this?

MR. YOKEL: This kind of satellite collar has been in use since

1990 and these data run through 2012, and this GPS collar were first used in 2003 in the Central Arctic Herd and 2004 in the Teshekpuk Herd and through 2012, although not every year for the Central Arctic Herd.

MR. BODFISH: Roy, (Statement/question in Inupiaq).

MR. NAGEAK: Yes, (Response in Inupiaq).

MR. BODFISH: Yeah (affirmative), where warble flies are.

MR. NAGEAK: Warble flies all...

MR. YOKEL: We refer to warble flies and bot flies together as Oestrid flies. That's...

MR. BODFISH: Yeah (affirmative).

MR. NAGEAK: But it's (Inpuiaq word) igutchaq [bumblebees] bumblebees.

MR. BODFISH: He was translating it in...

MR. NAGEAK: Wrong.

MR. YOKEL: Okay.

MR. BODFISH: I was correcting him.

MR. YOKEL: Sorry, you got caught.

MR. NAGEAK: Yeah (affirmative), that's my papa. (Translating

into Inupiaq).

MR. YOKEL: That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. NAGEAK: Any questions? (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. YOKEL: Is this you or Stacey?

MR. KELLY: Stacey. So I'm just going to go over the commenting again and then after I get done with this, just two slides, Stacey Fritz will lead a discussion on subsistence and the estimates that we have on the impacts of subsistence and hopefully, that will help people think of what they want to comment on.

So remember, comments would identify new information that we should use in our analysis. It should identify inaccuracies or inconsistencies in the information with your experience. It should identify impacts that we missed or didn't analyze correctly and it should -- could talk about what should be in the preferred alternative. There's five ways to comment and -- by email, by writing us a letter, by Fax, by hand-delivery, or you can speak here.

MR. NAGEAK: Go to the last one. Go ahead.

MR. KELLY: Go ahead. Do you want to go over this?

MR. NAGEAK: The one before that.

MR. KELLY: Okay.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: Okay, so now Stacey Fritz is going to talk about the subsistence analysis in the document and hopefully, we'll have some comments.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). Within the Nuiqsut area, right? That's what you're going to talk about?

MS. FRITZ: Yeah (affirmative), Nuiqsut, yes.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay, (Continuing translation into Inupiaq), Stacey Fritz.

MS. FRITZ: So going back to what Lon explained, Chapter Three explains everything -- summarizes what's known about subsistence in the Nuiqsut area and then in Chapter Four, they look at how subsistence, Nuiqsut subsistence would be impacted differently by all these alternatives and one thing that I think is important to point out is that the sections on subsistence were written by Stephen R. Braund and Associates, and I'm not sure if people in Atqasuk are as familiar with him as people in other

villages. Has he done studies in Atqasuk?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who's he?

MR. NAGEAK: Stephen Braund…

MS. FRITZ: Stephen -- Stephen Braund.

MR. NAGEAK: …and Associates.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Stephen Braund.

MS. FRITZ: Maybe not, because there hasn't been so much proposed development in this area. He's a -- he has a whole team of specialists in Anchorage and they have gone to Kaktovik, Nuiqsut, Barrow, Wainwright, Point Lay. They've been in all of those coastal areas.

They have done subsistence studies in basically all of these subsistence use areas on the North Slope and other places for many, many years and one way that they've been able to do a very more scientific study of that is by giving GPSs to hunters and tracking where they go and being able to track what are then the most densely used subsistence areas, winter use versus summer use, caribou use versus fish use. So they're able to do a very specific analysis of subsistence use areas and I thought that actually -- how do I make it go to that?

MR. KELLY: Just hit the down arrow or the left arrow.

MS. FRITZ: So this is one of the maps that Stephen Braund and Associates has done for caribou subsistence use for Nuiqsut.

MR. NEAKOK: The red is what?

MS. FRITZ: It's just -- the red is denser. So the redder it is, the denser the use, more people using that area. So you can see the Kuukpik, the Colville and the Nigliq Channel are obviously densely used and then the area directly west of Nuiqsut and along Fish Creek are very densely used areas.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq). In wintertime?

MS. FRITZ: Yes, so he maps them out for each -- so this is for caribou, but he does it for fish and for furbearers, that's a much wider use area. Some things are hunted close to town, but this is just an example of...

MR. BODFISH: Is fall included?

MS. FRITZ: Yeah (affirmative).

MR. NAGEAK: Go ahead.

MS. FRITZ: So as with most development, there are impacts. Then there's -- they try to analyze the different types of impacts that could occur.

Noise, traffic and the actual infrastructure itself could be disturbing. It could also affect the availability of key resources like caribou.

So he goes through, analyzes all four action alternatives. So there's an alternative that would mean no development. This is just talking about those alternatives that Lon discussed. Overall, the number one impact that is most likely to occur is avoidance by hunters of the development area.

Most people talk about this whenever we have meetings like this or people are interviewed, that hunters do not like to hunt near development and they will avoid it, depending on the hunter, by a couple of miles or by five miles or just steer clear entirely. So that is one of the number one impacts, that people will avoid the area.

Now, this particular project is very interesting because it's not that simple. People might just avoid the area, but at the same time, they're building a road through this subsistence use area that the hunters will be guaranteed the right to use and so that's called a countervailing impact, that we have a negative impact that people will want to avoid this development area, but at the same time, it will be much easier for people to go there by road and access that area.

So it makes it a little harder, but that's -- a little harder to analyze the impacts, but at least there's this countervailing impact of increased access to the area. Of course, that could mean more traffic, noise, disturbance in the area that could affect the availability of, for example, caribou. Does that make sense so far? So overall, there's not a lot of difference in...

MR. NAGEAK: Do you want me to...

MS. FRITZ: Sorry.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MS. FRITZ: I can't remember what I was just saying now.

MR. NAGEAK: That subsistence food tastes good.

MS. FRITZ: That's right. So I was saying that -- well, when they do an Environmental Impact Statement, they try and break down the resource into as many finite groups. So even though subsistence is such an important thing that impacts all aspects of your lives, they try to break it down so there's -- they analyze the economics, the economic impact of this project separately, subsistence separately, then they have an analysis of sociocultural systems, however that is hugely impacted by subsistence.

So if we have major impacts to subsistence, we can assume it will

have a major impact to sociocultural systems and then we also have Environmental Justice. So I'm just talking about the subsistence sections. It's not talking about the economic benefits of oil development or the negative social aspects of whatever; it's just the animals and hunters.

So overall, the four alternatives are all found that for the community of Nuiqsut, they would have a major impact on subsistence. So it's the only resource analyzed that actually has a -- was found to have a major impact and that's because in large part thanks to Stephen Braund's studies, he's able to very accurately describe how much land would be taken away from use, how much of the subsistence use area could be taken out of their subsistence use area and it is a significant amount, especially depending on how much avoidance there is, right.

He did find, and I agree, that Alternatives A and B, so those are the two alternatives that were described first that are very similar with the road and pipeline from CD5 to GMT1 with just a slight difference in the routing, would have overall the least impact of those alternatives. Alternative C -- you just stop me at any time.

MR. NAGEAK: No.

MS. FRITZ: Alternative C is the -- known as the Nuiqsut hub one, would likely have slightly more impacts. There would be more air traffic closer to town, more ground traffic closer to town and so it's likely that would affect availability of resources close to town.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay.

MS. FRITZ: So it does seem like that would have a slightly higher impact.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MS. FRITZ: I haven't talked about D.

MR. NAGEAK: You haven't talked about D?

MS. FRITZ: No.

MR. NAGEAK: C, you never talked about C?

MS. FRITZ: C is what's called the Nuiqsut Hub, so there would still be an apkuun [road]...

MR. NAGEAK: C is the Nuiqsut Hub? I keep getting those two...

MS. FRITZ: Yeah (affirmative), C is what's called the Nuiqsut Hub.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay.

MS. FRITZ: That means that a bunch of the major industrial planes

and traffic would land at the Nuiqsut airport, instead of at Alpine, and travel from Nuiqsut of what would -- now it's just called the spur road, that would be an industrial road. So it would mean a lot more air traffic and heavy industrial ground traffic right around town.

MR. NAGEAK: Nuiqsut...

MS. FRITZ: So...

MR. NAGEAK: Nuiqsut (continuing translation into Inupiaq).

MS. FRITZ: Is there any questions so far? Okay.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq).

MS. FRITZ: It looks like -- you look like you have a question.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) [side conversation]

MS. FRITZ: Okay, so D -- no, it's okay. So D is the alternative that would have no road between...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Just the airport.

MS. FRITZ: ...CD5 and GMT1. There would still be a pipeline, but there would be no road.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What is the proposal? I'm sorry (indiscernible).

MS. FRITZ: No, I know you came in late. We can -- that's okay, we can actually sit down with you and explain it, give you the summary afterwards. So Alternative D is the one where no road...

MR. NAGEAK: But the airport.

MS. FRITZ: ...between -- basically between the existing oil development just now extending just west of the Colville River to this new proposed oil pad, right, so there would still be a pipeline, but no road and that would likely have more impacts than any other alternative.

First of all, the number one impact cited by subsistence hunters is disturbance from aircraft and so if there are no roads, it means that there would be -- there would be ice roads in the winter, but no roads the rest of the time means that there would be a lot more aircraft.

Also, Alternative D means that GMT1 would have to have a lot more facilities and a larger footprint, because it wouldn't be attached by road to CD5. So there would actually be an airport at GMT1 and planes landing out there, instead of just a road.

So it -- also as far as air pollution, there would be more air pollution created by that alternative. Overall, to subsistence, it is analyzed to have --

estimated to have the most impacts.

MR. YOKEL: (Indiscernible).

MS. FRITZ: What's that?

MR. YOKEL: No countervailing...

MS. FRITZ: No countervailing impacts, exactly. Then you don't have a road that allows you to go hunt in that area if you wanted to. So it has fewer countervailing impacts. Make sense? So -- and I think as most people here know, there has been less development in the Atqasuk area, but avoidance of...

MR. NAGEAK: Nuiqsut.

MS. FRITZ: Sorry, so, but I was talking about Atqasuk.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay.

MS. FRITZ: Because the people in Atqasuk may -- they probably know this, even though there has been less development here, that the main impacts, as I said, were avoidance of developed areas and then when people stop using an area, then there's less community participation and less transfer of knowledge about that land to younger generations. People spend more money, more time and more effort to get to hunting grounds

that are further away.

So that's the analysis that's done for the EIS itself and then also, in Alaska, we do what's called an ANILCA 810 analysis and there's also a cumulative analysis in here, where you look at all the additive impacts of everything that's happened in the past, in addition to everything that is likely to happen in the future.

So for the community of Nuiqsut, you have to look at the fact that their hunting grounds extended to Prudhoe Bay and much of that land has been taken over by oil development coming from the east and now extending to the west and so they are more boxed in by development than other communities. So they've lost some of their subsistence land.

The cumulative analysis also has to consider other future projects that might happen and when we do that, we have to determine what communities will be impacted and when we do the cumulative analysis, we look at things like the road to Umiat and offshore development and a gas pipeline, other possible future projects.

When we do that analysis, we have to conclude that those could impact subsistence hunting in all the NPR communities -- NPR-A

communities, Point Lay, Wainwright, Barrow, Atqasuk, Nuiqsut and Anaktuvuk Pass, all right. So with that larger historic and future scenario could affect everybody. Yes.

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq) Alternative D will have the most impact.

MS. FRITZ: Most likely.

MR. NAGEAK: (Continuing translation into Inupiaq). …cumulative impact.

MS. FRITZ: Cumulative impact.

MR. NAGEAK: ...way before it goes out that way, right, that's what you're talking about.

MS. FRITZ: Yeah (affirmative), the cumulative, so it has to look at all the impacts that have occurred in the past, right?

MR. NAGEAK: Right.

MS. FRITZ: Mainly that is oil development spreading west from Prudhoe Bay into that subsistence area and then at all the potential future projects. So further development westward from GMT1, we have to look at what the impacts of a road to Umiat, road and pipeline to Umiat,

offshore development and pipelines coming onshore from that, if all those things happened, the effect of all of that together would most likely affect subsistence all over the NPR-A.

MR. NAGEAK: And that's why all of this studying and the whole book has to be made.

MS. FRITZ: Right, actually, and that also includes climate change. That is another impact that has to be included.

MR. NAGEAK: All the cumulative studies have to be made. (Translating into Inupiaq). That's my favorite fishing hole (continuing translation into Inupiaq).

MS. FRITZ: Do you have a question?

MR. BODFISH: Yeah (affirmative).

MS. STUDSTILL: Can you please state your name for the record?

MR. NAGEAK: For the record, your name.

MR. BODFISH: For the record, my name is (speaking Inupiaq) and my full name is Paul Bodfish, Sr.

MS. STUDSTILL: I'm sorry, what was the last name?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bodfish.

MR. BODFISH: This is about 1978, but every (speaking Inupiaq).

MR. NAGEAK: (Speaking Inupiaq).

MR. BODFISH: You want me to say it in English, too?

MR. NAGEAK: Yeah (affirmative). Well that was my father, that's who he's named after.

MR. BODFISH: Well, I said that in the past that when BLM personnel named Isaac-- I don't know who else was here, but they did come and they asked us a bunch of questions and you know, we gave them where we hunt and which routes the caribou take and it's not in one place, because they're such a numerous species, you know, our caribou herd and they got a wide array of trails all the way, 90 miles south of here that I know that they follow this river down or follow it up, whatever the (indiscernible) -- whatever the area and we know that the Western and the Central or the Teshekpuk Herd, when they go through, they don't stop and we know all the trails and that's where we've been hunting them all these years and my cousin here knows all about that too, and he knows and all the way between here and Barrow and I know the inner route is traveled a lot.

The Meade river is traveled a lot to the south and all of that has been

recorded and I'm just saying, "How come they're not using that information (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)?"

MS. FRITZ: We -- we do try to use all the information that has been given to us and it's -- I assure you, a comment that BLM hears a lot is that our comments are the same ones we've been giving you since the '70's.

MR. BODFISH: Yeah (affirmative).

MS. FRITZ: We use the information that we've given you (sic)...

MR. BODFISH: Yeah (affirmative).

MS. FRITZ: And -- and I appreciate that and we really are trying to use that information and I would say that most of this information is based on what people have learned throughout the years. At the same time, the government can't permit a project without coming and asking you, saying, "This is what we think. This is the new information that we know of and please, give us your input on anything that you know or more importantly or as importantly, if you can think of any ways that we could mitigate the impacts."

We are always open to suggestions about ways that we could mitigate the impacts of this development and so even though it is very

frustrating, this public process, where people feel like they're repeating themselves over and over again, it's still better that the government comes to you and asks you every time, than just does it without asking you.

MR. BODFISH: Yeah (affirmative), like in the beginning.

MS. FRITZ: Exactly.

MR. BODFISH: Well, my other comment would be I know that Nuiqsut had asked for roads and I would back them up about their proposal, whatever proposal that they're wanting the road access (indiscernible) my mind is set. I don't know what the other people here think about it, but I would back them up on whatever they want.

MS. FRITZ: I don't think that there's a consensus in Nuiqsut. If there is, it -- if -- maybe one thing that people agree on is that they do not want more aircraft traffic. It is the number one impact.

MR. BODFISH: Yeah (affirmative), and we've felt it here, just...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Especially here.

MR. BODFISH: Several years of studies that they've done here, it has greatly impacted us and we've felt that and that was just a little traffic.

MS. FRITZ: Yeah (affirmative), well, when Nuiqsut has thousands

and thousands of helicopters.

MR. BODFISH: We've had mad hunters go home because of it.

MS. FRITZ: Well, that's a -- it is a major impact. All the studies surveying, ice road stick-picking, fish, birds, water, everything needs to be studied before development can occur. People want to know what the impacts of development will be, so they do demand the studies, but the result of that is that there's a lot of required studies going on and people do it most often by helicopter and so it results in a lot of aircraft disturbance.

MR. BODFISH: Well, we've offered four-wheelers, boats, from our village and they said, "No," and they've chosen to -- rather use their aircraft.

MS. FRITZ: We -- we are definitely...

MR. BODFISH: That -- that would help our people with four-wheelers or boats that don't have jobs, you know.

MS. FRITZ: Right. Well, we're definitely trying -- always trying to come up with ways that studies can be done or stick-picking from ice roads, that we can figure out ways to do that -- those activities with fewer helicopter trips.

MR. NAGEAK: One of the things that we heard from Point Lay, too, was repetitive studies, different divisions in the government does or contract with...

MR. BODFISH: Well, you know, there are people, you know, like we've got people from Cincinnati that come up here every year. Why not gather some of their data because where they're doing their study, caribou goes right by them. What is it, a mile-and-a-half?

MR. NAGEAK: And they do it every year?

MR. BODFISH: Every year. We've asked for -- we've asked them to come and give us the type of information that they've gotten and I know they do key our fish and do they studies and not just the plants there, because there's a creek right -- that fish bearing right in that area, salmon berries and they've been doing a lot of studies on vegetation and all the fish that run through that creek.

MS. FRITZ: So I think you used to serve on the Subsistence Advisory Panel?

MR. BODFISH: Yeah (affirmative).

MS. FRITZ: So in 2010...

MR. BODFISH: (Speaking in Inupiat)...The local knows.

MS. FRITZ: Yeah (affirmative), so in 2010, the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Subsistence Advisory Panel expanded its purview. So it used to be just oil and gas industry had to come present what their projects were...

MR. BODFISH: Because we...

MS. FRITZ: But in 2010, recognizing that there were so many impacts to subsistence from all the science and research and climate change science and everything that was going on, so the Subsistence Advisory Panel expanded its purview to include science and research.

So now, a lot of the scientists and agencies who have big projects come to the Subsistence Advisory Panel to present and very valuable to them, to get a lot of feedback and meet people. So USGS, for example, has had these two camps, Chip (sp) south, Chip North.

A lot of people from Barrow have complained about those camps. They have really made a very strong dedicated commitment to coming to every Subsistence Advisory Panel, working with people, trying to reduce their impacts. We haven't been able to have one in Atqasuk yet, but I was

telling folks that we're going to try and do that, even though there's no hotel.

MR. BODFISH: Yeah (affirmative), our people that -- around here, you know, what are they doing here? We don't know.

MS. FRITZ: Exactly and it's the...minimum.

MR. BODFISH: They want to know what are they doing on our land.

MS. FRITZ: Right, right. We're really trying every different way that we can to let people know what BLM is permitting in the NPR-A. So we did finally get a Facebook page. You can like it, if you're on Facebook, and we're going to try and use that. We also produce a spreadsheet with all the permitted projects. It breaks it down by the type of project and it tells you who is doing what, where, when, where they're storing their fuel, where they have a fuel camp, what type of aircraft they're using, how many flights, takeoffs, and landings they're estimating and we put that all into a spreadsheet and we try to distribute that to as many people as possible.

So if anybody wants more of that information, please give me your email address or however like you'd like to be contacted.

MR. BODFISH: I wrote it down on the sign-in sheet.

MS. FRITZ: Okay.

MR. NAGEAK: Are there any more comments?

MS. FRITZ: Does...

MR. BODFISH: You guys from Nuiqsut weren't here when I kind of stated -- when I first started speaking that I would back them up on whatever it is, the decision that they make on this project, you know, but on my point, I didn't know how (speaking Inupiaq), but whatever suits them because it's their land. They live there and I would back them up on whatever they're...

MR. YOKEL: Can you speak up, please, Paul?

MR. BODFISH: Okay, I'll turn my volume up. Thank you. Well, my comment about this project is whatever Nuiqsut people or the village wants, you know, I would back them up on their decision, because it's their land and they're the ones that are being greatly impacted and they're the first village that's being greatly impacted and whatever consensus you come up with them, I would back them up on their decision on the road, access road north, that's about what, eight miles long?

MS. FRITZ: It's 7.9 miles.

MR. BODFISH: Eight or nine miles?

MS. PSARIANOS: It's -- Alternative A is 7.8. Alternative B is 8.6.

MR. BODFISH: So to help them, I would, you know, just go right along with them and back them up on their decision, whatever decision that they make and if they haven't had one, well, I'll wait until they make their decision.

MR. NAGEAK: It's the same thing as what Point Lay says.

MR. BODFISH: Because I wouldn't want to make a decision for them. I don't live over there. I visit over there, but it impacts them and I've heard a lot over the years leading the Planning Commission and Subsistence Advisory Panel and we've heard a lot of their concerns and we -- I know what they go through and they go through a lot, a lot of frustration, so anything to back them up.

MS. AIKEN: Could I say something?

MR. BODFISH: ii [yes].

MS. FRITZ: Please.

MR. NAGEAK: Yeah (affirmative).

MS. AIKEN: (Speaking Inupiaq). [I understand that they came with a final paper to this meeting. Is that correct? They came here with a final paper, these people with this.]

MR. NAGEAK: (speaking Inupiaq). [They need to talk about it to the public and after they present it to the public, the final draft will be April...]

MS. AIKEN: (speaking Inupiaq).

MR. NAGEAK: (speaking Inupiaq) [They will have open public comments until April 22.] The final draft will be made April 22, right?

MR. KELLY: No, that's the close of the comment period. The final draft of the...

MR. NAGEAK: Closing… (speaking Inupiaq) April 22 (speaking Inupiaq).

MS. AIKEN: (speaking Inupiaq).

MR. NAGEAK: (Speaking Inupiaq) After all the final comments are made, they'll make a final...

MS. PSARIANOS: A final document.

MR. NAGEAK: Final document.

MS. PSARIANOS: Sometime in the summer, this summer.

MR. NAGEAK: (speaking Inupiaq). [They will be done sometimes this summer with a final document. In the beginning they should have mentioned that if anyone have any problems with this document they could make changes to it.]

MS. AIKEN: (speaking Inupiaq).[This negative impact, that they are talking about, is it drilling?]

MR. NAGEAK: (speaking Inupiaq). [What?]

MS. AIKEN: (speaking Inupiaq). [The negative impact, the people drilling, is that what they are talking about.]

MR. NAGEAK: (speaking Inupiaq) [they will set, an alternative, it will be given to them after they work on it. They will follow the alternative, to lessen the impact in the areas that the public is concerned about.]. The alternative will be a recommendation or it will be a...

MR. KELLY: We'll put together -- in the final document, there will be an agency's preferred alternative, it's called. It's not necessarily A, B, C, or D. It could combine elements from those, but it would be where the

agency is leaning as they develop this document. It's a disclosure of what the agency thinks the best thing is to do and so - does that answer the question?

MR. NAGEAK: Agency BLM?

MR. KELLY: It's all -- it'll be -- it'll be BLM, because we're the lead agency. It's our responsibility, but we'll take input from all the cooperators, as well as the comments.

MR. NAGEAK: Yeah (affirmative).

MS. AIKEN: (speaking Inupiaq). [I thank you. For the rivers flowing that they use for subsistence hunting. Wherever they are and if they protect them, it is good. I want to say more but I forget what I want to say. Thank you very much.]

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating for Ms. Aiken). She says that she's glad we are here and that the alternatives are available, especially for the buffers for the rivers, the larger buffer for the larger, more subsistence area and the smaller buffer for the ones that are being utilized a lot, but still there's graylings because we've seen that in one of those studies and like you say, the final paper document will consist of different things from

Alternative A, B, C, D and make it with the comments that are being received.

MS. PSARIANOS: And so the final Environmental Impact Statement has a preferred alternative. That's not a decision. BLM will issue a decision document about a month after it puts out the final Environmental Impact Statement.

MR. NAGEAK: And this is -- this is still a living document (translating into Inupiaq), especially in Nuiqsut because they will be the most impacted and ASRC, if they've got comments and they will have input and those are -- that's what's needed. That's why they're all -- hitting all these villages. We're in Point Lay, today, here and then tomorrow, Barrow, and then next week, Wainwright.

MS. FRITZ: And then Nuiqsut.

MR. NAGEAK: Nuiqsut, Thursday.

MS. FRITZ: Thursday, and next Monday, Wainwright.

MR. NAGEAK: Next Monday, Wainwright, Tuesday, Anaktuvuk Pass.

MS. FRITZ: And then Fairbanks.

MR. NAGEAK: Fairbanks.

MS. FRITZ: And then Anchorage.

MR. NAGEAK: Maybe we'll see Mark Ames make a comment.

MS. FRITZ: So please, if anybody has any other comments on subsistence or any aspects of this project, the easiest way to do that is state them for the record here in the meeting. As Lon explained, there's all these other ways you can comment, but anything you say here, we will try and consider it -- we'll consider it as a comment.

MR. BORDEAUX: I just wondered, does everybody understand what they're saying, all of you, because I only see just a handful of (indiscernible) and they're going to wonder what they're talking about. Shouldn't we kind of simplify things for them to understand? I'm sure we should hear what they have to say, too, right? You know what I'm saying?

MR. NAGEAK: Which ones? Which group?

MR. BORDEAUX: Everybody else who's not here. I mean, they don't know what's going on. I mean, really, obviously, I mean, look at us, it's only a handful of us. We need to know -- they need to understand what's going on.

MS. FRITZ: So we will absolutely welcome suggestions on ways that we can communicate what's going on to people besides notices on the radio and in the paper and public meetings and a Facebook page, and you know, announcing it on VHF. I don't -- I don't know. We do, Lon and I travel around to the villages, other than for these public meetings and try and talk to people.

MR. BORDEAUX: I understand that, I mean...

MS. STUDSTILL: Sir, can I get your name for the record?

MR. BORDEAUX: Pardon.

MS. STUDSTILL: Can I get your name for the record?

MR. BORDEAUX: Chris Bordeaux.

MS. STUDSTILL: Okay, thank you.

MR. NAGEAK: Bordeaux, B-o-r-d-e-a-u-x.

MR. BORDEAUX: I'm just saying everybody should be hearing about what's going on here because it's just a few of us making a decision right now, what they want to hear and I think everybody else should hear the same thing, don't you? I mean, you really understand what's going on here?

MR. BODFISH: Yeah (affirmative).

MR. BORDEAUX: All right, I'm just wondering if everybody else does.

MR. NAGEAK: We advertised it, correct? We advertised it.

MR. BODFISH: It's a proposal for CD5 [GMT1] and it's a public commenting period time.

MR. BORDEAUX: Okay, I can understand that, but I'm just wondering if everybody else here in town does because it has an impact on all of us. It does.

MS. PSARIANOS: This is -- and this is an additional pad west of CD5 that ties the...

MR. NAGEAK: Go to the -- go to the ways to comment.

MR. BODFISH: Do you see the map over there (indiscernible)?

MR. BORDEAUX: I used to work around that area.

MR. KELLY: So I'll just put this slide up. It's also on our website. You know, there's lots of ways to comment.

MR. BODFISH: Are you going to be leaving some copies of that?

MR. KELLY: Do we have any handouts? Do we have a handout on

that?

MR. BODFISH: For people to read and see how to submit comments.

MR. KELLY: How to -- how to submit comments.

MR. YOKEL: These four maps can stay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible - speaking simultaneously).

MR. BODFISH: I mean, what's on the board here, you've got copies of those?

MS. PSARIANOS: I think we can (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously).

MR. KELLY: That's a good idea. We should have that.

MR. BODFISH: (Indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

MS. PSARIANOS: (Indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

MR. BODFISH: ...those people that aren't here will, you know, after they see all of this and they want to comment, you know, they have that. They'll have that opportunity and (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

MS. PSARIANOS: We can write the email address down.

MS. FRITZ: So the ways to comment are listed in the notice that's in the "Arctic Sounder" and it's also in the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and there are several copies here in town.

MR. KELLY: We can take your names and email addresses and email this out, as well. We should have -- I agree, Paul, we should have that available on the handout and I'll start doing that tomorrow.

MR. YOKEL: And the EIS is out there available as a hard copy and on a CD.

MS. FRITZ: And it's online.

MR. NAGEAK: In a sense, Chris, you're right, there's only like five from Atqasuk that I see.

MR. BORDEAUX: And we've only got what, 3% of the town here.

MR. NAGEAK: Four, five, six -- six.

MS. FRITZ: So actually, Lon will be interviewed tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m. at KBRW.

MR. KELLY: It's going to be a great show.

MS. FRITZ: I don't know if it's a call-in show.

MR. KELLY: I don't think so. It...

MS. FRITZ: 8:00 a.m., so I think that goes on live at 8:00 a.m. on KBRW.

MR. BODFISH: I know they announced it over the VHF radio.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: They should.

MS. PSARIANOS: And Lon's presentation will be on our website too.

MR. KELLY: Will it?

MS. PSARIANOS: We usually do that.

MR. KELLY: Awesome. Okay, well, is there anybody else who wants to comment on this GMT1 proposal?

MR. BORDEAUX: I can't really say anything because I kind of missed out on probably half the meeting, so I'm not really sure what's going on.

MR. YOKEL: But you have a month-and-a-half or so to provide comments.

MR. BORDEAUX: It's like I say, there's not -- actually heard from a lot of people that knows about this.

MR. KELLY: Well...

MR. BORDEAUX: I mean, it's just kind of rare to get access to even all the radios or we don't have any newspapers or anything like that here.

MR. KELLY: Yeah (affirmative).

MR. BORDEAUX: It's not advertised here either.

MR. BODFISH: It's in the "Arctic Tundra," if you get the "Arctic Tundra." [Arctic Sounder]

MR. BORDEAUX: Everybody gets Sounders [Arctic Sounder].

MR. KELLY: Okay, so I'm not -- I don't want to cut you off or anything. I just -- if there are no comments on this proposal, I'm just going to close the record for that.

MR. BORDEAUX: Okay.

MR. KELLY: We can talk for a little bit longer about...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: BLM.

MR. KELLY: ...BLM issues or whatever, just a little bit longer, because we have to get to Barrow tonight.

MS. AHMAOGAK: If I may, if Atqasuk will allow me to speak. I

have...

MS. STUDSTILL: Can I get your name?

MS. AHMAOGAK: Mary Ellen Ahmaogak. I have a written statement that I wanted to read and so Atqasuk how ASRC feels. I will be presenting on ASRC today, if that's okay?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah (affirmative)

MS. AHMAOGAK: Quyanaq [thank you]. For the record, my name is Mary Ellen Ahmaogak and I am on the Board of Directors of Arctic Slope Regional Corporation. ASRC supports Alternative A as it's -- as proposed by ConocoPhillips, our partner in development.

We support the efforts of Kuukpik Corporation to work with ConocoPhillips to design a project that meets the needs and concerns of the community of Nuiqsut. Alternative A responds to Nuiqsut's concerns over aircraft traffic in and around the village. The excessive amount of air traffic has a negative effect on the community and subsistence through disturbances to the animals.

ASRC agrees with the community that road access is better because it will allow broader access for subsistence to the west of the village in the

Fish Creek area. Alternative A and the road also addresses safety issues, both for emergency situations, but also will allow for faster and more efficient oil spill response.

Local Nuiqsut residents will have use of access to the road to include access to subsistence hunting areas west of Nuiqsut, even northwestern NPR-A.

ASRC owns most of the subsurface of the GMT1 development and will receive significant royalty revenue through the development. GMT1 is a project of ConocoPhillips that will produce oil from ASRC's subsurface, a right given to us through ANCSA to support our shareholders and through the sharing provisions, benefit Alaska Natives across the state.

It's through development like GMT1 and the revenue ASRC receives through its royalty ownership that keeps its dividend policy strong. GMT1 is an essential project to maintain North Slope production and the economic benefits that it brings to the North Slope oil through its tax based that supports the infrastructure of the North Slope communities, such as our community of Atqasuk.

GMT1 is not a new project. It was reviewed and approved by BLM

and its cooperating agencies in 2004. It was then known as the CD6 development, a western satellite to the Alpine oil field.

Communities of the North Slope and within NPR-A would like to have the benefit of the same amenities that non-rural communities have with respect to roads to provide connections between communities to larger cities and to allow fast, reliable telecommunications and internet services and to assist in lowering the cost of energy.

Communities would rather have roads developed over additional airstrips and increased air traffic for access because roads provide broader range and to access subsistence resources, whereas aircraft track negative impacts subsistence through sound disturbances to the animals.

We would also like to see the gravel remain in place after oil and gas activity to allow residents to have continued long-term access to subsistence resources. Gravel is a very valuable commodity on the North Slope, so to have the companies pick it up and haul it away after they are done with producing oil would be bad for our villages and our villages would have the opportunity to use the gravel in ways that benefit them. Thanks for listening.

MR. KELLY: All right, is there anyone else who'd like to comment on this? Okay, I'm going to at this time, I'll close the ANILCA Section 810 subsistence hearing and the record for our discussion of the Greater Mooses Tooth #1 Unit, Environmental Impact Statement. Quyanaq.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:19 p.m.