GREATER MOOSES TOOTH UNIT 1

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/ ANILCA §810 Hearing

Wainwright, Alaska

March 17, 2014

ATTENDEES

Raymond Aguulua (sp), City of Wainwright
Eunice Ahuakelld (sp)
Willie Akpih (sp)
Kenneth Anashugak (sp), City of Wainwright
Dennis Aveoganna
Jim Aveoganna (sp), City of Wainwright
Virginia Aveoganna
Erin Donmoyer, SLR
Della R. Driggs
Roy W. Ekak (sp)
Simon Ekak (sp)
Stacey Fritz, BLM Subsistence Specialist
Steve Hartman, BLM
John Hopson, Jr., City of Wainwright Mayor
Teresa Imm, ASRC
Jimmie F. Kagak (sp), WVFD
Lon Kelly, BLM Authorized Officer
Roy M. Nageak, BLM Barrow Office
Joe Nukapigak, Kuukpik
Agnes Okakok (sp)
Joshua Okpowruk (sp)
Keith Ongadruk (sp)
Hugh Patkotak, Chairman/CEO Olgoonik Corporation
Sandra Peetack (sp), City of Wainwright

Lisa Pekich, ConocoPhillips
Laura Perry, ConocoPhillips
Bridget Psarianos, GMT1 Planner
Bonnie Spencer
Morgan Stanton (sp)
Miranda Studstill, Accu-Type Depositions
Oliver Swan, World
Terry Qaqsu Tagarook, Wainwright
Jenna Wallis, SLR
Eugene (sp) Unidentified
Sam Unidentified
Unidentified Speaker
Dave Yokel, BLM Wildlife Biologist, Fairbanks

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:36 p.m.

MR. KELLY: I'm Lon Kelly. I'm the Field Manager for the Arctic Field Office, which includes the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, which surrounds, as everybody knows, Wainwright, and I'm really happy to be here and appreciate you inviting us to your village for this meeting and I'm glad that we were able to find a place to do it, since the community center is frozen up.

INVOCATION

An invocation was given by Mr. Tagarook.

INTRODUCTIONS/ ROLL CALL

MR. KELLY: So I'd like to ask everybody to just turn down your cell phone alert so you don't have a startle reaction when they go off. The exits, I think there's only one way out, which is there, and if the place does start on fire and we have to get out, let's meet over across the street there by the hotel.

I've already introduced myself. So I think what we'll do is we'll just go around the room like this and just intersperse our BLM introductions with your introductions, so we know who's who.

Participants introduced themselves and stated their affiliation, if any.

MR. KELLY: So this meeting this evening is to talk about a proposal by ConocoPhillips to develop a road, about a seven -- just under eight-mile road from a pad, a drill pad that's being constructed right now north of Nuiqsut near the Nigliq Channel called CD5.

So the plan is to develop another drill pad further to the west that would produce the first oil from public lands and public minerals in NPRA.

It also will produce quite a bit of oil from ASRC minerals.

So we'll have this presentation shortly and then what we'll do is once we open the meeting formally, we'll just have the mics on and the transcriber will be transcribing and so everything that's said will be on the record and if you ask questions or make comments, they'll be considered part of the public comment, but if you have written comments or would like to say something more formally, you can wait until the end and we'll also have time for that after you've had a chance to assimilate what -- what's happening.

This is also a subsistence hearing as required by Section 810 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. What that Act says is that when there is going to be or thought to be a significant impact on the subsistence practices, by which we mean access to subsistence species or the species themselves, we'll have subsistence hearings in villages that will be significantly affected.

We'll get to this in the last part of the presentation. We don't think that this action will have a significant impact in and of itself on subsistence

access and subsistence species, but taken as a whole with everything that we can see probably coming on the North Slope, including offshore development and onshore facilities to support that offshore development, we do think that there will be significant impacts to access to subsistence species over the next few decades.

So we feel that this action taken as a whole, taken as part of the whole requires us to hold this subsistence hearing. So now, we'll read a little statement, open the hearing and go from there.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION / ANILCA 810 Hearing

MS. WALLIS: 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 NPRA.

You will have the opportunity to ask questions and provide public comment. If you would like to speak, please do so loudly and identify yourself for the record. The entire meeting will be recorded and on the record to ensure all comments are captured.

MR. KELLY: So -- and I'm going to go over just the outline of the presentation. We're going to describe the project. We're going to talk a little bit about the process, the National Environmental Policy Act that requires us to do this process and have these public meetings.

We're going to talk about the alternatives that we've identified and a little bit about how to read the document and then we're going to have Dave talk about the caribou sections, because I think that's the section that probably people care about the most, as far as the biological impacts that we analyze.

We'll talk about how to comment on the plan and then we'll finish with a discussion on subsistence issues that Stacey will lead and then we'll have that last chance for public comments where you can summarize your comments or read a formal statement or -- and at the end of that, we'll close the period for comments.

If you have any other questions about what BLM's up to, BLM practices or our projects, I'll stay as long as anyone cares to or we get kicked out. So sometimes that works pretty good as a forum for

discussion, but it's not necessary.

So it's Bridget Psarianos who is the lead planner who is pulling together this document, which runs about 1,000 pages. So we'll going to go through the document and kind of set the stage here. I'd like to say, if you have questions as we go along, you're welcome to ask them. They'll all be part of the record.

MS. PSARIANOS: And if you guys have trouble hearing me, just wave and I can talk louder. So my name is Bridget and I'm the planner for this document that BLM is preparing and it's to evaluate a proposal by ConocoPhillips to develop an oil production pad in the National Petroleum Reserve.

The pad itself would be about 11 miles from Nuiqsut and it's about 205 miles away from Wainwright and we've also gone to most of these other villages. We'll be going to Anaktuvuk Pass tomorrow to continue talking about the document and getting public comments on it.

This slide shows a map of where the project is proposed to be. It's -- might be a little blurry, but...

MR. YOKEL: There's a pointer on the...

MR. KELLY: A couple of them.

MS. PSARIANOS: Okay. So the Greater Mooses Tooth Unit is right in here and this is the boundary of the National Petroleum Reserve and this, to give you a sense of scope, this is the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and so oil developed at the Greater Mooses Tooth 1 pad would travel by pipeline to the Alpine facility that's currently owned and operated by ConocoPhillips and then any sales quality oil would be carried by pipeline all the way eastward to the TAPS and then it would travel south from there.

So it would be used -- a lot of this would be used with existing Alpine facility infrastructure and I just wanted to give you guys a quick overview of what the process that BLM is doing is (sic). It's part of the National Environmental Policy Act, which applies to projects with federal involvement like federal funding or federal authorizations.

So for this project, the Bureau of Land Management would be issuing an authorization for a permit to drill for the actual pad, as well as a right-of-way for the proposed road and pipeline, which would go across

BLM land, as well as Kuukpik land.

The point of his Environmental Policy Act is so that the government can make informed decisions and get public involvement and public comments and it requires us to analyze the proposed action and identify reasonable alternative ways to do the project and to evaluate and kind of daylight impacts that could come to the environment -- to both people and the environment.

The main -- the main reason we're here is for the public involvement part of NEPA that requires us to get public input and have you guys help us identify areas where we might have missed impacts and so we have two earlier documents that apply to this project that Conoco is proposing.

One of them is the recent BLM -- it's the IAP, integrated activity plan, which is sort of a master leasing plan for the area. That document has a lot of best management practices and mitigation measures that apply to the entire NPRA, so the -- across most of the area, as well as some specific mitigation measures that would apply to on-the-ground projects.

This document is actually -- it's called a supplemental environmental

impact statement because we're supplementing an environmental impact statement that BLM did back in 2004 that analyzed this project. It analyzed basically the entire Alpine field and so we're doing this subsequently to evaluate new circumstances that have arisen over the last 10 years, so new data that we have, as well as the fact that the project itself has changed. The drill pad has moved and the road is a little bit shorter and we also wanted to provide new opportunities for public participation since it has been 10 years.

We have a lot of cooperating agencies on the project. The Army Corps of Engineers is a cooperating agency. They were at the meetings in Barrow and Nuiqsut, so some of you might have seen them there. The EPA is also involved, so is Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. The State of Alaska is also a cooperating agency and the North Slope Borough, as well as the Native Village of Nuiqsut, and again, if you guys have any questions, just stop me.

This map shows the land status in the area. It's also up on the wall if anybody wants to look at it up close later, and so as you can see, the drill

pad is right here and there's the proposed road and pipeline and it would tie in at CD5, which is on Kuukpik-owned land and we also believe that most of what would be developed would be ASRC minerals. I think it's about 90% ASRC minerals that would be developed on the pad, but the pad itself is on Bureau of Land Management surface.

Part of the National Environmental Policy Act requires us to evaluate an alternative which is no action. So if BLM decides that we're going to deny Conoco's application for a permit to drill and deny the right-of-way, what sort of the baseline right now is, and so this is that map. It's not very interesting looking, but it has CD5 on there, Nuiqsut right down here and the proposed Nuiqsut Spur Road and the road and bridge to CD5 are dotted lines, because those are currently permitted and are getting construction underway.

This map is Conoco's proposed project. As I said before, the pad would be right here and this is the pipeline and road. The road under Conoco's proposed action is 7.8 miles and it would be gravel and would connect to CD5.

This blue area shows what are called setbacks. These are BLM management decisions that try to keep oil and gas infrastructure away from major waterways. So this area is the Fish Creek setback, which is an important waterway for subsistence and this is the Ublutuoch River setback.

Under Conoco's proposed action, some of the road and pipeline would go through the Fish Creek setback. So Conoco would seek a waiver or an exception from that from BLM and this map also shows the Clover material site. That's where Conoco has proposed to take gravel from to build the road and the pad. It also shows the existing ASRC mine site.

Questions so far? As I said before, BLM has to consider other alternatives to the proposed actions. So what we did was we looked at what the alternatives were in the 2004 EIS that analyzed this project and sort of tiered off of those, so things that were alternatives in 2004 were updated and evaluated again.

This alternative is called Alternative B and it tries to avoid putting infrastructure in the Fish Creek setback that I just talked about earlier, since

it is an important subsistence waterway. Under this alternative, the road and pipeline would take a more southern route and avoid that setback area. Although, this route would be somewhat challenging. There's some thaw basins here. It would have one less bridge and one less large culvert, but otherwise, it would still tie in at CD5 and there would still be a bridge over the Ublutuoch River.

Alternative C was included at the request of the Native Village of Nuiqsut, who is a cooperating agency. They were interested in seeing what some of the economic benefits would be to them from more industrial activity closer to their town.

So under this alternative, there would still be a road and a pipeline connecting to CD5, but then the Nuiqsut Spur Road, which is currently being constructed by Kuukpik Corporation, would be widened to an industrial grade road and the Nuiqsut Airport would be extended.

The airport extension would also require a bridge over a small waterway there and this alternative has the most gravel fill and the largest footprint of any alternative. It also isn't something BLM could probably

pick as its preferred alternative because we don't have any jurisdiction to make it happen. Kuukpik has said that they oppose the widening of the spur road and so it doesn't really seem like this would be an alternative the BLM could move forward with to permit the project. No questions on that?

MR. PATKOTAK: I've got one for you.

MS. PSARIANOS: Okay.

MR. PATKOTAK: When you say setback, are you specifically targeting subsistence activity within that?

MS. PSARIANOS: Yes.

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

MR. PATKOTAK: Hugh Patkotak, Chairman/CEO for Olgoonik Corporation.

MS. STUDSTILL: Thank you.

MS. PSARIANOS: Yes, the setbacks were -- they're only for certain waterways that are biologically sensitive or important for subsistence. I think the Fish Creek setback has been around since 1998.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

MS. PSARIANOS: And it's three miles on either side of the river. That's the largest setback we have in the entire National Petroleum Reserve. Most of the other setbacks are half a mile to a mile.

MR. TAGAROOK: That have (indiscernible) Terry. Yeah (affirmative), when you look at the map, you can see all of these ponds and I don't know how far up this picture was taken of the map, but when you get -- when you have a closer look, all those ponds are ended up connected with little streams here, here this way, going that way and in some years, there might be some drought and then the fish will be in different places, not through the one that are -- where it's kind of dry on some years and you need to consider those facts, too, and those fish will travel through the little streams to the other ponds and you think there's no fish, but there are.

MS. PSARIANOS: Right. We actually -- we have a lot of maps in this document and we have a hard copy in there, too, and one of them tries to identify all of the fish-bearing water bodies in the project area. I mean, we know it's not perfect, but if you'd like to take a look at that and if you

have any feedback on that, that would be great, but we know it's kind of hard to tell where the fish go all the time.

We also have mitigation measures for building infrastructure near water, as well as for water removal for ice roads. So we try to do what we can to make sure that we're not overly impacting streams that are fish-bearing.

MAYOR HOPSON: I -- right here, John Hopson for the record. To kind of ease the fish-bearing part, how many percent of the -- or how many bodies of water are near the proposed pipeline and road that are fish-bearing? Do you have that information?

MS. PSARIANOS: Not offhand. I can find it in...

MAYOR HOPSON: But based on the information you know, I mean that's just something to ease the mind of that question that...

MS. PSARIANOS: Right. Well, Lon can you flip...

MR. KELLY: I might be able to find it.

MS. PSARIANOS: Okay, well, I have this one, too. This might be easier to look through. I know there's a fish -- fish-bearing water body map

in there somewhere that might be kind of around there.

MR. TAGAROOK: Could I make a comment?

MS. PSARIANOS: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

MR. TAGAROOK: Terry again, you know, one -- when -- way before these structures were built, way before Nuiqsut ever came -- went back, our people were nomadic from the east and to the west and they'd pass down information where all these fish-bearing lakes were. It's all up here in the information. We didn't have no papers, but they had it up there and they passed down the information where all of the fish-bearing lakes are and where all the fish go in to spawn and these are some things that -- and I can notice that you're looking for where are the fish-bearing lakes, but our people knew it up here in their -- in their heads and passed that information from people from the east to the west and if you are thinking about making roads, you better come and talk with the people that are going to be affected because they know where the fish-bearing lakes are and one year, we went to Nuiqsut and then they took us for a ride and -- and we -- they said they were getting water to make the ice road, but when

we stopped, we saw little small frys on the ice road, then I think you need to watch out for those fish-bearing lakes and where you get the water to make the ice roads. Those are some things that you need to look at. Thank you.

MS. PSARIANOS: Thank you.

MR. PATKOKAT: Another question on the setback, does it pertain to all of the rivers within the state of Alaska or is this pertaining to the North Slope?

MS. PSARIANOS: No, this is -- we only have setbacks established, at least for purposes of this project, within the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska. They're -- they're just BLM management measures and so that's why I was saying Conoco could seek a waiver or an exception from it if they submitted something to us in writing and we reviewed it and we thought, "Okay, this isn't going to have a lot of overly negative impacts on fish and things like that," but you know, our management practices can only apply to BLM lands.

MR. PATKOKAT: And where did this setback come from?

MR. YOKEL: I can address that, Bridgett. Back in 1997 and '98, when we wrote the first land use plan for this part of the NPRA, the North Slope Borough government actually wrote their own alternative for that plan and they worked with the people of Nuiqsut and the people said, "We want a three-mile buffer on either side of Fish Creek with no development," and that made it through that plan to the decision. So that's where we got this three-miles on either side of Fish Creek buffer, a smaller buffer around the Ublutuoch River and some of the others in the area.

MR. PATKOKAT: Specific to that region?

MR. YOKEL: Yes.

MS. FRITZ: No, I -- I can actually add to that, that in the last plan we did, the IAP, we went ahead and tried to identify all the rivers that would be important subsistence rivers that were on BLM-managed land and put buffers around those. So most of the Kuk here out of Wainwright is on the Olgoonik (ph) Corporation land, but the tributaries of the Kuk, for example, are on BLM-managed land. So the Kaolak, Ketik and Avalik (sp) all have those buffers also because they're recognized as important

subsistence rivers.

MR. PATKOKAT: Okay, that's the reason I'm asking. The bigger the river, I think the setback should be a little wider and that's what I'm questioning and...

MS. FRITZ: And I think...

MR. PATKOKAT: ...while we have yet an opportunity to persist on the changes (sic).

MR. TAGAROOK: And if you remember that the fish-bearing lakes should have a much more -- buffer zone so that the fish-bearing lakes won't be affected by...

MAYOR HOPSON: But I think the idea of building roads, permanent roads would help mitigate that problem about fish-bearing lakes. Every year, they're building ice roads and they're having to use lakes from all over to build these ice roads. The more permanent roads we can put in, the less we have to deal with fresh water lakes and salt waters to deal with that (sic).

So we will have -- and over time, less affect on fish-bearing lakes

than we would today and that's, you know, that's kind of the concept there that I understand.

MR. TAGAROOK: And when (indiscernible) do come in, it's going to be more people coming in and messing up the fish-bearing lakes that we care about and they won't care about it.

MAYOR HOPSON: But those are -- those are part of the -- the benefits everybody's been looking for, you know, we have the high cost of freight. We have the high cost of fuel and it's because we fly everything in, except our fuel. We're always barging them, but to have permanent roads in place so we can haul stuff, it's going to be cheaper, especially on our end, the local end where it cost almost nine grand to barge a truck from Anchorage to here, 4,500 from Prudhoe to Wainwright. If we had a permanent road, you'd do it on your own dime by buying fuel and hotel stay, that's about it.

MR. TAGAROOK: I'm just saying these are...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If you want me to narrate this (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

MR. TAGAROOK: ...the resources that we depend on. They can't say anything about them, what these people are going to do (sic). We depend on some of these subsistence resources and we look at Nuiqsut, it's been encompassed by those oil -- oil companies that are coming in.

MS. PSARIANOS: Well -- well...

MR. TAGAROOK: It used to be you could barely see Deadhorse, right. Now it's surrounded by all the oil.

MS. PSARIANOS: Yeah (affirmative), and one thing I should have mentioned earlier, I apologize, we also have -- BLM has setbacks in place for fish-bearing water bodies. It's a 500-foot buffer. So it's not as big as for the rivers, but if Conoco wants to build a road and a pipeline closer than 500 feet to a fish-bearing water body, then they also have to apply to BLM for an exception and for this project, some of these, they are going to have to, but it's something that BLM's going to look at very closely.

MR. KELLY: And it -- I think you can see from this map that all the shaded lakes and rivers, these are -- this is an area that we've done a lot of research on. You can see that we knew that this was coming and we did a

lot of surveying on these lakes.

So the lakes that have no shading, they weren't surveyed, but these other lakes have been surveyed and the ones that are the darkest have fish species, besides ninespine sticklebacks and these other have stickleback and the shaded streams have fish and the species that are on this map, you know, range from black fish to sockeye.

So we do have pretty good data on the streams, better than we have almost any place else in NPRA on the -- the fish in the streams and lakes and I appreciate your comments on the importance of understanding that connectivity between these water bodies.

MR. NUKAPIGAK: My name's Joe Nukapigak from Nuiqsut. I -- would you kind of clarify that the setback is no permanent facility (sic)? Could you clarify that?

MS. PSARIANOS: Right. So there is a setback for no permanent oil and gas facilities. These setback don't apply to things like subsistence cabins and infrastructure. They're just for oil and gas facilities. For rivers and streams, they vary by the water body. So like I was saying, Fish

Creek's three miles. The Ublutuoch's a mile-and-a-half. A lot of them are about half-a-mile or a quarter-of-a-mile, but any fish-bearing -- fish-bearing lake is 500 feet setback from, I think it's the shoreline.

MR. KELLY: And that could change, too, as we learn more about the lakes, you know, if we found out this lake has fish in it and we didn't survey it before. It would have to have that setback.

MS. PSARIANOS: Yeah (affirmative).

MR. PATKOKAT: When you're about to do research, I mean, anything prior to development and how do -- how do you choose a certain area to go into the (indiscernible) broad sweep of a certain region or just slice-by-slice by development?

MR. KELLY: I think Dave probably is best suited to...

MR. YOKEL: Well, I -- there's been so much work done in this area because ConocoPhillips and their predecessor Arco and Phillps have shown interest in this area since 1999. They bought leases in our first lease sale in '99, and they've been doing exploration drilling out in that area every since. I don't know, Lisa, correct me, maybe 25 to 30 wells, so we know they're

interested in this area.

We've been doing fishery research in this area. Fish and Game has been and so has ConocoPhillips and their contractors, all working together to get as much information as possible and some of those contractors have been talking to the local people in Nuiqsut about the fish, too.

MS. PEKICH: Lisa Pekich for the record. Terry, I just want to clarify when you're talking about other people showing up. There isn't a permanent road across the Colville. I mean, it's still not accessible from the haul road, only from the ice roads there, does Alpine and Nuiqsut get connected. So it's not -- there isn't -- there isn't access that way.

MR. TAGAROOK: But it's going to happen after I'm gone, you know.

MS. PEKICH: I just wanted to make sure you...

MR. TAGAROOK: Not in my lifetime, but it's going to happen in the future.

MAYOR HOPSON: It might even be during your lifetime. You never know.

MS. PSARIANOS: If there's no more questions about setbacks -- so this is the last alternative that BLM is looking at right now and this actually has no road between CD5 and the Greater Mooses Tooth 1 production pad. So Conoco's production pad would get built at the proposed site, which is west of Nuiqsut and then there would be an airstrip built out there and the pad would be accessible by ice road in the winter and aircraft year-round.

We would still have bridges to support the pipeline, but there would just not be that additional road between the two pads. So this would have a lot more air traffic than the other alternatives. The pad would also be slightly larger. Under the proposed action and the other three alternatives, the pad is about 11.8 acres large. Under this alternative, it's about 15.2 acres. So it's considerably bigger because there would need to be additional infrastructure on the pad for emergency response and a camp for personnel and things like that. Yes.

MR. PATKOKAT: The same, you know, when I looks at the setbacks on the creeks or the rivers, does that same thing apply to the other regions for the same margins?

MS. PSARIANOS: Yeah (affirmative), well, these -- these setbacks are -- apply under every alternative.

MR. PATKOKAT: Okay, even the ones on -- further on top and to...

MS. PSARIANOS: These, yes. These all apply. The reason they kind of stop and start like this is because this is Kuukpik land and so as I said earlier, the setbacks only apply on BLM-managed land. If Kuukpik wanted to enforce these setbacks on their land, they could adopt something similar, but we at BLM can only control what happens on BLM land.

This slide is a map showing all of the action alternatives on one map. It's a little bit easier to look at than when you're looking at a bunch of lines on four different maps. We also have these as handouts in case anybody wants to take them home, but you can see basically Alternatives A, C, and D all use the same route for the pipeline and for A and C, it would be the same route for the road.

The purple line is Alternative B, which goes further south to avoid that Fish Creek setback, which is a little confusing, but on this map, it's green instead of blue, and the blue line shows the widening of the Nuiqsut

Spur Road under Alternative C and the expansion of the airport and this brown airstrip would be the Alternative D airstrip. Yeah (affirmative).

MS. IMM: Teresa Imm for the record. How far does the Alternative A and C go into the Fish Creek setback? What is the distance for the pipeline and road?

MS. PSARIANOS: I think it's -- I think it runs through it for something like four -- between four and five miles.

MS. IMM: So...

MS. PSARIANOS: I'm not sure how deep in.

MS. IMM: In what -- in length and then it's what, maybe half-a-mile inside the buffer?

MS. PSARIANOS: Right.

MR. KELLY: There's a little scale down there. So it looks like it's a little more than two miles.

MS. IMM: So about three miles in length and about half-a-mile inside the buffer?

MR. KELLY: If that.

MS. PSARIANOS: Right.

MS. IMM: Okay.

MS. PSARIANOS: Yeah (affirmative), it's not -- it's not deep into the buffer by any means and it is a three-mile -- it's three miles on either side, so...

MR. KELLY: It looks like about half a mile at the deepest spot.

MS. PSARIANOS: So if there are no more questions on that, here's some of the big components of the alternatives. The drill pad size, like I mentioned before, is larger under Alternative D. This also compares the length of the road. So Alternative A and C, the road -- this is just the road from CD5 to the production pad, so the new road that would be built. It's slightly longer under Alternative B because it goes a little further south to avoid that setback area and so Alternative A has the least amount of cubic yards of fill, just because the road's a little bit shorter.

Alternative B's the -- has the second most (sic) fill, yeah (affirmative), second lowest (sic) and then Alternative C has the greatest amount of fill and Alternative D is the third in line for most fill.

As I said before, BLM is doing its NEPA process. The idea behind our environmental impact statement is that it will also serve for permits that other agencies have to issue. So the Army Corps of Engineers is also going to issue a 404 permit, which is what enables ConocoPhillips to fill wetlands and the North Slope Borough will also be issuing quite a few permits, zoning permits and I think the state will also be issuing a lot of water use permits. So we're hoping that by working together on this document, that they'll all be able to incorporate this for their permitting decisions.

This draft SEIS that we're here to talk to you about was released on February 21st for public review. Right now, we're in a 60-day public comment period that ends on April 22nd and -- although we have had some requests for extensions. BLM is going to address all of the substantive comments that we receive in the final. It will be its own separate chapter where we address public comments and respond to them and this draft doesn't identify a preferred alternative and in the final EIS, BLM will have a preferred alternative and generally, it's not just BLM adopting whole hog one of the alternatives in the document.

Usually, it will pick and choose parts of each alternative. So that might affect the way you comment. It's not generally very helpful if people just vote for an alternative because usually, BLM will incorporate parts of each, and then BLM is going to prepare a final supplemental EIS that will hopefully be released sometime this summer and then there will be about a 30-day period for a public review of that document and then a record of decision will be issued and that will adopt probably the preferred alternative, as well as any new mitigation measures that BLM adopts for this project.

MAYOR HOPSON: How -- how firm are you on those dates?

MS. PSARIANOS: Well, we're -- we're as firm as we can be. I mean, we know right now that the public comment period is scheduled to end of April 22nd and then we're going to draft the preferred alternative in consultation with our cooperating agencies, but we still need time to go through all the public comments, fix any errors we identify in the draft, but we're hoping to, you know, move as quickly as we can while still doing a good job and addressing all the impacts properly.

MR. PATKOKAT: On Wainwright, Nuiqsut's with (indiscernible) over there east of us. What's the primary reason for this meeting today?

MS. PSARIANOS: Well, Stacey Fritz is going to talk kind of extensively about that, but as part of this process, there were a lot of studies done for caribou and subsistence and so cumulatively, the subsistence impacts could be felt in Wainwright, which -- not from this GMT1 project, but with all reasonably foreseeable development in the area, because of the migratory patterns of some of the caribou herds.

Our subsistence subcontractor found there could be impacts in Wainwright. Also, there's, you know, a level of interest here because of interest in royalties and things like that.

MR. PATKOKAT: Yeah (affirmative), I could see where the difference would be for us, you know, what we've learned from the east and think about cultural shifting here and I think we definitely do need to have an education all across the board, you know, in terms of (indiscernible).

MS. PSARIANOS: And so I know that, you know, there are a lot of public meetings up on the Slope and you guys probably hear a lot about all

these different documents that people want you to review and so we had talked about kind of going through what we think are some of the more important parts of the document and kind of just how it's set up and so as Lon said earlier, this is about 1,000 pages.

Chapter One is just an introduction. So it's basically what we just talked about right now. Chapter Two runs through the alternatives. So that's also kind of what I just summarized, but it gives you more detail about each alternative and a lot of numbers.

Chapter Three is called the affected environment section and that's basically -- it goes resource by resource. We address about 20 different resources; water, air, caribou, fish, and go through and just try to write down everything that we know right now, data-wise, about what the situation is on the ground.

Then Chapter Four is really kind of the main part of the document. It talks about what impacts BLM thinks would be felt from this project, both the direct and indirect impacts from the production pad and cumulative impacts from other reasonably foreseeable development, so

things like continued expansion westward, a potential road to Umiat, potential future pipeline, you know, additional impacts from climate change. Those are all in the cumulative section in Chapter Four and it also discusses mitigation measures and any impacts from spills are also in here.

MR. PATKOKAT: Considering what we're seeing today, I mean, I'm sorry I missed some of this stuff and now I was just thinking about when I -- right before I walked in here was kind of like, do we ever follow through after effects of development?

MS. PSARIANOS: Well, one of -- I mean, one of the reasons we're doing this supplemental EIS is because Conoco has been required to do a lot of monitoring and a lot of research over -- especially in the last nine years because of the Alpine development and so they have done a lot of monitoring out there and this document goes a long way in trying to include all the studies on caribou and water, and you know, there's now an air quality monitoring station in Nuiqsut and so, you know, we're glad that we have the benefit of all of that research to make this document, you know, a lot more detailed than I think the 2004 one was.

MR. PATKOKAT: Yeah (affirmative). Yeah (affirmative), I've been flying for a long time up here, most -- more than half my life I've seen more sensors up here and that's where some of these questions come from.

MS. PSARIANOS: Yeah (affirmative).

MR. PATKOKAT: And I've seen the impacts of development before and afterwards, air quality, even on the ground, affecting the water quality, that's where -- that's where some of these questions are coming from.

MS. PSARIANOS: Yeah (affirmative). Yeah (affirmative), we're really trying to incorporate all the new data that we've gotten as a result of the development out there, because otherwise, what's the point of making industry do all the monitoring if we're not going to use it.

MR. PATKOKAT: Yeah (affirmative).

MS. PSARIANOS: And so if there's no more questions about that, I'll turn it over to Dave Yokel to talk about some of the caribou studies that have been going on and what's in the document for that.

MR. YOKEL: Thank you, Bridgett. There are many different resources to assess the impacts of this development on (sic) and this EIS

tries to assess the impacts on all of those resources and social issues and so we're going to use caribou now as an example of how we try to assess the impacts, place them in different levels of impact.

So this -- this table shows how the impacts were broken down into four different categories of impact and each of those categories broken down into three different levels of impact. So for instance, what is the intensity of the impact? Is it high, medium or low, and so the definition of those three levels for impacts of terrestrial mammals was that if it affects more than 25% of the habitat for a species or more than 25% of the population, then it's a high level impact. If it affects between 5% and 25%, it was determined to be medium and if it's less than 5%, it was low.

Now in duration of the impact, how long does the impact last? It was considered to be long-term if it lasts five or more breeding seasons, interim in nature if it lasts two or longer breeding seasons, but less than five, and just temporary if it lasts less than two breeding seasons.

As far as context, this one's a little bit more difficult to understand, at least for me, that it was considered unique if the resource is rare or if it's

been depleted for some reason. It's important if it's protected by legislation or has a distinctive role in the ecosystem, but it doesn't meet the criteria of unique and it's just common if the resource is ordinary or local in the area.

Now, as far as geographic extent, that's how widely is the impact felt? So the highest level is -- this calls it statewide, but for our case, it's just throughout the Arctic coastal plain of the North Slope, regional if the habitat change or the effect on caribou is -- extends from 300 feet out to the range of the population and it's just local if the impact is felt underneath the gravel and within 300 feet of it.

So those are how -- those are the definitions that we set up beforehand to say, "Okay, this impact is high, medium or low in nature."

MR. TAGAROOK: Dave.

MR. YOKEL: Yeah (affirmative).

MR. TAGAROOK: Just before you turn the slide off, so unique and important, they're -- when you talk about those, it's just before oil activities are going on or...

MR. YOKEL: Yes, this is what we think it is now.

MR. TAGAROOK: Without the oil activities going?

MR. YOKEL: Right, so...

MR. TAGAROOK: Okay.

MR. YOKEL: And we're going to talk about caribou in a minute, but caribou are common in the area.

MR. TAGAROOK: Yeah (affirmative).

MR. YOKEL: And caribou habitat is common in the area.

MR. TAGAROOK: Okay, I have a follow-up question. If industry should come in toward the west, the important and the common would become unique because of the oil activity that's going to be happening in the future, so...

MR. YOKEL: Well...

MR. TAGAROOK: And it will be affecting your route probably.

MR. YOKEL: In the case of caribou, if development was to move far enough to the northwest, you would get into the Teshekpuk Herd's calving area and so that would raise the level of impact under context, according to these...

MR. TAGAROOK: I'm sorry, I think I'm getting ahead of myself, just movement toward the west toward our way, have you done any studies on the west side?

MR. YOKEL: We have not tried to assess the impacts of anything west of this because we have no proposals. We've tried to assess the impacts overall in our land use plan that we completed a year ago, but it's not with the -- as much definition as we have here, because we didn't have a specific proposal to deal with then.

MR. KELLY: We do look -- we do look at a broader area for cumulative.

MR. YOKEL: True, yeah (affirmative), in this. Anything else? So here's the results of that impact assessment and we see that for terrestrial mammals, the results were the same for all three of Alternatives A, B, and C. So they're lumped together here in one table and the rows highlighted in yellow are the ones for caribou.

So this top row up here talks about the impact level on caribou habitat and it says that it will be low in intensity because it will only be

with -- the effects will only be within 300 feet of the gravel pad. It will be long-term because those facilities, if built, will be there for a long time. It's common because caribou habitat is very common in this area and the geographical extent, again, is local.

Now the effect of disturbance on the caribou, if we're talking about non-calving caribou, the intensity is low because it would affect less than 5% of the herd. It's long-term again, because it will stay there a long time. It will be important because caribou themselves are important in the ecosystem and local, and then the same again for calving caribou because the caribou don't calve closely enough to this proposed development for it to be any more impact on it.

When we get to Alternative D, we again see the same impact levels for habitat loss and alteration, but the big difference we have here is for, excuse me, non-calving caribou, the intensity level is medium and that's because there's -- there would be a lot more air traffic under this alternative. This is the one that doesn't have the road access, so everything would have to be flown in, in the summer and a lot of it would still be flown in, in the

winter. So there would be a lot more disturbance of caribou and it would occur -- so it would affect more than 5% of the caribou herd.

It's still long-term and it's still important, but now the geographic extent is greater because the disturbance by aircraft goes more than 300 feet beyond the footprint of the development because that noise is herd for a longer distance.

For calving caribou, it's still the same as above because caribou, for the most part, don't calve within about 20 miles of this area. Any questions on this table?

So as it was stated earlier, ConocoPhillips has been doing a lot of studies in this area for almost -- well, almost 10 years since the 2004 EIS, and when they permitted CD4, the North Slope Borough required that they do caribou and fish and subsistence studies within a 30-mile radius of CD4.

So this is the area in which they've been doing caribou studies in the NPRA and within this area, they've done aerial surveys. So they fly back and forth on established routes and count the number of caribou and this way, they can determine the density of caribou in this block, but note that

here's the proposed development right here, GMT1, so density within this whole block is not necessarily the same as caribou density right within the -- say a quarter-mile or less of this development and the next slide will show that.

Here's the results of those aerial surveys and there's a lot of data points here and the reason there are is because they use a different symbol in every year and they did fly many different times of the year between mid April and mid November, but basically to me, the take-home message of this graph is that no matter which year it was or what season of the year, the density of caribou within that greater block were usually less than two caribou per square kilometer, which is about the same as five caribou per square mile, and in fact, during most of those surveys, the caribou density in this study block was less than one caribou per square kilometer.

Now, this is pretty busy, so bear with me and I'll try to make sense of it. These maps show data from satellite-collared caribou. So these are movements of actual caribou. It's not all the caribou in the herds. The green or dark color is animals that we believe to be Teshekpuk caribou and

the red are animals that we believe to be Central Arctic Herd caribou and there's eight maps for eight different seasons of the caribou year starting in winter, then spring migration. The next is calving, then post-calving, mosquito season, oestrid fly season, late summer and fall migration.

The same thing on the other side, except these are data from a different kind of satellite collars. So they were kept separate in this presentation. So what you can see here is that although it varies, depending on what time of the year it is, for the most part, caribou density in this larger study block is very, very low in the area of the proposed development.

Well, it's right here. The seasons where the caribou density is the highest around this GMT1 development would be in the fall migration and the oestrid fly season, which is the tail end of July and the first week or so of August.

There's less caribou in these maps because we've had less of this type of collar. This is a newer kind of collar and there's been less of those put on caribou over the years, but this map -- these maps here on this side

include data from 1990 through 2012. So that's a pretty good length of time, although we had fairly low sample sizes in the early years, but we think it gives us a pretty good representation of what caribou do and accounts for the variability among years.

So do you have any questions on this map, because I think it's my last slide. You want a last chance to take a jab at me? Go, Terry.

MR. TAGAROOK: Just one question on the end of summertime when it -- are you -- are the caribou being affected by activity that's happening when they are going out from the insect relief areas?

MR. YOKEL: Well, the two insect seasons that we recognize are the -- where'd it go, mosquito season when the caribou tend to bunch together in big groups and head into the wind and in this case, they head into the wind out toward the ocean or the oestrid fly season. These are the warble and bot flies and when those flies are bad, the caribou tend to break up and move around in kind of random directions and much smaller groups or if they come upon barren ground like a big sandbar or a partially drained lake or the beach, then they'll -- they tend to stand still with their noses down in

the sand to try to keep the flies out.

So that -- they behave differently in these two seasons and they behave that way naturally before there's any development in the area, which is the case in these maps. The only development in these maps is east. Here's the proposed development. The current development is showed here, the City of Nuiqsut and the Alpine field here.

So this -- these maps do not represent -- well, actually, part of these data are collected before the Alpine, so it's a mix of before and after Alpine here and it's -- and Nuiqsut was there before any of these data were collected. I don't know if that got the answer you're looking for.

MR. TAGAROOK: Once -- once the insects are very bad when it's hot, the caribou don't even look, they just come toward and they'll go back by...

MR. YOKEL: Yeah (affirmative).

MR. TAGAROOK: So in one case, there was one caribou that was just running away from the -- kept his eyes closed and run into the fence up at the airport.

MR. YOKEL: Yeah (affirmative), the -- you know, caribou have different motivational levels, depending on what's affecting them at the time. You know that better than I do, but when the mosquitos are really bad, they head into that wind and they don't hesitate much. They know where they need to go.

When the flies are bad, they -- they break up into little groups, but they don't pay attention to a lot of other things. I've had them walk right up to me while the flies are bothering them and they walk right by me like they don't even know I'm there, this far away. So yeah (affirmative), they -- depending on their incentive to go somewhere, there -- it's more or less easy to disturb them or alter their movements. Well, thank you.

MR. TAGAROOK: Dave, where are the caribou now?

MR. YOKEL: What?

MR. TAGAROOK: Where are the caribou now?

MR. YOKEL: Well, this is (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously) map.

MS. PSARIANOS: So like I was saying earlier, one of the reasons

we're here is to get public comments and even if you don't comment today, there's other ways you can send us letters, which I'll talk about in a minute and the most helpful comments we get are the ones that can help us identify new information that would affect our analysis.

So if you see something in the document that you think is incorrect, that would be really helpful. This is just a draft. So anything that's inaccurate or errors in the way that resources like caribou or water or air are described would be good or help us identify new impacts that we may have missed, ideas for changes to the alternatives or suggestions for any potential new mitigation measures.

That's one of the big things we're trying to focus on in this document are mitigation measures and suggestions about what you think should be in the preferred alternative in the final.

MR. TAGAROOK: Could I make some comments before you go on?

MS. PSARIANOS: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

MR. TAGAROOK: You know, with all of our elders passing on

now and there's only a few that really know where -- where they used to hunt by dog team and by boats or traversing the land by going from river to river. That -- all that information they knew is being lost, right? We are the ones that have to go out for high school -- out of Wainwright and that information that was -- they knew can't continue on. There's hardly anybody that -- alive that are healthy that knew those things that are happening (indiscernible). You know, that's something that we need to look at.

MS. PSARIANOS: So there's a few ways you can comment. Everything that is on this slide is also on one of the handouts at the door. So you can send us an email. The email address is on that piece of paper. You can write a letter and send it regular mail. You can Fax in your comments or you can hand-deliver comments here at this meeting or to our public room, either in Anchorage or Fairbanks, or you can speak at this meeting.

All of the comments are being captured by our Court Reporter, Miranda, so any comments that are made here are captured and are on the

public record.

So if we don't have any more questions about that, Stacey Fritz is going to talk about the subsistence sections and how those were written.

MS. FRITZ: Hi, so as Bridgett said, I'm just going to give you a basic idea of how the subsistence impacts were studied and how that organization is in the EIS.

So the first thing that I'd like to say is that the sections on subsistence were done by Stephen R. Braund and Associations, and I think most people in Wainwright are probably familiar with Stephen Braund. He's done a lot of research over many, many years in Wainwright, Kaktovik, Nuiqsut and Barrow and other places, but on the North Slope and in those places and a lot, specifically, in Nuiqsut for several years and he does -- so from 2010 on, he's been doing caribou use area and harvest data specifically in this area.

He does also a resource specific use area analysis. So he does a map that shows where people hunt geese and a different map that shows where people hunt caribou and a different map that shows where people hunt fur

bearers and then he shows the density. So he shows the densest area of subsistence use for each of those species. So they're very geographically specific documents.

They show the type of resources, the percent of harvest of them, the percent of harvesters that are actually successfully harvesting, the timing of those activities and the method of transportation, whether people are going by boat or four-wheeler or snow machine, whatever.

So Stephen R. Braund has also been incorporating a lot of traditional ecological knowledge into those analyses and he has also, in the Nuiqsut area, been documenting the impacts to caribou hunting that have occurred since the development of Alpine in the last '90's, and the Alpine satellites.

So as Bridgett said, in the EIS, Chapter Three would have everything that's known about subsistence in the Nuiqsut area and then Chapter Four would describe the actual impacts to subsistence. The primary impacts that have been identified are reduced availability of subsistence resources and that is primarily due to aircraft. It won't be a surprise to you that aircraft, for as many years as people have been up here studying and aircraft have

been around, aircraft has always been names as the number one impact to subsistence hunters. It doesn't reduce the number of resources, but it's the number one source of disturbance.

The other primary impact would be reduced access to subsistence use areas and hunter avoidance of industrial areas. So the actual footprint of the development project is itself not that large, but hunters tend to avoid developed areas at a much larger distance (sic). So that depends on the hunter themselves, whether they go nowhere near it. Some have no problem hunting right up next to development pads. It depends on the hunter, but we can gauge that there is an avoidance effect for developed areas.

So the result of those impacts is that hunters have to spend a lot more time, money. They have to have better equipment. They'd use their equipment more and it could actually affect the success of the hunt. In the case of Nuiqsut, these impacts would last for multiple generations. They affect key subsistence use areas and they would affect the overall Nuiqsut subsistence activities.

So I'll just show you one slide to give you an idea here. So this is Stephen R. Braund's map of the caribou subsistence use area in the project area. So the reddest is the densest, the most -- most popular-used area. You can see the Colville River is very popular, but also the area west of Nuiqsut is very popular.

The actual development itself is just a little line and a pad. The project study area expands out two-and-a-half miles in any direction from that development. So he looks at that specific area. So obviously, this project study area overlaps with the Nuiqsut subsistence use area. We can consider that in some ways, that is a loss of a traditional use area.

The very interesting thing about this development is that in three of the alternatives, including Conoco's proposed project, there's a road to the development pad and so that's what we call a counterbalancing impact because people of Nuiqsut will have the right to use that road to access that area and so while on the one hand, people might tend to avoid the developed area, on the other hand, they will have facilitated access to the area.

Now that's complicated. That could mean more people go there. There's more traffic, more disturbance of resources, but it could let -- allow people easier access. Stop me, please, at any point if you have any questions about this. So -- so that's in alternatives -- the alternatives that include a road.

Overall, Alternatives A and B, the two that Bridgett described with the road and pad up there, had the fewest impacts, mainly because there would be less air traffic involved with those alternatives and the road traffic would be limited to the road between CD5 -- so I should say A and B, not the Nuiqsut hub, but A and B, the industrial traffic would be limited to the road between CD5 and GMT1.

C, Alternative C is the alternative that would expand the industrial use of Nuiqsut and use the airport in Nuiqsut and the Kuukpik Spur Road. That would have likely more impacts because there would be more ground traffic and air traffic right near Nuiqsut and that could deflect subsistence resources away from the town.

Alternative D, that's the road-less alternative, so you would not have

that counterbalancing effect of a road that allows hunters to access the area and you would have much greater aircraft traffic in the area. So the analysis shows that would likely have the greatest impact. There would ben an airport at GMT1 and yet, no road to go -- for hunters to access the area. So that's likely to have the most impacts and that is all specifically for Nuiqsut.

So we find that all of those action alternatives, A, B, C, D, would have impacts on subsistence for Nuiqsut. By law, however, we also have to look at all the -- the big picture, as Terry was referring to, like the history of all the impacts that have occurred so far and everything that could happen in the future, what we call the cumulative analysis.

So if you look at for Nuiqsut, you have to look at the oil development that's spread west from Prudhoe Bay, Kuparuk and Alpine and effectively removed areas from the Nuiqsut subsistence use area. Then you have to look at future, potential future projects. So that is a bit of a gray area because we don't know for sure what will happen in the future, but we do have to analyze what the impacts of these future projects would

be.

So in that, we look at what the impacts would be if oil development continues west -- west of the Colville and we also look at what the impacts would be if there was development at Umiat and a road and pipeline from Umiat to the haul road.

We look at the possible future impacts of climate change on subsistence on the North Slope and we have to look at the potential impacts of offshore development, if that was to happen and pipelines and infrastructure was brought onshore.

That is one of the reasons that when we look at that entire big picture, we have to say that the impacts could extend to all of the North Slope villages. This project itself will just impact Nuiqsut.

So in addition to doing the analysis in the EIS, we do what's required by ANILCA, the ANILCA 810, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and those -- those follow very closely. It's slightly different language for that analysis, but it basically follows very closely that A, B, and C, so the alternatives with a road, would have long-term

impacts that would be of high intensity.

D would have long-term impacts of high intensity and also significant and that is basically due to the fact that there would be no road and a lot of aircraft. So does anybody have any questions about how that analysis -- one -- one thing I should say is that when Dave and Bridgett mentioned that there are many, many resources analyzed and studied in the EIS; they break it down resource-by-resource.

So subsistence, obviously, has a huge impact on sociocultural life, on economics, on environmental justice issues. Those are studied separately. So this section just looks very specifically at subsistence. However, when you then go to the other sections and look at the sociocultural impacts, they are impacted by subsistence. You can't separate them, but those -- those resources, those issues are studied separately. Any questions about any of that? Okay, thank you.

MR. KELLY: So thanks. Does anybody have any comments that you'd like to make to kind of wrap things up or written comments that you'd like to submit or comments you'd like to read?

MAYOR HOPSON: I just draw a blank on your name and I've seen you so many times.

MR. KELLY: It's Lon.

MAYOR HOPSON: I'm just trying to concentrate. John Hopson for the record, City of Wainwright Mayor. I've go to attend numerous public hearings throughout the many years that I've been out of high school, which is not a lot compared to some of the elders here, but a lot.

In today's day and age, we hunt with snow machines and four-wheelers and boats with outboards and all of that takes money to go hunt. There's only a handful of people in here that will raise their hand if I ask them, "Who's hunted with a dog team or skin boats on a yearly -- throughout the whole year, not just for one little season, but throughout the whole year?"

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: None.

MAYOR HOPSON: None, and there's us that have hunted with snow machines and boats and four-wheelers our whole life, even with trucks and -- and that's a life we know and the life we know also consists of

a high school and the life we know consists of a fire department a clinic, but all of that takes money to continue it, you know, and the North Slope Borough takes care of all of that with the tax base dollars they have from the oil and gas companies at Prudhoe Bay.

The more infrastructure we build on the North Slope, the more money your North Slope Borough gets to continue the programs we have today, your schools, your clinics, your fire department and your public works.

The North Slope Borough has no other income, zero, zilch. If we slow down the process of development with declining revenues, we cannot sustain ourselves. There's no other economy that we have money from and that's scares me. We're not diversified. We rely solely on oil and gas and that's why it's so important that we, as community leaders and as concerned citizens, must continue to be willing to sit at the table with the federal government and with the operators, so that we can have responsible development and move forward so we can continue to have what we have with a growing population and declining revenues.

I don't know where we're going to go or what we're going to do, but we need to move forward. We need to continue our progress in oil and gas. If that includes building roads, building airports, building pads, building pipelines, then so be it, because I cannot find $400 million a year for the next 40 years anywhere else. We have none.

The federal government is cutting back on grants to the native villages. The federal government is cutting back on grants to supply services everywhere else. The state of Alaska doesn't even want to say hi to us anymore. They're out doing their own thing.

So if I go back and I ask the Native Village of Wainwright or ICAS, "Can you sustain our communities with the current funding you have today if we stop oil and gas?" Every one of their council will have to say, "No," because they don't even have money to keep themselves going right now.

So we have to do this. In the last week, I've got to hear testimony from different people about this project and as -- as a community of Wainwright, I think we should support our neighboring village Nuiqsut in Alternative A.

Nuiqsut supports Alternative A. The North Slope Borough supports Alternative A. ASRC supports Alternative A. Conoco supports Alternative A. These are their projects. This -- we should be supporting them in this. It provides less impact on subsistence and it provides benefits for their community and it provides the resources to ASRC and it provides the resources to Conoco and continued jobs.

We need to continue that. I, as your city Mayor, have to come and stand up and support this based on those (sic). It's for the betterment of our people. It's for the betterment of our corporations. It's for the betterment of Nuiqsut, which they support Alternative A. So I support Alternative A.

Very few opportunities (sic) I get to speak to you guys about issues like this, so I try to do as much as I can, when I can, but we have to be proactive. We have to continue to attend these meetings. Was it Dino (sp) Olemann in Barrow who talked about traditional knowledge and how we must continue to use that?

I agree, but we're learning more. So we must continue to have these public hearings with the new information we're getting to better ourselves

as a people who live up here and that's what we should continue to do. So I encourage you guys to speak up. I encourage you guys to be involved and ask questions and learn as much as you can, but with the understanding we're gaining more knowledge about the caribou. We're gaining more knowledge about the fish. We're gaining more knowledge about the -- the birds -- and use those to our betterment.

So I think -- I think we all should agree to the idea of Alternative A being the preferred alternative that BLM should be pushing toward their Secretary of Interior. Alternative A's the way to go, based on the meetings that I've heard and the people that support it. Thank you.

MR. TAGAROOK: Can I say something? That's all good and what we need to do is educate our younger people and going off to college and take jobs away from people that are being taken over by outsiders and that's something that we need to educate our young people now, because most often, the young people don't know what's happening with the federal government or the -- the state or the council or the tribe or corporation.

We need to help our young people get jobs. They're just waiting

here, doing nothing and that is something -- that dependency upon other organizations, you know, and I wish these young people would -- I would encourage and push them and go -- go to vocational training, go onto the college, taking courses.

If I can do it, they can do it. You know, it took me longer to get my degree, but I -- I earned it and it -- and (indiscernible) paid off and I need young people like him. I'm glad he's speaking up for his age group, you know, but we need to concentrate on the younger ones that are still at school. We need to encourage them to go -- higher education and that is one way of finding jobs for them, not jobs will come to Wainwright (sic). They have to go out to find jobs nowadays. That's all I can say. Say something, guys; it's going to affect our village.

MR. NUKAPIGAK: If I may, my name's Joe Nukapigak for the record. I'm with Kuukpik Corporation. Even though at Nuiqsut I have testified (indiscernible) with impartial testimony. The Village of Nuiqsut, majority of the Nuiqsut people have -- is in support of Alternative A, because of the least environmental in that respect (sic) and even though

there's a little fraction in that whole -- except for other alternative like this no road system to help -- to the proposed project.

As we know that in the village, that when the Alpine was being developed that time of construction (indiscernible) and there was a lot of traffic, I mean airline traffic because it was (indiscernible) and (indiscernible) amount of concerns about it, but we, at first, like anybody else, we complained because of the traffic, but over time, it has, you know, we got used to it because after the operation remote on the Alpine. So it, you know, it became more clear, you know, over time and whatnot.

As my cousin here (indiscernible) was saying about this encouragement of our young people. At Nuiqsut Alpine, we have an internship program working with ConocoPhillips. Getting our young people while they're in high school, having to go to Alpine over the weekend or during the summer off when the school is out. We get these young people to (indiscernible) electrician (indiscernible) and whatnot that requires some of these technical (sic) and after that -- so we got more young people getting to the -- getting to some of those -- some of those

technical work.

It has worked well for our young people over time, getting their certification and whatnot. So it helps a lot. Encouragement for our young people is a must. Thank you.

MAYOR HOPSON: You know, I questioned the dates earlier about how firm are you with your dates. For example, when Shell got busy last year in Wainwright, we had how many people working just gravel haul, Eugene, about 16 of us? Sixteen of us just doing gravel haul when we all thought Shell was going to, you know, come and then they killed the program and decided not to come. So 99% of us got laid off and only two or three or four of them stayed on for -- to stay on for the continued part of the demob and stuff.

I ask the question about how firm are you with this so that you understand by prolonging events in this fashion, will prolong the opportunities for jobs as Joe was just talking about for the Nuiqsut residents.

Once you get something in motion and you have your set dates, stick

to them. We've had plenty of time for public comment. You don't need to extend it based on one special interest group or two. Everybody else had their time for comments and they also have time to put them in writing. So you should expand on those and that's just an example of how it affected Wainwright just on one little project when Shell decided to back off and -- and we have planned on hiring, I think maybe 20 more for different other projects and we couldn't because there was no more work to be done and that's how one decision will affect a community and that's just in Wainwright, alone. I don't know how it affected Barrow as they were really ramping up for Shell and other communities as well.

So once you have those dates, stick to them. Don't go off and go decide to go screw around with this idea of prolonging it because somebody decides, "Oh, crap, I forgot to add a T to my sentence later on." That's a -- that's a true example of what it did to Wainwright on a different scale. So stick to your dates. Tell your boss up there to quit screwing around and stick to his dates or her dates. We don't need these prolonged. There's a real positive benefit to what's happening here and that's all we

want to see are the positive benefits.

We know the negative impacts are there based on your presentation, but there's so much more positive impacts that outweigh the negatives to it. Thank you.

MR. KELLY: I'll just comment that -- so this slide, you know, we do -- we do have a couple requests to extend the comment period and we do recognize the time sensitivity of this because losing a field season, you lose a whole year. So we certainly understand that.

The government likes to be liberal about providing for public comment, but you'll notice that after that public comment period, we don't really have hard dates and that's because the big if is developing the preferred alternative, incorporating all the comments from all of our cooperators. So there are agencies working on this and it could go really smooth and we sure hope it will and we sure hope we can keep to the schedule that we originally had, but that's, right now, probably the biggest unknown that we have is how getting all those people together will work and I hope it will be worth it, because if we come out with a decision that's

inconsistent with the decisions that our cooperators, like EPA and the Corps would make, there's no point in -- in developing an alternative that can't be implemented because it can't get a Corps permit.

So we really need to coordinate all the different permitting agencies and make sure that we're on the same page, as far as a preferred alternative and decision and that, hopefully, will go smoothly, but we just can't -- we didn't feel confident on how long it was going to take to put dates on it.

MR. TAGAROOK: And you've got to also remember about the Peace, you know, the Green Peace (indiscernible) they will have an impact on the government trying to get these projects going, get it -- they'll slow us down. You've got to think about those people.

MR. KELLY: It's happened before. We'll have to see, certainly thinking about it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: May I say something?

MR. KELLY: Yes.

MR. EUGENE UNIDENTIFIED: How positive are you on these data for (indiscernible) like what John was -- he was saying about what has

been going on over here?

MS. STUDSTILL: I'm sorry, can I...

MR. EUGENE UNIDENTIFIED: I've seen -- I've seen and heard a lot of (indiscernible). They say they were going to do something next year, but then they do a setback and then they turn around and say, "I'm sorry, we're not coming back this year." Something came up and I see a lot of that negative going on up there (indiscernible) we started something up here and then (indiscernible) two -- two or three years up here. We started something over there and they shut us down and then they come back and say, "We're going to have a public meeting about something like this," and then how positive are you with it and what kind of impact are we having and what are -- what -- I want to know how positive are we.

It's going to affect us down the road again. I -- because I went through people that was doing a lot of studying here, fishery, fish and game, caribou, people inland. I've taken a lot of -- in our corporation -- our corporation took a lot of people down south. They had birds. They have things that swim in the ocean and then they turned around and say, "I'm

sorry, we're only coming next year. We'll probably be here," and right now, it's like up in the air.

How positive are you with this -- what you -- what you got going on here? Is it -- will you be coming back to us and have a good impact or is it just something that you're going to say, "I'm sorry, we're heading back again"?

MR. KELLY: Well, I'm quite sure that -- I would bet my own money that we'll be back here doing something similar next year or the year after.

MR. EUGENE UNIDENTIFIED: Because I've seen a lot -- I'm sorry, I've seen a lot of it over here.

MR. KELLY: Yeah (affirmative), I think -- I think you're asking me something that I'm not qualified to judge, you know.

MR. EUGENE UNIDENTIFIED: It's -- we need answers. We need -- we need to put people to work here.

MR. KELLY: Right.

MR. EUGENE UNIDENTIFIED: And I...

MR. KELLY: It's...

MR. EUGENE UNIDENTIFIED: I do a lot of encouragement, too, for our young people, when you get out of high school, go out, go to school, get away from home, get some education. It's a way that you can help our young people here in Wainwright, about take them out to school, put them somewhere.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or hire them during the summer.

MR. EUGENE UNIDENTIFIED: Make them learn and make them see what's coming ahead of us, because down the road, I'm not going to be here. I'm almost there for retirement, too, myself, because I'm going to see it down the road. I'll be sitting on my couch wanting to (indiscernible).

MR. KELLY: Okay, well, how about this -- how about if we -- okay, so that's a big question, is what BLM can do to help people, help young people get jobs and that's really not this...

MR. EUGENE UNIDENTIFIED: I mean -- I mean, not just BLM, like you know, an oil company, send someone up here to teach our young people here to go out and do them some kind of (indiscernible - speaking

simultaneously)...

MR. KELLY: This is a real good...

MR. EUGENE UNIDENTIFIED: ...or something.

MR. KELLY: It's a real good thing to discuss, but what I'd like to do is close the discussion on this project and then we can talk about that as much as you'd like, okay? So Erin, or somebody should...

MS. STUDSTILL: I'm sorry, before we go off record, can I get your name?

MR. EUGENE UNIDENTIFIED: Sorry, Eugene (indiscernible).

MS. STUDSTILL: It's fine, all right, thank you.

MS. IMM: I've been (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

MR. KELLY: Wait a minute.

MS. IMM: We're not done.

MR. KELLY: Okay, go ahead.

MS. IMM: So I'm Teresa Imm and I'm with Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and it's nice to be in Wainwright again. ASRC has traveled to all the community hearings, particularly because this is ASRC minerals, as

they said, that are being developed under this project and we think it's important for people in our communities and our shareholders to understand that Conoco is developing minerals from ASRC.

I'm happy to be sitting next to Joe. Joe and I have actually worked on this project together since 2002, and ASRC and Kuukpik were very strategic in making our land selections so that we could select lands in this particular area to be developed by oil and gas.

We also worked together with respect to the Fish Creek setback and what that setback meant with -- with future development and this is a project that has actually been reviewed in 2004 under an EIS and now it's up for a supplementary EIS, but a lot of the comments I hear in here are very important for discussion because communities do gear up for projects and they make investments in these projects and then there are changes in decision that then the community or the village corporation or independent business owner loses that investment when a project gets stopped.

Likewise with workforce development, you know, people learn a skill set in anticipation to go to work and then when a project gets stopped,

they don't have that job at the other end and so these are things that are really important to ASRC and that's why we're traveling around to the communities, mostly to hear what individuals in the communities have (sic), but also to share that, you know, these are ASRC's resources.

We will receive a royalty revenue through this development. It's through our royalty revenues that we're allowed to make that dividends that we can -- have been making to our shareholders. We've listened in Nuiqsut. We've talked about, with Kuukpik, about the road and the desire for the people in the community to have a road and to have access along that road so that they can access -- have easier access to the Fish Creek area, which is an important subsistence area for the community. So ASRC supports a road to the project.

People in the community do not want additional air traffic. So having a standalone airfield would be a negative impact. It impacts subsistence through disturbance to the animals. It impacts quality of life through noise in the village and so people in the community have asked that they don't have a standalone airport out there, that they would rather

have a road so that they have access and that the access be open to people in the community and the residents of the community.

So because of that, and because of our discussions with Kuukpik, discussions with the community, our long-term involvement, ASRC is supportive of a road and Alternative A, in particular, over Alternative B and the reason for that is Alternative B is actually, as was pointed out earlier, have drained (ph) lake basins. It's more wetlands and it has potentially more impact to the environment because of the wetlands filled up -- would be required and so I'm here, like we've been in every community and we'll be in Anaktuvuk and Fairbanks and Anchorage in the next couple of days making sure that people in the general public, but mostly our shareholders on the North Slope know what ASRC's positions is. Thank you.

MR. KELLY: So does anybody else have anything to say before we close the record for this evening?

MR. AGUULUA: You've got a website to comment, right?

MR. KELLY: We have a website and you can comment by email.

MS. STUDSTILL: I'm sorry, who asked that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Raymond.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Raymond.

MS. STUDSTILL: Raymond, okay, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Raymond.

MR. AGUULUA: Raymond (indiscernible).

MR. TAGAROOK: I have a -- I have a question. This is Terry again. Since most of us vets came back and we were -- we applied and were hoping to get our land allotments, we applied, but we were denied. They said because of the oil company or (indiscernible - speaking simultaneously)...

MR. KELLY: Are you sure it's not because...

MR. TAGAROOK: And if I can't -- Wainwright was just little cabins here and there.

MR. KELLY: We can talk about that after -- after we close the record here.

MR. TAGAROOK: Okay, I'll make sure (indiscernible - speaking

simultaneously)..

MS. WALLIS: This BLM -- this BLM public meeting and ANILCA Section 810 hearing for the proposed Greater Mooses Tooth 1 project is now closed. Thank you for your participation.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.