

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

DONLIN GOLD PROJECT  
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
PUBLIC MEETING

NUNAPITCHUK, ALASKA

Taken March 17, 2016  
Commencing at 1:15 p.m.

Volume I - Pages 1 - 67, Inclusive

Taken at  
Community Center  
Nunapitchuk, Alaska

Reported by:  
Mary A. Vavrik, RMR

Page 2

1 For U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:  
 2 Keith Gordon  
 3 Project Manager  
 4 For U.S. Bureau of Land Management:  
 5 Alan Bittner  
 6 Anchorage Field Office Manager  
 7 For AECOM:  
 8 Nancy Darigo  
 9 Physical Science Lead  
 10 Jessica Evans  
 11 Public Involvement Lead  
 12 David Every  
 13 Biological Science Lead  
 14 Donne Fleagle  
 15 Senior Rural Outreach Lead  
 16 Amy Rosenthal  
 17 Social Science Lead  
 18 Yup'ik Translator:  
 19 Lillian Michael  
 20 Taken by:  
 21 Mary A. Vavrik, RMR  
 22  
 23 BE IT KNOWN that the aforementioned proceedings were taken  
 24 at the time and place duly noted on the title page, before  
 25 Mary A. Vavrik, Registered Merit Reporter and Notary  
 Public within and for the State of Alaska.

Page 4

1 assisting us in developing the Environmental Impact  
 2 Statement.  
 3 The Army Corps of Engineers is neither a proponent  
 4 for the project nor an opponent of the project. We're  
 5 required to do middle-of-the-road analyses of the  
 6 potential effects of the project, disclose those to the  
 7 public, and give you all an opportunity to comment not  
 8 only on the project that Donlin is proposing, but the  
 9 alternatives to the project and the analyses of potential  
 10 impacts of the project.  
 11 Our agenda for today, I'll go through a brief  
 12 presentation that describes the things I just mentioned to  
 13 you, and then Mr. Alan Bittner of the Bureau of Land  
 14 Management will do an introduction to the 810 ANILCA  
 15 subsistence hearing they are going to do today. After our  
 16 two presentations, we will break and give you all a chance  
 17 to look at these 12 posters we have on the wall over here.  
 18 Three of them give you a description of what Donlin is  
 19 proposing to do by way of their project, and the other  
 20 nine just give you information about the potential impacts  
 21 of the project.  
 22 After that poster session, we will reconvene to take  
 23 your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement,  
 24 and then the BLM will do their 810 ANILCA hearing.  
 25 We will start by giving a little bit of background

Page 3

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S  
 2 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** Good afternoon, folks.  
 3 Lillian will give a little bit of information about what  
 4 we're here for today, and then we will go ahead and get  
 5 started.  
 6 **MS. LILLIAN MICHAEL:** [speaking in  
 7 Yup'ik.]  
 8 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** All right. Thank you  
 9 very much. I know we may still have a few people coming  
 10 in, but because we are doing a comment session on the  
 11 Draft Environmental Impact Statement today as well as an  
 12 810 hearing, we kind of need to go ahead and get started.  
 13 My name is Keith Gordon. As Lillian mentioned, I'm a  
 14 project manager with the Army Corps of Engineers. We're  
 15 here today to give you a little information on the status  
 16 of the EIS, draft EIS that's out for your comment in  
 17 relation to the proposed Donlin Gold Mine project, as well  
 18 as a description of that project and primarily information  
 19 on how you can comment to us on that project.  
 20 The Army Corps of Engineers is the lead federal  
 21 agency for the development of the Environmental Impact  
 22 Statement simply because of our role in the process. We  
 23 have 11 cooperating agencies assisting us in development  
 24 of the EIS. You can see the logos of those folks on the  
 25 screen, as well as the Native communities that are

Page 5

1 information on Donlin's proposed project. The project has  
 2 three primary components: The mine site facilities, the  
 3 transportation infrastructure needed to move equipment and  
 4 people to the mine site if it's permitted, and the  
 5 pipeline route that would be used to supply energy to it  
 6 so it could operate.  
 7 The mine site itself also is composed of three  
 8 primary components. The first component is depicted by  
 9 No. 1 on the screen. That is the mine pit itself. As  
 10 proposed, Donlin would actually start by opening up two  
 11 pits, the ACMA and Lewis pits. Those two pits would be  
 12 expanded into a single pit over time. The pit itself is  
 13 expected to be about 2.2 square miles in size and,  
 14 depending on whether you measure the depth of the pit from  
 15 the lowest point of the topography on the edge or the  
 16 highest point, it's anywhere from 1,100 feet deep to 1,850  
 17 feet deep.  
 18 The second primary component of Donlin's proposed  
 19 project is the tailings facility. Tailings are simply  
 20 effectively the crushed rock or the ground up rock that's  
 21 left over after the milling process. And basically it  
 22 would be stored in the valley that you can see on the  
 23 screen depicted by No. 2. There is a given amount of  
 24 water that is also entrained in those tailings, that  
 25 ground up rock, before it's put into the valley as a

Page 6

1 result of the milling process. And there may also be some  
 2 residual chemicals in the tailings. All of those tailings  
 3 would be constrained or held in place by a downslope  
 4 tailings dam that just retains them in the footprint they  
 5 are placed in. That tailings storage facility would be  
 6 about 3.5 square miles in size.  
 7 The third primary component of the mine site is the  
 8 waste rock facility. That facility is also about 3.5  
 9 square miles in size. Waste rock is either the  
 10 overburden, the material that needs to be removed so they  
 11 can get to the ore, or ore that simply just does not have  
 12 enough gold in it to be worth milling. So all that waste  
 13 rock would need to be piled up somewhere. And that's the  
 14 proposed location.  
 15 One thing to note while we talk about reclamation  
 16 later in the presentation, the pit itself would remain in  
 17 perpetuity. There would be a certain amount of backfill  
 18 that goes into the pit from waste rock or rock that wasn't  
 19 going to be milled that they need to put in the pit. The  
 20 waste rock facility would see some recontouring at the end  
 21 of mining life so that there is the potential to  
 22 revegetate the surface of it to a degree.  
 23 The tailings storage facility would also see some  
 24 recontouring, as well, to see if it can be revegetated.  
 25 The pit itself would fill with water over 50 to 55 years

Page 7

1 and become a large lake that would just remain in  
 2 perpetuity.  
 3 One of the other things that's important to note is  
 4 whether it's the pit that would become a lake or the water  
 5 in the tailings storage facility or water anywhere else on  
 6 the project, any and all water has to be treated to meet  
 7 federal and State water quality standards before it could  
 8 be released back to Crooked Creek or the Kuskokwim River.  
 9 You can also see the mill facility that is depicted  
 10 on the screen. And there is a variety of other facilities  
 11 that would be needed to be constructed around the mine  
 12 site.  
 13 A second primary component of Donlin's proposed  
 14 project is the transportation infrastructure. The vast  
 15 majority of all materials, supplies, fuel, et cetera,  
 16 based on the way Donlin is proposing to construct the  
 17 project, would have to be barged up the Kuskokwim River.  
 18 So that large pink blob in the center of the screen is  
 19 Donlin's proposed mine facility. They are proposing to  
 20 construct a 30-mile access road down to the Kuskokwim  
 21 River to what would be a new industrial port facility at  
 22 Jungjuk just downstream of Crooked Creek. The road  
 23 itself, the port would be industrial facilities not open  
 24 for public use.  
 25 There is also, if constructed as proposed, a

Page 8

1 5,000-foot airstrip that you can see on the screen that  
 2 moves personnel in and out of the project so that the  
 3 workers can get in and out, safety inspectors, all that  
 4 sort of thing.  
 5 There is also an expectation that the project would  
 6 use approximately 40 million gallons of diesel a year to  
 7 power the heavy mining equipment, the haul trucks, the  
 8 excavators, et cetera. All that would have to be barged  
 9 up the Kuskokwim River, and a portion of it is temporarily  
 10 stored at the port site. The vast majority of it would be  
 11 stored in tanks at the mine site.  
 12 Donlin's proposed project overall, just to give you  
 13 an idea of scale, if you put all the developed facilities  
 14 in a single footprint, it would occupy an area about 26  
 15 square miles. So that's just -- gives you an idea of the  
 16 overall footprint of the project.  
 17 The third primary component of what Donlin is  
 18 proposing to construct is a 315-mile long, 14-inch  
 19 diameter buried steel pipeline that would run from the  
 20 western side of Cook Inlet over to the mine site. And we  
 21 will give you a depiction of that route in relation to  
 22 alternatives a little bit later.  
 23 Donlin is currently proposing to purchase all that  
 24 natural gas on the open market, so that doesn't  
 25 necessarily mean it comes from the same supply that

Page 9

1 supplies Cook Inlet. It may or may not. It could just  
 2 come from wherever they need to purchase it from.  
 3 Project phases. If the project were constructed as  
 4 proposed, it takes three to four years to construct, is  
 5 expected to operate for 27 and a half years, and then  
 6 closure takes a number of years; but it's important to  
 7 note that, for instance, there are expected to be  
 8 facilities, if the project is permitted, that are needed  
 9 for construction only that would be effectively reclaimed  
 10 during the construction phase or at the end of the  
 11 construction phase. There is facilities that Donlin may  
 12 need that they would need for operations but they may only  
 13 need for a few years, so some of those facilities may be  
 14 reclaimed in a short period of time.  
 15 The vast majority of reclamation would take place at  
 16 the end of the mining life, so approximately 31 and a half  
 17 years after construction started. And reclamation is --  
 18 there is a wide variety of definitions of what reclamation  
 19 means. There are some facilities that would effectively  
 20 nearly be reclaimed to look like the former footprint of  
 21 what was there before Donlin went in.  
 22 There is a variety of other facilities that would not  
 23 be reclaimed necessarily to the same level; for instance,  
 24 that 315-mile pipeline, there is no road proposed to run  
 25 along that entire pipeline route. There is just a

Page 10

1 corridor through the trees, et cetera, so that the  
 2 pipeline can be constructed. There would have to be in  
 3 some segments what they call shoofly roads, short little  
 4 gravel roads that are used for construction. Some of  
 5 those roads are used to access water sites. Some are used  
 6 to access materials sites where they need to get gravel  
 7 for construction. Some of them are just because they have  
 8 to get around aspects of topography that mean they need to  
 9 build roads so they can keep building the pipeline.  
 10 Those roads would be reclaimed by putting some  
 11 material back on the surface of the road and allowing it  
 12 to revegetate naturally versus actually removing those  
 13 roads. But again, those roads are not intended to be  
 14 access routes for anyone, but they may still exist at the  
 15 end of the project life.  
 16 This slide gives you a little bit of information on  
 17 the major federal permits required for the project. There  
 18 are over 100 permits, authorizations of one kind or  
 19 another needed for Donlin's project to go forward. I  
 20 mentioned that the Army Corps of Engineers is neither a  
 21 proponent for nor an opponent of the proposed project.  
 22 One of the things to keep in mind is the Army Corps of  
 23 Engineers does have a role at the end of the day, as you  
 24 can see on the top of the screen, regarding whether or not  
 25 we would issue a 404 permit for fill in wetlands or other

Page 11

1 waters of the U.S., lakes, rivers, streams that would be  
 2 needed to construct the project. We would also have to  
 3 issue permits for impacts to navigable waters under  
 4 Section 10.  
 5 Well, regardless of whether or not the Army Corps of  
 6 Engineers decided to issue permits for the project as  
 7 Donlin is proposing to construct it, issue permits for  
 8 some alternative to what Donlin is proposing, or not issue  
 9 permits at all, that does not constrain any other  
 10 permitting entity to make the same decision, a different  
 11 decision or the opposite decision. So there is a whole  
 12 variety of folks who have a role to play in analyzing the  
 13 potential impacts of the project. And everybody --  
 14 virtually everybody's decisions are largely independent of  
 15 each other.  
 16 There is a variety of major State permits that were  
 17 also required for the project. These are just an example  
 18 of a few of those.  
 19 While we are talking about federal authorizations  
 20 required, I mentioned earlier that we are doing an 810  
 21 hearing today under ANILCA in relation to potential  
 22 impacts to subsistence. Alan, did you want to introduce  
 23 the 810 just by way of what you are going to discuss  
 24 today?  
 25 **MR. ALAN BITTNER:** Hi. My name is Alan

Page 12

1 Bittner with the Bureau of Land Management. I'm the field  
 2 manager for the Anchorage field office. And because the  
 3 Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act stipulates  
 4 if there is potential impacts to subsistence based on a  
 5 proposed project, BLM is required to do an analysis of  
 6 subsistence impacts, and then also required to potentially  
 7 affected communities conduct 810 hearings or Section 810  
 8 of ANILCA hearings.  
 9 So we're here to give you just a really brief  
 10 presentation when Keith is done and then later in the --  
 11 this afternoon conduct a short hearing where you can give  
 12 testimony as to either positive or negative benefits to  
 13 subsistence based on this proposed project.  
 14 Thanks.  
 15 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** Thank you very much.  
 16 Okay. Very briefly, the Corps of Engineers did scoping  
 17 meetings back in December and March of 2012 and '13 to  
 18 talk to some of the communities and get input on what the  
 19 major issues are that needed to be analyzed in the EIS,  
 20 whether that's subsistence impacts, air quality, water  
 21 quality, socioeconomics related to employment or other  
 22 issues. Those comments received during the scoping  
 23 meetings were in part used to define what we needed to  
 24 analyze in the draft EIS.  
 25 That EIS went out for public comment on November 27th

Page 13

1 of last year and is currently out for comments through  
 2 April 30 of 2016. So approximately six more weeks after  
 3 we get everybody's comments, after April 30, we will  
 4 respond to those comments and use those comments to  
 5 determine if our draft analyses are correct, draft  
 6 conclusions are correct, if there is any additional field  
 7 work we need to do, if there are analyses that need to be  
 8 expanded, if our conclusions are correct, et cetera.  
 9 Following the response to comments and any additional  
 10 work we may need to do, we would develop a Final  
 11 Environmental Impact Statement, put that out for the  
 12 public to take a brief look at, and then the Army Corps of  
 13 Engineers, the Bureau of Land Management and the Pipeline  
 14 Hazardous Materials Safety Administration would develop  
 15 their Records of Decision that indicate whether or not  
 16 they felt they could permit the project as Donlin is  
 17 proposing it, some alternative to it, or not permit it at  
 18 all.  
 19 I'll very briefly give you some information on what's  
 20 in the first half a dozen chapters of the EIS by way of  
 21 giving you an idea of what you might be able to comment on  
 22 or might be interested in commenting on. The first  
 23 chapter talks about the purpose and need for the project.  
 24 Of course, Donlin has their purpose for the project they  
 25 are proposing to construct, but the Army Corps of

Page 14

1 Engineers, by way of our role, has to define the overall  
 2 purpose and need of the project in relation to unbiased  
 3 analyses to facilitate the public's review of the project.  
 4 You can see our overall purpose on the screen. I  
 5 have to note, however, that we had an editorial change  
 6 that did not get made before the document went out. So  
 7 after "Western Alaska" in the document, if you look at it  
 8 now, there is a half a sentence there that was supposed to  
 9 have been removed before the document went out. That half  
 10 a sentence stated that part of our purpose was to maximize  
 11 the economic benefit of the project to Donlin's  
 12 stockholders, Calista and TKC shareholders.  
 13 Well, that's not accurate. That's not part of our  
 14 purpose because we are tasked with doing unbiased  
 15 middle-of-the-road analyses for the general public. We  
 16 can't excessively weight the economic benefit of the  
 17 project to any one group over another if we are doing  
 18 unbiased analyses. That doesn't, by any means, suggest  
 19 that we don't understand the potential positive benefits  
 20 of this project to the Yukon-Kuskokwim River region. That  
 21 is part of the analyses, and you will see that in the  
 22 document if you would like to take a look at it. We just  
 23 can't weight economics too heavily one way or another in  
 24 relation to the analyses and still be going down the  
 25 middle of the road.

Page 15

1 Chapter 2 talks about the alternatives. Donlin's  
 2 proposed alternative, what they want to do is Alternative  
 3 No. 2, the proposed action. There is half a dozen other  
 4 action alternatives on that screen. The Army Corps of  
 5 Engineers and the cooperators, as you can see on the  
 6 screen, developed over 300 alternative options that were  
 7 available to be developed into alternatives. We develop  
 8 alternatives by way of trying to figure out how we can  
 9 potentially minimize the impacts of a project someone is  
 10 proposing to construct. These are the alternatives that  
 11 survived for detailed analyses in the EIS.  
 12 Because we already talked about what Donlin is  
 13 proposing to do, alternative No. 2, I won't go through  
 14 that in any greater detail.  
 15 Alternative 1, as you can see, is the no action  
 16 alternative. That means that nothing is constructed,  
 17 nothing is developed, everything stays the way it is. We  
 18 are required by the National Environmental Policy Act,  
 19 that law, to analyze proposed projects and their  
 20 alternatives in light of the no action alternative. In  
 21 other words, we compare everything to that, as well as  
 22 comparing each of the alternatives to each other because  
 23 if we are not comparing what someone is proposing to do to  
 24 what currently exists in an area, then we can't be doing  
 25 functional analyses.

Page 16

1 As I mentioned, the alternatives are intended to find  
 2 ways to potentially see if a project can be developed in a  
 3 manner that minimizes impacts. So the rest of the  
 4 alternatives we will talk about have aspects to them that  
 5 may potentially minimize some of the impacts to the  
 6 project, but also each of those have tradeoffs in relation  
 7 to going with that alternative versus what Donlin is  
 8 proposing to do.  
 9 So Alternative 3A is the LNG-powered haul truck  
 10 alternative. What this alternative means is that instead  
 11 of the 300-ton payload trucks, the excavators, some of the  
 12 other heavy equipment that would operate in the mine being  
 13 powered by diesel, the haul trucks in particular would be  
 14 powered by liquid natural gas. The benefit of that is  
 15 diesel doesn't burn as cleanly as liquid natural gas. So  
 16 there is -- if this alternative went forward, what it  
 17 would mean is that you have to barge less diesel up the  
 18 Kuskokwim River into the mine site; less diesel has to be  
 19 stored; less diesel would be burned. But it has  
 20 tradeoffs.  
 21 If you are doing that, that also means that you have  
 22 to build an LNG plant at the mine site, which Donlin is  
 23 not proposing to build, to convert the natural gas into  
 24 liquid natural gas so it could then be burned in those  
 25 heavy haul trucks. But it also means that you are barging

Page 17

1 less diesel up the Kuskokwim River, so there is less  
 2 barging and less impacts from barging. There is less  
 3 potential for spills of diesel on the Kuskokwim River,  
 4 et cetera.  
 5 Alternative 3B is the diesel pipeline alternative.  
 6 This alternative is another alternative that potentially  
 7 minimizes impacts of diesel in relation to Donlin's  
 8 proposed action. This alternative means that that  
 9 315-mile pipeline that Donlin was proposing to build to  
 10 bring natural gas into the project, well, there would be  
 11 no natural gas pipeline. It would be replaced with a  
 12 diesel pipeline.  
 13 Currently it's proposed to follow the same alignment,  
 14 except for the fact that there would be a 19-mile segment  
 15 added to it to run down to Tyonek so that marine barges  
 16 could bring diesel to an expanded port facility at the  
 17 North Foreland Barge Facility at Tyonek. So that 315-mile  
 18 pipeline becomes a 334-mile pipeline, and you have got  
 19 diesel running through it instead of natural gas.  
 20 Well, the tradeoffs are that that virtually, except  
 21 during construction, eliminates all diesel barging on the  
 22 Kuskokwim River. So you have substantially less barging  
 23 on the Kuskokwim River. You have less potential for  
 24 diesel spills on the Kuskokwim River, et cetera. However,  
 25 the tradeoff is now there is less barging on the Kuskokwim

Page 18

1 River, but that barging is made up for by barging going  
 2 through Cook Inlet, and the potential for spill changes  
 3 from the Kuskokwim River to Cook Inlet.  
 4 There is also changes in the potential for spill  
 5 between a natural gas line leaking or rupturing versus a  
 6 diesel line leaking or rupturing. So again, anytime we  
 7 change alternatives, we change potential impacts. And the  
 8 idea we are trying to get across here is that anytime we  
 9 look at one alternative versus another, not only do we  
 10 change impacts, but we change how we weigh and balance the  
 11 potential effects.  
 12 So what we are interested from you all is, of those  
 13 300 things that we -- options that we had to turn into  
 14 alternatives, are there -- they are listed in an appendix  
 15 to the EIS. Did we include the right number of things?  
 16 Are there things we could have considered as alternatives  
 17 that we did not? Did we combine them in the right way?  
 18 Are there combinations that we could have made that we  
 19 didn't? In other words, are there other ways to minimize  
 20 potential impacts of Donlin's proposed project that we  
 21 haven't considered or considered adequately or reached the  
 22 right conclusions on?  
 23 Alternative 4 is the Birch Tree Crossing port  
 24 alternative. This is the last of the alternatives related  
 25 to potentially limiting barging impacts. I mentioned that

Page 19

1 Donlin was proposing a 30-mile access road to the new  
 2 industrial port facility at Jungjuk. Under this  
 3 alternative, instead of that 30-mile road being built, the  
 4 red line that you can see on the screen, the purple line  
 5 would be the road route down to a port facility at Birch  
 6 Tree Crossing.  
 7 It would be the same setup. It would be a private  
 8 industrial port served by a private industrial road, but  
 9 the road would be 76 miles long versus 30 miles long,  
 10 which would mean there would be substantially more truck  
 11 traffic; but one of the advantages of is this alternative,  
 12 potentially, you are all familiar with the potential for  
 13 stranding barges on the Kuskokwim River.  
 14 Well, this alternative, from what we are aware of --  
 15 and you can tell us if we are right or wrong -- there is a  
 16 half a dozen shallow spots we are aware of on the  
 17 Kuskokwim River where riverine barges get stranded from  
 18 time to time. Well, five of those six spots that we are  
 19 aware of are upstream of Birch Tree Crossing.  
 20 So save for a small amount of barging that would have  
 21 to be done upstream of Birch Tree Crossing during  
 22 construction of the project, this alternative means that  
 23 effectively there is no riverine barging upstream of Birch  
 24 Tree Crossing. And it's beneficial to point out that  
 25 obviously the -- all three of these alternatives relate to

Page 20

1 riverine barging that is taking place upstream of Bethel.  
 2 There is also a whole bunch of marine barging that would  
 3 have to take place downstream of Bethel, but these  
 4 alternatives primarily address the upstream issue.  
 5 Of course, if you are lessening diesel shipments on  
 6 the riverine portion, you are also lessening diesel  
 7 shipping on the riverine portion as well.  
 8 We'll now move to the last two alternatives we're  
 9 going to talk about. Alternative 5A is a dry stack  
 10 tailings alternatives. You remember that tailings  
 11 facility that I pointed out at the beginning of the  
 12 presentation, Donlin's proposed little valley fill? This  
 13 alternative has somewhat the same footprint, but in a  
 14 different configuration. This alternative basically means  
 15 that the tailings, that ground up or crushed rock that has  
 16 some water and/or residual chemicals entrained in it that  
 17 goes into the valley, still goes into the valley, but it  
 18 goes in much drier. Donlin would remove the water from  
 19 it, and that water would be placed in the operating pond  
 20 immediately downstream of the tailings facility.  
 21 So instead of one dam retaining the tailings and the  
 22 water that are entrained in them, what you end up with is  
 23 two dams retaining much drier tailings and then a  
 24 downslope dam, hydraulic dam, retaining all the water that  
 25 was removed from them.

Page 21

1 Well, why would we do this? What are the tradeoffs  
 2 of this? By separating the water and the tailings to a  
 3 greater degree, you are able to put the tailings in a  
 4 smaller footprint, but that also means that they would be  
 5 mounded up much higher, which means during the operating  
 6 life of the project, there is much more potential for wind  
 7 erosion of tailings and then dust deposition in the  
 8 general area. It also means that there is this operating  
 9 pond, this water that's removed from the tailings  
 10 downstream of it.  
 11 It's important to note that that pond would only  
 12 exist during mining activities. When mining activities  
 13 cease, that water would go over to the pit itself. And  
 14 again, any water coming off the project has to be treated  
 15 before it can be released to meet both federal and State  
 16 water quality standards.  
 17 The last alternative we are going to talk about is  
 18 Alternative 6A. Alternative 6A, there were a variety of  
 19 alternatives that were looked at by way of alternate  
 20 pipeline routes, alternate pipeline corridors. This is  
 21 the one that survived for detailed analysis in the EIS.  
 22 It's called the Dalzell Gorge pipeline route. One of the  
 23 advantages of this route -- or how does it offset impacts?  
 24 Well, it's a couple of miles shorter, but by going a  
 25 somewhat shorter route, we also end up with a route that

Page 22

1 has somewhat more impact potentially on the Iditarod  
 2 National Historic Trail.  
 3 So the gold color seen on the screen is Donlin's  
 4 proposed pipeline route. The purple color is the Dalzell  
 5 Gorge route that goes through Rainy Pass, Dalzell Gorge,  
 6 along the south fork of the Kuskokwim.  
 7 So again, you can take a look at the EIS and the  
 8 various other pipeline routes that were considered and  
 9 tell us whether or not we eliminated them for the right  
 10 reasons or whether or not they should be reconsidered for  
 11 other reasons or whether or not there are other pipeline  
 12 routes that should have been considered.  
 13 Another example of alternatives, there was  
 14 consideration of rail construction to get things to the  
 15 mine site, but that was not determined to be necessarily  
 16 economically or engineering -- as engineeringly feasible  
 17 as what Donlin is currently proposing or some of these  
 18 alternatives. There was also consideration of road routes  
 19 from the Yukon down to the Kuskokwim in addition to routes  
 20 to the mine, but there are no projects that we are  
 21 currently aware of that would construct such roads in a  
 22 time frame that would make them reasonable alternatives in  
 23 relation to what Donlin is proposing to do.  
 24 So that was Chapters 1 and 2 of the document. And  
 25 very briefly, Chapter 3 of the document is basically the

Page 23

1 heart of the document. It gives you a bunch of  
 2 information on the draft conclusions and the draft  
 3 analyses in the document. I'll introduce some folks or  
 4 have some folks that came with me introduce themselves  
 5 shortly before we go to the poster session. These folks  
 6 are from AECOM. AECOM is a third-party contractor. They  
 7 are an international engineering and environmental  
 8 analyses firm. These are the folks who are drafting most  
 9 of the analyses and drafting the conclusions that exist in  
 10 the document.  
 11 So what we need from you all is: Are these draft  
 12 analyses, conclusions accurate? This slide just gives you  
 13 an example of some of the analyses of the project,  
 14 specifically barge traffic and its potential impacts on  
 15 subsistence and fisheries. And this is just an example of  
 16 how the analyses were done.  
 17 There is 26 major resource issues that have been  
 18 defined in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. 14  
 19 of these are things that barging may impact. In other  
 20 words, surface water hydrology, impacts to wildlife,  
 21 impacts to visual resources, potential spill impacts, all  
 22 of those are major resource issues that we analyzed the  
 23 potential impacts of barge traffic to. And what we need  
 24 to know is: Is the draft analyses and draft conclusions  
 25 correct? Are there any resource issues that we looked at

Page 24

1 but didn't look at in sufficient detail?  
 2 By way of making our barge traffic example somewhat  
 3 functional for you, it's beneficial to talk about this  
 4 slide very briefly. This slide talks about existing barge  
 5 traffic on the Kuskokwim River versus barge traffic that  
 6 would occur if Donlin's project were constructed or if one  
 7 of these alternatives were constructed.  
 8 So the four bar graphs on the left side of the screen  
 9 relate to construction impacts and barging. The four bar  
 10 graphs on the right side of the screen relate to  
 11 operations impacts and barging. And as you can see, the  
 12 bar graph that only has a burnt gold color on it on the  
 13 far left side of each of the four is Alternative 1.  
 14 That's the no action alternative. That's just barging as  
 15 it currently exists on the Kuskokwim River. What we need  
 16 to know is: Do we actually understand barging as it  
 17 currently exists on the Kuskokwim River?  
 18 So it's our understanding that -- and please note  
 19 that this is riverine barging. It's our understanding  
 20 that 68 riverine barges leave Bethel to go upstream some  
 21 distance every summer. If we look at what currently  
 22 exists versus what Donlin is proposing, we use the example  
 23 of if you were standing on the shoreline upstream of  
 24 Bethel last summer, what you typically would have seen in  
 25 a 24-hour period is a tug pushing one or two barges go

Page 25

1 upstream past you in 24 hours.  
 2 If Donlin's project were constructed as they propose  
 3 under Alternative 2, in that same 24-hour period, you  
 4 would see a tug pushing anywhere from one to four barges  
 5 go past you three times in that same 24-hour period. If  
 6 it's the standard tug that currently exists, it would be a  
 7 small tug and a small barge. If it were one of these  
 8 configurations that Donlin is proposing, it would be a  
 9 larger tug pushing potentially two fuel barges, one or two  
 10 fuel barges, or up to four cargo barges.  
 11 But it's important to note that if you are looking at  
 12 the document, just looking at the tables and figures  
 13 doesn't always tell you the whole story. As you can see,  
 14 when we are talking about construction, virtually the  
 15 light blue color represents the change in barging activity  
 16 in relation to either Donlin's proposed alternative or any  
 17 of the other alternatives. And so for construction,  
 18 effectively we are talking about the same amount of  
 19 barging under any alternative, except please keep in mind  
 20 that Donlin is proposing to barge things up to the Jungjuk  
 21 port site. All the alternatives propose to barge things  
 22 up to the proposed Jungjuk port site, except for  
 23 Alternative 4.  
 24 Alternative 4, if you remember, only barges things as  
 25 far upstream as the Birch Tree Crossing. So while it's

Page 26

1 the same amount of barge traffic, it doesn't go as far  
 2 upriver. So you are eliminating some of those impacts  
 3 that would occur upriver.  
 4 The same thing occurs under operations, except that  
 5 you can see that there is a greater variation between  
 6 alternatives. Again, Alternatives 2 and 4 are represented  
 7 here. And they have the same volume of barge traffic, but  
 8 again, Alternative 4 only goes up to the Birch Tree  
 9 Crossing. It doesn't go as far up as the Jungjuk port  
 10 site. And then because Alternative 3A, that LNG haul  
 11 truck Alternative, and 3B, the diesel pipeline  
 12 alternative, mean that less diesel is shipped upstream,  
 13 that also means that there is less barging upstream as a  
 14 result.  
 15 I won't go into huge detail on these next couple of  
 16 slides because they are showing you the same thing you  
 17 have seen on the other slides when we talk about the  
 18 alternatives. The draft analyses and draft conclusions in  
 19 the document right now suggest that in relation to barge  
 20 traffic, we feel that there is potentially a moderate  
 21 impact to fish resulting from barge traffic. So whether  
 22 it's the wave erosion, prop wash, prop scour, et cetera,  
 23 impacting shoreline erosion, impacting fish habitat,  
 24 impacting their spawning grounds or just impacting the  
 25 fish themselves, we feel the impacts could be moderate;

Page 27

1 potentially greater impacts in shallow or narrow segments  
 2 of the river.  
 3 And then with each of the other alternatives -- 3A,  
 4 3B, 4 -- because there is less barging for each of those,  
 5 there is less potential impacts to fish. So it's the same  
 6 scenario you saw in the other slide, the same trends.  
 7 This slide just talks about tradeoffs of the various  
 8 alternatives in relation to barging and fish, whether it's  
 9 changes in spill risk, whether it's changes in emissions,  
 10 whether it's just limiting barging upstream of Birch Tree  
 11 Crossing except for construction. It's the same trend.  
 12 So again, the point to all of this is: Did we get the  
 13 draft analyses and draft conclusions correct? Have we  
 14 done enough analyses? And did we focus it in the right  
 15 directions?  
 16 So we are almost at the end of my presentation.  
 17 Chapters 4 and 5. Chapter 4 is cumulative impacts.  
 18 Cumulative impacts are something we use to forecast the  
 19 potential future impacts of a project if it's constructed.  
 20 So what we are doing is we are taking all past, present  
 21 and reasonably foreseeable future actions, combining them  
 22 and making a forecast for how the project might affect the  
 23 region. In this case we looked at the past impacts to the  
 24 Kuskokwim-Yukon Region. We looked at what's currently  
 25 taking place in the region. And we are looking at what

Page 28

1 Donlin is proposing versus these other alternatives;  
 2 combining it all together and saying, okay, if Donlin's  
 3 project goes forward, this is the type of impact we think  
 4 it would have over the next five, ten, 15, 20, 50 years.  
 5 What we need to know is: Did we get that right?  
 6 By way of mitigation, alternatives are a form of  
 7 mitigation. Mitigation is just methods by which you could  
 8 potentially minimize impacts of something. So if we are  
 9 talking about a tank farm that stores fuel, well, you are  
 10 required by law to put a berm around that tank farm. You  
 11 could put a liner under the whole facility before you put  
 12 it in place. That further mitigates the potential impacts  
 13 of spill. You could put in additional monitoring  
 14 equipment. You could stagger your storage of fuel that  
 15 you only stored maybe 10 percent more than you needed at  
 16 any given time so if there was a spill, you minimized  
 17 impacts of the spill. There is a whole host of things  
 18 that can fall under the heading of mitigation.  
 19 So what we need to know is: Did we consider the  
 20 right factors for mitigation, whether we are talking about  
 21 subsistence impacts, socioeconomic impacts, impacts to air  
 22 quality, et cetera. So any comments you have are  
 23 definitely appreciated.  
 24 In a few minutes, we are going to go to a poster  
 25 session. What I mentioned earlier, there is three posters

Page 29

1 over here on the wall that further define what Donlin is  
 2 proposing to do, and there is nine more posters around the  
 3 room that give you information on the potential impacts of  
 4 the project to be analyzed in somewhat greater detail.  
 5 And virtually all of these things are things that folks  
 6 commented on during scoping and said they had a specific  
 7 interest in seeing analyzed.  
 8 So the point of this whole thing today as far as my  
 9 presentation is: How can you substantively comment to us  
 10 on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement; in other  
 11 words, give us comments that tell us whether we got it  
 12 right, wrong, et cetera.  
 13 I don't know if I mentioned it earlier or not, but we  
 14 respond to comments that you make at this meeting, at the  
 15 previous meetings, or via any of the other mechanisms I'll  
 16 show you in a couple minutes by which you can comment, in  
 17 the Final Environmental Impact Statement. So if you make  
 18 a comment today, most of those comments we are not going  
 19 to address right here, but you will see the response when  
 20 the Final Environmental Impact Statement comes out.  
 21 So what is a substantive comment that tells us if we  
 22 got it right, wrong or otherwise. If 100 people tell me I  
 23 support the project and 10 people tell me I don't support  
 24 the project, well, our response to either of those  
 25 comments in the Final Environmental Impact Statement is



Page 30

1 going to be "comment noted" because there is nothing  
 2 attached to either of those statements that tells us why  
 3 someone supports the project or doesn't support the  
 4 project.  
 5 What we need to know is, if you support it, if you  
 6 don't support it, if you are somewhere in between, why.  
 7 And particularly is there anything we did or didn't do,  
 8 should have done, should not have done in the  
 9 Environmental Impact Statement so that we know what we  
 10 need to fix if there is something we need to fix? Or if  
 11 there is more we need to do, what is that more we need to  
 12 do? We just need -- we need a little more than -- or the  
 13 best comments you can give us as far as the level of  
 14 detail in regards to whether or not we adequately analyzed  
 15 impacts and alternatives.  
 16 You can comment today at this meeting, obviously.  
 17 You can comment at one of the upcoming meetings. You can  
 18 comment via the written forms you have in the room. You  
 19 don't have to come up and give us a verbal comment if you  
 20 don't want to. You can send us comments via email. You  
 21 can go to the website and put your comments in there. You  
 22 can fax them to us.  
 23 These are the meetings that we have already held and  
 24 the meetings that are coming up in the next couple of  
 25 weeks. We expect to conclude all the currently scheduled

Page 31

1 meetings by the end of this month.  
 2 And if you have any questions about these other  
 3 meetings, we can come back to this slide later so you can  
 4 see where they are and when.  
 5 You can also go to this website to get some  
 6 additional information. Under the EIS documents tab on  
 7 this website, the entire draft EIS is there. You can take  
 8 a look at it. You can get information on newsletters,  
 9 other project information, background information, other  
 10 presentations we have done. My contact information is on  
 11 the screen. And if you have matters of particular tribal  
 12 interest, you can contact Ms. Amanda Andraschko, the  
 13 Alaska District's tribal liaison, directly and talk to  
 14 her.  
 15 At this point in time, I'll turn it over to Alan  
 16 Bittner to introduce the BLM 810 hearing. And then when  
 17 he's done with his introduction, I'll ask the folks that  
 18 came with us today in the room to introduce themselves.  
 19 We will go to the poster session and give you all some  
 20 time to look at the posters, and then we will come back.  
 21 We will take your comments on the draft EIS, and we will  
 22 take your testimony for the 810 hearing.  
 23 If anybody would like the heater turned back on,  
 24 please let me know. If it's cooling off too much, we will  
 25 just run the thermostat back up.

Page 32

1 **MR. ALAN BITTNER:** Everybody doing okay on  
 2 the heat? Okay.  
 3 Like I said earlier, my name is Alan Bittner with the  
 4 Bureau of Land Management, and I'm the field manager of  
 5 the Anchorage field office, which encompasses the area of  
 6 this project. And we have received application for two  
 7 rights-of-way that involve the right-of-way for the gas  
 8 pipeline across 97 miles of BLM, and within that same  
 9 trench a fiber optic cable that would supply  
 10 communications.  
 11 Because of BLM's involvement in the project as a  
 12 cooperator, like Keith Gordon said, he's the lead agency  
 13 in the project with the Corps of Engineers. BLM is a  
 14 cooperator on it. Because of that, that cooperator status  
 15 by BLM, we are required to do an analysis of subsistence  
 16 impacts under the Alaska National Interest Lands  
 17 Conservation Act, and specifically Section 810 of that  
 18 Act. So we did that analysis. It's approximately 24  
 19 pages in length. And what I'm going to do is summarize  
 20 that for you real briefly.  
 21 And I apologize, but I want to be real accurate. I  
 22 have about five pages to read here and a few slides. And  
 23 then we will conclude and move on with the rest of the  
 24 afternoon as Keith described.  
 25 Okay. BLM has completed an analysis of subsistence

Page 33

1 impacts from the proposed Donlin Gold Mine, as described  
 2 in the draft EIS. Through that process, BLM determined if  
 3 a significant restriction of subsistence uses and needs  
 4 may result from any one of the alternatives discussed in  
 5 the Donlin Gold draft EIS, including their cumulative  
 6 effects, BLM used three factors for that analysis and  
 7 considered if the project caused -- and those three are  
 8 listed right here.  
 9 No. 1, the reduction in the availability of  
 10 subsistence resources caused by a decline in population or  
 11 abundance of harvestable resources. This may include  
 12 fish, wildlife, edible plants, house logs, firewood or  
 13 drinking water, for example. Factors that might cause a  
 14 reduction included adverse impacts on habitat, direct  
 15 impacts on the resource, increased harvest and increased  
 16 competition from nonsubsistence users.  
 17 Secondly, reductions in the availability of resources  
 18 used for subsistence purposes caused by an alteration in  
 19 their distribution, migration patterns, or location. Or  
 20 thirdly, limitations on access to subsistence resources,  
 21 including limitations from increased competition for  
 22 resources, or physical or even legal barriers.  
 23 Donlin Gold, LLC submitted applications to the Bureau  
 24 of Land Management for a right-of-way grant in July of  
 25 2012 and again in January of 2013. Donlin is proposing to

Page 34

1 construct, operate, maintain and close a 315-mile long,  
 2 14-inch diameter buried natural gas pipeline and  
 3 associated fiber optic cable from the west side of Cook  
 4 Inlet to the mine site near Crooked Creek within the  
 5 Kuskokwim River watershed.  
 6 The proposed 315-mile long pipeline right-of-way  
 7 would cross about 97 miles of BLM land north and west of  
 8 the Alaska Range and the Kuskokwim River watershed. This  
 9 represents about 30.7 percent of the total right-of-way  
 10 length, with State of Alaska lands constituting 65.5  
 11 percent and ANCSA Corporation lands, or Calista and TKC  
 12 and Cook Inlet Regional, or CIRI, constituting 3.7  
 13 percent.  
 14 The pipeline is part of the energy supply  
 15 infrastructure for a proposed open pit gold mine located  
 16 approximately ten miles north of the village of Crooked  
 17 Creek. In addition to the pipeline and the mine site, the  
 18 Donlin Gold Project will include transportation  
 19 infrastructure for barge transportation on the Kuskokwim  
 20 River. Two of the six alternatives analyzed in this draft  
 21 EIS would affect the pipeline component. Alternative 3B  
 22 would substitute a diesel pipeline for the natural gas  
 23 pipeline within the same planned right-of-way.  
 24 Alternative 6A would route a portion of the pipeline  
 25 through Dalzell Gorge, affecting 46 miles of State of

Page 35

1 Alaska lands.  
 2 The proposed Donlin Gold Project is evaluated in  
 3 three components: Mine site, transportation  
 4 infrastructure, and pipeline.  
 5 Although the permit application to the BLM focuses on  
 6 the BLM-managed portions of the pipeline or the 97 miles  
 7 of BLM land, the National Environmental Policy Act, or  
 8 NEPA, prohibits splitting the project into smaller  
 9 components in order to minimize the estimate of  
 10 environmental impacts. For that reason, this review of  
 11 impacts to subsistence will address the entire project and  
 12 not just the portion subject to permitting by the BLM.  
 13 So I'll give a brief overview now of the three  
 14 components again. I know Keith just went through that,  
 15 but I want to give you a summarized version of that that  
 16 we then did our subsistence analysis on. So -- and this  
 17 is a representative photo of where the -- where the  
 18 pipeline would cross near Windy Fork of the Kuskokwim  
 19 River watershed.  
 20 The proposed pipeline includes a 150-foot wide  
 21 cleared construction right-of-way; 12 airstrips ranging  
 22 from 3,500 to 5,000 feet long, nine of which would be  
 23 newly built along the pipeline right-of-way during  
 24 construction; nine construction camps; 65 cleared pipe  
 25 storage areas; an estimated 70 gravel pits ranging from

Page 36

1 one to 50 acres in size. The pipeline would cross seven  
 2 watersheds involving 396 stream crossings, 77 of which are  
 3 anadromous or salmon-rearing streams. And again, this is  
 4 the proposed pipeline route in the Windy Fork portion of  
 5 the Kuskokwim. And that's in Game Management Unit 19C.  
 6 The proposed mine itself includes a waste rock  
 7 facility that would fill in 2,240 acres of American Creek  
 8 and a tailings storage facility that would fill in 2,351  
 9 acres of Anaconda Creek. The tailings storage facility  
 10 would be contained behind a 464-foot high dam. The mine  
 11 has two pits: The ACMA pit that is approximately 1,850  
 12 feet deep from the high wall, and the Lewis pit is  
 13 approximately 1,653 feet deep from the high wall. The two  
 14 pits would merge at the surface into one open pit about  
 15 2.2 miles long and one mile wide near the end of mining  
 16 operations.  
 17 At mine closure, runoff from the tailings storage  
 18 facility would be pumped into the open pit. The pit is  
 19 estimated to take roughly 50 years to fill, and pumping  
 20 would be required to prevent it from overflowing into  
 21 Crooked Creek and the Kuskokwim River watershed.  
 22 The pit water may or may not meet water quality  
 23 standards and would need to be treated before it could be  
 24 released into Crooked Creek. A water treatment plant  
 25 would be constructed 50 years after mine closure. Water

Page 37

1 from the pit lake would have to be pumped and treated in  
 2 the wastewater treatment plant into perpetuity to prevent  
 3 untreated pit water from flowing into Crooked Creek and  
 4 the Kuskokwim River.  
 5 And this is a photo here of the proposed pit, the  
 6 waste rock facility and the tailings storage facility in  
 7 Game Management Unit 19A. In other words, this is an  
 8 overview of the mine site and the existing airstrip there.  
 9 The last part of the proposal is the proposed  
 10 transportation facilities component, and it includes  
 11 construction of expanded port facilities in Bethel at the  
 12 Bethel cargo terminal, a new port site at Jungjuk Creek on  
 13 the Kuskokwim River with 2.8 million gallons of fuel  
 14 storage, a 30-mile long access road from the Kuskokwim  
 15 River to the mine site, with 45 stream crossings and 13  
 16 gravel pits; a new 5,000-foot airstrip at the mine, as  
 17 well.  
 18 And this here is the Kuskokwim River at Game  
 19 Management Unit 19A. Another view of that same location  
 20 or the proposed sort site at Jungjuk Creek is here.  
 21 Barges would supply the mine with fuel and cargo and  
 22 involve 64 cargo barge round trips and 58 fuel barge  
 23 trips, for a total of 122 round trips annually from the  
 24 Bethel port site to the Jungjuk port during the 110-day  
 25 shipping season, or June 1st to October 1st each year.

Page 38

1 River barges would be transported by tug pushing up to a  
 2 four barge configuration each trip. Each fuel barge would  
 3 carry 1.29 million gallons of diesel fuel. The port at  
 4 Jungjuk would continue to be needed to supply fuel and  
 5 cargo to the wastewater treatment plant treating water  
 6 from the pit lake into perpetuity.  
 7 And again, this is Jungjuk Creek where the proposed  
 8 port and fuel storage would be constructed in Game  
 9 Management Unit 19A.  
 10 The preliminary analysis of impacts to subsistence  
 11 based on the alternatives outlined in the draft EIS  
 12 includes all six alternatives outlined in the EIS which  
 13 Keith went over a little while ago. The subsistence  
 14 analysis can be found in Appendix N of the draft EIS on  
 15 page 409 of the .pdf. And if you look in the table of  
 16 contents it will be Appendix M through O of that table of  
 17 contents. And that's where you can find our analysis,  
 18 then, as a component of the EIS or as an appendix.  
 19 The testimony and input from 11 communities where  
 20 public hearings will be held or have been held on the  
 21 impacts to subsistence from the Donlin Gold Project will  
 22 be analyzed and included in a final ANILCA 810 subsistence  
 23 impact evaluation, and it will be included in the final  
 24 EIS.  
 25 So with that overview, I'm not going to -- on each

Page 39

1 one of those components, we will briefly just describe our  
 2 preliminary analysis of subsistence impacts or our  
 3 evaluation on that.  
 4 The following is an evaluation of the effect of the  
 5 Donlin Gold Project proposal on subsistence uses and needs  
 6 for the mine site, natural gas pipeline and transportation  
 7 infrastructure components of the project. The subsistence  
 8 evaluation was done for each project component and looked  
 9 into the effect on subsistence uses and needs.  
 10 So for the mine site itself, villages closest to the  
 11 mine would potentially experience the most effects to  
 12 subsistence, including Napaimute and especially Crooked  
 13 Creek. Mine site activities such as ore trucks in the  
 14 mine, trucks on the road, drilling, blasting, power  
 15 generation, port site activity would likely change the  
 16 distribution of wildlife species important to subsistence,  
 17 such as moose, caribou and fur bearers. It would be  
 18 long-term and would cause potential impacts during the  
 19 construction phases and during mining activities  
 20 throughout the life of the mine.  
 21 Areas important to Crooked Creek for berry picking,  
 22 wood cutting and hunting would be directly affected by the  
 23 mine, and adjacent areas would potentially be contaminated  
 24 with dust emissions containing various particulate  
 25 materials from ore processing and from ore trucks on haul

Page 40

1 roads and access roads. This could make berry picking  
 2 areas undesirable or unusable to subsistence users.  
 3 The water treatment plant would be built 50 years  
 4 after mine closure to treat water from the pit that may or  
 5 may not meet water quality standards for fish. Possible  
 6 water releases from the mine during operations after mine  
 7 closure when water is being pumped into the pit and after  
 8 the water treatment plant is constructed may have the  
 9 potential to impact fish in Crooked Creek and the  
 10 Kuskokwim River, which could result in significant  
 11 restrictions to subsistence resources.  
 12 Potential runoff from the tailings dam and pit lake  
 13 would have the potential to contaminate fish resources  
 14 important to subsistence users in Crooked Creek and the  
 15 lower Kuskokwim River into perpetuity, impacting  
 16 subsistence fish resources important to all communities  
 17 from Crooked Creek to the mouth of the Kuskokwim River.  
 18 For the natural gas pipeline, the potential effects  
 19 to subsistence from the construction and operation of the  
 20 natural gas pipeline would affect the villages of Tyonek,  
 21 Skwentna, Nikolai, McGrath, Takotna, as well as downriver  
 22 villages of Sleetmute, Stony River, Georgetown and Crooked  
 23 Creek.  
 24 During construction, the effects of clearing a  
 25 right-of-way, trenching, drilling and the presence of

Page 41

1 machinery, pipeline workers and construction camps and  
 2 infrastructure on and along the pipeline right-of-way  
 3 would cause a redistribution of moose, caribou and fur  
 4 bearers and negatively affect access to subsistence use  
 5 areas and availability of subsistence resources.  
 6 During mine operations, the airstrip that would  
 7 remain along the pipeline right-of-way at Farewell would  
 8 potentially increase access to subsistence resources by  
 9 nonlocal residents using aircraft and increased  
 10 competition for those subsistence resources along and  
 11 adjacent to the pipeline right-of-way. Villages  
 12 negatively affected by increased access to and competition  
 13 in the area include McGrath, Nikolai and Takotna.  
 14 And lastly, for the transportation infrastructure,  
 15 the potential effects to subsistence from transportation  
 16 infrastructure, including barging of cargo and fuel and  
 17 the construction of a port at Jungjuk on the Kuskokwim  
 18 River, would affect all villages on the river from Crooked  
 19 Creek to the mouth of the Kuskokwim River. Impacts from  
 20 barging include displacement and disruption of subsistence  
 21 activities by barge traffic or reduced access to  
 22 subsistence fishing activities and sites such as set nets,  
 23 fish wheels, processing rafts along the river.  
 24 Subsistence fish resources, salmon and resident fish  
 25 species populations, may also be negatively affected by

Page 42

1 the magnitude and intensity of barge traffic proposed in  
 2 Alternative 2. Effects to fish may increase when river  
 3 water levels are low as barge rafts will need to be  
 4 uncoupled and barges towed individually or in pairs or  
 5 lighter barge loads per trip would be required to navigate  
 6 to the Jungjuk port. This would require additional barge  
 7 round trips on the river and potentially increase impacts  
 8 to subsistence fishers on the Kuskokwim River and to  
 9 subsistence fish resources.

10 This evaluation concluded that Alternative 2 may  
 11 result in a significant restriction to subsistence uses  
 12 for the communities of Crooked Creek and Napaimute in  
 13 relation to the mine site, the communities on the  
 14 Kuskokwim River from barge traffic on the river: Bethel,  
 15 Napiakiak, Napaskiak, Oscarville, Kwethluk, Akiachak,  
 16 Akiak, Tuluksak, Kalskag, Lower Kalskag, Aniak,  
 17 Chuathbaluk, Napaimute and Crooked Creek. And the  
 18 communities of McGrath, Nicolai and Takotna for increased  
 19 access and competition from nonlocal users at the Farewell  
 20 airstrip along the pipeline right-of-way.

21 In addition to potential spill scenarios involving  
 22 ocean and river barge release of diesel fuel, cyanide,  
 23 mercury, tailings dam failure, and release of untreated  
 24 water from the pit lake and tailings dam after mine  
 25 closure may also result in significant restriction to

Page 43

1 subsistence uses for the Kuskokwim River communities  
 2 listed above.

3 The BLM has found in this preliminary ANILCA 810 that  
 4 Alternatives 2, 3A, 3B, 4, 5A and 6 and the cumulative  
 5 case considered in the draft Donlin Gold EIS may  
 6 significantly restrict subsistence uses. These findings  
 7 require BLM to conduct hearings and to solicit public  
 8 comments and input from potentially affected communities  
 9 and subsistence users under ANILCA 810, Sections (a)(1)  
 10 and (2) in conjunction with the release of this draft EIS.

11 In a little while here, we are going to conduct a  
 12 subsistence hearing and gather testimony after the draft  
 13 EIS comments session, as Keith had previously mentioned.  
 14 And we welcome your testimony at that time.

15 So points 2 and 3 up here, following the public  
 16 hearing, a finding may be revised to "will not  
 17 significantly restrict" based on changes to alternatives,  
 18 new information, or new mitigation measures resulting from  
 19 the hearings or the information we receive from you. If  
 20 the finding of "may significantly restrict subsistence  
 21 uses" is not revised or the impacts cannot be mitigated, a  
 22 three-part determination must be made before the action  
 23 can be authorized.

24 So this last part is about if we still find  
 25 significant effects to subsistence after the final

Page 44

1 analysis is done and whether that project can be --  
 2 whether the project can still go forward or not. So an  
 3 810 Section (a)(3) determination section is to be prepared  
 4 only when there is a final finding of "may significantly  
 5 restrict subsistence uses" for the selected alternative or  
 6 action. The determination will separately address each of  
 7 the three required items under Section 810(a)(3) and state  
 8 why the proposed action is necessary and how the action  
 9 complies with each requirement.

10 The three items that are required in a determination  
 11 are: Why such a significant restriction of subsistence  
 12 uses is necessary and how it's consistent with sound  
 13 management principles of multiple use on public lands;  
 14 secondly, how the proposed activity will involve the  
 15 minimal amount of public lands necessary to accomplish the  
 16 purposes of the project; and thirdly, what reasonable  
 17 steps will be taken to minimize the adverse effects upon  
 18 subsistence uses and resources resulting from the project.

19 After compliance with this process of 810 and still  
 20 finding some significant effects to subsistence, a manager  
 21 could proceed with the action of authorizing the project.  
 22 And in BLM's case, that would be authorizing the  
 23 rights-of-way that I spoke about earlier for the pipeline  
 24 and the fiber optic cable.

25 So when commenting on or providing testimony on

Page 45

1 subsistence -- and incidentally, if you provide comments  
 2 to the draft EIS to Keith and the Corps of Engineers and  
 3 you mention subsistence, that will be available to the BLM  
 4 just as well as if you provided comments in a hearing  
 5 setting like I'm going to conduct in a little while.

6 So if you want to provide testimony in the hearing,  
 7 that's fine, or if you provide comments related to  
 8 subsistence during the draft EIS comment period in a few  
 9 minutes, all of those comments related to subsistence are  
 10 available to us and can influence our final decision and  
 11 analysis on subsistence.

12 When commenting on subsistence impacts, please  
 13 consider what additional specific information about how  
 14 the proposed mine would affect the abundance or  
 15 availability of subsistence resources important to you or  
 16 how it would affect access to subsistence resources  
 17 important to you.

18 Also how to comment, you can provide comment at  
 19 tonight's testimony. I also said that anything commented  
 20 during the draft EIS comment period is available to us.  
 21 You can also write directly to the Anchorage field office  
 22 of the BLM if you want or fax comments or mail them to our  
 23 biologist, our subsistence biologist, Bruce Seppi, by  
 24 email. And our comment period for the subsistence  
 25 analysis mirrors the draft EIS and closes on April 30th,

Page 46

1 as well. So any comments to subsistence, whether given to  
 2 the Corps or directly to the BLM, can influence the  
 3 outcome of our subsistence analysis. And like I said,  
 4 that final analysis will be included in the final EIS  
 5 document, as well.  
 6 So with that, I'll turn it back over to Keith, and I  
 7 think we go to the poster session next and then comment  
 8 period for the EIS, and then I'll conduct a brief opening  
 9 and closing of an 810 hearing where we can receive  
 10 testimony if you would like to give it at that time.  
 11 Thank you.  
 12 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** Thank you Alan. As I  
 13 mentioned, there is a variety of folks that accompanied us  
 14 here today. The largest percentage of those folks are  
 15 employed by AECOM, an international engineering and  
 16 environmental analyses firm who are doing the vast  
 17 majority of the development of the draft analyses and  
 18 draft conclusions that are in the EIS. So I'll ask Amy to  
 19 come up and introduce the folks that are with her today.  
 20 And she will give you an indication of their roles in the  
 21 project as well as which posters they may be able to give  
 22 you some information on. And then we also have a  
 23 representative of both Donlin and NOVAGOLD here who can  
 24 give you some information on the proposed project if we  
 25 can't answer those questions. And they are also available

Page 47

1 to comment on Donlin's proposed project.  
 2 **MS. AMY ROSENTHAL:** Thanks, Keith. Good  
 3 afternoon. My name is Amy Rosenthal, and I'm with AECOM,  
 4 which is the third-party contractor that Keith was just  
 5 mentioning. We were working on the Draft Environmental  
 6 Impact Statement, and I'm going to introduce members of  
 7 our team to you now.  
 8 I am the lead for the social environment resources,  
 9 which includes subsistence and socioeconomics. So during  
 10 the poster session, I'll be standing over here  
 11 [indicating] and can help answer any questions for you by  
 12 these posters, the socioeconomics and subsistence.  
 13 Ms. Nancy Darigo over here, she is the lead for the  
 14 physical resources, physical environment. And that would  
 15 include posters over here [indicating] that would be water  
 16 flow, air quality, water quality. She can help answer  
 17 questions about the tailings dam or any spill risk,  
 18 hazardous chemical concerns that you might have.  
 19 Dave Every is here. He is our lead for the  
 20 biological resources. He will be during the poster  
 21 session over here [indicating] by the posters related to  
 22 fisheries and barge traffic. He can also answer any  
 23 questions about wildlife that you might have.  
 24 Jessica Evans is in the back of the room, and she is  
 25 our public involvement lead. She will be at the posters

Page 48

1 that are discussing the project components over here  
 2 [indicating], the transportation infrastructure, pipeline  
 3 and the mine site itself.  
 4 Many of you met Donne Fleagle in the back when you  
 5 came in. She is also part of our public involvement team,  
 6 and she will be available to help answer questions on a  
 7 variety of subjects, as well.  
 8 And we have Lillian Michael also here as our  
 9 translator, part of our team, as well. Thank you.  
 10 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** Nova and Donlin?  
 11 **MR. VERNON CHIMEGALREA:** Many of you, I'm  
 12 Vernon Chimegalrea, and I've met with a bunch of you on  
 13 previous trips. If you have any questions, I'm available  
 14 to answer questions, as well.  
 15 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** All right. At this  
 16 point in time, we will go to the poster session. We  
 17 usually set aside 30 to 45 minutes for this, but we will  
 18 run it for less time if that's what you all need or more  
 19 time if that's what you all need. So just go ahead and  
 20 take a look at the posters and let us know if you have any  
 21 questions or comments. When we are done with that, we  
 22 will come back and start taking comments on the draft EIS.  
 23 Thank you.  
 24 (Off the record.)  
 25 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** Good afternoon, folks.

Page 49

1 We will go ahead and get started on taking your comments  
 2 on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Okay. As we  
 3 take your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact  
 4 Statement, Ms. Mary Vavrik, our court reporter, will  
 5 record your comments so that we assure that we get them  
 6 down correctly so that we can respond to them correctly in  
 7 the Final Environmental Impact Statement.  
 8 When you make comments, we would appreciate it if you  
 9 would come up to the front of the room. And if you don't  
 10 mind, use the microphone so that Mary -- we are sure that  
 11 your comment is loud enough so she can capture it  
 12 correctly. You are not required to use the microphone if  
 13 you don't want to. You don't have to come up if you don't  
 14 want to. We can have somebody bring out the microphone.  
 15 And as you are aware, Ms. Lillian Michael will be  
 16 continuing her translation as we go through the public  
 17 comment session.  
 18 So would Monica James like to comment?  
 19 **MS. MONICA JAMES:** My name is Monica  
 20 James. My family is originally from Alakanuk. I grew up  
 21 in Bethel, went off, got my education. I came home.  
 22 Well, I went to get my education because I was going to  
 23 come work for Calista. I remember when our Natives, many  
 24 of you in this room, had conversations with Congress on  
 25 what ANCSA meant for our people. And I was coming home to

Page 50

1 work for Calista for our people. I met my husband and he  
 2 was in the Army for 20 years, and we moved around. Then I  
 3 came home.  
 4 I work for Calista today as the Chief Operating  
 5 Officer. So Andrew. And I work right for Andrew. I  
 6 interface with the board of directors at all our quarterly  
 7 meetings.  
 8 We understand what ANCSA was established for and, as  
 9 Calista, your Native corporations, we have two primary  
 10 obligations. One is to generate profit for our  
 11 shareholders, each of you that are shareholders today, and  
 12 next year we will have new shareholders. Our descendants  
 13 will join all of us original shareholders.  
 14 We also have to increase the socioeconomic  
 15 opportunities for our people. We all know what challenges  
 16 we have, whether it's water, sewer issues, medical needs,  
 17 all different -- each village has different issues.  
 18 This project, when it goes forward, there will be  
 19 training opportunities, vocational opportunities for our  
 20 young people that are looking for jobs that want to stay  
 21 in their villages.  
 22 There will be royalties that are paid, 7(i) --  
 23 Calista hasn't paid any 7(i) because we don't have any  
 24 natural resources like Arctic Slope Regional with the oil  
 25 or NANA with Red Dog Mine or Sealaska with all their

Page 51

1 timber. They make money and they have to split -- they  
 2 have to share it. This is what our Elders, when they met,  
 3 said we are all one people; we need to share. So we will  
 4 get 7(i) monies, and we will share it with other Native  
 5 corporations, and then 7(j) goes to our village  
 6 corporations. Plus our local governments and our state  
 7 governments would get tax revenues.  
 8 We each know our state right now has challenges.  
 9 Governor Walker inherited -- if you think of a budget,  
 10 they budgeted \$115 per barrel of oil. Today oil is \$30  
 11 per barrel. We have a big gap. My auntie from Alakanuk,  
 12 she -- her public assistance has gone down. Her food  
 13 stamp card -- she's only one person in her house. She  
 14 used to get 100. Now she's getting, like, \$48. Same with  
 15 public assistance; it's gone down. Her rent went up. All  
 16 these things -- the state -- we are in this fiscal crisis  
 17 and it's going to be hard on all of us as Alaska  
 18 residents.  
 19 For all those reasons, Calista supports and  
 20 encourages the Army Corps of Engineers to permit  
 21 Alternative 2, the applicant's proposed alternative.  
 22 I'm going to switch for a minute and talk about  
 23 subsistence. With respect to Mr. Bittner, he said we did  
 24 our subsistence analysis. I think as subsistence -- each  
 25 of you have being subsistence users, I think there should

Page 52

1 be some sort of a council. You should have input in their  
 2 analysis. Instead, they did their own analysis, their  
 3 biologist, a gussak guy. And then they come to you and  
 4 say, here is our analysis, here is what we did. But how  
 5 come now afterwards they come to you and say, tell us this  
 6 and tell us that. What do you think?  
 7 I worked for Alaska Aerospace for ten years. At  
 8 Alaska Aerospace, we had to do -- same thing here. We had  
 9 to do NEPA, all the regulations, because everybody is  
 10 concerned when we launch that big rocket for the  
 11 government, what's the impact to the musk ox, the buffalo,  
 12 the seals, the sea ducks, the halibut.  
 13 So again, different region, but we have Natives that  
 14 live in that area that are subsistence users. When they  
 15 launch the rocket, the buffalo in Kodiak, they don't even  
 16 move. The seals, they are sunning themselves on the rock.  
 17 They don't even move. We had to work with the Coast  
 18 Guard. So all of this, it's all regulatory.  
 19 I find it interesting, 40-some years ago when they  
 20 wanted access to our oil, we all agreed to ANCSA. So what  
 21 did they do? They built the pipeline. What's happened?  
 22 I have been up there. The -- well, there is muskox up  
 23 there, but the caribou -- there is more caribou. They  
 24 like being up there. There is heat that comes off that  
 25 pipe where they stand. I was up there last spring. Lots

Page 53

1 of birds coming back.  
 2 So you know, they have their job. BLM has their job.  
 3 But we, users of the land, we have our job. We need to  
 4 ask questions. No disrespect to them. If you have a  
 5 question and you don't want to talk here, write them down  
 6 or let somebody in your family write a letter and share  
 7 your concerns.  
 8 Quyana.  
 9 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** Thank you. Those are  
 10 very good comments. And we do need your comments and we  
 11 want your comments because, as is pointed out, we don't  
 12 live out here. And we have our regulatory processes to go  
 13 through, whether it's NEPA, whether it's ANILCA process.  
 14 We need to know whether or not the analyses is correct.  
 15 We need to know whether the conclusions are correct.  
 16 Please understand that in both cases, the NEPA  
 17 conclusions are draft conclusions at this point and draft  
 18 analyses. The ANILCA conclusions at this point are  
 19 preliminary conclusions. And via the process, if any of  
 20 you would like to establish a committee to address the  
 21 analyses that's been done and the conclusions that have  
 22 been done, you can do that and then comment back to us.  
 23 That's not a problem, by any means.  
 24 Okay, Mr. David Nikolai.  
 25 **MR. DAVID NIKOLAI:** [speaking in Yup'ik.]

Page 54

1 On the Kuskokwim River when we fish, they fish -- they can  
 2 ice fish for pike. And then there is lush, and there is  
 3 sheefish. They talked about that. They cover that, too,  
 4 over there, Emmonak. Even the smelt. Maybe those won't  
 5 make it alive, especially in the spring. In the  
 6 springtime when those fish are small -- those fish are  
 7 small in the spring. Those could be affected, too.  
 8 [speaking in English.] I wanted to ask if there was  
 9 any study done on any other species of fish that swim in  
 10 the Kuskokwim, whether be it downstream or upstream.  
 11 There is just not salmon. There is lush, pike, sheefish,  
 12 blackfish and trout. We catch trout, too. Have those  
 13 been studied, too?  
 14 And then think about this. How many barges a day,  
 15 22? Every day, is this Monday through Sunday? Is this  
 16 Sunday through Monday, 22 a day? We'll be fishing Monday,  
 17 Wednesday, Friday, six hours a day, for our own food. How  
 18 much impact will this have when they give us that window?  
 19 [speaking in Yup'ik.] And the summer is short, and  
 20 fishing is not long because it's scheduled. When there  
 21 was no federal government -- [he's going back and forth  
 22 between English and Yup'ik.] Our federal budget is being  
 23 cut, and if -- [I think he's talking about assistance.]  
 24 If assistance is gone, what then? We cannot forget our  
 25 subsistence way of life. We will still be standing.

Page 55

1 When the federal government quits giving us funds,  
 2 what will we do? I hope I'm understandable. I'm just  
 3 talking about what the future may bring.  
 4 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** Thank you very much.  
 5 Louisa Vandeventer.  
 6 **MR. LOUISA VANDEVENTER:** The only comment  
 7 that I wanted to say was that the decision you make today,  
 8 or whenever it comes, is going to affect us, all of us.  
 9 So the only strongest thing that -- thing that we want you  
 10 to consider is what's important to us has always been  
 11 life, health and safety.  
 12 And they talk about how direct impact it is. You  
 13 know, the local Elders say you think the distance is far,  
 14 but it's closer than you think. Because if you can see  
 15 the picture -- like Japan, they say, look at how far it  
 16 is, but how close the impact is. The fish this past  
 17 summer was messed up because they were all coming in at  
 18 the same time as different cycles. So the drying time and  
 19 the subsistence was cut short. So not as many fish was  
 20 brought in for drying and put away. Those are some of the  
 21 things that were impacted.  
 22 And we rely heavily on rain and ice, and whatever  
 23 activities that they have goes up to the air and comes  
 24 to -- comes down as water for us. And they notice there  
 25 is more chemicals in the water, particles that weren't

Page 56

1 ever there before.  
 2 So we strongly say, please, consider life, health and  
 3 safety when you start deciding before you give out these  
 4 permits. I'm not against or for it. I'm still making my  
 5 decision because, like she said from Calista, our funding  
 6 is not here. And like Mr. Nicholai said, whatever runs  
 7 out after we get it, we are the ones that are still going  
 8 to be standing here. So we have a decision and you have a  
 9 decision that's going to impact us all for -- for the  
 10 length of this project. So please take into consideration  
 11 the life, health and safety for all of us.  
 12 Thank you.  
 13 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** Thank you very much.  
 14 Mr. John Berlin.  
 15 **MR. JOHN BERLIN:** [speaking in Yup'ik.]  
 16 You all know me. I am old. Fishing from way back then is  
 17 different now, especially without money. Things are  
 18 getting expensive, including fishing. Gas is high. And  
 19 any machine is high. Nowadays right now please help this  
 20 assistance to us, including the dividend. And it was --  
 21 it was pretty expensive. We got a lot of dividend. Some  
 22 of us could afford machines, gas and go somewhere and go  
 23 fishing or hunting. They are starting to cut these funds.  
 24 And if they cut deeper, there is -- look at how many  
 25 people are without jobs. If they begin cutting the funds,

Page 57

1 where are we going to get the gas? Where are we going to  
 2 find a machine to go hunting and fishing? What are we  
 3 going to do? We need to think about that.  
 4 When they talk about from Calista and how it would be  
 5 helpful -- she brought that up. We have someone to take  
 6 care of us, and especially the Creator, those things for  
 7 us to use and the risks and try to earn the funds for  
 8 those. And some of them use them the right way. And  
 9 Calista Corporation is trying to earn funding, and we all  
 10 should help. Those of us who are shareholders should help  
 11 try and get those funds, too.  
 12 And she's trying to help us do that. Before somebody  
 13 can try and get money, just sitting there we are not  
 14 helping. [And he's repeating what he said.]  
 15 If Donlin Gold becomes truly, the generations after  
 16 us, they will not be able to eat our Native foods,  
 17 especially due to money. Back then -- our lives from back  
 18 then to now are different. Right now we are relying on  
 19 money, and if we have no money we have nothing.  
 20 Everything costs in the villages: Water, sewer,  
 21 everything. Even our stove oil. We live by assistance.  
 22 And our younger people are -- there is a lot of them that  
 23 use these assistance monies trying to survive. These  
 24 assistance monies are being cut. The federal  
 25 government -- the funding that -- or the help we get from

Page 58

1 the federal government is being cut, as well. We need to  
 2 think about this.  
 3 Thank you.  
 4 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** Thank you very much.  
 5 Mr. Henry Tikun.  
 6 **MR. HENRY TIKUN, SR.:** [speaking in  
 7 Yup'ik.] Henry Tikun, Sr. from Atmaultuak. Some of the  
 8 assistance that we have heard of are being cut. [He's]  
 9 been involved in the Fish & Game meetings. My mind is  
 10 especially concerned about fish. Above Kalskag on the  
 11 other side of the mountain, we talk. It starts from  
 12 there. And young boys can walk from there to Kalskag.  
 13 And it's a short ways from Kalskag to where they are  
 14 trying to open the mine. And there is lots of fish in the  
 15 river. And as they talked about it, there are fish that  
 16 are to come. And the Kuskokwim River branches off those  
 17 spawning areas.  
 18 In the Yukon in the spring when it breaks up, we know  
 19 the water rises, and this area, too, as well. And if that  
 20 gold mine has a disaster, it will affect us, too. It will  
 21 affect that river that brings the fish here. Not only do  
 22 we -- not only be the Kuskokwim. All the tributaries and  
 23 all the areas that reach the villages during the flood or  
 24 the risen waters, those would be affected. And these are  
 25 spoken on the radio, too.

Page 59

1 Nobody will employ anyone. A person making --  
 2 creating the funding will not employ anyone. We know the  
 3 federal government opened marijuana and drugs. I  
 4 understood them -- before they did that to work at an  
 5 expensive place, the federal government raised these  
 6 expensive jobs, and maybe they were thinking of people  
 7 that passed before. Which way are they going to go? What  
 8 alternatives do they have? Those of us who are acting not  
 9 in their right mind are acting like people with -- not in  
 10 their right minds under the federal government. And us  
 11 and our children to be provided jobs is a long ways.  
 12 And there might be somebody to wants to speak, as  
 13 well.  
 14 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** Thank you, sir. Mr.  
 15 Earl Samuelson.  
 16 **MR. EARL SAMUELSON:** Earl Samuelson,  
 17 resident of Napaskiak and also disclosing I'm a Calista  
 18 board member. On the alternatives on this, I would like  
 19 to support No. 2. Looking at it from the Calista side, we  
 20 are one of the poorest regions and restricted people than  
 21 probably the whole state of Alaska. We got the highest  
 22 suicide rates, highest crime. Our jails are always full,  
 23 fullest in the region. And look at our jobs out here. We  
 24 are very limited. The whole region, we are limited.  
 25 And look at this project. It's going to employ

Page 60

1 thousands and thousands of people for 20 to 30 years.  
 2 Sure, we are going to have some issues. It's not going to  
 3 solve everybody's problem, but it's going to be a start.  
 4 And I look at our lands out here. We are living on a  
 5 reserve, like a refuge. Our whole delta is owned by the  
 6 federal government. Can we go out there and drill oil  
 7 over here? Probably not. Can we go over here and go gold  
 8 mining over here in the Kilbucks? Probably not?  
 9 But you see, the refuge limits us, too. The land  
 10 where they want to do gold mining is a unique spot. It  
 11 can affect the socioeconomics of a region, boost the  
 12 economy, put our young people to work. But we still have  
 13 to be careful. Hopefully they will do it right.  
 14 I'm here also to listen. I have been going to -- I  
 15 listened to the one on the radio. I listened to the  
 16 one -- went up to Akiak and listened to the people. So  
 17 also take their comments very seriously.  
 18 Thank you very much.  
 19 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** Thank you very much.  
 20 Mr. James Berlin.  
 21 **MR. JAMES BERLIN, SR.:** [speaking in  
 22 Yup'ik.] This is James Berlin, John's younger brother.  
 23 And nowadays -- [and he's the mayor of this village.] I  
 24 support in favor of this, but I have been wanting to ask a  
 25 question that's been bothering [him]. If those pits,

Page 61

1 those two pits that are to be dug, if they spill over it  
 2 will affect the fish, including the tributaries of the  
 3 Kuskokwim in the wintertime.  
 4 When these fish cannot stay on the tributaries, they  
 5 winter in the Kuskokwim River. And those will be  
 6 affected, too. And it will be affected by arsenic and  
 7 mercury. And that's what we hear. Maybe we have  
 8 questions to these guys. The ownership, the future  
 9 ownership, NOVAGOLD, Barrick -- [and he's listing the  
 10 people we should ask.]  
 11 Those two gold companies, how -- how can they work on  
 12 it to prove to us to make us trust them that they don't  
 13 spill? If it does spill, all those animals and people we  
 14 named will be affected, even us, even the animals and fish  
 15 we eat. And we will no longer be able to eat them.  
 16 Thank you.  
 17 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** Thank you, Mr. Mayor.  
 18 Is there anybody else who would like to comment on the  
 19 Draft Environmental Impact Statement?  
 20 **MR. BOBBY HOFFMAN:** Yeah. I'm Bob  
 21 Hoffman. I have family here when I was 20, so everybody  
 22 probably knows me.  
 23 I want to talk a little bit about subsistence. You  
 24 know, we all -- I hear everybody crying about our  
 25 subsistence, our fish, our moose, ours. But I'll tell you



Page 62

1 something. They are subsistence. We can take them  
 2 whenever we want. That's the way it sounds to me. Ours.  
 3 I'm going to tell you, that's what subsistence.  
 4 [speaking in Yup'ik.] Fish and the other species are  
 5 not ours. If you want to try it and go out, you can try  
 6 subsistence. Try it. Some peace officer will take you.  
 7 [speaking in English.] We need money. I hear a lot  
 8 about subsistence. Our subsistence is not close to the  
 9 villages, not close to Bethel. They are far away from the  
 10 people. We have to buy gas. We have to buy snowmachines.  
 11 We have to buy four-wheelers. We have to feed our  
 12 families. Today I don't see nobody buying nothing. We  
 13 can't afford -- we got to have money to buy guns, ammo,  
 14 food, duck horns. We got to have money to subsist. And  
 15 right now our fish are going to be hurt, lots of barges.  
 16 Not only the barges are going to hurt us. Like last year  
 17 and the year before, the State of Alaska who boss of the  
 18 Fish & Game are going to hurt us some more, too.  
 19 Subsistence, if we say subsistence, how come we only  
 20 got three kings last year apiece?  
 21 [speaking in Yup'ik.]  
 22 [speaking in English.] first time. Kings. First  
 23 time we had a -- somebody telling us how many we can  
 24 catch. It's very scary how people got to know  
 25 subsistence. That's not ours. And we need money even --

Page 63

1 even we want the subsistence food, we need money to go get  
 2 them.  
 3 Our young boys got no jobs now; young girls, no jobs.  
 4 Just a few lucky ones all in the villages. Same ones.  
 5 Same ones. Never -- and we are happy. They are not.  
 6 They need money. They want to go subsist. They want to  
 7 feed their own little kids. They want to -- they want to  
 8 be a mama and a daddy. Not let ap'a and grandma feed  
 9 them. Today, how can [indiscernible] subsist? I have  
 10 been up there by my grandma's house. I know, like me.  
 11 So we talk about subsistence. That is pronounced by  
 12 the State government, and the State is going be like a  
 13 policeman already, making us only fish a little bit and  
 14 take a little bit. And now more problem with barges.  
 15 I just wanted to let you know, in order to subsist on  
 16 our land, we got to have money. And that's the only  
 17 thing -- our young boys got nothing now, no money.  
 18 I want to see our young men and young ladies be proud  
 19 of who they are, raising their own kids themselves. And  
 20 they will be like a mom and dad when they [indiscernible]  
 21 their ap'a and grandma, like us. Long ago they let us --  
 22 they let us be what we want to be. And look today, we way  
 23 up there.  
 24 [speaking in Yup'ik.]  
 25 [speaking in English.] They got nothing. No

Page 64

1 nothing. No gas to go visit their family. No money to go  
 2 catch any fish and geese.  
 3 We need this gold mine. It's going to help our young  
 4 people so that -- I'm tired of listening to us talking, us  
 5 talking. We going to be gone pretty soon. We are going  
 6 to be here very short. We are trying to let you know our  
 7 young men going to live the next one. We got to start  
 8 them off right. Let them learn how to handle money  
 9 because if we don't let them play with money, they are  
 10 going to be on the ground listening to people tell them  
 11 what to do.  
 12 I want them young men to be proud and young girls to  
 13 be proud and take care of their own families. And the  
 14 only way they can do it is if they get help. And the only  
 15 help that I see in the world today is that gold mine up  
 16 there, way up there.  
 17 Our fish -- we talk about mercury; mercury, cyanide.  
 18 This is one you heard before last week or last month. Red  
 19 Devil Mine or the other mine, mercury mine, for 50 years  
 20 they make them mines, 50, mercury mines. How come me and  
 21 you never hurt nothing yet?  
 22 [speaking in Yup'ik.] from them mines long ago. [He  
 23 hasn't been to the hospital for 50 years.  
 24 [speaking in English.] Long ago the mines, they were  
 25 [indiscernible], but today, 2017, '16, modern technology

Page 65

1 might make it a little bit better. The government and  
 2 policemen will be watching them hard, not like before.  
 3 But we hear about hurt in the river. It can't hurt  
 4 us no more than we already hurt now. I'm 65. He's going  
 5 on 80.  
 6 **UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:** 81.  
 7 **MR. BOBBY HOFFMAN:** [speaking in Yup'ik.]  
 8 [speaking in English.] So them mines up there really  
 9 didn't hurt us that much. This new one will do the most  
 10 positive thing for us. It will put our young people to  
 11 work and let them handle money. And most of all  
 12 important, they will take care of their own families and  
 13 be a proud mother and father and don't have to ask ap'a  
 14 for gas money and borrow my snowmachine and borrow my  
 15 boat.  
 16 I hear a lot of hurt, but I don't see it much. More  
 17 than poor people. We are not poor. We got jobs. Look.  
 18 Tribes. [indiscernible] The ones that got jobs, yeah, we  
 19 talk. But we fight for the young boy who got no jobs.  
 20 That's the ones I want to see living on their own making  
 21 the rest of us proud Natives of Alaska. That's all.  
 22 Thank you.  
 23 **MR. KEITH GORDON:** All right. Thank you  
 24 very much. Is there anybody else who would like to  
 25 comment on the draft EIS? Okay. At this point in time,

1 Mary will make a switch, and Mr. Alan Bittner with Bureau  
 2 of Land Management will formally open the 810 ANILCA  
 3 hearing for your testimony on subsistence issues.  
 4 (Proceedings adjourned at 3:41 p.m.)

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

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

1 I, MARY A. VAVRIK, RMR, Notary Public in and for  
 2 the State of Alaska do hereby certify:

3 That the foregoing proceedings were taken before  
 4 me at the time and place herein set forth; that the  
 5 proceedings were reported stenographically by me and later  
 6 transcribed under my direction by computer transcription;  
 7 that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings  
 8 taken at that time; and that I am not a party to nor have  
 9 I any interest in the outcome of the action herein  
 10 contained.

11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed  
 12 my hand and affixed my seal this 28th day of March 2016.

13  
14  
15  
16 MARY A. VAVRIK,  
Registered Merit Reporter  
Notary Public for Alaska

17 My Commission Expires: November 5, 2016

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25