

**ROGER BURGGRAF:** I'm Roger Burggraf. I reside at 830 Sheep Creek Road, Fairbanks, Alaska. We appreciate you coming here this evening. This is the first chance that a lot of us have had the opportunity to hear about the program or your plans.

I would like to comment that I don't know what process you use of notifying people, but I was unaware of this until today. So I would hope that in the future if you have other hearings, that you provide ample notice so that more people can show up.

I understand you guys inherited this from Enstar's project. I personally don't feel Enstar really considered our problem as much. They were primarily interested in getting that line down to Anchorage, and they just thought they'd throw some gas over our way.

Fairbanks wants gas. We're very anxious to have a -- get gas down here either by truck or later on by pipeline. As I mentioned before, we've had very little input in this, and I was kind of shocked when I noticed where that spur line was dead-ending right near the University. The explanation I got there was that it could tie into Fairbanks natural gas lines. Their lines are not large enough or sufficient to tie into. Where most of the gas is going to be used initially will be out at North Pole, at Flint Hills and Golden Valley. There are other industrial uses that I think the gas can be used for and, you know, that would follow once we get gas here. I -- you know, I just -- you know, there's Golden Valley, Flint Hills and possibly the military. So the routing, I feel that that pipeline could be carried down along the highway, tie into the levy and then down to North Pole. That's where we need the gas, and that's where the distribution lines can be pulled off at North Pole and also into Fairbanks.

So basically those are my comments, and thank you for the opportunity of talking to you.

**GLENN PRAX:** Thank you for coming to town. My name's Glenn Prax. I guess I have no reason to oppose the pipeline. I think you're looking at it -- not necessarily the economics, but use of State property and to that extent you can put pipeline wherever you please. That makes me happy.

I do think that you certainly should consider extending -- from the existing plan, extending that to the load centers in North Pole. That makes a lot of sense for going through this much trouble.

Also I think that you should consider -- in fact, there's another project proposal out there that considers running the line, instead of going directly south from Livengood across Minto Flats to the east end of Minto Flats, to run it down the Elliott Highway to Fairbanks and then going backwards, if you will, to your spur line. I think that has some advantages. There's possibly some mineral that could be more accessible if the gas was more available to them, shorter distance, something that you should consider and then coming down.

Other than that, I have no reason to object to the plan. Thank you very much.

**JIM DODSON:** I'm Jim Dodson. I'm president of the Fairbanks Economic Development Corporation. I'd like to thank you for coming today and encourage you to continue with the process.

Alaska needs energy. Energy is the issue that's holding up the development of Alaska. It's not just the railbelt communities; it's all of Alaska.

If I could encourage you to do anything, it would be to think outside the box and find out how could we get energy not only to Fairbanks and Anchorage, as is suggested in House Bill 369, but find a way to develop all of Alaska's resources through the distribution of energy. We all want some.

Alaskans are suffering. Rural Alaskans are moving out faster than ever before. Alaska's economy is in decline. We need to find a way to prop up our economy before crude oil runs out on the North Slope. Some say that's 10 years, some say 15 years. It really is immaterial. If it's 20 years, we need to find a way to change Alaska's economy today and gas has the potential to do that. So I'd like to encourage you to think outside the box and find a way to take this project and make it a project for all of Alaska.

Secondly -- and others have mentioned it tonight -- your 32-mile extension into the Fairbanks community is short by about 30 miles. And I'd like you to take a look at that and incorporate it with the project, because when this project's EIS is complete and approved, it is not the time to go out for a new EIS, to go out for new funding. The time to do it is today.

With that, thank you.

**PAM MILLER:** Hello. My name is Pam Miller. I'm representing the Northern Alaska Environmental Center, and I'm pleased to present comments on your proposed project.

I will say right off the bat the Northern Center is generally supportive of gas development from the existing stranded gas at Prudhoe Bay. We're part of the Fairbanks community and we have a high priority of reducing our carbon emissions and in the short term, natural gas is one solution in combination with renewable energy.

A major issue with the proposed project is that the pipeline does not come down existing road corridors right into Fairbanks, right into our utility system, into GVA, into military bases, into the core of our town where a natural gas distribution system will be easy to start, unlike the University end of town which is the more remote end of town. So having to have a lateral to get into Fairbanks just is a nonstarter. It doesn't make sense.

In general, we have a number of principles that we've worked with the conservation community statewide to evaluate all of the different gas pipeline projects. I'll just read the general principles that we have and we have more detail that we take into account for each project.

One of them, the first is: Does it minimize environmental impacts? Does it protect Alaska's wildlands and the integrity of parks, refuges, critical habitats, preserves and conservation areas? Does it provide maximum benefit for the citizens of Alaska? Does it meet the national need for energy? Is there a full and open participation, review and comment including for planning, construction, operation and decommissioning?

I will go into a little bit more detail about the routing because a lot of assumption has been that the natural gas pipeline will come down the existing haul road all the way to Fairbanks, and then either go towards Cook Inlet and Anchorage or go to the Lower 48, depending on the size of the pipeline.

Along the way the fact that there -- the cut-off involves new corridors into Minto Flats State Game Refuge and also into Tanana Valley State Forest. Those raise whole new issues that a pipeline along the existing road corridors would not. So the benefit to Fairbanks socially for our energy, feeding it into the system, far prefer Fairbanks than the existing road corridor.

It's difficult from the materials that are presented to see where these game refuges are, where the -- just that this route will also go through Denali National Park or next to it and have visual impacts to the park. The Richardson Highway alternative that's been considered before would not affect Denali National Park.

So there's an EIS process underway by the Corps of Engineers, and we would support the streamlined process for evaluation of this permit at the same time as you're considering this route does not just involve State lands. It involves federal lands; it involves private lands. It makes sense to do all this at once to consider your alternatives, the whole package, the baseline information, have the best information to the public all at once and then we can proactively work together to find a natural gas project that makes sense, that can produce the most clean energy with less carbon emissions than our current power plants and homes are burning. That would make sense to us at this time.

I think that's my major comments. Thank you.

**R.L. ODSATHER:** I'm with Odsather for International Marketing. I'll take the full five minutes, but I won't be able to cover what I have to say.

First of all, I'd like to know if this is the only public hearing on this project that will ever happen. If it is, then it's a great loss to the State of Alaska and to its citizenry because there's more to say than what's in a pre-application hearing.

From what I hear just in the background here, it sounds like ASAP wants to take credit for populations served but not provide any of the service. Specifically I asked about off-takes. They said there's only a couple off-takes I think out here at Dunbar, down here at Milepost 39. And I would think that ASAP would want to take the more global look of being an in-state pipeline serving in the state, and they can't do that with two or three off-takes. For example, why not use the Yukon River and have a site there? You can serve the communities up and down the river and do it with ISO containers and so on.

But I've heard also the comments with regard to the lateral line coming in, or the spur line, and I think that the people are justified that that line should end up at Anchorage and at the section, which is North Pole, more specifically, GVEA, and with the Flint Hills facility if they so choose. It also gives you the chance to go to Eielson, back to Wainwright, come into the University. And they could do that by following the -- what do they call that thing back there. It's a barrier to hold back the Tanana coming into Fairbanks.

I looked in the book -- in both books, the plan of development and the application here and there appears to be big information disconnect with the plan of development. It has been already submitted to BLM for EIS on which the DNR right-of-way is based. I'm not quite sure why you want to have a right-of-way within the state only 30 feet wide, because if you take the width of the pipeline and then you take, you know, whatever your berm is you work at, you can't get two vehicles back and forth. It just seems to be too narrow. Why not keep it the 50 feet like you do on the rural lines?

There doesn't appear to be any storage plans for propane down at Milepost 39, at least that I can find. I'm very disappointed that you haven't considered any other alternatives because I believe that the alternative going into Valdez is worthwhile considering. You add 8,000 more people. You add three military bases that may want to convert. You have two power plants, one at Delta and one at Glennallen that could convert and safely secure the eastern part of Alaska south of the Yukon River. Plus you also get a deep-water port in Valdez. The Port of Anchorage is not a deep-water port. It cannot handle medium- to large-sized tankers. The tanker criteria is mean low level water or MLLW, mean low level water, and it's ten fathoms per 60 feet. Cook Inlet cannot handle that, so anything you want to do out of there for export and so on, unless it's a medium or small ship, you ain't going to get it out of there.

There was really no comment with regard to export of LNG or petrochemicals, which leads to another question. There was nothing written in there and I'm surprised. There is nothing with regard to explosions. Didn't see that. And it appears that the pipeline is going through, looked to me, like 40 miles of Minto Flats. They can get that cut down, I'm sure.

Fairbanks needs to get more of the methane, needs to get propane just like the rest of the state.

**LUKE HOPKINS:** Thank you very much for this opportunity. I'm Mayor Luke Hopkins, Fairbanks Northstar Borough.

I signed a letter that was delivered to the governor on April 15th of this year, along with other mayors along the Richardson Highway. I believe that the State office has received a copy of that letter and of course it addresses the issue about another route starting in Fairbanks and heading into Anchorage.

Let me start first by saying I'm glad that there is a gasline that's planned and is actually on some maps to deliver gas to Fairbanks. Fairbanks has of course, like so many other areas of the state, a need for lower-cost energy and of course we also have a PM2.5 air quality issue in this community that must be addressed soon or otherwise even a construction project in a noncontainment area will certainly be put at risk. So I am glad this project is being considered.

The project is being considered also with public dollars. That's one of my concerns as an elected official in the state and responsible for how public dollars are spent.

The issue of a new route for a gasline running -- separating at Livengood and having a new route along the Parks Highway where there are many stream crossings, more access roads that have to be built. I'm not sure that in terms of a lease this is the best use of public dollars. There is an existing pipeline corridor that runs all the way down and of course has matched up with the ANGDA right-of-way issues that ANGDA has worked on resolving that would, again, take an in-state line, whatever diameter is best. That's up to the gasline corporation to determine that.

But in terms of the route and how public dollars are best spent on this, I believe that the existing TAPS corridor has been well studied, many EIS's on it, and that would be the wisest use of State dollars in terms of what the lease ought to be and what the route ought to be. When it turns onto the Glenn Highway and brings gas into Anchorage, we've seen that plan. It's been out there for years, how that route would be.

I understand that that would also tie into the Enstar line and serve the Anchorage customers as we understand that they need gas service. I believe that this - your application or this application that is before you needs to be considered as what is the best use of public dollars and the land that will be occupied by this in-state bullet line.

Again, I want gas in Fairbanks. I want gas served to other parts of the state. This hopefully will be reasonably-priced gas and the way that happens is, again, public expenditure of dollars and that's what we need to do wisely. So I think it is incumbent upon your evaluation of a lease to consider the cost benefit of it and address the alternative route that I don't believe has an adequate cost-benefit evaluation on it.

So as a public official here, I will be submitting more comments. I believe I have until May 27th to submit comments. Again, I want to be on the record that an in-state bullet line is probably going to be the first major gas that actually gets through the State of Alaska. Good for that. It's needed. Our economy needs it. But, again, the cost benefit on what the route is, what the new road construction is going to be are all tied into a lease action that the Department of Natural Resources will be evaluating.

I understand that there's further actions that can be addressed with the Corps and what is the best alternative route. There's population issues. And, again, who is best served? You don't really have a concern with what's called HB 369, the law that sets things in place as to how in-state gas will be. But, again, all of that rolls into a cost-benefit analysis that I hope that the State of Alaska undertakes for the benefit of the dollars that are spent and the people that live in this state.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to address you.

(Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.)