GREATER MOOSES TOOTH UNIT 1

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/ ANILCA §810 Hearing

Nuiqsut, Alaska

March 13, 2014

ATTENDEES

Jake Adams, North Slope Borough (NSB) Mayor's Office
Rhoda Ahmaogak, NSB Planning
Bart Ahsogeak, NSB Planning
Harry Baij, US Army Corps of Engineers (CORPS)
John Boyle, NSB
Carl Brower, Kuukpik Corporation
Charlotte Brower, Mayor NSB
Gordon Brower, NSB
Wendy Brower
Rusty Creed Brown, ConocoPhillips
Olivia Cabinboy
Tony Cabinboy
Erin Donmoyer, SLR
Lynn DeGeorge, ConocoPhillips
Lottie Evikana (sp)
Stacey Fritz, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Subsistence Specialist
Dwayne Hopson, Acting City Mayor of Nuiqsut
Teresa Imm, Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (ASRC)
Martha Itta, Native Village of Nuiqsut (NVN)
Bernice Kaigelak, Kuukpik Corporation
Rosie Kaigelak (sp), City of Nuiqsut
Virginia Kasak
Lon Kelly, BLM Arctic Field Office Manager / Authorized Officer
Ryan Klimstra, NSB Wildlife
Samuel Kunaknana, NVN

Annie Lampe
Dora Leavitt
Steve E. Leavitt
Rolan (sp) N (Unidentified)
Roy M. Nageak, BLM Barrow Office / Inupiaq Translator
Thomas Napageak, Mayor of Nuiqsut
Bruce Nakapigak, NVN
Bryan Nakapigak
Edward Nukapigak
Eli Nukapigak, NVN
Isaac Nukapigak, President Kuukpik Corporation
Joe Nukapigak, Kuukpik Corporation
Lucy Nukapigak
Ted Nukapigak
Thomas Nukapigak, NVN
Mamie (sp) Pardue
Margaret Pardue, President NVN
Crawford Patkotak, Chairman of Board ASRC
Bridget Psarianos, BLM, GMT1 Planner
Barrett Ristroph, The Wilderness Society
Rose Seilak
Miranda Studstill, Accu-Type Depositions
James Taalak, City
Cora Tagarook
Richard Tebbe (sp)
Darryl (sp) Unidentified
Unidentified Speaker
Unidentified Speaker
Jenna Wallis, SLR
Julie Weber
Dawn Winalski, NSB Law
Dave Yokel, BLM Wildlife Biologist

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:13 p.m.

INVOCATION

An invocation was given.

INTRODUCTIONS/ ROLL CALL

MR. KELLY: We know that you've got a lot of things that you could be doing and we really appreciate you coming here and helping us try to make this Environmental Impact Statement that we're working on the best that we can do.

If you can hear me all right, I'd just as soon not use this and have this pass around to people making comments. Can you hear me okay?

MR. NAGEAK: (Translating into Inupiaq) no, yes? (Translating into Inupiaq).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Much better.

MR. KELLY: All right, I think the blessing that we had will suffice for the invocation and we have an exit here and an exit in the back corner, at least. So if...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible - too far from microphone) in the back. [displaying safety exits]

MR. KELLY: And an exit back here, okay, great. So if we need to evacuate, we'll go out here and let's meet out in the parking area, and I'll go ahead and introduce myself and our team, where everybody's going to talk to some extent, I think. I'm...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's no meaning of the word "um."

MR. KELLY: Okay, am I doing that all the time?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (speaking Inupiaq). [side conversation]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible - too far from microphone). [side conversation]

MR. KELLY: All right, my name's Lon Kelly. I'm the Field Manager for -- I'm the Field Manager for the NPR-A, the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. So I'm the lowest level decision-maker for BLM. In this case, I'm the Authorized Officer for this hearing that we're going to have and it's our group here that pretty much has the lead for writing this Environmental Impact Statement that we're going to be working on.

What we'll do is have a short presentation on the draft Supplemental

Environmental Impact Statement and we're going to take public comments throughout. So we'll open the meeting momentarily. We'll start recording. The Court Reporter will be recording everything. Your comments will be on the record and -- but we'll also have a formal period at the end of the meeting where people can read prepared comments or make whatever comments you've been storing up.

This meeting is also a meeting under the National Interest Lands Conservation Act Section 810. Section 810 of ANILCA mandates that when there's going to be a significant impact on subsistence resources or access to subsistence resources, that those villages that would be experiencing that significant impact will have a public hearing and because we believe that taken all together, not just this action, but all the development actions will have significant impacts on subsistence, we're having this meeting on the draft Supplemental EIS, but also on the impacts -- to disclose the impacts that we think will happen to subsistence, actually whether or not we do this action, just all the development actions taken together. So who's going to read the opening statement? Jenna -- wait, we should do introductions.

Participants introduced themselves and stated their affiliation, if any.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION / ANILCA 810 Hearing

MR. KELLY: I know that you probably do this by habit, but if you can -- when you're commenting or testifying, making comments, it would be great if you could just say your name for the record, so that the transcript will follow along.

MS. WALLIS: I'd now like to open this BLM public meeting (sic). I'd now like to open this BLM public meeting and ANILCA Section 810 hearing. This meeting is to support a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for ConocoPhillips' proposed Greater Mooses Tooth 1 Project in the NPR-A.

You will have the opportunity to ask questions and provide public comment. If you wish to speak, please use the microphone that's located here at the front. It won't make things louder, but it will allow the Court Reporter to hear you clearly. Also, state your name for the record. The entire meeting will also be recorded by Miranda and the record - and on the record to ensure all comments are included.

MR. KELLY: So if you -- you don't have to come up here to testify. If you will just use that microphone, it's loud enough that the recorder can hear you.

All right, I'll try to go through this; I know that particularly, that people from the Borough and our pilot, too, need to get home at a certain time because of safety considerations. So in outline, we'll go through what the proposed project is. We'll talk a little bit about the National Environmental Policy Act and how this fits in with that process that's mandated for us to use to evaluate the project.

We'll talk about the various alternatives that we've identified and considered in the draft document. We'll go through a little bit about how you might look at the document. It's about 1,000 pages long with the figures and -- and appendices and so we'll try to tell you how you could maybe hone in on the things that are of concern to you and check out the reasoning behind the conclusions that are drawn. We're going to do that by looking at the caribou section of the plan or the EIS.

We're going to talk about how to comment on the plan. Then we're going to, as part of the comment period, I think we'll talk -- have Stacey

Fritz talk about the subsistence write-ups in the document and we'll -- that, I think will lead to people thinking about what comments they have to make about the document and the process.

I -- I hope that most people here are familiar with the project. It's called the Greater Mooses Tooth project. It's a production pad for oil development about 12 miles from Nuiqsut. It's about 145 miles from Barrow or Atqasuk and we started this week out in Point Lay, which is 280 miles away from the project.

You're probably familiar with this. This is the Colville River and the Nigliq Channel. Nuiqsut sits right here. The GMT1 pad would be here. Prudhoe Bay is over here, Deadhorse.

Just an outline, there is Kuukpik land involved in this project. The project builds off of the CD5 pad and has a road that's between seven and eight-and-a-half miles, depending on which alternative we look at, and paralleling the road is a pipeline with some other utilities. It's a multi-pipe pipeline.

We're evaluating this project like we do all projects, according to the [National] Environmental Policy Act of 1969. So pretty much any federal

project where there are federal lands, federal funds, federal permits being issued, is evaluated under this process and it's a decision-making process, but it's also a disclosure process.

It requires the federal government to look at and analyze the impacts of various alternatives to meet the purpose and need of the action. It requires a public process to seek and use the information from the public in the analysis and it will disclose any impacts and any permanent commitments to resources, so anything that can't be reversed is especially important to be disclosed.

This act is an amazing thing, really, for the United States that has been going on for a long time. It's one of the most widely emulated acts that the United States has ever passed. There are a lot of [National] Environmental Policy Act-like laws in other countries based on this.

So we already have two Environmental Impact Statements that are applicable to this action, really directly applicable. One is the Integrated Activity Plan that, excuse me, we completed in late 2012, the actual plan, and it -- and a decision [Record of Decision] was issued in February of 2013.

We also had the Alpine satellite -- and that plan, the 2013 decision, made land use decisions for the whole of NPR-A and it set up where we could lease and where we could develop and where we could add infrastructure looking at NPR-A as a whole. We also, in 2004, had the Alpine Satellite development plan EIS.

Thanks, Roy, and -- and that really looked at this -- this project almost very similarly. So there was a project in, it's called CD6, in the 2004 Environmental Impact Statement. It was very similar. So this document that we're working on is supplemental to those two other Environmental Impact Statements.

It serves to evaluate new circumstances and information. So between 2004 and 2014, we learned things and we know extra things. It provides opportunities for public participation that are specific to thinking about this action and it addresses some changes between the 2004 proposal that we looked at and now.

It also is -- it's our shot at, with a bunch of cooperators, at implementing an administration, a presidential initiative to -- called Integrated Arctic Management and what the President wants us to do is all

the federal agencies minimize the amount of fooling around and maximize the amount of communication and coordination to streamline and simplify the process of making decisions about the Arctic.

We're supposed to -- well, the main thing here is that we're supposed to use the best information and we're supposed to all use the same information and use it to make our decisions. So it's our hope that this document will be the environmental documentation that will be used by all the permitting agencies with all of our cooperators and that includes the Corps of Engineers, the Environmental Protection Agency, [US] Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, the state of Alaska, the Native Village of Nuiqsut and the North Slope Borough.

So just a little bit closer look on -- on the project and the land status. This hatched area is Kuukpik surface, ASRC subsurface. CD5 is here. The road runs through Kuukpik land. There's a couple of bridges. It comes out to the CD5 pad, which is just barely on federal land.

A lot of the oil that will be drained -- developed by GMT1 is actually on ASRC minerals. This pink area is selected land that may be conveyed in the not too distant future and this darker line here with all these squares,

the squares are leases and this is an area that ConocoPhillips has demonstrated to the government that there's reason to develop it as a unit to maximize the potential production and it's just a way that they can do the work that's necessary to maintain the leases by focusing on a small part of the unit. That's where this plan gets its name, the project gets its name because the unit is called the Greater Mooses Tooth Unit.

So when we do our [National] Environmental Policy Act analysis, the first thing we need to do is look at alternatives and generally, the first alternative we develop is the no action alternative. All the other alternatives are called action alternatives and the no action alternatives just look at what would happen if we continued existing management into the future.

So under no action, CD5, the spur road, the bridge across the Nigliq Channel, all those things have been permitted or almost permitted and so we assume that those will be completed and in operation in the future as we look at Alternative E, the no action alternative.

Alternative A is the proposed action and so I've been showing you that, GMT1, CD5, the road and a pipeline between them. So the oil would

come from GMT1, be sent by pipeline back to the Alpine processing facility where it's processed and transformed into oil that can be shipped out through the Alaska Pipeline.

So as an alternative to that, we looked at these areas, which are buffers on federal land away from sensitive streams. The, forgive me if I mangle this name, but the Tinmiaqsigvik River and Fish Creek are those rivers. Fish Creek has a three-mile buffer on each side and the Tinmiaqsigvik has a half-mile buffer on each side and in our Integrated Activity Plan, that plan that we completed in 2013, we set those buffers up and the proposed action actually comes into the buffer a little bit and so Alternative B, the first alternative that we looked at, is routing the road away from this buffer to conform with our Integrated Activity Plan and not require an exception and exceptions are allowed under the Integrated Activity Plan.

Alternative C, we call the alternative access and basically what this looked at is the benefits and costs of trying to route more industrial activity through Nuiqsut that would require lengthening the runway and widening the spur road with the idea of being -- that there might be some fewer

flights, but more economic activity in Nuiqsut. So pretty much everything on public land is the same as Alternative A.

This alternative is something that was brought forward from the 2004 Environmental Impact Statement. It's something that we felt we needed to consider for completeness, but it's not something that we can make happen. It's not something that we could probably pick as our preferred alternative because all the differences are on Kuukpik land. They're on Kuukpik surface and we don't have authority to make that happen.

We also have an alternative, which is limited access, which instead of adding a road between CD5 and GMT1, it has just the pipeline and the messenger cable and other equipment required to run a pipeline, but not a road. So there would be an airstrip near GMT1 and a seasonal ice road rather than a permanent gravel road.

So if you look at these all together, this map is, I think, on some of the tables and I believe that we have copies that you can take with you, the proposed action, the road runs like this through this brownish, it looks brown to me, it might look green to you, does it look green?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It looks green.

MR. KELLY: Okay, so this -- this is the proposed action, Alternative B. Alternative C widens this road and lengthens the runway in Nuiqsut. Alternative D, the limited access road, would not have any roads here, just this airstrip and in the winter, an ice road.

So if you look at the direct impacts to the land, you can see that Alternative A, the proposed action, has the same size drill pad as in all the alternatives that involve a road. The road length is as short as any of them. It has the smallest amount of gravel fill and the smallest gravel footprint. It has one more bridge and that's about it.

Alternative B, it has slightly more miles of road, more fill, more acres that are filled, one less bridge. Alternative C, actually has a lot more fill and a lot more acreage because the spur road is widened and the runway's lengthened and Alternative D, surprisingly to most people, has a lot -- the drill pad has to increase because it has to be more independent because it relies on an airstrip that won't necessarily be available 24/7.

You know that there will be weather days and times when you can't get in and out of there. It doesn't have a road, but nevertheless, that airport

and the bigger pad actually require a lot of fill and a lot of acreage compared to the other two alternatives with the road, A and B.

Makes sense? Am I going too fast? Great. Okay, so where we are right now is we've released this plan and we're accepting public comments through April 22nd. We'll -- once we get done with the comments, actually as the comments are coming in, we're going to be looking at those and figuring out how we're going to address those, how we're going to make changes in the final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement to address the comments that tell us that there are mistakes, that there's missing data, that our conclusions are wrong. We'll identify those and address them by making changes to the final.

We'll also be looking at those cooperating agencies and correcting those and we have some errors that we're calling errata. They're mistakes that we already know about that just crept into the document, editorial mistakes and errors that we -- where we made edits and they didn't make them into the printed draft. Some of those are available on our website and as we look at it closer, we find more things that just in a 1,000-page document, you're going to make mistakes and so we know we're going to

be addressing those.

A preferred alternative is part of the [National] Environmental Policy Act process where the federal government's required to identify to the public when we write a final, you're supposed -- we have to identify where we're leaning, what we think the action that we'll authorize will be and this is something that we'll do with our cooperators because we don't want to have a situation where BLM picks one alternative, but another cooperating agency picks another one and so hopefully, we'll ask -- be able to come to a good understanding on the interests of all of our cooperators and come out with a good preferred alternative and we'll write that up in a final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

They'll be a public review period and then they'll be a record of decision. A decision will be made on BLM's choice of what we'll actually implement. If we've done a really good job on the environmental -- on the preferred alternative, probably the decision will be we'll adopt the preferred alternative, but generally, there are some changes that creep in to the preferred alternative based on comments and just the thought process that goes on.

So probably no one in here, except maybe Bridgett, will read the document from front to back. Most of us will go and look at the areas that are controversial that we really care about and so this is one way that you might do it. There's a table called 1. -- 4.1-1 that basically -- that was summarized in the previous slide where I showed the total amount of fill and all that.

That kind of lays out the direct impacts to the land for each alternative and then right following that, it summarized the impact of each alternative on the environment and so on the elements of the environment and so like caribou are terrestrial mammals and there's a line on that table that summarizes the impacts, low, medium, high, comparatively for all of the alternatives.

So that's where I'd start out and then you'd go to Chapter Four, which is the chapter that describes the impacts and you would look -- I would look at the areas that I'm interested in, subsistence, terrestrial mammals and caribou, and that's what we're going to talk about today, fisheries, hydrology, whatever you're interested in, it's, I think, it's pretty easy to go find Chapter Four. There will be a few pages there that will describe that

resource and what we think the impacts would be for each alternative.

You could also, if you're concerned about -- we have a special section on the impacts of spills and on cumulative impacts. So cumulative impacts are the impacts that take into account everything that's already happening and that will happen in the area in the foreseeable future. So it's a way of -- in the law, the idea is to avoid making decisions a little bit at a time, like turning up the heat a little bit at a time until you get burned.

We also have some pretty good mitigation measures. In other words, these take the form of restrictions on what people can do and guidelines for how they'll do it. It's everything from having to have a subsistence plan to staying away from streams and that sort of thing. So we have a lot of mitigation measures that we've inherited from the earlier EIS's and that we're developing as part of this, but we also disclosed any impacts that we can't mitigate that are going to exist if we implement any of these alternatives.

If you see something as you look at Chapter Four, at the impacts, that doesn't make sense or seems wrong to you, then you would circle back and look at the reasoning behind the impacts assessment and look back at

Chapter Three where the existing environment is described to see the reasoning that the specialist took to come to those conclusions and that would help you decide where the issues might be with the analyses that you think don't make sense.

So I hope that helps people to see that you don't have to -- you don't have to be too intimidated by this big document. Most -- most of the things that people really care about are a few pages and so with that, I'm going to turn it over to Dave Yokel, our biologist, who works on mammals and he's going to kind of walk you through the impacts that we think will accrue to caribou.

MR. YOKEL: Good evening again. I'll hope you'll forgive my informal attire tonight. I had to take my suit and tie off because it was a little bit warm in here when I arrived. So this Environmental Impact Statement assess or attempts to assess the impacts of these four alternatives and the cumulative alternative to many different resources and social issues and so I'm going to use the caribou example to try to walk you through how we go about assessing those impacts.

There's a lot of words on this table, but I'll try to make it as simple as

I can. The impacts on terrestrial mammals were broken into four categories, see these here; intensity, duration, context, and geographic extent and each of these four categories were broken into three levels of impact and then there are definitions or criteria for how to put a certain impact into a certain level of effect, okay.

So for instance, under intensity, it was determined that the intensity of the impact is low if it affects 5% or less of the population or 5% or less of the habitat for that species. Medium, if it affects 5% to 25% and high if it affects more than 25%.

For duration or how long the impact lasts, it was considered temporary if it lasts less than two breeding seasons or two years. Interim in effect if it lasts more than two years, but less than five, and long-term if it lasts more than five years.

The context is broken down into common, important, and unique, and so common was defined to mean the resource or habitat is pretty ordinary or it's not depleted and it's not protected by legislation. Important resources are those that are protected by legislation or the portion, the affected fills a distinctive role in the ecosystem, but it's not things that have

a specific importance, such as calving areas for caribou. Those would fall under unique context, and then finally, the geographic extent, how large of an area over which the impact is felt was broken into local, regional, and statewide.

Local would mean right underneath the gravel or within 300 feet of the gravel footprint. Whereas regional means that any habitat loss or disturbance to the animals would be -- would be extending beyond 300 feet of the gravel footprint, but and all the way out perhaps to the known range of that population, so in the case of caribou, a herd of caribou and then finally, statewide was defined in this document as being the Arctic coastal plain for mammals.

Please stop me any time and ask questions if I'm not making myself clear. Don't worry about interrupting me. I'm used to that.

MAYOR NAPAGEAK: I've got a question...

MR. YOKEL: Okay.

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

MAYOR NAPAGEAK: Testing. Thomas Napageak, subsistence

hunter for Nuiqsut. My question is you've been putting collars on the caribous. Just how many collars are out there being active? What's the number of caribou collars that are out there and you know, the last time I've seen a collared caribou was back in the mid 1980's, and that's as far as I can remember about caribous being collared back then, but as of today, how many collared caribous do you have out there?

MR. YOKEL: I can't answer the exact number, partly because I'm not directly involved in deploying the collars and partly because animals die each year and so there -- the number of collars put out every year don't remain active for the whole year, but for the Teshekpuk Caribou Herd, I would guess there's probably about 35 satellite collars on them and there are also some VHF collars that Fish and Game puts out and I'm not clear on the number of those.

MAYOR NAPAGEAK: You know the last time I've seen a collared caribou was back in -- in 1986 and we had -- we have to shot (sic) that caribou down because it wasn't feeling so good. It took -- it took about 11 shots just to kill that caribou and we -- and when we cut it up, it had so much yellowish color inside the body and what -- what did they do? Do

they tranquilize them first before they put the collar -- collars out?

MR. YOKEL: I'm sorry, could you repeat that last question? I didn't...

MAYOR NAPAGEAK: Do they tranquilize them first with some kind of, you know, the tranquilizers before they collared them?

MR. YOKEL: The answer to that is no. For the Teshekpuk Herd caribous -- caribou are captured by net gunning from helicopters so that no drugs are injected into the caribou. As far as you not seeing collars very often, that's because the number of caribou that are collared are a very, very small percentage of each herd.

As far as the collar making the caribou sick, we try to get an idea of how collars affect caribou survival. We don't have a really clear answer, but there is an indication that collars can lower -- reduce the total number of years that a caribou lives. It's not concrete evidence yet, but there is an indication that way. We feel that the information that we get from the collars outweighs any adverse effect it has on the few individuals that wear the collars.

Okay, this next slide I have -- the last one, I tried to show you what

criteria were used to place an impact in a certain category, a level of impact. This shows the results of that for terrestrial mammals and the lines on the table that are highlighted in yellow are those specifically for caribou.

So this top table here combines the impacts for all three of Alternatives A, B, and C, and it does that because it turned out, using the criteria that I just described, that the impacts of those three alternatives are identical.

So for habitat loss or alteration for caribou, the intensity is low because it's less than 5% of the caribou habitat. It's long-term because those facilities, the roads and pads will be on the ground for many, many years. It's common because caribou habitat is common in the area and it's local because it only affects habitat within about 300 feet of the road or pad.

As far as disturbance of the caribou themselves, for non-calving caribou, the intensity of the effect is low, again, because it affects less than 5% of each herd. It's long-term again because those facilities will be there for a long time. It's important because it's -- the caribou themselves are important in the lives of the people and it's local because the disturbance

effects of the roads will only be within a short distance of the roads.

For calving caribou, it's the same, except -- well, it's the same again. It's local, long-term, important, and local , and the reason it's only in the important section is because calving caribou don't -- or caribou do not generally drop their calves near where this development would be. The Teshekpuk Herd primarily calves 25 or more miles further northwest and west and the Central Arctic Herd calves that many miles or more further east.

Now, Alternative D did not turn out quite the same. Alternative D is the one where there would not be a road all the way out to the pad, instead there would be an airfield near the pad with a short road connecting it to the drill pad. So Alternative D would have a lot more air traffic than any of the other three alternatives.

The effects on caribou habitat are still the same as the other three. They're in that low range, but things are a little different for disturbance to caribou, again because there's a lot more air traffic. So here's where we see the changes from the other three alternatives. The intensity is no longer low. It's medium because the effects of aircraft cover a broader area and

affect more caribou and are likely to affect more than 5% of the herd.

The other difference is the effect -- the geographic extent of the effect would be regional, rather than local. In other words, it would be felt by the caribou much more than just 300 feet from roads and pads. The calving caribou is the same as the other three alternatives, again because caribou don't calve near this proposed development.

No questions? I'll move on. So ConocoPhillips has been collecting data on caribou density in this area since 2001. I'm going to be referring to what they call their NPR-A study area. They've expanded that area twice. They started out here in 2001, expanded to this area in 2002, and added this area up here in 2005, and they're still collecting data there, but the data I have to show you today are up through 2012.

So what you can see here is the data I'll show you in the next slide come from this entire block, but remember the -- almost all of the effects of this development on caribou will be in this one small part of that block.

So this slide shows the density of caribou that they found when they flew aerial surveys in that NPR-A study area. So they flew small airplanes or one small airplane back and forth along fixed lines and counted the

caribou they saw, extrapolated that to the area, the entire area of the study area and then estimated the density of caribou and there's all these different symbols here because they used a different symbol for every year of the survey in this picture and then they also did it over a course of several months, from mid April to mid November.

What you see in general from this picture is that almost all of those flights showed that the density of caribou in that study area was less than two caribou per square kilometer and that's equal to about five caribou per square mile. To go further, you can see the great majority of those, fall in an area less than one caribou per square kilometer. So overall, this shows that in that study area, caribou density is pretty low relative to caribou density in other areas and you can see that much more easily -- well, maybe not, because at first, you can't see where the development is here, but that study block in the previous slide filled up most of each of these pictures here.

These are data from satellite-collared caribou and there's two sets of them, one for each of two different technologies of satellite collar. This, we call it a PTT, which stands for platform transmitter terminal, but it's a

kind of collar that uses, I didn't want to get into this, but Doppler shift in satellite picking up the collared signal and then from that shift in the Doppler effect as the satellite moves on, it establishes a location for where that collar's coming from.

On this side here, these are GPS collars and you're all familiar with GPS nowadays. This provides a lot more accurate location for the caribou than this older technology, but we have more -- over the years, we have more of these collars in our database. So you can see the higher density caribou on this side than on this side and that's because there's more collars represented here.

Overall, there's no more than 259 collared caribou shown in this side on the Teshekpuk, which are the dark green, and 60 Central Arctic Herd caribou in the red here.

Also, there's eight pictures for each collar type because it's broken into season in a caribou year. Unfortunately, they're not in chronological order in this picture, but we start here and this picture is for winter location, next is spring migration, you know, we've got to drop down here to see the calving season, then there's the post-calving up here, next is their range

during mosquito season, then fly season, late summer and fall migration and then finally, the last important point to make here is that right here, and Lon was trying to train me the other day how to hold a pointer steadily, but I haven't learned yet, right here is GMT1, right in this area here.

So in general, what these show you is that in most seasons of the year, there are few caribou in the area of this proposed development. Now remember, there's just a few hundred caribou represented by each of these. So it's a very small proportion of those two herds, the Teshekpuk Herd and the Central Herd, so I'm certain that there are more caribou that occur out in this center area than what this shows, just as there are more caribou that occur out in the outer areas than it shows, but in general, when we use these collars, we make an assumption that the data we get from them are representative of what the herd is doing as a whole.

So I'm about at the end of my presentation now. So I'll just make the point again that we believe that the area, fortuitously, the area where this development is proposed appears to be right on the boundary of these two caribou herd ranges and as result, has very relatively little -- low caribou use compared to other areas around it. So I'm done. If you have any

questions before I hand it over to Lon or Bridgett, I'll take those questions. Thank you.

MR. GORDON BROWER: I've got a question.

MR. YOKEL: Okay, Gordon, Ely? You first, Ely.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible - too far from microphone). [side conversation]

MR. YOKEL: I'm sorry.

MR. GORDON BROWER: Well, I'm just going to comment probably on the...

MS. STUDSTILL: I'm sorry, can I get your name for the record?

MR. GORDON BROWER: I'm Gordon Brower.

MS. STUDSTILL: Thank you.

MR. GORDON BROWER: I am from Barrow. I came with the North Slope Borough, but just in terms of movement of caribou, there are -- I'm wondering if there's -- looking at the duration, there are peak movements and I'm not sure if they're captured in these two depictions when they're just running through and that would just be my concern in this depiction is from expectation of the caribou movements in their normal

movement areas.

MR. YOKEL: Well, one thing I did not mention is that there are two seasons out of these eight where you see apparently more caribou activity in this proposed development area than in the other six seasons and those are during the fly season, in late season when -- when the flies are bad, these are bot flies and warble flies, the caribou tend to break up and disperse and go every which direction or if they find bare gravel or bare sand, they'll just stand still, but they spread out and they move in more areas and we see it more here. There's some barren sandbars along rivers in this area.

This one is fall migration and a lot of the movements we see here, we see lines going through here, those are caribou that are moving pretty quickly because they're heading south for the winter and I think that's what you were referring to.

MR. GORDON BROWER: But just one more, you said there was very limited collaring. So one collar is a representative of a herd if you wanted to extrapolate. So we've got 36 collars in a herd that's 30 -- I'm not saying the whole herd is there represented at that time, but one collar could

mean 5,000 animals?

MR. YOKEL: More like 1,000 in the Teshekpuk Herd, maybe 2,000 when they were at their peak and in the Western Arctic Herd, which we're not talking about tonight, which is a much larger herd, then you're right, a collar might represent 5,000 or 10,000 caribou.

MR. ELI NUKAPIGAK: Eli Nukapigak for the record. These are the outdated data that you've been sharing and the caribou movement each year is different and also, when industrial activity in one area that is heavily used by industry, it causes change of the migration. Have you considered some of these kinds of issues that are out there?

MR. YOKEL: You guys are really good at picking out some of the things I forgot to say. One thing is these data here are from collars that were out there from 1990 to 2012, not the same collar on the same caribou every year, but we have been maintaining this kind of collar for over 22 years, a little bit less from the GPS collars because they came along later and there were some years in the Central Arctic Herd where no collars were bought, but what we hope by having such a long data set is that we get a pretty good idea of that variations among years in caribou movements

and range use so that we -- if we only looked one year, we wouldn't get a very complete picture of what the caribou do because exactly what you said is true, they don't use their range the same every year, but if you look over more and more years, you realize that there are trends, just like you see looking from the ground level, that there -- there are places you like to hunt because the caribou generally go through there.

Now as far as development affecting where caribou go, I can't -- I can show you some pictures here that look like that they're suggestive that's going on because here's the Central Arctic Herd and here's a road right along here. So one could say I think those caribou are right here and not over here, because they don't want to cross that road. I -- I can't conclude that from these data, okay.

MS. IMM: So I'm sorry, but when you're pointing out a road up there...

MR. NAGEAK: For the record use the mic...

MS. IMM: For the record, Teresa Imm with -- I just would like to know what road we're talking about in that particular area.

MR. YOKEL: I think that's the road that goes down to Meltwater.

MS. IMM: Okay.

MR. YOKEL: Here's the Colville Delta right here. I don't have that picture close up enough to see it. I think I'm right about that. Actually, it -- I may not be. That might be the main channel of the Colville.

MS. IMM:: I think that's the channel.

MR. YOKEL: That I thought I looked at a map earlier, like here's -- maybe this is the Meltwater Road here.

MS. IMM: Correct.

MR. CABINBOY: Test.Tony Cabinboy over here.

MS. STUDSTILL: You might want to hold it just a little bit further away...

MR. YOKEL: Okay, I guess I'm gonna sit down.

MR. CABINBOY: I hear you're making all these assumptions and getting these pretty good ideas. Is it fair to say that one of your assumptions and could be a pretty good idea just looking at that spot on the east side of the [Drill Site] 2L Tarn Road that goes out to Meltwater, that is the Porcupine Herd, which just comes in the summer and then heads back to the eastern part of the Brooks Range?

MR. YOKEL: Well, first, I believe I only stated one assumption and that I tried to state very clearly that we assume that this limited sample of caribou is representative of what the herd as a whole does. Now, to answer your second question, I've been to Nuiqsut many times over the last 20 years and have heard about the Porcupine Herd coming as far west as the Colville River.

The way that agency biologists define the herds, we don't see that happening. We believe that all of these caribou represented by the red data are from the Central Arctic Herd and that the Porcupine Herd remains much further east than this.

MR. CABINBOY: I have to disagree with that.

MR. YOKEL: I can...

MR. CABINBOY: You've been -- you've been coming here how many years?

MR. YOKEL: About 20 years.

MR. CABINBOY: Every year?

MR. YOKEL: Well, there's some years I haven't been in Nuiqsut and there's some years I've been here more than once, but...

MR. CABINBOY: Have you been down in the coast and actually seen that -- that herd?

MR. YOKEL: I -- Tony, I'm not...

MR. CABINBOY: Central Herd?

MR. YOKEL: I'm not here to tell you you're wrong. I'm not here to disagree with you. I'm telling you our understanding of where we catch these caribou and collar suggest to us which herd they belong to.

MR. CABINBOY: Okay.

MR. YOKEL: And that's how we get to this point and say these, we believe, are Central Arctic Herd animals. I didn't...

MR. CABINBOY: And you're assuming and suggesting -- I have to disagree. I'm sorry.

MR. YOKEL: Okay, I can accept that.

MR. AHSOGEAK: Bart Ahsogeak for the record. We had a NPR-A Subsistence Advisory Panel meeting in Anchorage -- I mean Fairbanks. Your presentation is kind of much like the Conoco's contractor that did the caribou study.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: ABR.

MR. AHSOGEAK: ABR, that would be more better scenario what you're saying. In other words, let ConocoPhillips give a presentation by their contractor.

MR. YOKEL: Well, unfortunately, I missed that meeting because I was in Barrow for a different meeting. This -- these figures come from a report by ABR from ConocoPhillips.

MR. CABINBOY: Yeah (affirmative), Tony Cabinboy again, yeah (affirmative), I just -- looking at your scales on the reported wildlife, you know, as far as caribou, they are really low and it seems even though you're using these collars in making these assumptions -- guesses more like, I think the numbers are higher. Thank you.

MS. LEAVITT: My name is Dora Leavitt for the record. My question is have you compared these data with other agencies that have collected the caribou studies over the years too, along with ABR and the North Slope Borough? I know they've -- they've done a lot of studies too, with the caribou. That's my question.

MR. YOKEL: Thank you. We have all worked cooperatively, the North Slope Borough, Alaska Department of Fish & Game, the Bureau of

Land Management, ABR, and ConocoPhillips have all worked together to collect these data. These data represent efforts by all of those combined.

MR. THOMAS NUKAPIGAK: Thomas Nukapigak again, and I think what you need to do if for GMT1 is go to the protection into go back to you data and give us the updates. That was in the past, because we have -- we are really seeing a lot of changes to the caribou migration and just last year, we were fortunate to see a caribou come by this was from the east side after like 13 years later and that's way too long. We want your up-to-date information about caribou movement up here. Thank you.

MR. YOKEL: I don't want to -- I agree with you. We should use the most up-to-date information. This is the most up-to-date information we have that's been depicted in this graphic form. These are data through 2012. The data were collected through 2013, but it just hasn't been combined in picture form with the rest of the data yet.

To me, the most important way to use these data for this proposed development in GMT1 is to look at this picture of several years of movement before the development and then look at the same kind of data after the development and see if there's any significant difference, but I

agree, up-to-date information should be used. Well, if there's no more -- Dora.

MS. LEAVITT: Once again, Dora Leavitt for the record. I know over the years, this is what we -- when we first had meetings with industry coming to us, we had asked as a community to collect studies. These are the data that we've been looking for. So I just want to kind of point that out to all of you that we've asked for studies. They've done their studies.

There's 22 years of studies. They have combined the studies and this is the data. You know, it might -- now we're asking for more up-to-date, you know, this is something that we've been looking for and asking for at all the meetings I remember going to and I just want to point that out.

MS. BERNICE KAIGELAK: Bernice Kaigelak for the record. You know, this summer I had to travel down the creek, up the creek, Fish Creek, down river, upriver, looking for caribou and that one day, I saw five choppers roaming. So when we ask for more studies, we're asking for more air traffic, which affected my hunting this last summer and what I've noticed over the years, you know, we were taught by our elders to let the first herd go, the first bunch needs to go to make the path.

Nowadays, once they hear about caribou, boats go out and they shoot whatever comes through. So we're kind of losing our -- what our elders have taught us to do. Some of our young hunters aren't allowing the herds to go through like they're supposed to and we can't force them. We can only tell them, but I've seen that happen, too, but what bugs me the most is the air traffic and you guys were out there, too.

BLM was out there. I found out one of the choppers was BLM going out there and that was in the span of three or four days of traveling up and down the river, Colville River, went out to the Colville mouth and down and then eventually heading to Fish Creek and I see -- I saw some of the hunters out there, too, and so I -- I -- so I really would discourage any air traffic during hunting, late July, August and I hope you guys will listen to that, because we have to get our caribou late July, August when they're fat and that was way too much air traffic last -- last fall.

MR. YOKEL: I think Tony has got another comment.

MR. CABINBOY: Again for the record, Tony Cabinboy. The reason I was disagreeing on the numbers is I have a campsite near the mouth of Fish Creek and I take my family there every summer, every

spring, summer and fall.

We geese hunt down there in the spring. We set nets in the summer. We hang fish to dry. All the time, we go caribou hunting for the prime caribou in the fall, the one that's -- that's the best time to get them, but during all those three seasons, I'm still hunting caribou, taking my family down.

Now I've got my grandchildren I'm taking down this summer and we were down there a couple of years ago. A nice herd came through. We got a couple of nice bulls and I didn't see you down there and I'm just -- all these assumptions and these good numbers you're getting from a collar or two in the area, I just -- I just have to disagree with that.

MR. YOKEL: Okay, at least if you didn't see me, that means I wasn't flying around disturbing your hunting.

MR. ISAAC NUKAPIGAK: For the record Isaac Nukapigak, Kuukpik. I -- I fully agree with Bernice's statement. I have stated that in -- I do live in the Point Lay area, duplicates of studies that are going on in NPR-A, whether it's funded by the University through the Natural Science Foundation, would cause chaos of traffic, diversify the migration.

Every organization that's out there, BLM, you have every other agency besides BLM gathering the same data. I don't see why -- why the agencies can't share these data, you know. I fully agree with Bernice, what she said, and people get frustrated because there's too much air traffic going after the same data that they're trying to gather.

MR. JOE NUKAPIGAK: For the record, my name is Joe Nukapigak. In relation to some of the caribou, whether it be tagged or whatnot, we have always tried to teach our young hunters, you know, about the -- you know, to wait for the caribou, like what Bernice said or Isaac. I think because -- that actually is whoever is studying these caribou, probably should come camp for a couple of weeks and count these animals or fish study or whatever or what have you that we have (indiscernible) of doing some studies within that proposed project, whether it be GMT1 or future projects within the NPR-A or even most (indiscernible) for that matter.

MR. GORDON BROWER: I just wanted to add, it's kind of impact related, there are scientists that -- it's not -- I hunt out of Barrow about 70 miles southeast in NPR-A, a lot of aircraft and other things, small

helicopters, too, and camping of scientists during critical movement times, but the thing I observe the most is using the wrong colors of things, the very bright -- bright orange tents and it's -- it can be seen from a long ways.

I would -- I would, you know, if the scientists collecting information camping out, try to do the same way like the regular hunters do, be -- be inconspicuous, you know, don't be -- don't be so brazen out there, is my concern and that was word of mouth and...

MS. LAMPE: (Speaking Inupiaq) west end of Nuiqsut since 1973, when we moved at tent (Speaking Inupiaq).

MR. NAGEAK: (Speaking Inupiaq).

MS. LAMPE: (Speaking Inupiaq) how do you say it?

MR. NAGEAK: (Indiscernible - too far from microphone). [side conversation]

MS. LAMPE: How many years ago (Speaking Inupiaq) we used to get 10 caribou for the winter (Speaking Inupiaq). I don't know where these come from (Speaking Inupiaq). It's very changed (sic) from many years ago (Speaking Inupiaq). Thank you so much.

MR. YOKEL: Okay, Roy, translate, please.

MR. NAGEAK: (Speaking Inupiaq) that was one of the (indiscernible). The (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)... [side conversation]

MR. YOKEL: Could you start?

MR. NAGEAK: Roy Nageak for the record with BLM.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible - too far from microphone).

MR. NAGEAK: Her name, Lampe, Annie Lampe. Our condolences, Anne, for her, her older brother passed away yesterday. Our deep condolences for (Speaking Inupiaq).

When they first started moving from Barrow, one of the things that a lot of the old people, and we heard this story before, but I'm going to retell it, that the elders that had moved away from there wanting to go back, back to their homelands because we remember that they told them that if the children didn't come -- take them to Barrow for education, that they would take them away. That's one of the reasons why all the people that lived down in this area went to Barrow back in the 1940's, 1930's, somewhere in there when a school started in Barrow and then when the Native Claims

Settlement Act started, they started their -- a lot of the elders that were taken -- to be home, wanting to go back home because they felt like this is their land and they don't want to lose their land and that's why Nuiqsut was restarted for the people that are wanting to go home and that -- those were the years that they stayed in tents for a year or many years (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

MR. ISAAC NUKAPIGAK: About 18 months.

MR. NAGEAK: Eighteen months. These guys were kids when they first started moving.

MR. ISAAC NUKAPIGAK: Teenager.

MR. NAGEAK: Teenagers, and there was plenty of animals when they first moved because hardly -- the oil companies hadn't gone this far west and they were mostly out on the Prudhoe Bay area and there was a lot of caribou and the fish were fat in the Colville River. Then when we're talking about this -- the elders that have lived the subsistence way of life and not depended on store-bought food, they always prefer subsistence food, like the caribou, the fat caribou (speaking Inupiaq) that were available around here and things have changed and she talked about the

glass - another thing that came from the gravel pit preparing for expansion of the industry and it was interruptions like then with the industry coming closer to Nuiqsut and now, come closer, they're catching fewer caribou.

For her family, 10 caribou is good for the winter, but they couldn't catch any when they were flying planes all the time. They only got about two this year. When they (indiscernible)look back when the industry was getting closer and there were a lot of meetings like these, well, in a sense, not going to those meetings might have caused a lot of things to happen.

In a sense, they feel like the oil companies are coming freely without rules or regulations guiding them, in a sense. These are things that were happening in state lands and one of the things that they saw the change in the environment was the development when they started going up toward Umiat to do their hunting in the summer and the fall time, they noticed that there was a lot of drums along the shoreline of the river that were floating down and sometimes, if they -- they found drums of fuel, diesel, white gas, gallons of -- one gallon and five gallons and this wasn't happening in just one season. It was a lot of things that were floating down and they think it was from Umiat because they started falling into the river from the oil --

whatever they did back in Umiat and I think they did a lot of things within that area.

In the past, when this was totally a subsistence and there was no form of industry coming, the elders in the past told them that things will change and they told them what was going to happen and a lot what they told them is happening, especially to the weather, too.

The -- some of the elders that were really old that things would come and change your lives and now that is happening. She used to live in Atqasuk, almost right in the middle--middle area of NPR-A and that's her concern is that what's happening in Nuiqsut might happen in Atqasuk, her hometown and what they are doing now, what -- the way of life and fishing, that has changed. They have started fishing in the lakes, but they prefer to fish in the rivers because they see the Qaataq [arctic cisco] remains Ahnaaliq [broad whitefish] that has changed and we know because we lived in Barrow, but we always -- wintertime loved the Qaataq [arctic cisco] that they shipped to Barrow, at least it started with (indiscernible) or two plane loads of Qaataq [arctic cisco] because I can remember my dad telling me (speaking Inupiaq) get me some Qaataq [arctic cisco] and they

were fat and they were the best fish around, but times have changed in the rivers and the Qaataq [arctic cisco] are -- I don't know if they're as good as they were in the past. That's just some of her story. Quyanaq [thank you] Annie.

MR. AHSOGEAK: Bart Ahsogeak for the record. I'm just going to speak on my own, what I went through with BLM and it's all about migration of caribou and the locals went up the rivers to get -- get their catch in one to two weeks and my experience was that I was told to investigate who's flying around in the chopper, real low flying, scaring all the caribou and then after we found out that -- whose aircraft it was, we found out they went over there investigating and then they found out that these guys were telling us that they would need a permit because they're under BLM and for future development, I think, any kind of studies up here should have a permit from the Borough, from the local government. It's -- that way, the locals would know who's coming in or who's coming out. I just want to say this stuff before this thing closes up.

MR. KELLY: Thanks.

MR. CABINBOY: For the record, Tony Cabinboy again. Yeah

(affirmative), I just wanted to add in the 25 years I've been going to Fish Creek with my family and seen the caribous come and go, I've gone up the river all the way up to Judy Creek seeing caribou. I even got a couple of reindeer one summer and all these groups, even small groups, two or three, even larger ones, I've not once seen a collar on any one of them in the 25 years I've been hunting in that area and it scares me to think that the next generations with this GMT1 going up, are not going to be able to experience the good hunting that we have in the Fish Creek/Judy Creek area and I just wanted to say that now while I have a chance before this thing is over and I just hope you folks take that to heart if you have children or grandchildren, I would hope that you will listen to what's coming in the future.

MR. KELLY: So let's remember that we're here -- these are great comments, but we're really trying to take comments on this draft. So I think what we'll do is we'll go ahead and let Bridget talk about how to make comments and then we'll start going around the room and taking formal comments on the draft. Is that all right?

MS. PSARIANOS: Hi, everyone. My name is Bridget Psarianos

again. I'm the Project Manager for the document that we're here to talk about that evaluates the impacts of the GMT1 project and as Lon said earlier, we're here to get your input on the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

Right now, it's a draft, which means it's not perfect and we want input from the local communities to let us know how we could make it better and some of the ways that comments can be really helpful is like you're doing right now, helping us identify new information that would affect the analysis that's in the document.

The document's kind of long. So Chapter Three covers what's called the affected environment and that's what we have identified as the data and the conditions that are on the ground, so the environment as it is right now, and then Chapter Four is the analysis of impacts and those are the impacts of this project directly and then cumulative impacts from other development in the area and so if you can identify any inaccuracies in the information or anything that seems like it doesn't make sense, please let us know, any mistakes that you see in the document and if you can help us identify new impacts that we haven't identified, such as different impacts to

subsistence that we might not have thought of, ideas for new alternatives or new potential mitigation measures.

This document has about 11 new potential mitigation measures for subsistence that are based on interviews from people in Nuiqsut and they were passed onto us from Stephen R. Braund and Associates. So if there's any additional mitigation measures you would like us to consider for this, please let us know, and suggestions about what should be in the preferred alternative and BLM's final decision on this.

There are a lot of different ways you can comment. There is a piece of paper at the sign-in table and that has information on how you can comment. You can submit your comments by email at the email address here and on that piece of paper. You can also write us a letter at the address that's on that paper. You can send me a Fax. You can hand-deliver comments here or at either one of our BLM offices and you can speak at public meetings like you all have been doing right now and everything that we're hearing right now is going in the public record and it will be identified as public comments on this draft and so that's all I have.

MR. KELLY: Are we connected now?

MS. FRITZ: Yeah (affirmative).

MR. KELLY: So we're connected. Stacey's...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's an elder here.

MS. SEILAK: I just have a question. I'm Rose Seilak. I was one of the people that came down here with everybody and my big question is I grew up in Anaktuvuk. That's where all the caribou are, right, and I know the caribou, how they go around -- wintertime and springtime and fall time, and my big question is, that you know, a long time ago when I was growing up, we had wolf bounties and when our family would take a wolf, we would send the skin to the timberlands and they would pay the people that got the wolf $50 and the caribou you guys are tagging, we know we've killed some and we have nothing to do with the tags and my biggest question is do you know where the caribou is, the ones with the tag?

Do you just assume the caribou is dead somewhere in the tundra or how do you know that caribou is dead, because we do kill them and we don't know what to do with them, so we just throw the tags away. Thank you.

MR. YOKEL: Well, most of those collars...

MR. DARRYL UNIDENTIFIED: I'll follow her, probably. You guys don't even fucking know who the fuck -- how are you guys -- you guys -- you guys want to go hunting? Do you guys know us?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Darryl -- Darryl, come on.

MR. DARRYL UNIDENTIFIED: You guys don't even know this shit.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Come on, Darryl.

MR. DARRYL UNIDENTIFIED: Who does hunting? Do you guys hunt? Right? We always hunt. We hunt for our food, right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Darryl, come on.

MR. DARRYL UNIDENTIFIED: Why don't you tell me that? I know your name. I do.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Come on, Darryl.

MR. DARRYL UNIDENTIFIED: I know your name.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Darryl (speaking Inupiaq).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Let's go to (speaking Inupiaq) come here.

MR. DARRYL UNIDENTIFIED: I fucking know his name.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah (affirmative), they heard you. They heard you.

MR. YOKEL: In response to the lady who spoke previously, most of these collars have what we call a mortality signal.

MR. DARRYL UNIDENTIFIED: (Indiscernible - speaking simultaneously) fuck you. All of the younger ones (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

MR. YOKEL: So in other words, the radio signal that comes from the collar changes when the movement of the collar decreases to a certain point.

MR. ISAAC NUKAPIGAK: Lon, I apologize for Mr. (indiscernible) [name of man who was just speaking] tend to occur, so we're sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No problem.

MR. ISAAC NUKAPIGAK: We didn't expect that to happen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. YOKEL: Is it okay if I say that again, in case not everyone heard me, but these collars have a mortality signal in them. When they

stop moving at a certain rate, then the signal that the satellite picks up is different and that's how we identify it as a mortality. In other words, the caribou's not moving anymore, so we assume that it's dead.

There are also VHF collars out there that we don't get a signal from unless we fly around in the airplane and listen for it. They also have mortality signals. So if we're flying around and hear that, we assume that collar's dead or the caribou's dead. Now, what should you do with a collar if you shoot a caribou, we would appreciate it if you'd call Alaska Department of Fish and Game and Geoff Carroll in Barrow would be a good one to call. That's 852-3464 and tell him that you have a collar. He might ask you to describe the collar because these satellite collars are very expensive. They cost $3,000 to $4,000 each and if we can get one refurbished, a used collar refurbished for far less than we can buy a new one.

The VHF collars cost much less and they're often not worth refurbishing, but if you'll call Geoff or any other Fish and Game number that you can get out of hunting reg books or whatnot, they'll tell you what they would like for you to do with the collar. Thank you.

MR. KLIMSTRA: Ryan Klimstra for the record. Also, I just want to add to what Dave just said there. You can also call the Wildlife Department and -- in Barrow with the North Slope Borough directly and we can also help you find out where the rightful owners or where to send the collar, as well, so...

MR. KELLY: All right, in the interest of moving things along, we're going to -- there will still be time for comments and I know there are people that want to give formal comments. So I'll have Stacey talk a little bit about how we -- just very shortly about how we did the subsistence portion of this document, because I know we'll all be interested in that and then we'll go through and just go around the room and listen to comments.

MS. FRITZ: Hi, thanks for having us. So the sections on subsistence in this draft SEIS were written by Stephen R. Braund and Associates, who many of you are familiar with. They've done caribou research in this area for many years, specifically from 2010 to 2013.

So they've done use, area and harvest data and resource-specific use area analyses. So they have geographically specific data that documents the types of resources, the percent of harvest, the percent of harvesters, the

timing of activities, and the methods of transportation.

MR. DARRYL UNIDENTIFIED: (Indiscernible - too far from microphone).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible - too far from microphone).

They also incorporate a lot of Traditional Ecological Knowledge whenever they can and they have been documenting the impacts to caribou hunting that have occurred since the development of Alpine. So the impacts to subsistence are described in Chapter Four.

I'll just speak louder, that's all right [referring to Mr. Darryl Unidentified in the background]. As many of you know, I really don't need to tell you this, the primary impacts to subsistence from development are the reduced availability of subsistence resources, largely, we believe to be due to aircraft disturbance to hunting.

MR. DARRYL UNIDENTIFIED: Get out of my way (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We might want to take a break because we can't hear you.

MS. FRITZ: Do you want me to talk into the microphone or should we take a five, 10-minute break?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think we need a break.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible - speaking simultaneously).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible - speaking simultaneously) get rid of him.

MS. FRITZ: All right, let's...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Take a break.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you take a break (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

MR. KELLY: All right, we'll have a break until five after.

7:57

(Off record)

(On record)

8:05

MR. KELLY: Hi, everybody, we need to kind of move back to our seats and reboot here.

MS. FRITZ: As I was saying, the reduced availability of subsistence resources...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously).

MS. FRITZ: All right, sorry, just so that people can hear me, maybe we can quiet down for a minute, so that people who want to hear can hear. Aircraft disturbance has always been identified as the number one impact, subsistence impact.

We have reduced access to subsistence uses in use areas. We have, the number one impact besides aircraft is hunter avoidance of developed areas. The actual footprint of the development area is not that large, but the area that's avoided by hunters is much larger and so that's actually a major impact.

So the main results of these disturbances are that hunters spend a lot

more time, a lot more money and have to have much better equipment, overall much greater effort and a lot less to lose if they go out and they do not successfully hunt. So hunting success, lack of hunting success is a number one impact.

The impacts from -- as analyzed in 2004 and subsequent BLM land management plans, these impacts to subsistence from this type of development last for multiple generations. They affect key subsistence use areas and they would affect the overall Nuiqsut subsistence activities.

So I'm just going to quickly show you this slide. This is one of the Stephen R. Braund slides. This is caribou subsistence use area for Nuiqsut. The project study area for GMT1 overlaps with this subsistence use area and so that would constitute a loss of traditional use areas.

One thing that's very interesting about the GMT1 project is that you have development that would normally be avoided, but you have the counterbalancing effect, at least in Alternatives A, B, and C of a road directly through that development area. So that provides easier access for hunters to that area and I want to specify that it is a mitigation that we're putting forward that the oil companies and ice road companies will give

specific explicit written permission to Nuiqsut subsistence hunters to have the rights to use those roads. Overall, looking at -- yes.

MR. ISAAC NUKAPIGAK: Yeah (affirmative), for the record, Isaac Nukapigak. If you could hear me…

MS. FRITZ: Okay.

MR. ISAAC NUKAPIGAK: Under the land use agreement that we have, there's a provision in there where there is no restriction access to any residents of Nuiqsut to hunt in the Kuukpik [Corporation-owned lands]-- and when in the withdrawal area.

MS. FRITZ: Right.

MR. ISAAC NUKAPIGAK: I want to make sure they clarify that and no restriction at all.

MS. FRITZ: The Kuukpik agreement with the oil companies...

MR. ISAAC NUKAPIGAK: Under our land use agreement that we have.

MS. FRITZ: Right, okay. Overall, if you look at all four alternatives, Alternatives A and B, which are very similar and have the road and pipeline out there and use CD5 and Alpine as the industrial hub,

have the fewest impacts.

I should say that overall, all the alternatives generally have the same amount of impacts, but trying to do a comparison among those alternatives, A and B have the fewest impacts, mainly because with the road there would be less air traffic and road traffic would be limited to the road between CD5 and GMT1.

Alternative C, also known as the Nuiqsut Hub, the analysis shows that would likely have slightly more impacts and that's due to an increase in ground traffic around the community of Nuiqsut and an increase in air traffic close to the community that could deflect resources, caribou, away from town.

Among the alternatives, Alternative D is estimated to have the greatest amount of impacts. So with Alternative D, you would have in increase in the amount of air traffic, probably a very significant amount of increase, even though there would be ice roads in the winter and it also would not have that potentially counterbalancing impact of having a road that allows easier access. So D, overall, has the greatest amount of impact.

We also have to look at the cumulative impacts for all of these

resources. So for subsistence, we have to look at, basically the loss of subsistence use areas that Nuiqsut subsistence users have experienced from Prudhoe Bay, Kuparuk, Alpine and now oil development extending to the west.

So we look at the historic impacts and we also look at future impacts, so reasonably foreseeable future impacts. That includes further development on the west side past GMT1, but it also includes things like development at Umiat and a road and pipeline from Umiat to the haul road and natural gas development, offshore oil development that would include pipelines coming across the NPR-A.

So that cumulative analysis would -- is estimated to have a significant impact, not just for Nuiqsut, but for all of the NPR-A communities, so Point Lay, Wainwright, Atqasuk, Barrow, Anaktuvuk Pass, and Nuiqsut.

So in addition to the analysis that we do in the EIS itself, we are also required to do an ANILCA 810. Section 810 of ANILCA requires us to do a very specific analysis of subsistence impacts and it has the -- they very much correlate to each other. For Alternatives A, B, C, and D, the effects

to subsistence would fall above the level of significantly restricting subsistence use for Nuiqsut.

There are slight differences between the alternatives for A, B, and C. Those impacts would be long-term and high intensity. For Alternative D, they would be long-term, high intensity and significant, again, because there would be no road and a lot greater impact, a lot greater aircraft.

So that was my quick and dirty overview of the analysis of subsistence impacts and I know that's really the resource or area that most people are concerned about and I'll just briefly say that the EIS breaks the resources down into different sections. When it looks at subsistence, it's looking just at user access, resource availability, subsistence-specific.

The other sections of the EIS, sociocultural and Environmental Justice, reflect those impacts to subsistence. That takes in those negative and positive impacts and also the counterbalancing impacts of the economic benefits of oil development. Yes.

MR. BOYLE: Do you...

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

MR. BOYLE: Yeah (affirmative), John Boyle for the record. Do

you have clearly defined criteria for what constitutes something as being reasonably foreseeable?

MS. FRITZ: Yeah (affirmative), I would say that when we do a cumulative analysis, we do have a lot of issues defining what is reasonably foreseeable. The one rule that I think we all agree on is if it is a project that has been proposed, like an EIS has been started.

So for example, the road to Umiat is an interesting situation. An EIS was completed by the Corps, but not quite completed before the final came out. The project -- that process was ended, but Linc Energy is still developing or exploring at Umiat and if they find oil resources worth developing, then likely, they will restart that Environmental Impact Statement process.

MS. PSARIANOS: And just to clarify, it also goes beyond things that we have an EIS permit for.

MS. FRITZ: Right.

MS. PSARIANOS: So we included a potential pipeline to the Chukchi, just because that could be -- that is reasonably foreseeable, you know, there were a lot of lease sales out in the Chukchi Sea.

MS. IMM: But GMT1 would be done before any of that starts.

MS. PSARIANOS: Right, but we'd rather be more inclusive than less inclusive when we look at what's reasonably foreseeable.

MR. BOYLE: So it's somewhat subjective to a certain degree?

MS. PSARIANOS: To a degree. We incorporated a lot from the 2012 plan that covered the entire NPR-A. We looked to that a lot and so something like development of GMT2 is probably more reasonably foreseeable than a Chukchi pipeline, but they're both in there, so yeah (affirmative), subjective.

MR. KELLY: So what -- what I'd like to do, if it's all right, is just go around and get the people that have prepared statements to read, get those out of the way and then we'll have this more interactive discussion continue until -- what time should we leave, Dave?

MR. YOKEL: I think the Borough wants to leave before we do.

MR. KELLY: Okay, so...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: At what time? What time are you leaving?

MR. YOKEL: We would like to be out of here by 11:00.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: By 2:00?

MR. KELLY: Okay, so how about if we -- if we start with the prepared statement of the Borough. I think every -- we missed the Borough at our meeting last night and everybody would like to hear what the Borough has to say, so Mayor Brower.

MAYOR BROWER: Thank you very much. Yesterday when...

MS. STUDSTILL: I'm sorry, can I get your name for the record?

MAYOR BROWER: Charlotte Brower, Mayor of the North Slope Borough.

MS. STUDSTILL: Thank you.

MAYOR BROWER: I was at Point Hope having a meeting with Native Village of Point Hope, City of Point Hope and Tikigaq Corporation, so I was not able to attend your meeting in Barrow. So I apologize. However, I am very happy to be here with the Kuukpikmiut to hear what their concerns are and also to hear what else is being presented by BLM.

For the record, my name is Charlotte Brower and I am the Mayor of the North Slope Borough and tonight we've heard some very good discussions, both from the residents and from BLM and hopefully, we'll

hear more discussions.

The comments that I'm offering is on behalf of the North Slope Borough and we've listened to the different alternatives that have been developed by the Bureau of Land Management on the proposed Greater Mooses Tooth GMT1 project.

We've also listened to potential impacts that these alternatives may have on the residents of the North Slope Borough. The issue of balancing development with our ability to continue to the subsistence practices that have sustained our people and culture for millennia is not a new one.

Ever since oil was discovered in Prudhoe Bay in 1969, we've endeavored to strike the proper balance between these two critically-important activities and this debate continues this evening.

What is unique about the project being discussed tonight is that GMT1 project is the first major project geared toward developing Inupiat-owned natural resources. In addition to bringing direct benefits to the shareholders of Kuukpik, ASRC and other Native corporations entitled to 7(i) distributions, this project will benefit the North Slope Borough and the state of Alaska through the increased tax revenues and by extending the life

of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. It will also bring benefits to the villages that rely heavily on funding from NPR-A grants.

The North Slope Borough supports the Greater Mooses Tooth Project 1 and the adoption of Alternative A as the preferred alternative. We believe that Alternative A incorporates rigorous mitigation and best management practices that will enable this project to move forward in a responsible manner, while also protecting the ability of our local residents to continue their subsistence practices.

It also has the smallest gravel footprint of all alternatives, which is important given the scarcity of gravel on the North Slope. Alternative A also includes road connections that will provide increased access to hunting areas for local subsistence users. Roads will provide for more timely and efficient responses to an oil spill or other unforeseen incident.

Further roads will allow emergency responders access to the project site, even in the severe weather conditions. Roads will also enable residents of Nuiqsut to have access to the project site and will create greater employment and training opportunities for the village.

Alternative A will also minimize the amount of noise and required

overflights by helicopters and fixed wing aircraft, which has been repeatedly expressed to the BLM and stated in the SEIS document as being more disruptive to subsistence hunting than any other activity and because GMT1 project (sic) is located in an area that is not heavily utilized by Teshekpuk or Central Arctic Caribou Herds, a road connection is unlikely to have any substantial impact to this important subsistence resource.

For all these reasons, we feel that Alternative D or any other alternative that would promote road-less development is a poor concept and should not be considered further as a viable alternative. As the SEIS acknowledges, air travel has been restricted at the Alpine site between 13 to 22% of each year over the last four years.

It is not prudent or reasonable to risk the life, health or safety of the workers at the project site, or hamper response times to oil spills for the sake of road-less development. Alternative D will also create more ambient noise and will have a greater negative impact to air quality than all of the other alternatives. The SEIS states, "Alternative D would likely have the largest impact to subsistence and thus Environmental Justice for Nuiqsut." We agree and we feel that this alternative should not be

recommended.

Lastly, BLM states on page 177 of the SEIS that, "BLM will determine whether or not to remove the roads upon abandonment and reclamation." The North Slope Borough and other stakeholders should have input on these kinds of decisions and the BLM should utilize a mechanism, such as the NPR-A Working Group before making decisions unilaterally, and again, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this matter and quyanaqpuk [thank you very much](speaking Inupiaq).

MR. KELLY: Who else has a prepared statement? Isaac?

MS. BERNICE KAIGELAK: Over here, because Alternative A is the preferred choice and when you stand back and look at the whole picture, we are giving up more, but we have to learn to be good neighbors.

So I would like to charge that ConocoPhillips and all the other industry do their best to reduce emissions, do their best to reduce noise, if you want to be good neighbors, especially during our subsistence time and I would like for that to be put on record.

There's technology now where you can operate vehicles with natural gas. That's less emissions. I'm sure will be more technology as to the

flaring or whether they're reinjecting the natural gas back. So if we are to be good neighbors, I -- I ask you to be good stewards, as well, and that you be accountable for that part, to do your best to reduce emissions and reduce noise, because we are your neighbors.

You get to go home on your R&R. We have to live here. So please -- please do your best to be good neighbors and BLM needs to be accountable, too, in enforcing your permits. If there should be a violation or what have you, there needs to be a way or somehow that's best for us that live here.

We do have the North Slope Borough here, maybe they're the way. I don't know, but there needs to be a way, because BLM does not have employees up here. So that needs to also be looked into, but for me, as a resident of Nuiqsut, you know, I wear many different hats, but I -- tonight, I'm speaking as my own , as a hunter, fisher. I would prefer A, but I also want you to be responsible, especially when we hunt. Thank you.

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

MS. BERNICE KAIGELAK: Bernice Kaigelak.

MS. STUDSTILL: Thank you.

MR. ISAAC NUKAPIGAK: Hello, Isaac Nukapigak for the record, President of Kuukpik Corporation, which is under the land claim for the Village of Nuiqsut.

First, I want to welcome each one of you from the Bureau of Land Management, the Corps of Engineers- Hank Baij, distinguished guests from the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and our honorable Mayor Brower and this department staff.

GMT1 is an important project for Kuukpik because part of the GMC1 would be built on Kuukpik conveyed land and all of GMT1 would be located on historical land that the Kuukpik need to rely on for subsistence, for security.

If GMT1 is built, Kuukpik would receive a share of the overriding royalty or a consent agreement with our mother/parent corporation and Nuiqsut and the other villages throughout the Slope will enjoy the benefit from the taxes that the North Slope Borough, through its taxation power that will provide -- continue providing services such as healthcare, fire protection, water/sewer services and this list goes on. These services cost money.

With depleting, aging oil field, this new satellite that goes on with other beneficial throughout -- throughout this North Slope region. These financial benefits are not significant to justify GMT1 if GMT1 cannot be built safely with minimum impacts and a balance in environmental responsible manner.

Kuukpik Corporation is still in the process of reading the roughly 1,000 pages of text, tables and maps that make up the draft Supplement EIS. I know I won't have time -- I know I think we did our some sort of analysis of the draft Supplement EIS, but those will be integrated when Kuukpik submits its detailed written comment before the deadline.

I offer these preliminary comments on behalf of Kuukpik Corporation based off our review so far. This is just a piece of it. Kuukpik has historically been supportive of oil and gas development that is balanced and environmentally responsible.

By balanced and environmentally responsible, Kuukpik means a project that respects and protects the land and the resource -- of the wildlife resource which our people depend on for our food security.

Kuukpik can support a project that minimizes the impact of oil and

gas and mitigates the impact of the -- on the community of Nuiqsut that cannot be avoided. For instance, Kuukpik successfully worked with the industry to relocate the bridge, the Nigliq Bridge, from the two initial proposed sites to the current site as it's built today.

In the past, Kuukpik had opposed this project until other necessary changes were made, which we were able to compromise and accept the changes. Past examples of mitigations are the supply through our negotiation of where natural gas that this community was able to negotiate, with the community, would give Nuiqsut the cleanest, lowest cost energy, even negotiate with our municipal government, the North Slope Borough, to reduce the electric rate, along with a community mitigation fund by negotiating with industry, the Alpine satellite known as CD3 and CD6, now known as GMT1.

While Kuukpik's review of the draft Supplemental EIS is still ongoing, our preliminary conclusion that Alternative A is the most balanced environmentally responsible of all alternatives and that Alternative A has the least impact to this community.

Kuukpik Corporation prefers Alternative A because Alternative A

uses less amount of fill to the wetland and a small footprint and uses less amount of other resources like water, which would not have been building GMT1 at all, would use less gravel and have a small footprint that the Alternative A identifies.

The people of Nuiqsut had complained repeatedly for years and years about aircraft, fixed wing, helicopter noises that interfere our subsistence hunt trying to gather for our food security and Nuiqsut consistently opposed building any more airstrips in the traditional land of the Kuukpikmiut [people of Kuukpik] because of disruption of our hunt.

Because of a large increase in aircraft traffic, a greater impact overall that Alternative D, the road-less alternative that (indiscernible) Kuukpik opposes Alternative D because of more impacts. In addition, if GMT1 were built road-less, it would make it more likely that the other satellites also would be built road-less and more airstrips to be built in the Fish Creek area and known as other satellites.

A second airstrip near Fish Creek would be -- would be even more unacceptable than the first airstrip in Alternative D. Road-less development of Alternative D would require large amounts of unnecessary

duplication of facilities at GMT1. A pad plus an absence of a road requires GMT1 to have more standalone facilities, including a year-round man-camp, incinerators, generators that cause emissions. From Alternative D, there would be less -- five times greater from the Alternative A.

Using Nuiqsut as the hub under Alternative C is not acceptable to Kuukpik at this time. Kuukpik does not want ConocoPhillips building roads, pads, other -- other facilities inside the city limitand we understand that neither the industry nor the community would like that idea because it would increase impacts, social impacts, subsistence impacts. Including increase the air traffic, blocking operation -- operational activity. It would be accountable (sic) to this community.

Kuukpik would not make the land inside the city limit available for this project because of impacts, air emissions, dust, you name it. Kuukpik also believes that trucking activity under C, like I indicated, dust, air control (sic) would be unacceptable.

Alternative B and pipeline project, that would harm more acreage and more valuable habitat that ConocoPhillips propose where the recent Alternative A is less environmental harm than Alternative B because of --

Alternative A is in high value wetland marsh area and we're trying -- and we want to protect it. So that is actually my -- my -- the statement for tonight. Thank you very much.

MR. KELLY: Does someone else have a prepared statement you'd like to read?

MR. PATKOTAK: Thank you. For the record, my name is Crawford Patkotak. I serve as Chairman of the Board of Arctic Slope Regional Corporation. Arctic Slope's mission is to actively manage our businesses, our lands, natural resources, our investments and our relationships to enhance Inupiaq cultural and economic freedom, continuity, responsibility and integrity. The corporation is owned and -- and represents the business interests of approximately 11,000 Inupiaq shareholders.

GMT1 is a project by ConocoPhillips that will produce oil in ASRC subsurface. It's a God-given right given to us through the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to support our shareholders financially, to be self-sufficient, self-reliant and to partly fulfill the intent of ANCSA and through sharing provisions, benefits through the Alaska Native Claims Settlement

Act, also known as 7(i), which has been mentioned by Kuukpik, so the whole state benefits from this, more so, the people of the Arctic Slope.

It is important to note the history of the land selection, some limitations placed on Arctic Slope Regional Corporation when the Land Claims Settlement Act came into play, along with the village corporations under ANCSA. NPR-A was, for the most part, placed off limits and this proposed development is a great opportunity for our people to become more self-reliant, as opposed to depending on government handouts.

ASRC purposefully waited to make selections. Working closely with Kuukpik, we had Kuukpik Corporation leadership to select the lands with the highest potential for resources. This is one of the tools we have to maximize benefits to our people.

ASRC owns most of the subsurface of GMT1 development and would receive significant royalty revenue through that development of GMT1. It's through the developments like GMT1 and the revenue ASRC receives through its royalty, its ownership, keeps our dividend policy strong.

ASRC is also a manager of the GMT1 -- GMT Unit and has been

working with ConocoPhillips, Kuukpik, and the BLM to bring this project to development since the unit was formed in 2008. ASRC intentionally took over selection and administration of GMT1 leases with the goal of taking this project to development.

I'm not going to go through all of the specific points, but I think it's important to hear that ASRC shares the common interests, concerns and goals of the different entities, like the North Slope Borough, the Village of Kuukpik (sic), Kuukpik Corporation, and I think it's a demonstration of how we can benefit more for our people and our community when we support responsible development and receive the maximum benefits for our people and I'd like to also just mention that in any project, we need to find a way to work with the tribal organizations, hammer out our differences, find a common -- find a common interest that we share with them.

I think when you look at the recent developments, as far as the start-up of the NPR-A Working Group, there's -- that's a good opportunity for everyone to really get together and find ways to move projects forward in a responsible manner.

We support Alternative A. We're with Kuukpik and the community

on this and we will have a written statement submitted on behalf of Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and while ASRC supports a road and road access, we do not support just any road. It's after the consultation with Kuukpik and the local community members is the main reason, but we share the same common interests, such as gravel roads being in place, make -- making these decisions locally and maximize the use of these resources when the project ends.

I think there's been the common concern of too much flights on any given project, whether they be studies, responsible development, and if there is a way we can minimize the flying for the subsistence concerns, that would be great. So with that, that's our testimony for this evening. Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Thank you. Does anyone else have a prepared statement? Does anybody else like to make a comment or ask questions?

MS. ITTA: Martha Itta for the record. I just wanted to concern (sic) on what the President and ASRC was saying about our community being on the same page for the alternatives that they've chosen. I disagree with that because not a lot of our community members know what's going on in

our village on the west side.

I've heard a lot of complaints. I've heard a lot of concerns about what is going on. They don't know what's going on until it's actually happening. So I just wanted to, for the -- state for the record that we're not all on the same page for those alternatives. Thank you.

MR. ELI NUKAPIGAK: Good evening, my name is Eli Nukapigak and I (indiscernible-coughing) Nuiqsut. This is a subsistence hearing, how we will be affected in the long-run. I'm a hardcore subsistence hunter about the land, the ocean, sea and the waters around us.

I am the one that will be mostly affected, even though I'm a shareholder of Kuukpik and ASRC. My (speaking Inupiaq) [identify as an Inupiat in this village] has changed so much. How much more is it going to shrink? How much more am I going to suffer and how much more are my loved ones going to suffer in the long-run?

These are long-term impacts. Cumulative impacts have been going on for years and years. What will happen now, since the last blow out that we had, nobody wants -- no one needs to help the village out. Another blow out that -- that come out with (indiscernible) from hunters on our land

that will kill off everything.

What kind of mitigation plans are in place? What kind of mitigation records will be in place if this has to happen in our backyard? These are issues that are not being foreseen by some of our leaders here, but our concern as a tribal member for our tribe these are what we are facing now.

How are we going to do in the long run of what we're going to lose? My identity as Inupiaq shrink, my subsistence way of life to the land I used to hunt shrink. What are we going to do when it happens? Who's got answers to some of these stuff that will be happening?

Money runs out just like it does in your pocket. It don't (sic) stay in your pocket year-round. Our mitigation measures are very low just being under the industry that is making billions and billions of dollars in our backyard and yet, we still suffer every year the same. How are you going to mitigate our way of life that is shrinking?

My identity has an impact here in the community that I plan to help out my younger generations. What are they going to do from there on, the next 30 years? Thank you.

MR. GORDON BROWER: My name's Gordon Brower and I just

wanted to make some comments here. I do support Alternative A. I work for the North Slope Borough in Land Management and I also want to thank the community for allowing us to be here, along with BLM.

It's important for folks like us in the Borough, as well, to hear all of these comments. Once BLM is completed with their EIS, with the preferred alternative, they eventually will use that preferred alternative and synthesize a master plan that will come to the Borough, as well.

Again, there, the North Slope Borough will work with the community. There will be additional public hearings. So once an EIS is done, I think the work is just beginning to try to move forward and I'd like -- I just wanted to offer those comments. The North Slope Borough will have to rezone the GMT1 to its new location. In the past, in the Alpine satellite, CD6 was deleted until such time that there was a better consensus to develop it and I think these are the efforts from that period of time when CD6 was deleted from the lease zone to try to incorporate that. Thank you.

MR. JOSEPH NUKAPIGAK: I'm not going to use this mic. Can I use this?

MR. KELLY: Well, you have to plug it in. It won't make it louder.

It will just...make transcription possible.

MR. JOSEPH NUKAPIGAK: For the record, my name is Joseph Nukapigak. I have been with Kuukpik Corporation from day one. I am one of the longest -- been on the Board of Directors and I'm also the Natural Resource Director on behalf of Kuukpik.

In relations to some of these upcoming development that I'm seeing in NPR-A when -- when Alpine got started, it was on the state land under 14F state land. Back then, that region we -- we envisioned that there would be some further development or discoveries around the Village of Nuiqsut, but as the oil industry gained their knowledge of the subsurface, either through seismic activities within the surrounding, it helps to understand what is beneath the land.

One thing that I have come to realize is that access to the land, whether it be leases under the state jurisdiction or the federal, the state of Alaska has their own interest, as well as the BLM, federal government, has their own interest. With their regulations, sometimes with the state not having a subsistence hunting/fishing rights, but under the umbrella of ANILCA 810, we have access to those lands, but sometimes when those

lands are leased to the oil industry, that brings some concerns to the community, whether it be Nuiqsut or any other village that might be affected from the activities.

Access to the land is very important because we don't know no boundaries when we go out hunting. Am I on BLM land or what? Well, I go there. These are the concerns that have been brought up time and time again. Access is the most important component if we have (indiscernible) or separation that will allow our villages to have access to those lands for subsistence use.

As some of those maps depicted, that it goes beyond what -- what some of the specialists in the land might have given you. Some of those overlap with other villages, whether it be Atqasuk, Barrow -- Barrow for Teshekpuk area ismainly used by these communities and for that matter, I'm glad that -- that there is a North Slope BLM Working Group, you know, that will represent all the villages and some organizations to my understanding.

I think that has been long overdue and now I'm finally seeing that is happening, because that has been my advocate for a long time is to have

some kind -- because we don't know sometimes other -- what the other villages are thinking. In the state, the hunting -- when one village is affected the most, they think that other villages are affected more than the other or vice versa.

Subsistence will always be there for us. We all know that from the day that we grow up to hunt by our parents teaching us how to hunt. I came from the whaling family. I'm one of those that has -- was born and raised into (speaking Inupiaq) Barrow, didn't even know where my parents were born until I came to realize they were from another region.

They are -- there are many issues that we have seen come and go, but some of those are repeated year in and year out when there's any proposed development, whether it be in the state or federal and I -- and this document that I was -- as I was reading, I didn't even get to read about half of that, half of that 1,000-plus-page, because I -- I love to read some of these because it will affect me some time in the future, well into the future of my children, my grandkids and whatnot or the village itself of -- surrounding the North Slope.

We will always have concerns, whether it be access to the land -- has

been my concern all these years, having to go -- having to go to the east for (indiscernible) state control – Prudhoe Bay, Kuparuk. With the absence of access to those lands, we are no longer hunting over that way because of the safety, safety reasons that oil industry might have.

So when the Alpine was discovered, it was my people -- my village is going to have access to those lands that we have always hunted and here, it's our land. We have selected those lands for high value subsistence because not knowing that we will have some of the lands that have oil beneath us. That's why, along working with Arctic Slope, that we have selected those lands for subsistence and whatnot.

Now -- then when the state of Alaska leased that -- what land -- what land that they have selected on the state side, which is Alpine being one of the state selected lands -- so how do we have access to those lands? How do we resolve that? How do we compromise to which that -- to resolve some of the concerns of our locals?

The -- we come to a conclusion that might -- that is workable for this village, if by working or having an agreement with the oil industry, bilateral agreement, so that we continue to have access to those lands,

whereas normally would have been off limits because of the state-selected and 30 years down the road, probably, who knows, a long time gone when all the land, NPR-A oil industry find some here and there. I know that some time in the future, as they have already leases out to the -- to the Chukchi Sea and Beaufort Sea, that's where the concerns are most -- we are really affecting the Inupiaq way of life as we see it.

Even though we have been affected the most in the last 40 years in our land development, whether it be state or federal land, sometimes it hurts your mind to see people suffering, have to go a long distance to harvest caribou or what have you. It costs more and more because 40 years ago probably a motor gas used to be maybe two dollars, but now, it's what, five, eight dollars a gallon, and that's going to take pretty much of your budget, not knowing if you're going to be successful or not.

If you've got to go to that Point A where you think that there might be some animals, sometimes that animal is not there most of the time when you expect it. It -- during the summertime, when the wind shifted to the east and west, sometime they -- yeah (affirmative), they would come or they would go back when the east -- west and east winds.

We've known that. So we wait patiently, but now, over time, that we have learned some of these, even though some of the oil industry has -- has their own study because they've got money to turn to -- to do the study, whereas the villages don't. A lot of times that we have to rely on some of those, either through the North Slope Borough Wildlife Department or with the state Fish and Game and whatnot.

There are times that one must, state and the federal must, have to -- from what I could see that they need to collaborate more with each other, instead of duplicating some of the -- what -- instead of duplicating some of the studies that I've seen over time. Maybe some of these studies that are obtained maybe they need to be -- bring up-to-date so that everybody is on the same page with everybody else.

Sometimes, you know, when you have a contradicting document that says this and that, but it's not on the same page as what they want to believe, but for Alternative A is most, for me, to be acceptable, because there's a lot of -- it's the least use of gravel, smaller footprint versus the alternative or that probably some years down the road, they will not have it, but not now. I have seen all these years of being observant. I have

participated in some of the process. I've seen that. I thank you.

MR. THOMAS NUKAPIGAK: Thomas Nukapigak for the record. You know, these types of (speaking Inupiaq), these types of meetings remind me of our forefathers fighting for their right to live as subsistence hunters and it really reminds me of my dad and my uncles and my aunts that were speaking, you know, for the future generations like we're here already, but what about our future generations out ahead to come?

You know, they really fought for them. They really fought for our first leaders because I know for a fact that my dad used to take me to one of these kinds of meetings back when Prudhoe Bay was being discussed and it really bring me -- it really brings lots of memories back of the -- of how they fight for us.

I think that you guys should really make strong considerations to make the best possible way to develop on the west side of us without doing so much harm to our environment. Everybody is still hunting out there, but the question is will our food still be the same? Will it still be edible?

You know, this is probably the first time that we haven't eaten any white broad fish on the harvest that we catch every fall. God knows how

many dead ones we'll be seeing around the river when the ice goes out. We'll be waiting for that to see what will happen to our white broad fish.

You know, we've been eating those for -- since we can remember and this is the first time that we've been changed up this way-- being affected and the other scientists doesn't quite agree with the findings that they have. The other scientists from other universities, you know, they don't really agree with that water hole. There's something out there that is, you know, contaminating them and we must look very close because God knows how many white broad fish will be sitting along the coast once the -- once the ice breaks up and yes, I agree with Alternative A, the same with the Borough and the other colleagues. I think that would be the best alternative for the west side. Thank you.

MS. BERNICE KAIGELAK: I have one more, one more. Bernice Kaigelak for the record. A couple of years ago, maybe three years ago when I used to be with the Native Village of Nuiqsut, some paperwork had come in requesting to do studies on the eroding and permafrost on the coast and how methane levels were high. So I think there is something to look into.

We're faced with climate change and global warming and the permafrost is melting and I read in that report that possibly there was methane leaking on the edge, on the coast due to the permafrost melting.

These are lots of things to consider and often times it's real easy to blame someone because you see them right in front of you, which is the industry, for things that are happening in our land and that's why I really would like for all of us to reduce emissions, all of us, even in the community. The whole state needs to reduce emissions.

I forget who, it was want of the -- they were wanting to come out and do that study because they were finding that methane was leaking out and it was going into the waters. So I -- I don't know if that has anything to do with what's happening with the fish. I don't know. That's not my expertise, but I've come across that and read that.

So I just wanted to share that information because that needs to be looked into because that affects us. It affects our way of life. It affects our fish. So I -- I would like for you to look into that more, you know. Somebody has to. I don't know if it should be BLM or who, but someone needs to and that's all. Thank you.

MS. LEAVITT: Thank you for coming. My name is Dora Leavitt for the record. I'm a resident of Nuiqsut. I grew up here. When I first moved here, there was nothing, you know, and we were excited about subsistence and learning our (indiscernible), our heritage that was passed on to us by our generation of our elders that taught us how to live our subsistence life.

We're here as we've seen the impacts of Alpine. We've seen impacts of, not just from Conoco, we've seen it from Repsol, from the offshore development and we, as a people, that eat and live off this land, we're concerned about the impacts that are coming to us and we are mitigating subsistence.

We mitigate little, very little, which in turn, turns to social impacts. For one, gas vouchers, what little we're going to get, it turns into a fighting. How do we define a subsistence hunter, you know, when these vouchers are passed out to everybody? That's how it's written.

The North Slope Borough, for your information, and the City of Nuiqsut, we are impacted and -- and yeah (affirmative), we're hunting. We're still hunting. We get our catch. We go out seal hunting, caribou

hunting. A lot of people go further. A lot of people have their own preferred places they like to go, their grandparents that brought them to these places and I see that we ignore a very important part of this impact. It's the social impact that is brought to our people.

We can mitigate. We can study the fish. We can study the caribou. We've got so much data from all the different agencies and I've addressed this before, our leadership -- we talked about our future generation today in this community and other communities. I don't see any structured programs that are going to offset these impacts for our generations to come, you know.

We don't -- we see and talk about a lot of money that is going to come and benefit ASRC and Kuukpik and whoever's going to have a pot in this -- this oil development. Are we sharing this with our future generations? I'm not only asking the ConocoPhillips, you know. Over the years, I've been a Little Dribblers [children's basketball team] coach and they've been really generous to everybody, Kuukpik, the city, ConocoPhillips, Repsol, BP, they've been contributing a little, but yet, these social impacts, they still live with us every day, these kids and we

ignore that, and you know, we're talking about this new development, talking about how it should be developed, runways or roads.

We can go on talking about all this and talk, talk, talk, money comes, money goes, and I'm going to ask everybody, even ASRC, Kuukpik, everybody, you know, we talk about we're going to protect our future leaders. How about our future leaders? Today, I see our future leaders don't have programs that are structured, that are going to teach them, you know, with drugs and alcohol coming into the village because of this ice road or airplane. It's coming. We don't have programs and I -- I fought for years for that and I hope the North Slope Borough is listening to me.

The BLM, the permitters should implement this in the EIS. I know you won't implement this because it's -- it costs so much, but yet, ConocoPhillips, Repsol, BP, they go back home and bring their billions of dollars, extracting from underneath us, from around us and that's my number one concern is that more development comes, you know, we're always having a lot of meetings and -- and these kids, we call them our future leaders. We're not -- we're not taking good care of them when we don't see any structured programs for our people, for our kids.

We only have a teen center that -- it's just a hang out, no programs, nothing to teach our kids. We have the school, you know, all -- we've been good neighbors with Conoco. We've had trainings with the fire fighters -- fire fighters go to Conoco, do their training there or at Kuparuk.

The ice road has saved a baby's life not too long ago. The plane couldn't land here. They went and brought this patient to Alpine, was able to get them out. So there are good and bad impacts, you know, that is going to come with this and I know that when you guys quit, when you run out of oil and you're in some other -- most everybody's not on natural gas yet and I'm glad I'm on natural gas, because when I ran out, I hated to wait for like eight hours until the fuel opens to get my -- my diesel fuel. So I'm happy for the natural gas.

We grew up, you know, when we first came, we grew up with the fire wood, with the Coleman stoves and cutting wood. Today, I think -- I don't know, you know, if the oil runs out, are we -- will we be able to -- going to do that, but I just want to say my preferred alternative is A.

I don't want to see any runways. I've experienced a lot of -- we have a camp about so many miles from CD2 and Alpine, kind of north of it, and

with the planes coming in and out when we're camping and doing our summer subsistence, that has a great impact on us. There's too many flights.

There's no restriction on the subsistence on this road, proposed road. The Alternative A, I like the idea, you know, but how about 10, 20 years from now, you know, when the other agency says there's been too many miss -- close calls with this road and industry? The agencies are going to find ways to maybe stop subsistence users from accessing this road. I'm just kind of looking into the future.

We can say it's accessible right now, but you know, 10, 20 years down the road, there's going to be different people sitting in these seats that are permitters. They're going to be -- they're going to have a different view of the place. So is this going to be really in black and white that we're going to have access for the life of these fields?

That is -- that is my preferred alternative. I want to thank you all for coming and getting comments, but let's not leave the social illness (sic) in these communities when you go and do your thing. When you go and get the big dividends, give out the big dividends, I'm not just talk to -- to

whatever (sic), I'm talking to our people, too.

You know, we have all -- we all have a stake in this. We all want it done right. We've always wanted to work together. This -- when we came, this community worked together. We were all one and over the years, you know, we've had disagreement because of development like this that turns to social impacts and yet, we continue to ignore that and I'd like to see that implemented on the EIS on covering, you know, some social impacts, programs to our communities. Thank you.

MS. LAMPE: (Speaking Inupiaq). Thank you so much.

MR. NAGEAK: Thank you, Anne. (Translating from Inupiaq) Basically, the gist what is happening is that the people from Barrow, when they come here to be-- sometimes with the people that are in Nuiqsut that are always here and they always have all these meetings. When they are alone as a village, basically, and with their limited English and what she hears sometimes, comments like you can't really access this area for hunting and once it's developed, it will be off limits when they try to hunt in winter and summertime.

It might not be coming from the heads of the oil companies, but with

workers, basically the people that work out in the field and they make these comments in the sense reflecting of the sense of how development and the oil what I'm hearing is from the lower ranking people that do -- that are the front people in the development area and comments, with their limited English, that these people shouldn't be hunting around here or whatever.

It's comments that people that are higher echelon usually come to the meetings, but the people when they're out there trying to hunt and do stuff said the front people or the people that are out there doing all the work, the comments -- all comment that you guys shouldn't be hunting or being in the area where there's development and I think that's the case of what their statements are when they're (indiscernible) anybody could have a sense (indiscernible).

It's -- I don't know how often the oil companies meet or have individual meetings with the village of Nuiqsut, but often times, there are people not around to be attending a lot of the meetings that they have and sometimes they don't get the feel of how they're being impacted. Thank you.

MR. HOPSON: Good evening, Dwayne Hopson for the record.

From the City [of Nuiqust], I can't speak for all of us in the council members, but I'm pretty sure we agree with option A, and as for the -- you know, I'll move onto CD5 development and spur road and what we have (indiscernible) and GMT1 and from what I understand, that's CD6 and I've heard there's a CD7, you know where the location is and then you can shed some light in the village on where CD7 is and when that will be developed after CD6 is (indiscernible)?

MS. DEGEORGE: Lynn DeGeorge from ConocoPhillips. We were just doing exploration this winter around areas of (indiscernible - too far from microphone).

MS. STUDSTILL: I'm sorry, can you speak up?

MS. DEGEORGE: Sorry. We're just doing exploration this winter for areas around GMT1 where a GMT2, which would be the next development might be. There's two wells. One, I think they're just at the beginning stage and a second one that they're looking at for today, tomorrow to initiate the drilling activities.

There is a proposed -- a location that was proposed earlier in the EIS, but we're not quite sure that's where an actual development would be. We

can't say it would or it wouldn't, but it -- we will know a little bit more after this year's exploration activities.

Timing-wise, when CD5 was developed and GMT1 and GMT2 were sort of a two-year window, a two-year construction window for CD5. So this is the first year of construction, followed by a subsequent year and then it's our hope that GMT1 would follow along and we have a two-year development window. So the first drilling at that location would be in 2017, and the first drilling of CD5 would be 2015, but it really depends on what we find in our exploration activities, but two to three years down the road after that, the GMT1 would be developed is our -- would be our current long-range plan.

MR. ELI NUKAPIGAK: Eli Nukapigak for the record. I'd like to add on -- on mitigation measures on the subsistence way of life. We've been trying to build that access road to go to that river for subsistence purpose for the last 20 years, what our elders have tried to put and we've just got an invitation at this time.

How do you compromise something like this when industry takes away my living hood on the west? Our way of life is now shrink (sic), as

you know. We want a route to the main river that will be more accessible for our people to hunt, access more to the game, that there will not be unlimited to us.

Help us build that road. BLM has part of that road. Help us and we'll compromise to do what is best for our people, because Nuiqsut will still be subsistence hunters, no matter what's going on around us. How do you compromise and work with them, communicate with them, help them for the purpose of our way of life. Thank you.

MR. KELLY: Thanks, Eli. This is pretty off topic, but we, you know, Hank and I can talk to you about that road real briefly and I think it's going along and you'll be pleased with what's happened.

MR. BAIJ: Do you want me to speak to that, Lon, a little bit now or later?

MR. KELLY: Well, let's -- let's make sure that we get people's comments on the Environmental Impact Statement. Okay, so what I'd like to do at this point, if no one has any further comments, we'll close the -- we'll close the testimony. We'll close the 810 hearing at this point. Do you want to read a little closing statement?

MS. WALLIS: I'd now like to officially close this BLM public meeting and ANILCA Section 810 hearing. Thank you so much for your participation.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:31 p.m.