

## **APPENDIX F**

### **Scoping Meeting Transcripts**

**Anchorage, Alaska**

**December 14, 2009**

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

SENIOR CENTER

December 14, 2009

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage, Alaska - 12/14/2009)

(Presentation)

(On record)

MR. LAKOSH: Questions?

MS. BENSON: Sure.

MR. LAKOSH: From the State's -- I've got several questions. The State isn't actually going to build this thing?

MS. BENSON: No, in fact I should have made that point. The State is just doing the pre-work, the -- to facilitate the purchase by private pipeline developers. Neither -- we will not -- the State -- I don't work for the State, the State won't be building the project, it'll be sold to pipeline development entities.

MR. LAKOSH: So all these costs for doing this are going to be recovered from the final.....

MS. BENSON: I don't know exactly how that works, but -- I don't know exactly how that works. We could -- we could find that out and get that back to you.

MR. LAKOSH: Well, I think.....

MS. BENSON: And the pipeline developer will not own the gas either, they will have to purchase the gas from local producers, they will just be building the pipeline.

MR. LAKOSH: So when is the open season supposed to be on this?

MS. BENSON: July, 2000 -- oh, this doesn't have an open season. This is different than the big line as I understand.

MR. KENDALL: Well, Tom, if I might. Are you telling me the gas coming out of the North Slope is not ours, are you telling me it belongs to the producers as opposed to being Alaskan gas?

MS. BENSON: No, who builds this pipeline will not own the gas that goes in it, they'll have to purchase it from the North Slope producers.

MR. KENDALL: I thought it was our gas. So we have no access to our gas, we're building a pipeline for somebody else, paying dividends for their gas?

MS. BENSON: This pipeline project that we're reviewing tonight in EIS is actually not about building the pipeline, we're -- the state of Alaska's not building the pipeline, it's going to be sold, this package of permits will be sold to someone or a company that wants to build the pipeline. We're just at the very beginning stages so this will be bundled up into a package of permits and environmental information and the project's builder will buy that and then build a pipeline assuming it's feasible.

MR. LAKOSH: Now what's the relationship -- I was told when I came in by the alumni that this wouldn't go through if the main line goes through. So is there a special relationship

and is there a fixed relationship to the main line as far as go or no go, proceed or not proceed on this -- at least the northern half of this project or what?

MS. BENSON: If the big line is built in a timely way this would become a spur line to supply Anchorage's south side.

MR. LAKOSH: So.....

MS. BENSON: Because neither one of the big lines comes south. So.....

MR. LAKOSH: Well, the question is I'm worried about paying \$3 billion in tariffs for a pipeline that becomes obsolete two years after it's built and has to be torn out. So what -- I'd like to know what -- is there anything in writing that creates a fixed relationship between -- you know, a decision point between the main line going through, how long you've got to wait for the main line to go through, how much delay and wait in the main line is an acceptable delay before this -- more than half of this project will go through?

MS. BENSON: Those are all really good questions. I don't have the answer to that. If the big line is built in a timely fashion and actually beats this construction schedule, then this would become a spur line off the big line. If it's not this project, if it receives all its permits and received the record of decision underneath us would be the line. So they're not linked.

MS. SWEET: And I -- from a corps of engineers

standpoint I just wanted to speak to the corps requirements. One of the purposes of looking at all of these different aspects of the project is to incorporate into the analysis the possibility that the big line may or may not be constructed within a timely manner. So we're trying to cover all bases to make sure that if a big line does come on line in 10 years, it could become a spur line very easily without having to duplicate this environmental analysis, however if it does not come on line there's a backup plan that could be used to bring the gas south from the North Slope.

MR. LAKOSH: Well, that -- okay. So this is part of the alternatives decision that the corps is going to make?

MS. SWEET: Well, I guess alternatives speak to different projects that fit the purpose and need. If you're talking about a spur line that's a different purpose and need than say a stand alone line from the North Slope. What we're trying to make sure is that we include all the possibilities.

MR. LAKOSH: Well, that's the point here for the -- my beef -- you know, I could argue about a spur line too, but my biggest beef is building a \$3 billion pipeline north of Fairbanks that is going to be obsolete with a 48. Nobody's going to put gas in a 24 line when they can get it cheaper out of a 48.

MS. SWEET: Certainly.

MR. LAKOSH: So why would we want -- why would the

State even pursue such a boondockle (ph) and what is the alternative process for looking at the alternative of 48 to Fairbanks versus a 24 to Fairbanks. Is there a firm position of the corps on that alternative and where is the breakdown on how much delay in development of the main line is acceptable before you permit this 24 inch line north of Fairbanks?

MS. SWEET: And there isn't a firm agreement or firm termination at this point, but one of the things we are looking at is the possibility of examining perhaps a large diameter line versus just a 24 inch line at this point, but we need that kind of input and this is -- this is exactly the kind of information we're looking at from the public and to incorporate in our analysis. So like I said we're very early on and we're trying to get all the feedback we can. So this is going to help us when we go down the road.

MR. LAKOSH: I mean how does the corps assess impediment to high velocity flow through the active layer above the permafrost. Most of this stuff north of Fairbanks is going to only have a few feet of active sub-strait, you know, it's going to be frozen two to three feet down and you're talking about blocking that cross flow across that area. What is the standard -- the corps of engineers standard regarding that, you may have to build below the line, can they -- is a berm above that active layer the preferred method, what -- what's the standard of construction?

MS. SWEET: At this point we don't have a stan -- a position on the standard of construction, but again any information you have, any ideas you have that we could look at, we're definitely looking for that kind of input. Did you have any other.....

MR. LAKOSH: So there's no standard for Arctic construction under the corps for -- in permafrost?

MS. SWEET: At this point we don't have a standard for permitting. We look at the project as proposed and receive public input.

MS. SWEET: Did you have any other comments or questions?

MR. LAKOSH: Oh, I got a lot. I'll give somebody else a chance.....

MS. SWEET: Okay. If you could just.....

MR. LAKOSH: They're all -- they're all on the dole here so I don't.....

MS. SWEET: Yeah. We -- do you mind stating your name at the beginning and coming to the mic so we make sure he can get it on the.....

MR. ROGERS: My name is Mike Rogers and I'll followup on the gentleman who just spoke concerns about everything from boondockles through environmental hazards. As I hear a presentation revolving around an alternative, either or, a preferred route versus an alternative route, I'm inclined to

wonder if for whatever reasons brought up just a moment ago, boondockle or disaster for the environment, any reason, at this time can you preclude the possibility that there would be no pipeline, that it will either be a or be, or, is, in fact, it possible that the direct environmental impact statement will recommend do nothing?

MS. SWEET: One of the alternatives always examined in the development of an EIS is the no action alternative and that will be incorporated in the analysis so that will be put into the document and put forward for public comment also.

MR. KENDALL: Well, thank you. My name's Paul, middle initial P, Kendall. And I guess first of all I really -- you need to get some cameras, ladies and gentlemen. I -- these moments should be on camera going out to 700,000 people in Alaska so we can all be learning together. We miss these golden moments, everybody here will walk away feeling more intelligent than the next person and you should see -- the leaders should take trips to these classes and seminars. They come back thinking they're Einsteins and that we have no relevance. And by bringing a camera to these meetings we can -- we can educate everybody. And I think you're missing a golden opportunity, especially in the -- in the era of U-Tube and I'd like to see your questions go around repeatedly in turn.

And I guess my next question is I'd like to see an

instrument, a legal instrument from the oil companies that says they're not going to use that TAPS line to move gas. I'm very concerned that TAPS line's two-thirds empty and I do not think any more oil is going to leave Alaska which is a bigger discussion. But if they had planned the demise of that pipeline through some technological reconstructs of the carbon and the hydrogen and are able to move it they will really have scooped everything here and all this is for naught. And I think the confusion lies in not having clear signals from the oil companies to us as a community.

And I'll -- I have lots of questions, but I'll wait for everybody to have a turn. And I'm really curious how many citizens are here as opposed to all you working groups, eight or 10 of you, I'm sure you all met together before. So I'd like to hear the little people's voices so instead of -- instead of hearing each one of you jump in because we're beginning to see that too, we have meetings and all the groups are being paid and it becomes this inside discussion and not us.

MR. LAKOSH: About this section through the Park, why are they going through the Park when they have a utility corridor.....

MS. SWEET: We'll just.....

MR. LAKOSH: My name's Tom Lakosh, L-A-K-O-S-H. What's this about going through the Park when there's clearly a

powerline corridor on the other side of the road, can the State explain this?

MR. CARWILE: Well, there's also the state highway, the Parks Highway, going through the Park for about seven miles. And the intertie does take off from Carlo and heads across Theanner (ph), but then it diverges away from Healy Canyon and goes through some very ravine filled tributaries of the creek tributary to Healy Creek and comes out at Healy eventually in the coalmine area and powerplant. But it's a -- it's challenging country for a pipeline.

MR. LAKOSH: So they -- so technically since they're on the road they're in the Park and that's why they have to go through the Park permit process?

MR. CARWILE: Well, they -- if -- yes, they would need a permit both from DOT and the Park Service to go through the Park on the Parks Highway. But the.....

MR. RICE: Let me just clarify for the record that I'm Bud Rice and that was Steve Carwile with Denali National Park. I'm Bud Rice with the National Park Service.

And also if -- and the alternative looks at a route through the Park, we had to do a finding that -- we have a finding that indicates whether or not there is a prudent, feasible alternative outside the Park. Because one of the purposes for ANILCA which is the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, was to protect these conservation system

units and we don't want to degrade them even for something as important to the state of Alaska as a gas line. But even if we had a finding that a route through the Park -- there was another alternative feasible route and I think there is one because that's the proposal, there could still be a decision by the Park Service if we get authorization from Congress to allow a gas pipeline through the Park, that there might be more benefits than adverse problems, in other words the national park would like to get natural gas to run its bus fleet, to heat buildings, et cetera, in the summer, and then even the superintendent's interested in having a route that's a little ways away from the road and it would be a bike path and you can lay the gas line underneath that. So there's some interest, but I'm not sure it outweighs the adverse impacts to the Park. We would go through that decision process.

MR. LAKOSH: Yeah, can we get all of the resource agencies, that put links on the -- Tom Lakosh -- to put links on the website for all of the applicable regulatory requirements so we can have a full set of regs that will allow us to look at -- you know, for scoping and EIS purposes or for the entire permitting process, not just the -- me, but EIS stuff.

MS. SWEET: That's an excellent suggestion, we'll definitely take that down to make sure that gets incorporated onto the website.

Other comments or questions?

MR. LAKOSH: Yeah, the -- like I said my primary concern -- Tom Lakosh again. The primary concern regarding this project is an obsolete northern half of the line that's going to cost us somewhere close to \$3 billion to put in as opposed -- you know, right next to a -- the 48 inch line. And when I took a look at the plan before I came down here I noticed there was no removal and restoration for particularly hydrologic obstructions, river crossings, abutments, bridges, stuff like that. Isn't that a requirement for the EIS, I mean, isn't that a written prerequisite to have, you know, removal plans in place?

MS. SWEET: This is Serena Sweet for the corps. Yes, that is a requirement and it's something that we maybe don't have the details of just yet, but we are working on solving with the applicant. So that information will also be incorporated in the draft EIS, we just don't have it to date.

MR. LAKOSH: Well, wouldn't you check the application, is it sufficient for you without that in there?

MS. SWEET: Not necessarily.

MR. CARWILE: Is the question about the removal of the permitted facilities should they become obsolete?

MR. LAKOSH: Well, the river crossings, you can't leave an obstruction over a waterway, bridge abutments are going to obstruct the actual river flow, you're going to have a pipeline

that's, you know, undoubtedly going to affect the hydrologic flow of the permafrost, you've got all kinds of problems here, you know, with leaving, you know, bridges, abutments, the piping some places, facilities, roads, you know, access road, all of things can become obsolete two years, a year, two years, three years after the northern half is built.

And I just don't understand, you know, why there isn't a set in stone relationship to the main line here and, you know, a fixed, you know, period of time of delay that is an acceptable delay, level of delay, say five years, say 2022 or something before you'll even okay a permit on this or the State will even go forward or any third party that's going to actually build this and I think the State, you know, ought to get serious here and not waste all these folks' time with a permitting process, they've got better things to do than to -- to review a phony EIS for a nonexistent project. And before you guys -- you know, we haven't even gotten to the open season yet and you guys are talking about duplicating the route, essentially building a 24 right next to a 48, for \$3 billion. And the State ought to just withdraw the application and come back with a set, you know, relationship between the 48 and the 24 because this is a waste of everybody's time until we know what's going to go on here. I could see, you know, planning out a spur line, but clearly north of Fairbanks there's no reason to put these guys through a permitting process.

MR. CARWILE: So that could be a condition of the 48 inch line to hey, you remove the 24.

MR. LAKOSH: Yeah, right. So you better pay for Enstar.

MR. McDONNELL: I don't need a mic, I can speak without a mic. I'm just a private citizen, I don't belong to one of the sinister groups you're referring to here. And I appreciate all the -- I appreciate all the comments you're making, but, you know, Occam's Razor, are you familiar with that one, never make more assumptions than the minimum needed. I think all of a sudden you got way ahead of the game here and you're way up -- way out there. You know what these folks are trying to do is something that's very preliminary right now, just a governmental study to find out feasibility, you know, all of a sudden we're leaping way ahead here, years and years in advance. And you bring up some interesting points that I agree with you, but however I think we're -- instead of wasting a lot of time doing that, you know, what they're proposing here is trying to -- feasibility is just going to happen, we don't know it's going to happen, we don't know if anybody's going to buy the gas, we don't know if they're even going to make the thing, okay, going to build the line. But, again, don't make more assumptions than the minimum needed, (indiscernible) okay.

And I think if you keep that in mind and all the good points you brought up I think are well worth -- well worth

consideration, you should think about them. But I don't see anything wrong with what's going on right now in just trying to find out if it's possible. I mean we've got -- the legislature in our State is behind this thing, okay, our economy of the state unfortunately is tied to oil and gas. And personally I would like to see us put more money toward research and development for more green technologies, but it just so happens that here in Alaska we seem to be stuck with this right now. And we're going to be in this position for the next two or three generations, we're not going to run out of oil in 50 years, we're not going to run out of oil perhaps even for 100 years. We should be thinking ahead, but right now this is just one little piece of the pie.

And that's my personal comment and I'm just an average citizen, I don't belong to any of you sinister groups, okay.

MS. SWEET: You want to state your name also.

MR. McDONNELL: Oh, Jerry McDonnell.

MS. SWEET: Thank you.

MR. KENDALL: Well, I don't know if it's sinister or not, but I do think my country's on a wayward path, I think Alaska's a very special place. I think we're obligated to raise these far reaching concerns, but I do understand your need to stay positive, okay, and to cheerlead which is what you're really talking about. And I'm for that, but it seems to me that if I'm in a quandary and I'm the average person,

everybody else must be in a quandary too. And I don't understand the paralysis. And it would seem to me we would have put out a worldwide RFP in participates or a deed or an open -- open season. They come up with this trick techno -- tech terms and the stakeholders and things like that. We should have put out a list, a request for those people interested in gas and then we should be going from there. I don't think this chesting out if you will or this false sense of intimidation's going to work. And here's why I don't if I might. And I think this is an important discussion, both yours and Mr. Lakosh's, and I'm sure you folks, you gentlemen and ladies obviously could take up the whole night with just some smaller detailing.

But I'm concerned that Obama and the rest of the world is these boys are headed to de-carbon, don't you think for a minute they're not. So I'm talking this is a serious move here, the free enterprise market's coming with a force I've never seen before to move away from carbon. And here we are gambling everything on carbon and everything is set to leave. If you have not -- if you don't expect the oil -- the oil of Alaska's done for, ladies and gentlemen, it's never leaving Alaska again, 70 percent of that oil is used for transportation and the rest of the world if you'll go to my blog spot, mfh20magneticfields -- mfh20.(indiscernible).com.

So here's my concern, I want the oil companies here, I

want them here building testimony that goes to a factual record that is introducible to a court for an action of law or accountability. We continue to have this discussion outside of the principals out of some fear based mentality. And the minute that you realize there is no more oil free money as has been constructed or gas quite frankly, then I think we can begin to rebuild Alaska and find its true value.

And I don't want to stay up here all night. I'm for a redundant line, a gas line, but I was under the impression it was our gas, our gas. I'm not going to pay Exxon \$3 billion and some of the biggest corporations and the most influential corporations in the world to lay a pipeline for me so we can try to intimidate them while they run off somewhere else and I'm left, you know, with my people and their homes being hammered under some economic means of subjugation for Enstar and some bankers. Now so we need some reasonable discussions on this thing, but we need principals, we need those people who can be held to account with their public testimony as a matter of record. And the really sad thing I'm still -- it's so magnificent the time you're living in it's hard to shut me up because I feel like I should just -- if you could only see what's coming your way and how special you are, you're being diverted by all these trivial carbon conversations.

But if I might the carbon line would be a good line to lay in, that's what is -- it's a hydrogen with carbon line, in

the event you have some catastrophic event that was unpredictable and the reason that bullet line is a good thing is because you represent a land with vast amounts of resources and special challenges and then those challenges are additional resources. So Obama should be here along with you and the oil companies and they should be defining for us our role and their participation along with the respective corps of army engineers and the budget overflow, oversight committees and we should be developing Alaska as a very, very special place. But somehow I -- we can't seem -- the oil seems to be so part and parceled out that we can seem to get traction. And I blame it on the oil companies because they are not coming forward. And when you get a relationship like that where it's not clearly defined or showing you the look, we know what that means and believe me if you don't know what it means you'll do some research, you'll see that they don't need us and they're preparing to go carbon free in all their operations. Vallero (ph) put in 33 wind farm -- wind turbines, they just did a big contract with renewable oils from Prada, your Alaskan tankers just went to all gas to all electric unloading in San Diego, BP just put in a big 180 mile underground electric cable to an offshore gas platform, took the gas off, put in electricity and put in direct cable from Norway and there was -- BP's involved in the EV project, if you look that up there's 11 cities that are going -- well, I'm going -- I'm going to get back to your pipeline. But I'm

trying to show you that you're in the midst of some very special times here and what's happening is incredible, intelligent, loyal servants to the public are being distracted in some of these projects I think that are just not being well founded or well grounded in where we're going.

And again in closing -- let me say that a few more times, I'm real concerned about that pipeline, ladies and gentlemen, you can't lose \$24 billion a year going two-thirds empty, I mean, it's -- it's -- it is for all practical purposes your TAPS line could shutdown, they can shut that baby down within the hour. If that's the case, that would be a coup'd'tat if they could run those carbons through that pipeline and we need to know what their intentions are because all this other stuff is just diverting us.

Sorry for the long time, but.....

MS. SWEET: Any other comments or questions at this point? Anyone else have anything else before I.....

MR. LAKOSH: Comment.

MS. SWEET: Comments. Okay. One last comment and then we're going to close up, but we can chat more if that works.

MR. LAKOSH: Okay. A comment. The scope -- scoping should necessarily include alternative service of Fairbanks and points south through the Trans-Canada Pipeline, 48 inch main line as an alternative to the northern section. The alternatives that should be reviewed and evaluated should

necessarily also include service of Fairbanks with propane truck from the North Slope and distributed through a pipeline system through a regas -- through a gassification of pipe -- pipeline distribution system for the Fairbanks area as opposed to our illustrious Mr. Ramos' concern that individual tanks might fail. In other words, distribution through a pipeline system, through gassification pipeline system won't gel because it's all buried and below the frost line. And for service of southcentral Alaska of importation of liquified natural gas, cancellation of the export license and exploration and production of the remaining 2 TCF of natural gas in the Cook Inlet region.

To the extent that there are going to be -- that the application and EIS must necessarily have a retirement, removal and restoration plan associated with it for removal of all obstructions to hydrological flows including all abutments and pikes within potential channel of all rivers and for all areas where there is hydrological flow, again active sub-strait above permafrost and such that that obstruction to flow in that circumstance be considered for the life of the physical presence of the pipeline. In other words, this pipeline may be there for 1,000 years and the change in permafrost levels may preclude putting -- may require building the pipeline, digging the pipeline much deeper to prevent hydrological obstruction in the future, it may require building a berm above and that may

settle over long time reduction in permafrost, that there be an evaluation of the impacts to ecosystems from construction of a berm above the normal terrain, that there be a plan to most definitely remove all pipeline sections and physical facilities and structure after the useful lifetime and that includes under circumstances where the vast majority of flow through the 24 inch line is being better served by a 48 inch line so that the -- there be a cost benefit analysis be done as to the impact to -- the continued impact from minimal flows through the northern section of the pipeline where the pipeline no longer serves the original intended purpose of bringing 500 BCF or whatever or .5 BCF to Fairbanks and southcentral Alaska, there has to be a cutoff point where the flow -- sections that are not under active flow or under minimal flow be removed if they create an obstruction in adverse to hydrologic flow or other adverse environmental impact.

MS. SWEET: If you want we can chat more maybe with these other people and then we'll close up the meeting and we've got lots of time, we're going to be here until 8:00 o'clock and we'll just talk more if that's all right.

MR. LAKOSH: It's your meeting.

MS. SWEET: Thank you everyone, do we have any other quick comments or questions before I close it up formally?

MR. KENDALL: Can you stay on the microphone and continue to chat, just let those people leave, shut down the

official meeting, it would be nice to talk with you and still.....

MS. SWEET: We can do that, yeah. Let's go -- maybe move to the edge of the room so that people can move out. Will that work? Let's keep the court reporter on for a few minutes until we've captured everything I think, this is good dialogue.

MR. KENDALL: I'd like to give another comment, but I'd like -- I want to hear other people, you know, we're all here to listen. If I might -- I would enjoy a casual conversation. I'd like to add to it if I might that this really needs to be looked at from a hydrogen shipping point of view.

And I'm surprised that Obama and Mr. Chew -- let me tell you something, ladies and gentlemen, these people come out of Chicago, these boys have seen every con game in the world. They're moving to new energies with a swiftness and dedication I've never seen in my lifetime. And the home unit, they're now putting out home units, MIT just patented a home unit that on five meters of water can run your entire home and drive 500 miles. So the new reasoning has to be around hydrogen. And if you're not checking all of this piping with some hydrogen flow contents of energy (indiscernible) I think you're making a mistake there. So.....

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Was it you who said you're all bureaucrats?

MS. SWEET: We're not all bureaucrats.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just see you as all people,  
myself and lots of other (indiscernible), I don't know.

MS. SWEET: I think at this point we'll go ahead and  
formally close the meeting. As I said most of us will still be  
here for a while and we can chat if you have any other  
questions or comments.

Thank you all for coming and this ends the  
presentation. Thank you.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 23 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of proceedings, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

---

DATE

---

SALENA A. HILE

**Nenana, Alaska**

**December 10, 2009**

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

STATE OF ALASKA

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE (ASAP)  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

NENANA, ALASKA

DECEMBER 10, 2009

APPEARANCES:

MS. SERENA SWEET, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

MR. MIKE SOTAK, ASRC Energy Services

\* \* \* \*

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (Presentation given by Mr. Mike Sotak)

3 P U B L I C T E S T I M O N Y

4 MS. SERENA SWEET: I think at this point, we'll  
5 open up the floor for comments and questions.

6 MR. JIM SACKETT: I have a question. Jim  
7 Sackett with Toghotthele Corporation, T-o-g-h-o-t-t-h-e-l-e.  
8 Jim, J-i-m, last name Sackett, S-a-c-k-e-t-t.

9 What impact would the large diameter pipeline  
10 that Denali and TransCanada are considering have in terms of  
11 impact on this? If those go, does the stand-alone -- has that  
12 been taken off the table, or is this going to be based on its  
13 own merits separate from that, or will the large diameter  
14 pipeline have an impact?

15 MR. MIKE SOTAK: If the stand-alone -- or if the  
16 big line were to go within a reasonable period of time, this  
17 stand-alone would fall -- would fold up and collapse. It  
18 doesn't make sense if the -- if the big line is going to go in  
19 a reasonable period of time for the stand-alone to go forward,  
20 because as I showed you on the first slide -- I don't know if  
21 you can go back to that -- we looked at the options of the  
22 spur lines from the big line.

23 And so our conclusion was that if the big line  
24 were to go within a reasonable period of time, let's say,  
25 2020, -19, -20, -21, you wouldn't build a spur line -- or the

1 stand-alone.

2 MR. JIM SACKETT: I thought you had a completion  
3 date of 2014 on this one.

4 MR. MIKE SOTAK: 2015.

5 MR. JIM SACKETT: 2015?

6 MR. MIKE SOTAK: We do.

7 MR. JIM SACKETT: So it would already have been  
8 built for four years?

9 MR. MIKE SOTAK: Well, it would -- we're going  
10 to see -- you know, all of this is going to be the same time  
11 that the open season is going to be occurring for both -- for  
12 the big line. And so you're going to have some sense of where  
13 the -- you are with the big line after the open season.

14 MR. JIM SACKETT: At Mile Post 39 at Beluga,  
15 does Enstar own the pipeline from there down?

16 MR. MIKE SOTAK: Enstar owns the whole --  
17 they're the local distribution company for all natural gas in  
18 the Anchorage area.

19 MR. JIM SACKETT: So would they, in a sense,  
20 become a gatekeeper of sorts? You build this 700 miles of  
21 pipeline, but at the very end you turn control over to a  
22 private company?

23 MR. MIKE SOTAK: They would have to work out an  
24 arrangement with the purchasers of the gas from the North  
25 Slope, people who bought gas and are transporting it through

1 the system. Then they would be -- they would be transporting  
2 within their own system to the same purchasers. They're a  
3 common carrier pipeline, so they must provide service, and  
4 they just have to provide their rates. Their rates are  
5 regulated.

6 The one thing I guess I didn't say to  
7 everybody -- I think we talked about it earlier -- is that  
8 this pipeline would be a common carrier pipeline, and whoever  
9 builds this project does not own the gas that's in the  
10 pipeline. Whoever builds this project is building it and will  
11 transport gas through it at -- for a cost.

12 MS. SERENA SWEET: Thank you, Mike. Were there  
13 any other questions at this point? Comments? Thank you all  
14 for coming.

15 (Off record)

16 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

17

18 \* \* \* \*

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )ss.

3 STATE OF ALASKA )

4 I, Elizabeth D'Amour, Notary Public in and for  
5 the State of Alaska, residing at Fairbanks, Alaska, and court  
6 reporter for Liz D'Amour & Associates, Inc., do hereby  
7 certify that the annexed and foregoing ALASKA STAND ALONE  
8 PIPELINE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING  
9 was taken before Lynn DiPaolo on the 10th day of December,  
10 2009, beginning at the hour of 12:00 o'clock p.m. at Nenana,  
11 Alaska; and thereafter transcribed by Lynn DiPaolo; that the  
12 hearing has been retained by me for the purpose of filing the  
13 same with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CEPOA-RD, P.O. Box  
14 6898, Elmendorf AFB, Alaska, as required by the U.S. Army  
15 Corps of Engineers; that I am not a relative or employee or  
16 attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I  
17 financially interested in this action.

18 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
19 and affixed my seal this 29th day of December, 2009.

20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 Elizabeth D'Amour  
22 S E A L Notary Public in and for Alaska  
23 My commission expires: 12/28/2010  
24  
25

**Fairbanks, Alaska**

**December 10, 2009**

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

STATE OF ALASKA

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE (ASAP)  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

DECEMBER 10, 2009

APPEARANCES:

MS. SERENA SWEET, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

MR. MIKE SOTAK, ASRC Energy Services

\* \* \* \*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Presentation given by Mr. Mike Sotak)

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

(No public testimony was given following the presentation)

\* \* \* \*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )ss.  
STATE OF ALASKA )

I, Elizabeth D'Amour, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska, residing at Fairbanks, Alaska, and court reporter for Liz D'Amour & Associates, Inc., do hereby certify that the annexed and foregoing ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING was taken before Lynn DiPaolo on the 10th day of December, 2009, beginning at the hour of 6:00 o'clock p.m. at Fairbanks, Alaska; and thereafter transcribed by Lynn DiPaolo; that the hearing has been retained by me for the purpose of filing the same with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CEPOA-RD, P.O. Box 6898, Elmendorf AFB, Alaska, as required by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I financially interested in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 29th day of December, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Elizabeth D'Amour  
Notary Public in and for Alaska  
My commission expires: 12/28/2010

S E A L

**Denali Park, Alaska**

**December 11, 2009**

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

STATE OF ALASKA

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE (ASAP)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC HEARING AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

DENALI PARK, ALASKA

DECEMBER 11, 2009

APPEARANCES:

MS. SERENA SWEET, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

MR. MICHAEL SOTAK, ASRC Energy Services

\* \* \* \*

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (Presentation given by Mr. Michael Sotak)

3 (On record)

4 P U B L I C T E S T I M O N Y

5 MS. SERENA SWEET: I know a few of you came in  
6 a little bit after. We can fill you in maybe after this, but  
7 if -- does anyone have anything to add?

8 MR. CASS RAY: Could you take us back -- just  
9 for one second back to the slide that shows Glitter Gulch.

10 MS. TRICIA WAGGONER: It takes just a second.

11 MS. SERENA SWEET: This one?

12 MR. CASS RAY: Yes.

13 MS. SERENA SWEET: One more forward.

14 MS. TRICIA WAGGONER: You wanted the other one?

15 MR. CASS RAY: The next one.

16 MS. SERENA SWEET: Yes.

17 MR. CASS RAY: That's the one. Thank you.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is that the power line, the  
19 yellow line? The same route as the Intertie?

20 MS. SERENA SWEET: Is that yellow line the  
21 power line route?

22 MR. MICHAEL SOTAK: There will be a little bit  
23 of it along the power line, but not -- for the most part it  
24 probably won't. I would think that possibly right in this area  
25 here will be along the Intertie. But remember, the Intertie

1 can go across large spans where you can't put pipelines.  
2 That's why, you know, the Intertie comes through what is --  
3 what is the -- into this. The blue Intertie is here. Okay.  
4 Well, no, I'm sorry. This is.....

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's not the intertie.

6 MR. MICHAEL SOTAK: What is that canyon?

7 Moody -- I want to say Moody Creek. Is it Moody Canyon? Okay.  
8 Moody Canyon was looked at many years ago and dropped because  
9 of its difficulty of construction and terrain. You know, in a  
10 lot of areas you can put power lines across large spans, and  
11 you can do that through Moody Canyon, but you could not put a  
12 pipeline in there because you have the steep hills and ravines  
13 that go back and forth and back and forth and back and forth.  
14 And you're so isolated there, if you have an avalanche or  
15 something, the pipeline goes out, your whole supply to  
16 Anchorage is out for a long period of time, and you have no  
17 other option or alternative.

18 So this route is a very stable route and a very  
19 easy route, really to construct. Some people suggested that,  
20 yeah, it might be a difficult route. We looked at it, and it's  
21 very easy to move across.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is that a bridge?

23 MR. MICHAEL SOTAK: I'm sorry?

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Would it be a bridge?

25 MR. MICHAEL SOTAK: No. It will be open cut.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I mean, under the Yanert?

2 MR. MICHAEL SOTAK: I'm sorry?

3 MS. PAT WINKLMANN: You'd be going under the  
4 Yanert?

5 MR. MICHAEL SOTAK: You would go in and  
6 excavate the river bottom, put the pipe in, and then cover it  
7 back up. And you just are -- you have to put the pipe in -- if  
8 it's solid rock, then it's easy to blast. You put the pipe in  
9 the trench, and then you cover it over, and that pipe is going  
10 to stay in that solid rock.

11 If it's material that's -- you know, that  
12 can't -- you know, erode, you just have to put it down deep  
13 enough so that you get away from the scour area. And open  
14 river crossings are the easiest way to do it and the most  
15 effective way, because once it's in underneath the river and  
16 placed -- and the banks were restored, you don't even know the  
17 pipeline is there. Yes.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What are the Title 11 issues  
19 that you mentioned?

20 MR. MICHAEL SOTAK: Well Title 11, you know, a  
21 pipeline is -- under Title 11 -- you can do a lot of things  
22 under Title 11, but you can't put a pipeline into a  
23 National Park under Title 11.

24 MS. SERENA SWEET: Ron, would you mind giving  
25 us a few pointers on Title 11 requirements real quick.

1 MR. RON DUTON: A Title 11 allows  
2 transportation assistance to go through some of the  
3 conservation units that were created. In the case of  
4 Denali National Park, the Park Service is not authorized to  
5 grant a right of way for a pipeline. Therefore, the process --  
6 it's still conceivable that it could happen, but it ends up  
7 going to Congress after a lengthy review, and then to the  
8 President for approval.

9 There is legislation that's been proposed by  
10 Senator Murkowski. It passed out of committee, it's part of a  
11 much larger bill. We have no idea if it's going to move. But  
12 there is legislation that would authorize the Park Service --  
13 or give the Park Service authority to grant right of way. We  
14 would still have to go through the Title 11 process.

15 And that's one of the reasons we're looking at  
16 this as an alternative. If the legislation passes in time, the  
17 alternative could be accepted and go through the park. But it  
18 would have to pass prior to the Draft EIS. Because there's  
19 certain steps that -- either that or we'd have to start over  
20 the entire process.

21 MR. MICHAEL SOTAK: And the draft EIS would  
22 have to identify, as part of Title 11, that this is the  
23 preferred option to the other one. And a hearing would have to  
24 be held in Washington DC during the public hearing process.  
25 Those things would have to go forward to be in compliance with

1 Title 11.

2 MS. SERENA SWEET: And, sir, do you mind  
3 stating your name just so we can get that on the.....

4 MR. JOHN WINKLMANN: You bet. John Winklmann.

5 MS. SERENA SWEET: Thank you.

6 MR. JOHN WINKLMANN: I'm from Healy.

7 MS. SERENA SWEET: Excellent. Thank you very  
8 much. Other comments, questions?

9 MR. CASS RAY: Do you know what milepost the  
10 river will rejoin the highway there in the south? Do you know  
11 about what milepost that is?

12 MR. MICHAEL SOTAK: I don't, but right now  
13 we're -- right here is where we are at milepost -- what is  
14 it -- 2.....

15 MR. CASS RAY: 230.

16 MR. MICHAEL SOTAK: .....230, and this is  
17 roughly six miles from this point down to this point. So I  
18 would say this is probably about 235, 236, somewhere in there  
19 would be my guess.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's 224; the other  
21 direction. Yeah.

22 MR. MICHAEL SOTAK: I'm sorry. 224, 225. I'm  
23 doing the opposite.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We understand it.

25 MS. SERENA SWEET: And, I'm sorry. Could we

1 get your name, also, on the.....

2 MR. CASS RAY: Cass Ray.

3 MS. SERENA SWEET: Thank you. Do we have  
4 anyone else at this point? Well, we're going to be here for  
5 several more minutes, and there's information around the room  
6 if you want to take a look at that, and we can answer any  
7 questions you have. And like I said, thank you for coming, and  
8 we'll be here. Thank you.

9 (Off record)

10 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

11 \* \* \* \*

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )  
 ) ss.  
STATE OF ALASKA )

I, Crystal D. Scotti, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska, residing at North Pole, Alaska, and court reporter for Liz D'Amour & Associates, Inc., do hereby certify:

That the annexed and foregoing ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING was taken before me on the 11th day of December 2009, beginning at the hour of 11:53 a.m., at Denali Park, Alaska;

That this hearing, as heretofore annexed, is a true and correct transcription of the hearing, taken by me and thereafter transcribed by me;

That the original of this hearing has been retained by me for the purpose of filing the same with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, CEPOA-RD, P.O. Box 6898, Elmendorf AFB, Alaska, as required by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers;

That I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I financially interested in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 7th day of January 2010.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Crystal D. Scotti  
Notary Public in and for Alaska  
My Commission Expires: 9/15/2010

S E A L

**Barrow, Alaska**

**December 17, 2009**

ALASKA STAND ALONE PIPELINE

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

BARROW, ALASKA

HERITAGE CENTER

December 17, 2009

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Barrow, Alaska - 12/17/2009)

(On record)

(Invocation by Elder)

(Presentation)

MR. NAGEAK: How many fault lines long the.....

MS. SPRETER: I -- you know, I don't know. I don't have that answer. Does anybody here have the answer of exactly how many faults -- our person who's the expert in that is on his way to Hawaii. He's been going up and down this highway for over 30 years and I think he knows every fault.

MR. NAGY: You have mentioned in the past that there's potentially one in the Yukon River, which is the reason for the aerial crossing.....

MS. SPRETER: Right.

MR. NAGY: .....there, so that's at least two.

MS. SPRETER: Okay. There's two. Okay.

(Presentation continues)

MR. NAGEAK: Are there trees to be cut, willow, you know, and that other stuff or -- for the roads, and what would happen to all that.....

MS. SPRETER: It's restored.

MR. NAGEAK: Huh?

MS. SPRETER: It's -- anything that -- along the route, if I'm not mistaken.

MS. SWEET: The details of the restoration work have not been finalized, but input as far as what you would recommend would be good. We're going to be working on those details as we move through the process and.....

MR. NAGEAK: And what's the -- what's the width for that right-of-way?

MS. SWEET: I believe.....

MR. DUTTON: Fifty foot on federal -- fifty foot from BLM, 30 from the State, I believe, plus the width of the pipe.

MR. NAGEAK: How much?

MS. SPRETER: Going across State land it would be 30. If it's going across federal land, it's 50.

MR. DUTTON: Plus the width of the pipe.

MS. SPRETER: And then that one path I showed you where it would have reclaimed there, there's that one fault line that I showed you. Yes.

MR. HERREMAN: And in your corridors, you mentioned a 2000 foot wide corridor to start with, and then you said you're only doing 300 foot for your analysis for as far as wildlife impacts. So is your 2000 foot corridor, is that what's actually being -- what's the actual imprint during the construction?

MS. SWEET: The way this is being looked at is a 2,000 foot, it's a biological assessment corridor. That 300 foot corridor is speaking to the Watley's type survey. And then 100 foot corridor is the construction.....

MR. DUTTON: Yes.

MS. SWEET: .....corridor. So it's kind of necking down as you get more detailed to a smaller width, but they're still trying to incorporate the total footprint within the corridor so that additional data collection later on wouldn't be necessary if the pipe had been moved around a little bit within that -- when they do the actual design and engineering if it's just a light shift that's necessary, ideally it would be within that corridor.

MR. HERREMAN: And when you start looking at accuracy.....

MS. VORDERSTRASSE: Excuse me, can ask you the individuals asking questions to state their name and who they represent so that.....

MR. HERREMAN: I'm sorry.

MS. VORDERSTRASSE: .....we as a community who is speaking?  
Thank you.

MR. HERREMAN: Sorry. I'm Jason Herreman. I'm one of the biologists with the North Slope Borough.

REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. HERREMAN: So when you start talking about just raptor issues you know, you're looking -- you're looking at a half mile to a mile that you're required to stay away from some of these nests, so I'm kind of wondering why you're only looking at wildlife at a 300 foot corridor when you're going to be dealing with these issues directly on constructing this pipeline. I mean, that's -- just right there, that's one that just pops out

right away for issues as far as wildlife.

MS. SWEET: Okay. And I think that's the kind of information that we're looking for is what sort of factors are going to be needed for the different agencies to make their -- their permitting decisions or different local decisions, so if you just provide us with that, that's -- we will take into consideration certainly.

Real quick before we move forward, I just have two other quick points I wanted to make. The scoping process, as I said, is one of the earliest processes in the development of environmental impact statement. I also wanted to point out the timing that we expect the draft environmental impact statement to be completed, and that will be in probably July of 2010. We expect public hearings on the draft environmental impact statement of August of that year. And finally I just want to put up some information on -- my contact information and other ways to submit comments. This information is also available in that folded handout in the back of the room, so if you want to grab one of those, you're welcome to have that all written down. At this point, I would like to open it up to public comment and question, and as I said, if you could state your name we'd appreciate that and go ahead.

MS. VORDERSTRASSE: Edith Vorderstrasse from UIC UMIAQ. The presentation that was just presented today, is that available.....

MS. SWEET: Yeah, that's available on our website. And it's actually on the link for scoping meetings, I believe at the bottom it can be downloaded. And that website is -- it's the one up there. It's also on that handout.

MR. NAGEAK: Is that -- is that where we can get that -- your presentation today?

MS. SWEET: Yeah. On that website on the link that says scoping meetings you can download these slides that we -- we gave today.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay. Good. This one on the top?

MS. SWEET: Yeah. And I can get you a handout too that has it also.

MS. VORDERSTRASSE: It's on this thing, the (In Inupiat) that we got at the door.

MR. NAGEAK: Okay.

MS. SWEET: Yeah.

MR. NAGEAK: Thank you. Okay.

MS. SWEET: There have been a few technical issues in the last few days with some of the items on the website, so give us a couple of days and it'll be ready. We've been on the road, so we haven't been able to deal with them maybe, but we'll have it up for sure. And if for reason it doesn't work, get a hold of me and I'll make sure you get a copy. If nothing else, we can get you a CD or something else to make sure you get it.

I also wanted to mention quickly the formal scoping period

ends on February 5th. That's when we're going to cut off the comments accepted to be included within our scoping report. However, we will be accepting comments throughout the EIS process, so.....

MR. NAGEAK: So the -- I'm sorry.....

REPORTER: State your name.

MR. NAGEAK: Ben Nageak, BLM, Barrow. So the -- the agencies are working towards this project, they will be working on some of the issues themselves that might come up with the -- especially in the BLM area?

MS. SWEET: Right. The purpose of the environmental impact statement is ideally to get all of the information together in one place so that all the decision-makers can look at the same set of information and make educated decisions. Yes.

MR. JEMMING: Is the United States Fish and Wildlife going to be a cooperating agency as well? And this is -- my name is Jonny Jemming from North Slope Borough law department.

MS. SWEET: They have not signed on yet as a cooperating agency. That doesn't mean that they can't further on. There's no deadline to sign on as cooperating agency, but they have not yet indicated that they are interested in being involved.

MR. JEMMING: Okay.

MS. SWEET: Other comments or questions at this point?

MR. BROWER: In the August, later, in the impact statement, and then after, at a more appropriate, are you going to come back

to Barrow with that information?

MS. SWEET: We will send out notifications when the draft EIS is done so that everybody will get a chance to take a look at it and then we'll come back after you've had -- I think it's a -- there's a waiting period of about a month that we give the individuals. And then we come back and we'll -- we'll let everybody talk about it and have another meeting and discuss your concerns or issues at that point. So we expect that to be in August, but, you know, the best laid plans don't always go -- things may -- may change. That's our anticipated date. Yes.

MR. JEMMING: This is Jonny Jemming again with the North Slope Borough law department. If we're on the record, we'll submit comments in writing as well, but some of the things that we've been asking from other agencies is that in an environmental planning and review is for health impact assessments of projects and included in health impact assessments are analyses related to impacts of air emissions that are connected to the action, possible water quality impacts that we know you'll be looking at anyway, but we want to have those directly tied into the public and community health, specifically when you're looking at disproportionate impacts to village communities such as whether it be areas like Nuiqsut or others. But we know that with air quality in particular that we have a lot of interest in knowing where additional emission sources will be occurring, because the concentrations in areas like Nuiqsut are elevated. And so we're

trying to keep track of those trends as we look at the health impacts on those types of communities. So we would hope that you would look at those types of impacts.

And then we also have been asking for more indirect analyses on the possible habitat impact. And those, we'll get from wildlife and we'll submit them.

But the question that I have related to those comments is can you indicated to where you preliminary identified any compressor stations?

MS. SWEET: There -- there -- we're calling them compressor station envelopes at this point and actually within the -- I think it's the department of the army permit application, there's a set of maps that include the locations along the pipe where compressor stations could be. So take a look at those maps and that should give you an indication of a general area where they're proposed to be, the exact location and has not been finalized, so.....

MR. BROWER: Those compressor stations (indiscernible) that we can -- that you can give to the (indiscernible).....

MS. VORDERSTRASSE: Repeat the question. It's hard to hear you.

MS. SWEET: Yeah.

REPORTER: Speak up. Speak up, Arnold.

MS. SWEET: I think the question was related to is the compressor station going to be able to be used for LNG for smaller communities along the pipe or other.....

MR. BROWER: Private.

MS. SWEET: .....private entities?

MR. BROWER: Entrepreneurs that want to sell the  
(indiscernible) gas?

MS. SWEET: I think at this point that's not part of the proposal, but I don't think it's restricted, but -- and that's a good question and we're -- I think it's something that the State needs to -- to consider. And but if you wanted to include -- we'll include this in our comments so that they can definitely consider it.

MR. BROWER: For my area -- it's coming up on my area and that we're -- we certainly would like to be enjoying some benefit as the State.

MS. SWEET: Certainly.

MR. BROWER: And not pay \$9 a gallon for our  
(indiscernible).

MS. VORDERSTRASSE: Please speak up.

MS. SWEET: Other comments or questions at this point? Yes.

MR. JEMMING: Relating to the comment just provided, we also -- one of the comments that we'll also submit in writing to have on the record is relating to Executive Order 12898, an environmental justice analysis and talking about benefits to communities that will obviously be suffering some of the impacts of any possible impacts to be occurring; but Executive Order

12898 would ask that you -- and we would encourage you to look at an environmental justice analysis, identify possible benefits to the communities to offset any disproportional impacts, especially since we have a lot of indicators that these types of actions may have possible impacts on subsistence use. So we try to identify other ways to mitigate that.

MS. SWEET: Other comments or questions?

(No comments)

MS. SWEET: I think we're -- we're going to be here and we're giving this same presentation starting at 5:00 o'clock for those of you who may have come in a little bit late. But in the meantime we'll be here answering questions and be available.

So thank you for all for coming.

We really appreciate and thank you.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Salena A. Hile, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 11 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of proceedings, transcribed under my direction from a copy of an electronic sound recording to the best of our knowledge and ability.

\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
SALENA A. HILE