

GREATER MOOSES TOOTH UNIT 1
SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION/ ANILCA §810 Hearing
Anchorage, Alaska
March 20, 2014

ATTENDEES

Misty Alexa
Larry Angel, GIS
Pat Athey
Stacey Aughe, Weston Solutions
Gene Augustine, BOEM
Harry A. Baij, Jr., USACE
Francy Bennett, Prosperity Alaska.org
Bill Binford
Steve Brashear, ConocoPhillips
Jeff Bruno, SOA/DNR
Laura Cameron (sp), NMS
Lanston Chinn, Kuukpik
Steve Cohn, BLM
Patrick Conway
Tom Colrin (sp)
Bud Cribley, BLM
Karen Cribley
Maria Cruz
Jim Dicker
Gary Dixon, Teamsters 959
Lois Epstein, The Wilderness Society
Richard Farrand
Stacey Fritz, BLM Subsistence Specialist
Callie Gates

Ben Greene
Lindsey Hajduk, Sierra Club
Mike Hauser
Mike Heiring, Udelhoven Oilfield System Services
Caroline Higgins, Consumer Energy Alliance Alaska
Brian Hoefler, SLR
Teresa Imm, ASRC
Anna Jespersen
Michael Jespersen
Sam Johnstone
Lon Kelly, BLM Authorized Officer
Richard Knowler, BOEM
Betty Lau
Bark Lloyd, ACS
Tom Lohman, North Slope Borough
Andy Mack, Kuukpik Corporation
Tom Malmey, CH2M Hill
Don May
Bill Muldoon, ConocoPhillips
Josh (sp) Osborne
Roxy Oyagak, Jr., Kuukpik
Mary Patania
Kevin Pendorgast (sp)
Laura Perry, ConocoPhillips
Rachael Petro, Alaska Chamber
Katy Polluconi, DNR-DOG
Carl Portman, Resource Development Council
Pat Pourchot, DOI
Bridget Psarianos, GMT1 Planner
Amy Randolph, HDR
Barrett Ristroph, TWS
Karen Schmidt
Keith Silver
Dan Simpson, Baker

GMTU
March 20, 2014

Jeanine St. John, Lynden
Miranda Studstill, Accu-Type Depositions
Maynard Tapp
Sara Taylor, DNR
Cynthia Trapp, Arcadis-US
Richard Wilson
Nicole Whititu-Evans (sp), TWS
P. Wolfe, COPA
Dave Yokel, BLM Wildlife Biologist, Fairbanks
Grant Yutrzenka (sp)

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m.

INVOCATION

No invocation was given.

INTRODUCTIONS/ ROLL CALL

Mr. Kelly, Mr. Yokel, Bridgett Psarianos, and Stacey Fritz introduced themselves.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION / ANILCA 810 Hearing

A presentation on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement was given. Public comments followed.

MR. MALONEY: Good evening and thank you for providing

Alaskans with the opportunity to offer public comment. My name is Tom Maloney and I'm a 25-year Anchorage resident. I'm the Alaska Area Manager for CH2M Hill, which is a major Alaskan employer with approximately 2,500 employees working throughout the state.

In 2014, CH2M Hill is celebrating 50 years of continuous operations in Alaska. Our company fully supports Alternative A for the Greater Mooses Tooth Unit, henceforth called GMT, oil and gas project in the NPRA.

The proposed development can deliver approximately 30,000 barrels of oil per day. This much needed production would help stem the decline in TAPS throughput, the lifeblood of Alaska. There would be a multitude of high-paying job opportunities for engineers, designers, consultants, constructors and fabrication, installation, transportation and logistics firms, service suppliers, et cetera. The multiplier effect from oil and gas is very large compared to other Alaskan industries.

GMT would provide much needed economic benefits to local communities, the Alaska treasury through royalties and other tax payments,

GMTU
March 20, 2014

as well as the United States Treasury. Alaskans love royalties with a minimum of 25% going into the Permanent Fund. The more oil that is produced, the more Alaskan residents receive through their Permanent Fund checks and the more charities receive through "Pick, click and give."

Alaska Native corporations will have multiple benefits through direct work opportunities and revenue sharing among the regional corporations. All Alaskans receive economic benefits from Alaska oil production. We have attached a drilling graphic, which illustrates some of the benefits of a successful development. Successful drilling equals more production, equals more jobs.

Thanks again. We have full confidence that ConocoPhillips will do a great job on this development like they have done with so many others. Let's get more Alaskans working in high-quality jobs. I know our company, CH2M Hill, would welcome the opportunity to hire more Alaskans with great developments like GMT Alternative A to work on. Thank you and good evening.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (6:41:12): Thank you, Tom. Next, we

have Mike Heiring.

MR. HEIRING: Mike Heiring.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (6:41:22): Sorry about that.

MR. HEIRING: That's all right. Can I sit here? First, I would like to thank the Bureau of Land Management for the opportunity to speak to you this evening. I would like to speak in favor of the proposal of the Greater Mooses Tooth oil and gas development in the NPR, Alternative A, and I'm speaking both as a private citizen and an officer of the Udelhoven Oilfield System Services.

My name is Michael Heiring. I'm an Alaska resident with over 30 years experience in the oil and gas and petrochemical industry, specifically providing engineering and construction services. Udelhoven Oilfield System Services is an Alaska-based company employing Alaskan residents for over 40 years.

I encourage the Bureau of Land Management to accept the applications for the proposal for the betterment of the state of Alaska. We believe that GMT1 will increase North Slope oil production and help offset

declining production, benefit local state and national economies by providing additional jobs, and benefit Alaska Natives through royalty payments and revenue sharing among Alaska Native regional corporations.

In addition, I'd like to comment that we've had the privilege of doing business with ConocoPhillips, and we believe them to be responsible in health, safety, an environmentally conscious company who can be trusted with the development of the NPR Alternative A. We ask your support in this proposal. Thank you for your time.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (6:42:52): All right, next is Barrett Ristroph with The Wilderness Society, all right.

MS. RISTROPH: I want to thank BLM for having this marathon of hearings throughout the North Slope and Fairbanks and finally here, and I'm Barrett. I'm with The Wilderness Society. So I'll just offer some preliminary comments and we'll submit more written comments later.

We all know Greater Mooses Tooth is going to be the first commercial oil and gas development on federal land within NPRA under the 2012 integrated activity plan, and we, The Wilderness Society, supports

that plan. We want to make sure it's implemented as intended to avoid putting infrastructure in sensitive areas, especially Fish Creek and areas that are important for subsistence, caribou calving, insect relief, bird nesting and/or molting.

So it's critical that BLM sets a high standard for GMT1 and any future oil and gas infrastructure, because the cumulative impacts of GMT1 will be felt not only here, but throughout the entire -- here, being here at GMT1, but also throughout the entire NPRA and surrounding communities.

We'd like to see more information. We believe more information is needed to select the option with the smallest cumulative footprint and impacts in NPRA, so just some questions that we raised looking through the document. How would the CD5 GMT1 road contribute to the larger NPRA footprint beyond just GMT1?

Another question; what facilities would be required for GMT2 and the other developments that are in the GMT unit under both the road and the road-less alternatives? Would these other developments use facilities at

GMT1 or facilities at Alpine?

So what air emissions would be associated with GMT2, because right now, the analysis just looks are air emissions with GMT1. So what air emissions would be associated with GMT2 and other developments under both the road and the road-less alternatives? Could the impacts be reduced by conducting seasonal drilling, even if there is a road option, to avoid disturbing nesting birds during the summer?

I also feel like we still don't have a handle on the impacts, the differences in the impacts between roads and aircraft on both animal migration and subsistence use. So we would recommend that BLM calculate the number of flights by season, and correlate the flights with the life stages, such as migration, molting and calving and subsistence activity periods.

We'd also recommend better analyzing the impact of a permanent road on the fall caribou migration, and then we would ask BLM to consider how monitoring can be structured to minimize overflights. We also are looking at what mitigation measures, in addition to what's already listed

there, what could be used to help minimize -- mitigate some of the impacts associated with this project. So we ask BLM to consider measures, such as; reducing the emissions and noise, avoiding the use of diesel for power, reducing flaring, using automated, not just manual, shut-off valves for pipelines, ensuring adequate communication to the affected residents and addressing subsistence, social, health and environmental impacts. Thanks again for the opportunity to testify.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (6:46:26): All right. Next up, Jeff Bruno.

MR. BRUNO: For the record, Jeff Bruno is with the state of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources. The State is encouraged by the release of the draft Supplemental EIS. The estimated peak, 30,000 barrels per day, would be processed at Alpine and then transported to market via Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

GMT1 would help offset declines of North Slope production and maintain efficiency with the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. The State continues to strive to increase TAPS throughput to one million barrels per

day and GMT1 is vital to the State to achieve that goal and to the nation to move forward with increased energy independence. For this reason, the State continues to support the development of GMT1.

It has come to the State's attention that a request to extend the public comment period of 30 days has been made. The State objects to this request. The Alpine project -- the Alpine satellite development project has already be subject to unprecedented delays.

Additionally, this project has been extensively evaluated in the 2004 Satellite Development EIS and record of decision, the 2008 northeast NPRA integrated action plan Supplemental EIS, again in the 2012 NPRA integrated activity EIS and the subsequent 2013 record of decision and again here, in the 2014 Alpine satellite development EIS.

Each of these processes that I just mentioned has also included a number of public comment periods and stakeholder engagement and reviews.

Delays from this project have resulted in a million dollars of -- millions of dollars of lost revenue, wasted state and federal resources, and

hindered the ability for the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation to develop their lands and share their -- their revenues under the provisions laid out in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

Additionally, BLM has a required 45-day public notice period and for consideration, they extended this public comment period to 60 days already. Let's see, the current timeline for the supplemental EIS has been moved back 14 weeks currently and the State strongly encourages BLM to avoid any further delays.

Additionally, the State has reviewed the alternatives for GMT1, and like many people here, are in support of Alternative A. I'd just like to point out some of the impacts that the road-less alternative would have when compared to Alternative A; the need to construct the airstrip and related facilities, extra storage pad and a large number of redundant resources and putting in processes that can no longer be relied upon without a road access to the Alpine production facility.

The additional infrastructure would require approximately 15 acres in an increased footprint, 220,000 additional cubic yards of fill, 20 million

additional gallons of water during construction, 75 million additional gallons during the first six years after construction, six additional megawatts of power and the proposed alternative only would require one megawatt -- megawatt of power, higher emissions due to increased flights, and increased pipeline risk due to limited access for routine maintenance and activities.

I'm just going to quote for subsistence here, the impacts of the road-less alternative from the supplemental, "Alternative D would likely have the greatest impact to subsistence uses and activities for all -- all alternatives, as it would result in increased air traffic in hunting areas west of the community and would create a new source of air traffic that did not exist before."

Lastly, this alternative would subsequently require each connected development thereafter to follow the same design considerations, include the same redundant processes and systems, which would result in unnecessary impacts to the surrounding area without the road.

For these reasons, the road-less alternative seems unrealistic for the

environmentally preferred alternative and therefore, probably not appropriate for the preferred alternative. In...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (6:51:10): You've got about 30 second.

MR. BRUNO: In closing, as a cooperating agency on the supplemental EIS, the State of Alaska remains fully committed to support BLM and appreciates the Borough's hard work and maintenance of a responsible and firm timeline for completion of this supplemental document. Given the past delays, the State remains a strong proponent of the timely decision-making throughout the remainder of the EIS process, as well as throughout the potential permitting of the proposed project.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (6:51:40): Okay, next we have Grant Yutzenka. Go ahead.

MR. YUTRZENKA: Good evening. For the record, my name is Grant Yutzenka. I'm here to speak in favor of Alternative A of ConocoPhillips' proposal for the Greater Mooses Tooth Unit oil and gas development, and though I believe the economic benefits are obvious with

the estimated peak production estimated at 30,000 barrels per day, helping to offset the decline in the North Slope production and benefitting local, state and national economies with local hiring, et cetera.

I'm in favor of Alternative A for a few key reasons; 1) safety, should there be a serious injury at Greater Mooses Tooth 1, the road connection to Alpine could help in a more timely response, 2) in the event of an emergency spill, with road access from Alpine, a better, quicker response, more full response can happen from Alpine.

Lastly, Alternative A provides a smaller overall footprint with less noise, resulting in reduced economic or environmental impacts than Alternative D, the aircraft and ice road access alternative. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (6:53:06): Next is Lanston Chinn.

MR. CHINN: Good evening. Okay, my name is Lanston Chinn. I've been with the Kuukpik Corporation since 1992 and serve as Chief Executive Officer. Kuukpik is the village corporation for the Village of Nuiqsut, okay.

Nuiqsut is located in the northeast corner of the National Petroleum

Reserve Alaska within the boundaries of the North Slope Borough.

Nuiqsut has a population between 450 to 500 people, okay, and it's approximately eight miles from the Alpine oil field.

With the discovery of Alpine in 1994, the community of Nuiqsut knew there's a proper balance between the traditional subsistence hunting and fishing interests and those of oil and gas development would be critical to achieving mutual success, okay.

As a result, Kuukpik entered into service use agreement negotiations with Arco Alaska, okay, the predecessor of today's ConocoPhillips Alaska, okay. Provisions included, okay, (indiscernible) (6:54:21) in terms of jobs, training, contracting opportunities and protections for the land and resources of Kuukpik Corporation (indiscernible) (6:54:40) a consent agreement based on Section 1431(o) of ANILCA, okay.

It was executed at the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation. These landmark agreements were achieved through dedication and commitment by all parties and allowed production at Alpine to begin in 2000, but that was 14 years ago.

Tonight, we're addressing the proposed satellite field known as GMT1 or the Greater Mooses Tooth 1, okay. There are those who say it should never happen at all, those who advocate its construction and then there's Kuukpik, who seeks balanced development.

In this respect, a careful evaluation of BLM's SEIS, okay, Kuukpik has concluded Alternative A represents the best approach to the proposed development at GMT1. Along with the fact that the lands proposed for GMT1 development are Native lands, Kuukpik Corporation was specifically granted the right to select lands in the National Petroleum Reserve Alaska in Section 1431(o) of ANILCA.

Of all the village corporations on the North Slope, Kuukpik Corporation was granted this right by Congress, okay, to meet the federal government's, okay, land entitlement obligations (indiscernible) (6:56:15) Kuukpik under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. These major congressional acts established a basis for Kuukpik's unique selection rights.

Taken together, Kuukpik's privately owned lands are the foundation upon which its dual goals of protecting these lands, waters and resources

and promoting the subsistence way of life, have also served as a pathway toward economic independence.

Regarding BLM's 60-day public hearing process, Kuukpik believes the agency has provided adequate time for stakeholder input and comments. Again, Kuukpik supports Alternative A and the development of GMT1 as being consistent with, not only Kuukpik's goals, but it reflects the approach that serves the best interest of the Inupiat people from the North Slope of Alaska. Thank you and quyanaq.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (6:57:24): Next, we have Carl Portman.

MR. PORTMAN: Good evening. My name is Carl Portman, Deputy Director of the Resource Development Council. RDC is supportive of Alternative A in the draft supplemental environmental impact statement for the GMT project in NPRA.

RDC is a statewide nonprofit business association comprised of individuals and companies from Alaska's oil and gas, mining, timber, tourism, and fishing industries. Our membership also includes Native

regional corporations, village corporations, local governments, organized labor and industry support firms. Our mission is to help grow Alaska's economy through responsible development of our resources.

The GMT1 project is not new. It was reviewed and approved by the BLM and its cooperating agencies in 2004. It was further reviewed in the NPRA integrated activity plan. These reviews provided the public with many opportunities to comment and evaluate the cumulative impacts.

Moreover, the project has been modified only slightly from this original proposal. The project is essentially the same as that approved for permitting in the 2004 record of decision and evaluated under the 2012 IAP with changes that reduced impact and the overall footprint.

Reviewed requests -- we review requests for additional extension to the comment period as delay tactics, rather than legitimate concerns for public comment.

RDC, along with our North Slope members, including the North Slope Borough and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, understand the tremendous benefits of the GMT1 project to local residents, the state and

the nation. Through the 7(i) provisions of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, this project will provide significant revenues to Alaska Natives throughout the state through royalties and revenue sharing among the 12 Alaska regional corporations, Alaska Native regional corporations.

New production from GMT1 will help offset declining North Slope production. It will create new jobs, generate needed revenues to the Borough, state and federal government while reducing America's dependence on imported oil.

In conclusion, RDC supports Alternative A and encourages the BLM to move forward with this project without delay. We -- we have full confidence in ConocoPhillips' ability to develop GMT1 in a responsible and safe manner. We will provide additional detailed comment before the deadline. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on the SDEIS.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:00:14): Thank you. Bill Muldoon next.

MR. MULDOON: Good evening. My name is Bill Muldoon. I'm the Director of Permits and Sciences for ConocoPhillips Alaska and I

appreciate this opportunity to provide public testimony on behalf of ConocoPhillips.

My testimony will focus on six key aspects of our proposal and the draft SEIS. Number one, a road connection between the GMT1 site and the Alpine central facility is essential for emergency spill and safety response. Safe operations and environmental stewardship are of paramount concern in all of ConocoPhillips operations.

Alternative A, which is ConocoPhillips' proposed plan for GMT1 development, provides the necessary level of emergency spill response, environmental protection and safety assurance required to proceed with development.

As proposed in Alternative A, GMT1 will include a gravel road connection to the main Alpine facilities and the emergency response resources available there. Any proposed alternative for GMT1 without a permanent gravel road would lack the necessary reliable access to incident response resources, which is critical to moving ahead with -- with development.

Point number two, the road alternative minimizes environmental impacts. The proposed project, Alternative A, has been modified to reduce environmental impacts and lower the overall footprint and use of gravel. Alternative A involves the smallest gravel footprint of all the alternatives, even less than Alternative D, which lacks gravel roads, but would require the addition of a landing strip and an additional pad to replicate facilities that are otherwise available by a road connection to Alpine, such as a camp and a mud plant for drilling operations.

In addition, Alternative A has the lowest estimated emissions because it requires the least amount of new infrastructure and eliminates the need for aircraft support.

Point number three, GMT1 provides economic benefits to all Alaskans and the U.S. as a whole and in the interest of time, I will skip the details, but it is included in the written testimony.

Point number four, ConocoPhillips recognizes the importance of subsistence on the North Slope. ConocoPhillips recognizes the importance of subsistence activities to both the health and culture of the people of the

North Slope and we strive to work closely with residents to reduce and mitigate the impact of our operations on subsistence hunting.

Alternative A, ConocoPhillips' proposed development, was relocated out of the Fish Creek buffer to provide additional protection to this important subsistence area. Alternative D, which relies on aircraft and ice roads, rather than gravel roads, would have the greatest impact on Nuiqsut caribou hunting because it would result in increased air traffic in hunting areas west of the community.

In addition, the construction of an airstrip, as proposed in Alternative D, would result in increased air traffic directly over the village of Nuiqsut.

Point five, seasonal drilling is not practical for GMT1. In the interest of time, I will skip that, and point six, timing is critical for success.

ConocoPhillips initiated the permitting discussion for GMT1 with agency preapplication meetings in April 2013, and submitted the permit request to the agencies in July 2013.

Preparation of this draft SEIS has taken several months longer than envisioned due to government furloughs and protracted agency

endorsement processes. We urge the BLM and its cooperating agencies to maintain the agreed upon project schedule from this point forward, and discourage any extension of the public comment period, which is already longer than required under governing law.

In conclusion, I'm submitting this written copy of my testimony to the administrative record and this evening's proceedings, and ConocoPhillips is also preparing detailed written comments on particular issues in the draft SEIS, and in summary, we believe that Alternative A represents the best balance of broadly shared benefits and mitigated impacts and we encourage others to support the adoption of that alternative as the preferred alternative, and I appreciate this opportunity to testify on the merits of the proposed development on behalf of ConocoPhillips.

Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:05:07): Thank you. Next is Caroline Higgins.

MS. HIGGINS: Thank you for that. Good evening. My name is Caroline Higgins and I'm the Executive Director for Consumer Energy

Alliance Alaska. Consumer Energy Alliance is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization. It was formed to help support the thoughtful development and utilization of all domestic energy resources to improve domestic energy security and reduce consumer prices.

CEA has over 240 members nationally and about 400,000 individual members dedicated to the development and implementation of a balanced energy policy that will ensure affordable, reliable energy while protecting the environment.

Consumer Energy Alliance is testifying today to express our support of Alternative A for the Greater Mooses Tooth development. The project is not a new project. It was previously known as the CD6 development. This project was reviewed and approved by the Bureau of Land Management and its cooperating agencies in 2004.

The project was further reviewed as part of the 2012 NPRA integrated activity plan. During these reviews, the public and local stakeholders had many opportunities to evaluate the cumulative impacts and provide comment. A review of new data and information shows there

are no appreciable changes in the physical, biological or social resources associated with the project study area. The new data indicates -- includes multi-year studies on hydrology, birds and caribou.

Energy development in NPRA will benefit, not only Alaska, but the Lower 48, and will help offset declining North Slope production.

Development will provide benefits to local, state and national economies through local hire for jobs created during construction and during operation, tax revenues, royalties, and new resources to help meet our U.S. domestic energy demand.

The project is supported by the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, the North Slope Borough, as I learned this evening, Kuukpik, as well as throughout the (indiscernible) (7:07:30). The development will provide significant economic development to Alaska Natives on the North Slope, as well as throughout the state through direct payments of royalties and revenue sharing among -- among the Alaska Native regional corporations.

CEA Alaska is greatly concerned with the recent attempt by some members of Congress and now, I heard tonight again others, to delay an

important domestic energy project. Last week, members of the House Minority sent a letter to the BLM office seeking an extension of the public comment period to the Greater Mooses Tooth Unit project by an additional 30 days.

In our opinion, this can only be viewed as a tactic to delay or stop production from the NPRA Alaska. This is not a new project, as I've said before. It has been previously approved and reviewed twice and as I said before, during this time, public and local stakeholders has many opportunities to evaluate the impacts and provide comments. In fact, the comment period has already been extended 15 days beyond the statutory-required 45 days and the overall permitting schedule has been delayed by over 14 weeks.

Requests for further extensions should simply be viewed as delay tactics, rather than legitimate concerns for the public for public comment and participation. CEA Alaska urges BLM to move forward without delay and approve Alternative A. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:08:58): Thank you and next is

Keith Silver.

MR. SILVER: Good evening. For the record, my name is Keith Silver and I thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight. I'm here to speak in favor of Alternative A. I recommend -- just had a couple of recommendations and then I'll hand the mic to the next person.

I recommend that a review be done during the finalization of the EIS to make sure that the EIS is more lawsuit proof than previous ones that have been unfortunately, successfully challenged in court, because that just stops projects. The most recent one I can think of is where Shell was (indiscernible) (7:09:40) were shut down in the Chukchi Sea.

I recommend a component be included for village hire and I have not had an opportunity to read the whole thing and it's probably there already, but if it's not, I recommend they do something specific for the village hire for the Village of Nuiqsut.

With respect to the caribou, as a six-year -- somebody who's spent six years on the North Slope, at least the oil field workers, when you came up across caribou on the road, we were required to stop, shut down our

engines and wait until the caribou got up and left, and doing so otherwise would be considered harassment to the caribou and we would be, you know, terminated for doing such.

So I can't speak for the subsistence hunters, but with respect to oil field workers, we were not allowed to do anything with respect to caribou. So once again, I recommend Alternative A.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:10:36): Thank you. Rachael Petro next.

MS. PETRO: Good evening. For the record, my name is Rachael Petro and I serve as the President and CEO of the Alaska Chamber. The Alaska Chamber is a statewide pro-business organization representing hundreds of businesses and police and local chambers from Ketchikan to Barrow.

Our primary mission is to advocate for policies that include Alaska's business climate and as one of the state's most diverse statewide business organizations, it's sometimes a challenge for our members to agree on an issue, but responsible development in Alaska's federal Arctic, including in

NRPA (ph) (7:11:13) isn't one of the tough issues. It's actually something our members have agreed upon for years as essential to Alaska's overall economic viability.

The economic impact of the GMT1 project is very significant. It will help offset otherwise declining production on the North Slope, provide jobs during construction and operation, tax revenues, royalties, all while helping meet domestic energy needs.

So in short, the Alaska Chamber supports the GMT1 project Alternative A, which is substantially similar, as we've heard tonight, to the CD6 project approved 10 years ago. I think the difference between GMT1 Alternative A and the CD6 project are notable and that the Alternative A reduces impacts to the environment and lowers the overall footprint of the project.

It's also important to note that groups representing the people who live in the project area, like we've heard this evening, as well as members of (indiscernible) (7:12:10) North Slope Borough and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation support GMT1, the people closest to the project.

In conclusion, the Alaska Chamber supports this project and respectfully requests that the GMT1 Alternative A be selected as the record of decision and that the comment period not be extended again and that we return to a timely schedule that was agreed to with ConocoPhillips. Thanks again for the opportunity and presentation tonight. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:12:38): Thank you. Next is Francy Bennett.

MS. BENNETT: Hi, my name is Francy Bennett and I am the Communications Director for the Prosperity Alaska.org. I am a first-time testifier. So you'll have to bear with me.

Prosperity Alaska supports Alternative A for this project and we feel that there are many economic benefits, not only for Alaskans today, but for Alaskans in the future with money coming into local, state and national economies. It also will provide jobs, local hire, tax revenues, royalties and resources to help meet U.S. domestic energy demand.

The road in Alternative A is needed, as said before in other testimony, for emergency spill and safety response. As someone who grew

up in Eskimo villages, not in the north, but in western Alaska, I also know that having a road out into a different area of the land is helpful in subsistence cases. That's my personal experience.

Environmental and subsistence issue are also minimized with the road and lastly and most importantly, this -- this project has already been approved before and it is time, I think, now for it to go through and I really appreciate the time that the BLM has provided all of us to give comment and thank you so much.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:14:45): Thank you. Next is Lindsey Hajduk.

MS. HAJDUK: Hi, my name's Lindsey Hajduk and I'm -- some of you don't know (indiscernible) (7:14:04). My name's Lindsey Hajduk. I'm the Regional Representative with the Sierra Club based here in Anchorage. The Sierra Club is a national grassroots organization. We've got a few hundred members in the state and about two million members and supporters nationwide and I want to thank BLM for this opportunity to comment on the Greater Mooses Tooth Unit 1 proposed development

project plan and alternatives.

I'll keep my comments short because we'll be evaluating the supplemental -- the draft supplemental EIS and we'll submit more technical substantive comments in the future. We consider the BLM's integrated activity plan for the NPRA to have been a great step in the right direction for a balanced plan to manage the western Arctic with an eye for conservation and future development and we believe that BLM must set a high standard for this and any future oil and gas infrastructure and development as cumulative impacts will be felt within the immediate area and throughout the entire 23 million acres of the Reserve with future projects.

So because GMT1 is -- would be the first ever development in the public lands of the Reserve, we're hoping to see an alternative that -- that we were hoping to see an alternative that ensured development would be done in a way that protects wildlife, minimizes impacts to the land and safeguards public health.

However, the current alternatives do not fully protect wildlife and

subsistence values and there are also cumulative impacts of this and other projects that are analyzed throughout the Reserve. So GMT1 project should not be considered on its own. The GMT2 project, the Bear Tooth Units should be addressed as cumulative impacts and this should include what that road and pipeline network (indiscernible) (7:17:00), as well as impacts from research and other baseline studies for things like the OCS pipeline route and other possible development.

The SEIS for the GMT1 project should be comprehensive and set the bar high for future development by creating a more comprehensive direct, indirect and cumulative impact analysis as a basis for moving forward. We're also concerned that a sensible road-less alternative is not evaluated and that the analysis of aircraft traffic and ground traffic isn't sufficient to evaluate the impacts of each alternative.

There should be a much needed analysis of the cumulative air impacts, the air quality impacts from existing operations and future operations -- operations, especially through gas flaring and there should be an analysis of seasonal drilling and operations such -- and -- excuse me,

seasonal drilling in the alternatives as is done with C -- or excuse me, as was done with Alpine CD3 site, for example, which could reduce risks from blowouts and things from Fish Creek. So that was a whole bunch there and thanks for hosting the hearing on this beautiful night (indiscernible) (7:18:16).

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:18:19): Thank you. Maynard Tapp, sorry if I mispronounced that.

MR. TAPP: Thank you. My name's Maynard Tapp. I support Alternative A. I'm a partner in a small business here in Alaska and I've been working here for the last 29 years. We serve and work in the oil and gas industry and I think the oil and gas industry here is represented by ConocoPhillips, BP and Exxon are some of the most responsible developers of energy resources in the nation and in the world.

Since the original -- I've been testifying for the development since the original plan and I've been trying to remember when that was, but it seems like 10 or 15 years, I've been coming here and saying the same thing and so I -- maybe I should just (indiscernible) (7:19:06) ditto for my

comments. I'm not exactly sure, but let's get the oil and gas that is needed for the operation of Alaska's government and jobs.

It isn't necessarily oil we're pulling out of the ground. We'll pulling dollars out of the ground to support this wonderful lifestyle that we live here. There will be jobs for local communities and they'll be -- and they'll be more independence and security for the United States, as long as we can remain and become more energy independent.

We have (indiscernible) (7:19:35) the amount of time to develop the Alaska resource before acknowledging openly we have a limited amount of time to develop Alaska's resources before technology, solar, wind and some of these other sources actually take over the need for power and need for the oil and gas. So we have maybe a 50-year window in order for the state to maximize its -- its use of the resources and develop -- and for the good of the state of Alaska, we need to make these projects go farther and faster and sooner than later. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak and have a great evening. It's beautiful.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:20:20): Thank you. Jeanine St.

John.

MS. ST. JOHN: Good evening. For the record, my name is Jeanine St. John and I'm Vice-President at Lynden. Lynden is a multi-modal transportation and logistics company with over 900 Alaskan employees, a history of scheduled service to Alaska starting in 1954 and extensive activity throughout the state of Alaska, including support for all segments of the economy. Lynden has provided transportation services for the resource industry, including significant logistic support for virtually every project in Alaska.

It may seem a little unusual for a company like Lynden to -- to have public comments on the draft SEIS. However, the key result of all of these alternatives directly relate to logistic support, which we care about deeply as a transportation company.

Lynden is writing in support of ConocoPhillips development of GMT1 and BLM's request for the draft SEIS comments. We support Alternative A for the following reasons. As proposed in Alternative A, GMT1 includes a gravel road connection to the main Alpine facilities.

Having a road is critical to ensure that the operator can respond to any environmental and safety issues in an adequate and timely manner.

Alternative D, the aircraft -- the aircraft and ice road access alternative would not allow adequate access and on bad weather days, there would be no access. So emergency response resources would be lacking and it would create a significant environmental and safety risk.

As an operator of trucks, as well as aircraft, we understand the unique transportational logistics required for both operational activity and emergency response. The most reliable access for safety and security would be by having a year-round road access.

Economic benefits, production from GMT1 will help offset declining North Slope production, which is critical for Alaska's economic future and jobs. This is an Alaskan issue, not an oil company issue. We need to do all we can to turn around the decline in oil production and GMT1 will certainly help Alaska achieve that.

Our company benefits both directly and indirectly from increased resource development in the form of continued jobs in transportation

services. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:22:47): Thank you. Michael Jespersen.

MR. JESPERSON: Hi, my name is Michael Jespersen. I'm here representing myself and my family. My primary interest in this is an economic future for my children. My oldest will graduate from high school this year and start college next year. I'd kind of like him and his sister, who's here with me, and our other child to be able to stay in Alaska. If we don't do something to improve the economy, that's not going to happen.

I support Alternative A for reasons that have been laid out by many other people, not the least of which is safety. I used to live in western Alaska. I was in a community that was weathered in on multiple occasions and emergency flights could not get out and save people's lives. Depending on just an airport is ridiculous, in my opinion.

Next, we need -- the world's going to use oil and it's going to come from somewhere. If it's developed here in Alaska, it's going to be done more environmentally friendly than anywhere else on the planet. So to

save the planet, I'd rather drill here than drill in Siberia or Burma or Africa or somewhere where they don't have the environmental standards.

We're going to use the oil. It's going to be a minimum of 50 years before renewables to come close to doing what oil does. So let's do it here where it's environmentally safer. Alternative A is the safest both for the people and for the environment and for subsistence hunting and fishing.

Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:24:27): Thank you. Bill Binford.

MR. BINFORD: My name is Bill Binford. I'm a resident of Anchorage and thanks for the opportunity to BLM to speak tonight. A lot of the points I had have already been covered by a lot of good speakers. So I'm just going to tell you a little story.

I was on the team that got first oil in Prudhoe in 1977, starting in 1975, and I -- I'm amazed at two things; 1) what it did to the quality of life of Alaska. It really raised up the quality of life. It was a significant change and it has been getting better and better all through the years.

Today, it looks a lot different than it did then and secondly, the

environmental requirements of each project now compared with then is unbelievable and I'd like to say that I think ConocoPhillips is one of the best in the world at what they do. Exxon, BP, they're all very responsible operators. I think we're fortunate that we have good players in this industry. There's a lot of oil places in the world where you don't operate with environmental responsibility. So here, they do and we're all better off for it.

I'm a North Slope Area Manager for Conam Construction Company. Conam's in support of this plan and Alternative A. I'm speaking as a citizen for myself and my wife. We're in support of Alternative A. We think of all the alternatives, it makes the most sense for safety, environmental, subsistence and everything that we've already heard, so -- but thank you for your time again and please consider Alternative A.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:26:20): Thank you. Gary Dixon. This is our last speaker. So if anyone has changed their mind and would like to say something, sign up.

MR. DIXON: It's a lot of pressure being the last speaker. Good

evening, you know, a lot has been already said. I'd like to thank the BLM for this opportunity to speak on this project. My name is Gary Dixon. I work for the Teamsters Local 959 and I serve as Vice President. I'm a lifelong Alaskan. I worked on the North Slope for over 15 years in various positions, in various pipeline jobs.

Teamsters Local 959 supports Greater Mooses Tooth Unit 1 Alternative A development. Developing fields west of Alpine is important to increasing the throughput of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

With the declining oil production on the North Slope and the problems associated of maintaining proper oil temperature and flow on the TAPS line, the estimated 30,000 barrels a day will (sic) (7:27:23) come from this project will provide much needed new oil in the TAPS line. It will also provide good paying jobs to Alaska residents and help keep our economy healthy. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:27:36): Thank you. Stacey Aughe is next.

MS. AUGHE: Hello. My name is Stacey Aughe. I'm an employee

of Weston Solutions, a ConocoPhillips' Alaska contractor. I am testifying on my personal views regarding the GMT1 project. I believe the Bureau of Land Management should work quickly to issue a final EIS and record of decision naming Alternative A as the preferred NEPA alternative.

The benefits of developing GMT1 and moving into production include economic benefits to Alaska, Native Village of Nuiqsut, North Slope Borough and the United States.

BLM should choose Alternative A as the preferred alternative because it has the smallest gravel footprint of all alternatives. It has the lowest potential environmental impacts and it allows for proper safety and spill response provisions.

BLM should not choose Alternative D as the preferred alternative because that alternative does not include a road connection to the main Alpine facilities. The lack of a road connection means an increase in the total gravel footprint, an increase in the number of flights needed for crew and equipment transfers and an increase in potential air quality impacts. Furthermore, it could mean a greater health and safety risk and a longer oil

spill response time.

BLM should issue the final EIS and record of decision in a timely manner, given the delays in the process to date and the risk of project delays due to extension of permitting timelines if the -- if the comment period is extended. Thank you for the opportunity to provide my public comment.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:29:12): Lois Epstein.

MS. EPSTEIN: Hello. My name is Lois Epstein. I am an engineer and Arctic Program Director with The Wilderness Society and I'm actually just going to ask a question of BLM and something that I think needs to be elaborated upon in their analysis. We heard earlier tonight from Barrett Ristroph, who represented our organization's comments.

Given that the number of flights is a key factor in terms of determining subsistence impact and some of the other impacts and that air quality modeling is very sensitive to the numbers that you put in, I guess one concern I have as an analyst looking at the EIS is that we need to better understand the sensitivity of the numbers that are in there, particularly for

the special studies that are done and the -- the need for overflights, helicopter flights to go out and do the hydrological sampling, because that does have -- essentially, there are hundreds of extra flights that are listed under Alternative D and so if those numbers can be cut down, given that it's roughly an eight-mile distance between GMT1 and CD5 with a pipeline right-of-way that could be traveled, potentially, not -- not only by flying, and I recognize that some of the -- some of the sampling would take place a little further from the road (sic) (7:30:44), but that would be true even if you have a road, as well, so -- so that's -- that's my -- my point, maybe there should be some additional examination about whether that number can be cut down dramatically and what that would do for meeting air quality standards and reducing noise and reducing impact. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:31:02): Thank you. Teresa Imm.

MS. IMM: Thank you. I'm Teresa Imm and I'm with Arctic Slope Regional Corporation. I want to thank BLM for hosting these meetings. I think I've been -- this is my fifth meeting that I've attended. I've traveled across the North Slope and listened to what our local shareholders have to

say about this project in the communities.

Obviously, one of the big issues that our shareholders have is continued access to subsistence. Having been around development on the North Slope, our communities have -- are adjacent to a lot of the oil fields. Nuiqsut, in particular, has very close proximity. The comments that we frequently hear from our shareholders are that the air traffic into the communities and related to the oil field development has a large negative impact on their subsistence activities and that's a very important issue.

That was an issue that was raised in the 2004 Alpine satellite EIS and it continues to be an issue today. So the community on the North Slope in Nuiqsut has specifically asked for no additional airfields in and around the area.

CD5 was developed without an airfield. It was originally planned to have an airfield and Conoco had decided not to put that airfield in because of the impacts to subsistence. With respect to this project, GMT1, that -- that remains to be a significant issue to the community. I've heard that several times in my meetings with the community and with the other

communities across the North Slope.

So I would very seriously take that into consideration as you think about this project, because as Lanston Chinn with Kuukpik pointed out earlier, they have a very detailed surface use agreement with the operator and they work very closely representing the community of Nuiqsut with the operator as the operator develops its plans. So the GMT1 project has gone through that review with the local community before it was even proposed or applied for.

As most people in here have stated, as you know, they support Alternative A. Arctic Slope Regional Corporation supports Alternative A because we think that is the best alternative for our community and our shareholders.

I would also like to point out that while the development or the pad is on a federal lease, the resources to be developed are on Arctic Slope Regional Corporation subsurface and that's not made very clear in the SEIS document, nor in the presentations that I've experienced and have sat through.

So it's very important for people to understand that this is an Alaska Native resource. It's a resource that we received through our entitlement under ANSCA and the promise of ANSCA was that we could develop the resources to benefit and provide economic freedoms to our shareholders and so that's a very important aspect to this project and to the continued projects in this area.

So I would -- I thank everybody for their comments. I thank the BLM for hosting these meetings and just wanted to clarify whose resources were actually being developed. These aren't federal resources, for the most part. It's predominantly Native resources. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:35:16): Thank you. Anyone else?
Okay.

MR. KELLY: All right, we're done. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (7:35:33): Yeah (affirmative), so thanks, everyone, for coming, enjoy the weather and...

MR. KELLY: We'll clean up and don't stay inside the fence after 9:00.

GMTU
March 20, 2014

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.