

KAYE LAUGHLIN: Dear Mr. Thompson and Ms. Brown. The proposed pipeline project has the potential to positively or negatively affect the lives of generations of Alaskans. Although I have concerns in addition to those listed below my comments are restricted to three major categories in the Alaska Stand Alone Pipeline, ASAP, Draft Right of Way Lease.

Number 1. The draft ASAP right of way lease does not match the right of way lease application format. The important references to the public has been omitted in the following two examples. And I've underlined and highlighted public safety.

The word public was not included in the draft right of way lease. Human safety is inadequately addressed in the draft ASAP right of way lease. Planning for and responding to the less likely liquid waste receives a preponderance of attention while the more serious human safety factor of a high pressure gas pipeline explosion is not appropriately addressed.

My second bullet is public access. The word public was not included in the draft right of way lease. Public access is inadvertently addressed -- inadequately addressed except from the applicant's perspective.

Number 2. The ASAP draft right of way lease is based on the ASAP Plan of Development, POD, yet the POD conflicts with itself.

Number 3. Subsistence, recreation and traffic control are inadequately addressed.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

HAROLD HEINZE: Thanks. My name is Harold Heinze. I reside in Anchorage, Alaska. I am a gas consumer in this neighborhood. I also am a summer resident along the pipeline route up in the Talkeetna area. I'm also a former commissioner of the Department of Natural Resources. And it is from that kind of mode that I would like to speak to the proposed right of way lease and stipulations on it.

I have had a chance to read through the plan of development and look over the application. But, again, I'm going to focus mainly on the stipulations.

I guess I feel that the stipulations need to be strengthened. And let me see if I can explain to you a little bit why and then I'll tell you exactly what I think needs to be strengthened.

Number one -- I'll just observe to you, this is the biggest and most important pipeline in Alaska for, say, the last three decades. It certainly is something that is going to impact Alaskans for at least 50 years out into the future. It's an essential piece of what happens here in Alaska. The reliability of its operation is paramount; not just today, not just when it's built, but 50 years from now. And that requires that the State use all the authorities and all the abilities that it has to assure that its citizens are well served and well protected.

Right now the application is from a public entity and I have some confidence in them. But I also know the process is going to hand off this whole project to the private sector. And I don't know who that is right now. So I think we need to realize that as the commissioner issues this lease that it has to mean something out into the future.

The other issue is that this is the only time you have to set stipulations. Once this opportunity has passed there's no going back, there's no do-overs or anything else. If you miss an opportunity in these stipulations for future monitoring, or reporting, or other things it's just simply not going to happen.

While HB369 requires that the commissioner issue this right of way it doesn't prohibit the commissioner from using his whole discretion on authorities to assure public safety and public interests are met. In particular I focus you on things related to -- for instance, design. The stipulations related to that are very short, they're not very strong, yet we're faced with something that has to prevail over a 50-plus year period. We have to deal with something that was involving new technologies and having their application right now, having their application in the future.

The pipeline itself traverses over 200 miles in the state highway right of way. As you know, most Alaskans live along the highway. So that means this pipeline for 200 miles and at least for 60 of those intensely is in people's front yard. It's very important that that public interest be sought to -- again, not just in design but in the ongoing monitoring and following of the pipeline. There are no specific requirements in the stipulations for reporting and in particular reporting to the public. And, again, given the importance of this line to all the citizens I think those types of features are very important.

Basically what I'm urging you to do is to think about how you're going to feel if 30 years from now there's a problem with this pipeline, especially a pipeline that could have been or problem that could have been prevented by assuring more full compliance.

While I have every faith in the pipeline office, besides being a former commissioner I've also frankly officed in proximity for over a decade with the pipeline office. And I have every confidence in your technical expertise but it's through these stipulations that you have to enforce and you get to do the right things in the public interest. So I'd ask you to think about that future. I've asked you to think about 30 years out there and how we'd feel.

We've seen the result of things that weren't acted upon 10 years ago, 20 years ago, and what they have cost the state in terms of the variety of different pipeline issues. And I just don't want to end up in that spot in the future. So I urge you again, think it through carefully. This is the biggest thing you're going to have to ever write stipulations about.

Let's do a special job.

(The meeting concluded at 7:30 p.m.)