DONLIN GOLD PROJECT
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
PUBLIC MEETING

HOLY CROSS, ALASKA

Taken April 6, 2016
Commencing at 1:15 p.m.

Volume I - Pages 1 - 62, inclusive

Taken at
Holy Cross City Hall
Holy Cross, Alaska

Reported by:
Mary A. Vavrik, RMR

Page 2

For U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:

Keith Gordon
Project Manager

For U.S. Bureau of Land Management:

Alan Bittner
Anchorage Field Office Manager

For AECOM:

Taylor Brelsford
Social Science Lead

Nancy Darigo
Physical Science Lead

Jessica Evans
Public Involvement Lead

David Every
Biological Science Lead

Donne Fleagle
Senior Rural Outreach Lead

Taken by:

Mary A. Vavrik, RMR

BE IT KNOWN that the aforementioned proceedings were taken at the time and place duly noted on the title page, before Mary A. Vavrik, Registered Merit Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of Alaska.

Page 3

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

MR. KEITH GORDON: Good afternoon. What Donne is referring to is if you would like to make comments on the draft EIS, it just helps us if you take a number so that I call folks in the right order. You don't have to have a number to do that. And when we go to the public hearing, you can also offer testimony on that.

My name is Keith Gordon. I'm a project manager with the United States Army Corps of Engineers Alaska District Regulatory Division. Our purpose today is to give you some information on the status of the Donlin Draft Environmental Impact Statement and primarily how you can comment on that Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

We also are going to do a BLM 810 ANILCA hearing to take your testimony on potential subsistence impacts of the project. And Mr. Alan Bittner with the Bureau of Land Management will give you some information on that in a couple of minutes.

So why is the Army Corps of Engineers out here talking to you about a gold mine Donlin is proposing to construct? The Army Corps of Engineers is the federal lead agency for development of the Environmental Impact Statement that discloses the impacts of that proposed project, as well as contains analyses related to the potential impacts of it.

Page 4

Our role as the federal lead is to facilitate development of that document and assist everybody else in gaining the information they need so they can draw conclusions regarding whether or not the project should be permitted as Donlin has proposed, whether some alternative to the project should be permitted or whether we wouldn't permit the project at all.

Please note that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that is out there is a draft document. The analyses are draft and the conclusions are draft. So we have made no final decisions yet. And we will talk about that a little bit more as we go through the process today.

On the bottom of the screen up there, you can see five of the six symbols related to the federal and State agencies that are cooperating agencies involved in development of the Environmental Impact Statement, as well as half a dozen Native communities that are assisting us in development of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The role of the cooperators are to help us analyze the potential impacts of what Donlin is proposing, analyze the alternatives and give us an indication of whether or not we have appropriately defined the potential impacts of the project.

The agenda for today is to discuss what I just mentioned to you in relation to the Draft Environmental

Page 5

Impact Statement and how you can comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

After I go through this approximately just over 30-minute presentation about where we are at on the project, we will do a poster session. You can see on the wall that we have about a dozen posters that we have hung up. Three in the corner over here -- actually four, I believe, define the project Donlin is proposing to construct, and then the rest of the posters around the room give you information on primary impacts of the project that folks were concerned about when we came out through the communities between December of 2012 and early 2013 to do scoping meetings to define potential impacts of the project. So that poster session will last 30 to 45 minutes, however long you all would like it to last.

After the poster session, we will reconvene and formally take your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, followed by the Bureau of Land Management conducting the 810 ANILCA hearing I mentioned a few minutes ago. That will give you an opportunity to formally comment on potential impacts to subsistence of the proposed project. And Mr. Alan Bittner with the Bureau of Land Management will give you a little information on that hearing.

MR. ALAN BITTNER: My name is Alan

Page 6

Bittner, the field manager for the Anchorage field office. And because of our involvement in the project and the potential impacts to subsistence resources by the three components of the project, we have done an analysis of subsistence impacts, a preliminary finding. And there is copies of that over on the table, as well. But we will give a short presentation on that, and we will also conduct a short hearing.

So if there is any impacts, either positive or negative, related to subsistence that you are aware of, it would be great to hear from you either today or in written comments. Thank you.

MR. KEITH GORDON: Thank you, Alan.

So basically at this point in time, I'll try to give you a little bit of information on the project Donlin is proposing to construct before we start talking about the Environmental Impact Statement.

The proposed Donlin project has three primary components: The mine site, the transportation infrastructure related to the proposed project, and the mine site and the pipeline that would supply natural gas to the project.

So we will start with the first primary component, which is the mine site itself. The mine site is broken also into three primary components. The first one that

Page 7

you see depicted by No. 1 on the screen is the mine pit itself. Actually, what Donlin is proposing to do is open two pits, the ACMA and Lewis pits, and over the process of the mine life, those two pits would be commingled into a single pit. That single pit would occupy about 2.2 square miles in size. And if you are measuring the depth of the pit, depending on whether or not you are measuring the depth from the low side or the high side, you would determine that the pit is either 1,100 feet deep or 1,850 feet deep, depending on which side you take the measurements.

The second primary component of the project that you see on the slide up there is the tailings storage facility. Tailings are basically crushed rock that is the waste that results from the milling process after the gold is extracted from the ore. So after Donlin takes the rock, the ore that contains -- rock that contains gold is ore.

So after they take the ore and run it through the mill and crush it, remove the gold via a chemical process, the ground-up rock, the water and some residual chemicals form a slurry, and that slurry would go into this tailings storage facility. That tailings storage facility is a partial valley fill. It's about 3.5 square miles in size, and on the downslope side you have a large earthen dam

Page 8

which would retain the tailings and the water behind it. That facility as well as the mine site and the waste rock facility we are about to talk about will remain effectively in perpetuity if we permit the project.

So a third primary component that I just mentioned is the waste rock facility. That waste rock facility is also about 3.5 square miles in size as proposed. Waste rock is either the rock overburden that you have to remove to get to the ore, or it's ore that just doesn't contain enough gold to be economical to run through the mill. And the waste rock just needs to be piled up somewhere, and that's where they are proposing to pile it.

You can see a variety of other facilities on that slide: The mill facility, and then there is a variety of water supply dams that would be needed during operations.

One of the things to keep in mind is that -- we'll talk about reclamation in about 20 minutes. Reclamation of these facilities would include the pit lake that's expected to take 50 to 55 years to fill with water, and after the mining ceases, that pit would just be a large lake that would stay there in perpetuity. The tailings storage facility would be recontoured to facilitate some degree of revegetation and remain in perpetuity. The waste rock facility would also be recontoured and remain in perpetuity. All but potentially one of the small dams

Page 9

that are water supply dams would be removed.

Okay. The second primary component of Donlin's proposed project is the transportation infrastructure. What you can see by that pinkish blob in the center of the screen is the proposed mine site. Donlin is proposing to barge virtually all the fuel, diesel fuel and cargo that they need to operate the mine up the Kuskokwim River to a new private industrial port site at Jungjuk, which is depicted on the slide. They propose to run a 30-mile long road to connect the Jungjuk port to the mine site, and there would need to be a variety of gravel pits generated, developed along that road to construct the road and maintain the road.

Donlin would also need to construct a 5,000-foot airstrip that you can see depicted on the slide to provide access for workers, whether it's construction or during operations at the mine site. And you can see the camp facility depicted, as well.

You will also note that between the port site at Jungjuk and the mine site, they would need to store approximately 40 million gallons of diesel every year. The project -- the projected mine life is 27 and a half years after construction is completed. And so they would be burning approximately 40 million gallons of diesel per year for 27 and a half years. And that refers to

Page 10

operation of the mining equipment itself.
As far as operation of the mill facilities, a lot of the other facilities, the camp facilities, et cetera, Donlin is proposing to construct a 315-mile long, 14-inch diameter buried steel pipeline that would run from the western side of Cook Inlet approximately at Beluga through the Alaska Range over to the mine site. This pipeline, as is mentioned, would be buried pipeline. What would be left behind after the pipeline is constructed is a corridor through the vegetation so that Donlin can do inspections routinely each year and during the year just to make sure that the pipeline integrity is intact.
The project as proposed would take three to four years to construct, is proposed to operate for 27 and a half years. I mentioned closure and reclamation a few minutes ago. Donlin, of course, would be required to do a reclamation on a variety of the facilities that they develop.
To give you an idea of the scale of the project overall, the total footprint of all development proposed for this project is 26 square miles. The vast majority of that would need to be reclaimed to one degree or another. I mentioned the pit lake. Well, there wouldn't be any reclamation for the pit, really. Some of the rock that needs to be stored where it's not exposed to air would go

Page 11

into the pit, and then the pit would fill with water. That's all the reclamation the pit would see.
And I mentioned that the tailings storage facility and the waste rock facility would be recontoured to facilitate revegetation to a degree. That's the reclamation for those facilities. There is a variety of other facilities, the mill facility, et cetera. There is a whole variety of those facilities that actually would be largely reclaimed. Organic material would be placed over their former footprints after the infrastructure was removed. They would be allowed to revegetate.
There are, however, a variety of facilities that would be left in place. That 30-mile long road would be left simply because during construction, during operations and post operations, any water that Donlin is releasing off of the mine site would have to meet State and federal water quality standards. Therefore, the pit, as you can tell, annually it's going to have more water moving into it. Whether it's from direct precipitation, whether it's from snowfall, whether it's from groundwater infiltration, it's going to continue to fill. So the water is going to go somewhere, otherwise it's going to go over the top and have an uncontrolled release.
Well, to release water, Donlin would have to treat it to State and federal water quality standards, so therefore

Page 12

that would have to happen in perpetuity once the mine ceases operation. Effectively, forever. Therefore, a small portion of the port and the road would remain so they have access to that facility to do the water treatment and maintain those facilities.
In relation to the pipeline, the pipeline itself would be decommissioned, assuming nobody else decided they wanted to use it after Donlin was done with it. The pipeline would stay in the ground. The corridor would be allowed to revegetate. For those few places where there is a fault crossing or some other crossing that involves the pipeline being above ground for a very brief segment, those portions of the pipeline would be removed.
The shoofly roads, these are temporary construction roads that are needed either to actually do the construction of the pipeline or to access gravel or access water for construction. Those roads are proposed to stay in place, so the gravel fill, the road prism, would remain. And they would put some material onto it to facilitate revegetation, but that's a type of reclamation that's a minimal reclamation. So you could expect to see those remain.
But please note, there is no proposed road along the entire length of the proposed pipeline. It's just short segments of construction road where they are needed. And

Page 13

I believe that covers it.
The next two slides just give you a depiction of a variety of federal and State permits primarily required for Donlin to get approval for this project. There are over 100 authorizations required before the project could go forward as Donlin is currently proposing it.
These are the major State permits required. And we are in the process of doing the EIS, but one of the purposes of the EIS is to facilitate decision making for individuals doing permitting, whether it's federal, State agencies, tribal entities, et cetera; the information is available to anyone that wants to use it.
So as far as where are we at in this process? The Corps of Engineers and folks were out here somewhere between December of 2012 and March of 2013 for the scoping process. That's when they came in and they talked to you all and said, okay, for this EIS what are the things we should be concerned about, what are the things that we should include in our analysis and EIS. And nine of the posters on the wall contain those primary concerns that were expressed during the scoping process. And I'll introduce the folks in a few minutes who can give you more information on the issues and draft analyses and draft conclusions contained on those posters.
The draft EIS was put out for public comment on

Page 14

November 27 of 2015. We are currently in the review process for it. And currently the comment period closes April 30 of 2016. So the end of this month.

When we get comments on -- the comments you may make today or sometime before the comment period closes, when we get your comments, how will we address your comments? Well, we may be able to respond to some comments today, but primarily today we will take your comments and we'll take your testimony, and your comments or testimony will be responded to when the Final Environmental Impact Statement comes out. That's approximately summer of 2017.

Then the federal agencies that would use the EIS to actually formally make decisions -- that would be the Bureau of Land Management, the Pipeline Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, and the Army Corps of Engineers -- would produce Records of Decision that indicate whether or not we felt we could permit the project as Donlin is proposing it, whether we could permit some alternative to what they are proposing, or whether we could not permit the project at all.

Okay. Briefly I'll give you information on what's in the first half a dozen chapters of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement by way of giving you some idea of what you might want to comment on and where you could find it.

Chapter 1 is the purpose and need for the project as

Page 15

proposed. Because of the Army Corps of Engineers' role as the lead federal agency under the National Environmental Policy Act and our authorities under Section 10 and 404 in relation to permitting potential impacts of the project, it's incumbent on our agency to define both overall and basic purposes of the project as proposed. What you will find in the document is an overall purpose that is slightly different than what you see on the screen.

And the reason I'm bringing that up is because, for bureaucratic reasons, I have to note this. The overall purpose that we are basing our analyses on is what you see on that screen. What we have in the document after the words "Western Alaska," there is another half a sentence, and that half a sentence says that part of our purpose is to maximize economic benefit for Donlin stockholders, Calista and TKC shareholders. That part was intended to be removed before the document went out.

We are fully aware of the potential positive socioeconomic benefits of this project in the Yukon and Kuskokwim River regions, and we are aware of the potential negative impacts socioeconomically of this project. However, the Army Corps of Engineers' role is to do unbiased middle-of-the-road analyses of the potential impacts of this project, to disclose those to you, disclose the analysis and get your comments and come to

Page 16

final conclusions. We can't do that if we inappropriately weight the economics of this project to one entity or another too far off center.

As you can see on the screen, we have also defined the need for what Donlin is proposing. That largely is what Chapter 1 tells you in the Environmental Impact Statement.

One of the ways we are required to do an analysis and one of the ways we potentially limit impacts of proposed projects is to develop alternatives to proposed projects. What you can see on the screen are the seven alternatives that we have carried forward for detailed analysis in the EIS. We had over 300 options that were considered as ways we might develop an alternative to the proposed project. Those 300 options were weeded down into these seven alternatives that are considered in substantial detail.

What we need to know from you all is, did we consider enough things. One of the things that a gentleman brought up at a meeting yesterday was, well, you are talking about a natural gas pipeline; that is, Donlin is proposing to supply natural gas to the mine site. And one of your alternatives is Alternative 3B, a diesel pipeline that would replace the natural gas pipeline with a diesel pipeline. Well, have you considered the alternative of having both the natural gas pipeline and the diesel

Page 17

pipeline running together? That's the kind of thing we are looking for when you all make comments on the EIS, is that an alternative we should analyze.

Look at the 300 options that you will see in an appendix to this document and let us know if we have adequately considered the types of things that could be considered alternatives to what Donlin is proposing.

And an alternative, as I mentioned, is something that would reduce, minimize or avoid potential negative impacts of the project, or it can easily also be an alternative that would make the project more economically beneficial, either for the Yukon-Kuskokwim River region, for Donlin, whomever.

Okay. So of the alternatives on the screen, what are we actually talking about? As we go through them, I'm only going to talk about six of them. The one that I'm not going to talk about is Donlin's proposed action, Alternative 2, because that we have already described in the first few slides that we have looked at, and that's the alternative that we are comparing all these other alternatives to.

So what is Alternative 1? Alternative 1 is an alternative that the National Environmental Policy Act requires that we look at. Alternative 1 is the no action alternative. To do functional analyses, unbiased

Page 18

analyses, we need to start by comparing all the potential impacts of a project and the impacts of all the alternatives to what actually exists out here now. That's all Alternative 1 is.

Alternative 1 is the baseline condition. It's what actually exists in the Yukon-Kuskokwim River region now from the standpoint of the barging that happens now, the subsistence activities that happen now, the socioeconomic status of the region, the cultural status of the region, et cetera. So that's what we are comparing everything else to as we look at Donlin's proposed action and these others.

The next alternative that we are talking about is Alternative 3A. Remember 2 was Donlin's proposed action. Alternative 3A is called an LNG-powered haul truck alternative. As I mentioned, the reason for looking at alternatives is to find ways to minimize, avoid, mitigate, offset potential negative impacts of a project.

Alternative 3A means that we would power the haul trucks at the mine site, those 300-ton payload trucks that would actually move the rock inside the mine pit or to the waste rock facility or to the mill. Those trucks would be powered with liquid natural gas instead of powering them with diesel. Therefore, this alternative has the benefit of reducing the amount of diesel that needs to be barged

Page 19

to the mine site, therefore reducing the potential negative impacts of barging, also potentially reducing the amount of diesel you have to store, reducing the amount of diesel which could be spilled, reducing the amount of diesel that would be burned and generate some degree of negative air emission.

Good afternoon. We will take a break for a couple minutes while you get signed in. After you get signed in, there is tangerines over here, chocolate chip cookies, chocolate milk, et cetera.

(Off the record.)

MR. KEITH GORDON: Let me take one minute to give you guys an idea of where we started from. And it will only take about a minute. We're here today to talk about the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that discloses the potential impacts of Donlin's proposed gold mine project. We are going to do a presentation. We are going to give you some information on the posters you see in the room. We are going to take comments on the draft EIS and testimony in relation to the potential subsistence impacts of the project.

Donlin's proposed project, as you may be aware, consists of what would be the largest open pit mine the state of Alaska has ever seen. On this slide you see the mine depicted under No. 1. The tailings storage facility,

Page 20

the ground-up rock that would be left over after ore is processed through the mill, is No. 2. And the waste rock facility, the rock that just is not processed, just is waste, in No. 3.

Donlin is also proposing to construct an industrial port on the Jungjuk River downstream of Crooked Creek. The mine itself would be constructed about ten miles north of Crooked Creek, and they are proposing to construct a 30-mile access road between the mine site and the proposed port facility to receive cargo and fuel for the project. Donlin is also proposing to construct a 315-mile long buried natural gas pipeline running from the west side of Cook Inlet over to the mine site to supply natural gas to the project to power the mill and the camp and a variety of other facilities.

The project as proposed would take three to four years to construct, 27 and a half years to operate as it's currently proposed, followed by closing and reclaiming to various degrees a variety of the facilities proposed to be constructed. There are over 100 federal and State permits, tribal and other entities' authorizations required for Donlin to construct their proposed project.

This is just an indication of where we are at in the process. We started the process by doing some scoping, coming out to the communities and getting input on what

Page 21

you all feel we need to analyze in relation to the potential impacts of this project. And nine of the posters on the wall around here relate to the various issues people were concerned about when we did scoping. That's impacts to subsistence, socioeconomic impacts, fisheries impacts, barge traffic impacts, et cetera.

After we get your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, we will produce a Final Environmental Impact Statement and then make decisions regarding whether or not we will permit the project as Donlin is proposing it, permit some alternative to the project, or don't permit anything at all.

This is just the purpose of the project as we have defined it for purposes of our analyses and the need for the project as Donlin -- as we have determined.

There are a variety of alternatives that we were starting to talk about before you all came in. And the no action alternative is the alternative we compare everything else to; Donlin's proposed action, the mine site, which is Alternative 2, and all these other alternatives.

These alternatives are developed to minimize or offset potential negative impacts of projects, potentially finding a better way to do a project someone is proposing. And since we discussed Alternative 2 earlier, I was not

Page 22

going to go into any substantial detail. Alternative 2 is basically what Donlin is proposing.

Alternative 3A, the LNG-powered haul truck alternative, is an alternative that just means that the 300-ton payload trucks that would move rock around inside the pit to the waste rock facility to the mill facility, those trucks would actually be powered by liquid natural gas instead of diesel, therefore limiting the amount of diesel that would need to be barged to the facility, limiting the amount of diesel that would be consumed, limiting the amount of diesel that could potentially be spilled.

Alternative 3B is the diesel pipeline alternative. This alternative means that that 315-mile long natural gas pipeline would actually be replaced with a 334-mile long diesel pipeline; therefore, all those facilities that would have been powered by natural gas would actually be powered by diesel. If this alternative went forward, it means an additional 19-mile segment added to the pipeline, running from the proposed initiation of the natural gas pipeline at Beluga down to Tyonek. It means improvement of the North Foreland Barge Facility at Tyonek.

But primarily, from the standpoint of offsetting potential impacts of what Donlin is proposing, this alternative means a substantial reduction in barging on

Page 23

the Kuskokwim River because the diesel that would have to be barged up the river, those 40 million gallons per year for 27 and a half years, that would now actually be barged through Cook Inlet over to a facility immediately south of Tyonek, which would be pumped into that pipeline and the pipeline would route it all the way to the mine site.

But of course, anytime we're talking about an alternative, we are talking about changing the potential impacts of a project, obviously. So some of the offsets for impacts of this alternative versus what Donlin is proposing, if this 315-mile long natural gas pipeline is constructed, what happens if you have a crack in or a rupture of a natural gas pipeline? Well, you have natural gas under pressure blasting out of a pipe. Where does it go? It goes into the air, and it will dissipate over some period of time over some distance.

What happens if you have a leak or a rupture of a diesel pipeline? Well, you know what happens with diesel. It's a terrestrial spill and/or an aquatic spill. So if we go with this alternative versus what Donlin is proposing, again, we are changing the potential impacts of the proposed project. Therefore, every time we are changing potential impacts, we have to change how we weigh and balance these impacts one versus another when we do the analyses. So for every one of these alternatives,

Page 24

subsistence impacts have a given weight under one alternative. If you look at another alternative, some aspects of that alternative change some aspects of the subsistence analysis under that other alternative.

Alternative 4 is the last alternative we will talk about that deals with minimizing potential impacts of the barge traffic, primarily. I talked about that proposed port facility just downstream of Crooked Creek connected by that 30-mile road to the mine site, the proposed port site at Jungjuk. Well, this alternative has a proposed industrial port site at Birch Tree Crossing versus Jungjuk.

So what's the difference to this alternative? Well, if this alternative went forward versus what Donlin is proposing, you can see that the mine site is the red blob on the screen, and there is a short road running south to Crooked Creek. Also on the screen you see the 30-mile road Donlin is proposing to construct to their proposed port site at Jungjuk. This Alternative 4 is depicted in purple on the screen. What it means is that a 76-mile road would be constructed from the mine site down to Birch Tree Crossing.

So what happens if this alternative goes forward? Well, the advantage of this alternative -- there is a disadvantage. The disadvantage of this alternative is

Page 25

that we are talking 76 miles of road versus 30 miles of road, which means we are talking the trucks have to run two and a half times the distance; therefore, the trucks are burning more diesel; therefore, you have more negative air emissions coming in relation to those trucks operating longer and burning more diesel.

Well, what are the positive benefits of this alternative? The positive benefits of this alternative, as you all know, barges can strand on the Kuskokwim River, and stranding barges has the potential for spill, et cetera. Well, if you look at this facility, this proposed facility, it's approximately 75 miles downriver from the proposed Jungjuk port site. And of the half a dozen areas we are aware you have potential for stranding on the upper Kuskokwim River, five of those six areas are upstream of Birch Tree Crossing.

So if this alternative went forward, you are reducing the total number of river miles you have to barge cargo and fuel. You are avoiding five and six areas where we know there is a potential for stranding. If you are reducing the distance you barge diesel -- I talked about the fact that you have more negative air emissions because you have to truck cargo farther. Well, you also have less negative air emissions with barging because you are not barging the cargo as far. So again, every time we change

Page 26

alternatives, we change the analyses we are doing.
And what we need to know from you all is: Are the draft analyses in the document accurate? Do you think they're correct? Do you think the draft conclusions are correct? We need your opinions on whether or not we understand the environment as it exists out here, both the natural and human environment, and do we understand the potential impacts of this project, both positive and negative.
Alternative 5A, we are now going to talk about an alternative to tailings disposal. I mentioned the tailings, the ground-up rock that's left over after the ore is processed through the mill, goes to the tailings facility in the form of a slurry, ground rock, water and some residual chemicals. Well, this alternatives takes that slurry and dries it out almost to a dry state.
Dry stack tailings means that the water is removed from the tailings before they go into the tailings facility. So what does that look like? What it looks like is it's in the same valley, so a portion of that same valley would be filled in perpetuity with tailings, but the tailings are much drier. Because they are drier, they can be stacked much higher. And as a result of that, the footprint of the tailings is much smaller in relation to the tailings themselves.

Page 27

One of the negative impacts of this alternative is if you stack those tailings higher, there is more potential dust dispersion around the whole area from windborne erosion of those tailings.
There is a proposal under this alternative to cap those tailings at the end of the mining operation and attempt some revegetation by placing organic material over that liner that would close it all in. But also note that under this alternative, instead of one downslope dam that contains the tailings and the water that would be contained within them under Donlin's proposal, we now have two smaller dams retaining the tailings and we have a single larger dam downslope containing all the water that would have to be removed from those tailings.
So it's important to note that that water, that operating pond that you see there, is only there during the operating life of the mine. When mining ceased, that pond would be pumped over to the pit lake, and the water would be retained in that pit lake until either it evaporated or it was treated and released back into Crooked Creek, into the Kuskokwim River, or somewhere else in the watershed.
Alternative 6A, the Dalzell Gorge pipeline route. We talked about the various options we looked at. We had, I believe, at least a half a dozen different alternatives to

Page 28

Donlin's proposed pipeline route that were looked at. This is the one that survived for detailed analysis in the draft EIS. This alternative, one of the advantages of it is that the pipeline is about two miles shorter than what Donlin is proposing. However, one of the disadvantages of this alternative is that the Iditarod National Historic Trail has more negative impacts, in that this route has more potential impact to the trail.
You can see Donlin's proposed route depicted in gold on the screen. Alternative 6A, the Dalzell Gorge pipeline route which runs through Rainy Pass through the Dalzell Gorge and along the south fork of the Kuskokwim, is depicted in purple.
Those are the alternatives that are currently contained in Chapter 2. And again, what we would like to know is: Did we do an adequate analyses of alternatives? Are there other alternatives that we should have considered that we didn't? Did we draw correct conclusions about the alternatives that we did consider?
Okay. Chapter 3 of the document is basically the heart of the document. It contains the environmental analyses, the draft analyses, the draft conclusions regarding the potential impacts of the project. You can see on the screen an example of the analyses as it relates to the barge traffic impacts of the proposed project.

Page 29

There are 26 major resource issues that we have defined and included in our analyses. 14 of those major resource issues are on the screen because we think they are potentially impacted by barge traffic. And obviously, as you can see, that's everything from recreation to wildlife to water quality to climate change. It's just a little bit of everything. What we need to know, again, is: Are the draft analyses and are the draft conclusions functional?
Okay. So if we are going to talk about barge traffic, which is what we are going to use to provide a couple of examples of the analyses and the conclusions, we need to talk about barge traffic as it currently exists on the Kuskokwim River. And what we need to know from you all is: Do we have an adequate understanding of barging on the Kuskokwim River as it currently exists?
The burnt gold color on the bottom of the screen represents barging as it currently exists on the Kuskokwim River. So what you can see on these bar graphs is on the left side of the screen, you see the construction impacts under these four bar graphs. And what you see is Alternative 1 is on the far left side of the screen, and there are several other alternatives on the next bar graph, and the last two bar graphs are Alternative 3A and 3B.

Page 30

As I mentioned, the burnt cold color is the alternatives that currently exist. I'm sorry. The barging that currently exists. As we understand it, there are currently 68 barges -- riverine barges is what we are referring to, not marine barges -- that leave Bethel every year, and the configuration is typically one tug and two barges going upstream some distance before they return back to Bethel or somewhere else.

What is currently happening on the Kuskokwim River is basically light duty commercial barging with -- if we compare what is currently happening with what Donlin is proposing, if you were to be standing on some portion of the Kuskokwim River last summer, in a 24-hour period what you would typically have seen is a small tug pushing one or two barges upstream some distance. So a tug and one or two barges would pass you in 24 hours.

If Donlin's project is constructed, Donlin is proposing to use larger tugs pushing for cargo four barges each time a tug goes upriver or one or two fuel barges every time a tug goes upriver. And please note that that's -- every time -- every time a tug goes upriver, sometimes it's cargo, sometimes it's fuel. In that same 24-hour period if you were standing on that same spot after Donlin's project was constructed, you would see three tugs with barges passing you in that same 24-hour

Page 31

period.

So it could be three of Donlin's tugs and barges in their configuration. It could be one of the current commercial tugs that goes up the river and a couple of Donlin's.

So as you can see, one of the things we are trying to depict by this slide is that you can't always rely on the figures and tables in the document to tell you the whole story. You remember that I mentioned that Alternative 2, Donlin's proposed project, and the port site at Jungjuk versus the Birch Tree Crossing port, Alternative 4, which is 75 river miles downstream, well, those two alternatives are contained in the same bar graphs on this slide.

What you can see on the left side, that first bar graph with the blue above it is a depiction of Alternative 2, Alternatives 4, 5A and 6A and the impacts of Donlin's project. The blue on the screen is the additional barging that would relate from Donlin's project.

So for construction, all the alternatives except Alternative 1 where we permit nothing, all those alternatives have the same quantity of construction barging, but it's important to note that while Alternatives 2 and 4 are combined together in the same bar graph, remember that Alternative 4 has 75 miles less river barging going upstream. So the graphs and the tables in

Page 32

the document don't tell you everything. It helps to look back at the text.

On the right side of the screen, you see operations. Again, we have broken out the bar graphs the same way between alternatives. What you can see is Alternatives 2, 4, 5A and 6A have the most barge impact in relation to operations, the shipment of cargo and fuel. And that is a 179 percent increase of barging on the river beyond what is currently taking place now. But again, remember we have Alternatives 2 and 4 combined in the same bar graph. So while they appear to show the same amount of impact, Alternative 4 does not have the same amount of impact.

And again, as you can see, Alternatives 3A and 3B reduce the potential impacts of barging simply because there is less diesel going upstream by barge. So therefore, there is less barging impacts.

The last couple of slides on Chapter 3 give you a depiction of the potential environmental analyses of the project as it's currently proposed. Again, this is the same scenario that you saw on the other slides where we have Donlin's alternative, and the other alternatives are depicted by way of how they might minimize impacts of what Donlin is proposing.

Alternative 3A has the potential to have less impacts on fish because if we power the haul trucks with LNG,

Page 33

therefore barge less diesel, we have less impact on fish. Alternative 3B, same thing; even less diesel going upstream because effectively it's all going through the pipeline. The only time diesel is going upstream under this alternative via barge is during construction. And then Alternative 4, we are just not going as far upstream.

So the next slide slows you the same thing. It just gives you more indication of the potential for the alternatives to reduce impacts of the project. But please note that all we are doing in relation to these series of slides is giving you an indication of how the alternatives that we are looking at might reduce impacts in relation to barging. There are tradeoffs in relation to every other impact for these alternatives. So in some ways some of these alternatives have less impact for some resource issues, and some of these alternatives have more impact for some resource issues.

Chapters 4 and 5. Chapter 4 talks about the potential cumulative impacts of a proposed project. What are cumulative impacts? Cumulative impacts are the past, present and reasonably foreseeable activities that impact an area that have to be looked at in relation to a proposed project.

So for the Yukon-Kuskokwim River region, we looked at past activities that might relate to what Donlin is

Page 34

proposing. We looked at current activities that are going on or trends that are happening in the regions. And we look at foreseeable trends and future projects that might relate to what Donlin is proposing. We combine all of those together with the potential impacts of Donlin's project, and we forecast what the impacts might be into the future. That's what cumulative impacts are. They are a forecast of what might happen in the future.

What we need to know from you all is: Do we adequately understand what's happening in the Yukon-Kuskokwim River region in the past, currently and coming up in the future, and have we adequately defined the potential impacts Donlin's project might have?

Chapter 5 is mitigation. Mitigation is how we might offset the impacts of something Donlin -- a proponent for a project is proposing to do. Mitigation includes a wide variety of things.

Donlin includes things in their design like putting containment berms under and around fuel storage facilities that are mitigation. It's required by law, but it is also a form of mitigation. They also have just changed some designs to avoid some impacts because they just decided there is a way to do it that has less impact. That's another type of mitigation. A type of mitigation is the reclamation that could be done after an activity happens

Page 35

and we are restoring the area. And there is a variety of other types of mitigation that can be developed.

What we would like to know from you all is: Have we adequately defined, analyzed, disclosed, and drawn the correct conclusions in regards to the potential ways to mitigate what Donlin is proposing and potential mitigation that might be needed for the alternatives that we are analyzing in the project in the EIS?

I mentioned a poster session. Mr. Alan Bittner with the BLM will give you his introduction to the ANILCA 810 hearing before we go to the poster session, but I wanted to give you a little bit of information at this point in time about the poster session. You can see next to Mary over here there is three or four posters on the wall that depict Donlin's proposed project, and then there is nine other posters around the room that give you information on the primary resource issues, the primary effects this project might have.

There is a variety of folks here with me today that will introduce themselves regarding their role in Donlin's project and will be able to discuss the potential impacts of the project in relation to what you see in these posters and may be able to address some of your questions. And as I mentioned, after that poster session, then we will come back and take your formal comments on the draft

Page 36

EIS before we go ahead and do the ANILCA 810 hearing and take your testimony in relation to potential subsistence impacts of the project.

But the primary thing we're here to do today is to obtain the most substantive comments we can from you all regarding the potential impacts of what Donlin is proposing or any of these alternatives. So what do I mean by a substantive comment when it comes to a comment on an Environmental Impact Statement?

Basically what we need to know, whether you are for the project, whether you are against the project, or whether you are somewhere in between, we need to know why you are for it, against it, or somewhere in between. The reason we need to know why is because that tells us whether or not the analyses and the draft analyses and the draft conclusions that are in the Environmental Impact Statement are adequate. It tells us whether or not we know what we are talking about, whether or not we have adequately analyzed the project as it's proposed or the alternatives. It tells us whether or not we actually have an understanding of your culture, the economic situation out here, the situation in relation to subsistence, et cetera.

In other words, it helps us understand if we got it right or wrong. It helps us understand if there are

Page 37

things we need to change, if there are things we need to do over, if there are things we need to do more of, things that we just haven't done that we need to do.

So how do you provide a substantive comment? You can certainly comment that you are for the project. You can certainly comment that you are against the project. We ask, if possible, that you give us that reason why. But as I mentioned earlier, your comments are largely responded to in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. So the comments that we get on the EIS, our responses will appear in the Final Environmental Impact Statement when it goes out.

So if I have 100 people that tell me I support the project, well, if they don't say why, then our response to that in the Final Environmental Impact Statement is "comment noted." If I have 100 people that say I oppose the project but they don't tell me why, then our response to that in the Final Environmental Impact Statement is "comment noted." If they say I'm for it because or I'm against it because, then that gives me some idea of whether or not we know what we are talking about, whether or not we did the analyses correct, whether or not there are more studies we need to do, whether or not the analyses need to be reworked, just whether or not we got it right or wrong.

Page 38

So the more you can tell us regarding the why, the more that will help us understand if we know what we are talking about and if our draft analyses and draft conclusions are correct or not.

Regarding how you can comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, obviously you can comment at this meeting. We have one remaining meeting in Chuathbaluk next week that you can comment at, either by being there or calling in. You can email comments to us at that website. You can mail comments to me. You can fax comments to us. And on the next slide I'll show you our website where you can obtain additional information. On this slide I'll show you that our next meeting is in Chuathbaluk, but the date obviously has been changed.

Here is the website that shows where you can find information on the project. As I mentioned, the comment period is open until April 30. You can find the Draft Environmental Impact Statement under the EIS documents tab. You can find old newsletters, project information, background documents, old presentations that we have done. My contact information is on the screen. And if you have matters that are specifically tribal that you would like to address to our tribal liaison, Ms. Amanda Andraschko, her contact information is on the screen, and you can address those to her directly.

Page 39

At this point in time, Alan Bittner will give you the introduction to the 810 hearing that we will be doing in about an hour, hour and a half. And then we will go to the poster session.

It will take just a minute for the slide program to be opened and then we will continue.

MR. TAYLOR BRELSFORD: So I think it's a really special opportunity for the students to come and join us this afternoon. And you have been really patient, really attentive. I saw no yawns. I saw lots of paying attention. Could you tell us a little bit -- I think you are in high school, by your age. Who is your teacher in the high school?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Bader.

MR. TAYLOR BRELSFORD: Mr. Bear?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Jessica Leer.

MR. TAYLOR BRELSFORD: Jessica Leer. Boy, that was way out in left field.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Bader.

MR. TAYLOR BRELSFORD: So what did you know about the presentation this afternoon before you came out? What were you thinking we were going to talk about? This is like the Oprah moment. We walk around the audience and let you talk. You win door prizes,

Page 40

airplanes, snowmachines. It's going to be great. Tell me what you understood the meeting to be about.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I don't know.

MR. TAYLOR BRELSFORD: Not so sure. Okay. Let's try another angle. Why is it important for kids in Holy Cross to be thinking about the Donlin EIS project, the Donlin Gold Mine? How does it connect to your family or even your own future in the next few years? Who is going to be brave?

MS. DONNE FLEAGLE: Why did you come?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: [Inaudible.]

MS. DONNE FLEAGLE: To get out of class. That's a good reason. Has it disappointed you?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No.

MS. DONNE FLEAGLE: Did you learn something about the mine?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Kind of.

MS. DONNE FLEAGLE: Kind of? So have you -- has it been interesting? No?

MR. TAYLOR BRELSFORD: There is only one answer to that. It was fabulous. I can't believe it, the most interesting talk ever. Well, we are going to keep moving, but I think it's -- I wanted to be sure you guys knew how much we value you sitting in.

Page 41

So we are going to turn to another presentation for a few minutes here and then a chance to walk around with some of the scientists and talk about things like air quality or subsistence, stuff like that. But again, thanks for coming. We appreciate it.

MR. ALAN BITTNER: Yes. And thanks to all of you for being here today, including those of you from high school. My name is Alan Bittner with the Bureau of Land Management, and our involvement in the proposed project is as a cooperator with the Corps of Engineers and others on this Draft Environmental Impact Statement. And also because the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act Section 810 requires that we do a finding on subsistence impacts, so the BLM has drafted a preliminary finding of subsistence impacts based on the project, on the proposed project. And I've got ten slides here I want to run through and some text.

Forgive me for reading through this. I just want to be accurate about our preliminary finding, and then we will move on with the poster session.

One thing we would like to note today, obviously this project is down along the Kuskokwim River and in the Kuskokwim River drainage, you know, and from the Crooked Creek area. But one thing we would like to know, we know you go south for certain subsistence activities on the

Page 42

other side of the river, but we would like to hear not just how much you travel towards the Aniak area for any kind of subsistence activities, but do you get over towards Crooked Creek or that area where the mine is proposed and would there be any subsistence-related impacts to those of you living here? So that's an important thing that we would like to either get comment on in the draft EIS or a comment directly to the BLM in the form of testimony or written comment to us, so --

Through this draft EIS process, the BLM determined if a significant restriction of subsistence uses and needs may result from any one of the alternatives discussed in the draft EIS, including the cumulative effects. And we used three factors for that analysis.

The first one is reduction in the availability of subsistence resources caused by a decline in population or abundance of harvestable resources. So this may include fish, wildlife, edible plants, house logs, firewood or drinking water.

Factors that might cause a reduction include adverse impacts on habitat, direct impacts on the resource, increased harvest and increased competition from nonsubsistence users.

The second factor in the analysis, reductions in the availability of resources used for subsistence purposes

Page 43

caused by an alteration in distribution, migration patterns, or location. And the third factor was limitations on access to subsistence resources, including limitations from increased competition for resources or physical or legal barriers.

Donlin Gold, LLC submitted applications to the Bureau of Land Management for rights-of-way grants in July of 2013 and January of -- July of 2012 -- sorry -- and January of 2013.

Donlin Gold is proposing to construct operate, maintain, and close a 315-mile long, 14-inch diameter buried natural gas pipeline and associated fiber optic cable from the west side of Cook Inlet to the mine site near Crooked Creek within the Kuskokwim River watershed.

The proposed 315-mile long pipeline right-of-way would cross 97 miles of BLM land north and west of the Alaska Range in the Kuskokwim River watershed. This represents approximately 30 percent of the total right-of-way length, the State of Alaska lands constituting about 65 percent, and ANCSA Corporation lands -- Calista, The Kuskokwim Corporation and CIRI -- constituting about 3.7 percent.

The pipeline is part of the energy supply infrastructure for a proposed open pit gold mine located approximately 10 miles north of the village of Crooked

Page 44

Creek. In addition to the pipeline and the mine site, the Donlin Gold Project will include transportation infrastructure for barge transportation on the Kuskokwim River. Two of the six alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS would affect the pipeline component. Alternative 3B would substitute a diesel pipeline for the natural gas pipeline within the same planned right-of-way.

Alternative 6A would route a portion of the pipeline through the Dalzell Gorge, affecting 46 miles of State of Alaska lands.

The proposed Donlin Gold Project is evaluated in three comments: The mine site, transportation infrastructure, and pipeline. Although the permit application to the BLM focuses on BLM-managed portions of the pipeline -- or of the right-of-way, the pipeline right-of-way, the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, prohibits splitting the project into smaller components in order to minimize the estimate of environmental impacts. For that reason, this review of impacts of subsistence will address the entire project and not just the portion affecting BLM permitting.

So I'm going to talk about those three components real briefly, and then I'm going to give you our preliminary finding for each one of those components with regard to subsistence. And again, this is based on

Page 45

ANILCA, not on NEPA. So our threshold was a little bit different.

The preliminary finding, the choices we had for each of the components was either "may not significantly affect" or "may significantly affect." And again, this is just a proposed finding at this stage. We really need to hear from all of you as well as others in the other communities we have been in.

So the proposed pipeline includes a 150-foot wide cleared construction right-of-way; 12 airstrips ranging from 3,500 to 5,000 feet long, nine of which would be newly built along the pipeline right-of-way during construction; nine construction camps; 65 cleared pipe storage areas; an estimated 70 gravel pits ranging from one to 50 acres in size. The pipeline would cross seven watersheds involving 396 stream crossings, 77 of which are anadromous or salmon-rearing streams. And this is a picture of the proposed pipeline route in the Windy Fork portion of the Kuskokwim watershed, and that's in Game Management Unit 19C.

The proposed mine includes a waste rock facility that would fill in 2,240 acres of American Creek, a tailings storage facility that would fill in 2,351 acres of Anaconda Creek. A tailings storage facility would be contained behind a 464-foot high dam.

Page 46

The mine also has two pits. The ACMA pit would be approximately 1,850 feet deep from the high wall, and the Lewis pit would be approximately 1,653 feet deep from the high wall. The two pits would merge at the surface into one open pit about 2.2 miles long and one mile wide near the end of mining operations.

At mine closure, runoff from the tailings storage facility would be pumped into the open pit. The pit is estimated to take roughly 50 years to fill, and pumping would be required to prevent it from overflowing into Crooked Creek and the Kuskokwim River watershed. The pit water may or may not meet water quality standards and would need to be treated before it can be released into Crooked Creek.

A water treatment plant would be constructed 50 years after mine closure. Water from the pit lake would have to be pumped and treated into the wastewater treatment plant into perpetuity to prevent untreated pit water from flowing into Crooked Creek and the Kuskokwim River. And this is an overview of the mine site and the waste rock facility, the tailings storage facility. And that's in Game Management Unit 19A.

The proposed transportation facilities component includes construction of an expanded port facility at the Bethel cargo terminal, a new port site at Jungjuk Creek on

Page 47

the Kuskokwim River with 2.8 million gallons of fuel storage, a 30-mile long mine access road from the Kuskokwim River to the mine with 45 stream crossings and 13 gravel pits and a 5,000 foot airstrip at the mine. And this is a photo on the Kuskokwim River at Jungjuk, and that's in Game Management Unit 19A.

Barges would supply the mine with fuel and cargo and involve 64 cargo round trip barges and 58 fuel barge round trips, or 122 total round trips annually from the Bethel port site to the Jungjuk port during a 110-day shipping season, which is approximately June 1 to October 1, pushing up to a four-barge configuration each trip. Each fuel barge trip would carry 1.29 million gallons of diesel fuel. The port at Jungjuk would continue to be needed to supply fuel and cargo to the water treatment plant treating water from the pit lake into perpetuity. This is Jungjuk Creek here where the proposed port and fuel storage facility would be constructed. And again, that's in Game Management Unit 19A.

The preliminary analysis of the impacts to subsistence based on the alternatives outlined in the draft EIS include all six alternatives outlined. It can be found in Appendix N of the draft EIS on page 409 of the .pdf. And that's labeled in the document as Appendix M through O in the table of contents. And some of you

Page 48

received copies of that draft impact analysis to subsistence, and there is also some copies on the table over there.

The testimony and input from 11 communities where public hearings are held on impacts to subsistence from the proposed Donlin Gold Project will be analyzed and included in the final ANILCA 810 subsistence impact evaluation, and that will be included in the final EIS.

So for the evaluation, the following is an evaluation of the effects of the Donlin Gold Project proposal on subsistence uses and needs for the mine site, natural gas pipeline, and transportation infrastructure components of the project. The subsistence evaluation was done for each of the project components and looked at the effects on subsistence uses and needs.

So for the mine site, villages closest to the mine would potentially experience the most effect to subsistence, including Napaimute and especially Crooked Creek. Mining activity such as ore trucks in the mine, trucks on the port road, drilling, blasting, power generation and port site activity would likely change the distribution of wildlife species important to subsistence, such as moose, caribou and fur bearers. It would be long-term and would cause potential impacts during the construction phases and during mining activities

Page 49

throughout the life of the mine.

Areas important to Crooked Creek for berry picking, wood cutting and hunting would be directly affected by the mine, and adjacent areas would potentially be contaminated with dust emissions containing various particulate materials from ore processing and from ore trucks on haul roads and access roads. This could make the berry picking areas undesirable or unusable to subsistence users.

A water treatment plant would be built 50 years after mine closure to treat water from the pit that may or may not meet water quality standards for fish. Possible water releases from the mine during operations, after mine closure when water is being pumped into the pit, and after the water treatment plant is constructed have a potential to impact fish from Crooked Creek and the Kuskokwim River, which could result in significant restrictions to subsistence resources.

Potential runoff from the tailings dam and pit lake would have the potential to contaminate fish resources important to subsistence in Crooked Creek and the lower Kuskokwim River into perpetuity, impacting subsistence fish resources important to all communities from Crooked Creek to the mouth of the Kuskokwim River.

Now, for the natural gas pipeline, the potential effects to subsistence from construction and operation of

Page 50

the natural gas pipeline would affect the villages of Tyonek, Skwentna, Nicolai, McGrath, Takotna, as well as downriver villages of Sleetmute, Stony River, Georgetown and Crooked Creek. During construction, the effects of clearing the right-of-way, trenching, drilling and the presence of machinery, pipeline transport, workers in construction camps and infrastructure on and along the pipeline right-of-way would cause a redistribution of moose, caribou and fur bearers and negatively affect access to subsistence use areas and availability of subsistence resources.

During mine operations, the airstrip that would remain along the pipeline right-of-way at Farewell would potentially increase access to subsistence resources by nonlocal residents using aircraft and increase competition for those subsistence resources along and adjacent to the pipeline right-of-way. Villages negatively affected by increased access to and competition in the area include McGrath, Nikolai and Takotna.

For the transportation infrastructure, the potential effects to subsistence from transportation infrastructure, including barging of cargo and fuel and the construction of a port at Jungjuk on the Kuskokwim River, would affect all villages on the river from Crooked Creek to the mouth of the Kuskokwim River.

Page 51

Impacts from barging include displacement and disruption of subsistence activities by barge traffic or reduced access to subsistence fishing activities and sites such as set nets, fish wheels and processing rafts along the river.

Subsistence fish resources, salmon and resident fish species, may also be negatively affected by the magnitude and intensity of barge traffic proposed in Alternative 2. Effects to fish may increase when river water levels are low as barge rafts would need to be uncoupled and barges towed individually or in pairs, or lighter barge loads per trip would be required to navigate to the Jungjuk port. This would require additional barge round trips on the river and potentially increase impacts to those subsistence fishers on the Kuskokwim River and to all subsistence fish resources.

So the findings. This evaluation concludes that Alternative 2 may result in a significant restriction to subsistence uses for the communities of Crooked Creek and Napaimute in relation to the mine site; the communities on the Kuskokwim River from barge traffic on the river, including Bethel, Napakiak, Napaskiak, Oscarville, Kwethluk, Akiakchak, Akiak, Tuluksak, Kalskag, Lower Kalskag, Aniak, Chuathbaluk, Napaimute and Crooked Creek; and the communities of McGrath, Nikolai and Takotna for

Page 52

increased access and competition from nonlocal users at the Farewell airstrip along the pipeline right-of-way.

In addition, potential spill scenarios involving ocean and river barge releases of diesel fuel, cyanide, mercury, tailings dam failure, and release of untreated water from the pit lake and tailings dam after mine closure may also result in significant restriction to subsistence uses for the Kuskokwim River communities listed above.

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

So we are going to conduct in a little while after the poster session and the comment period a brief 810 hearing to receive testimony on how you feel subsistence uses may be impacted, and that could be positively or negatively. But if you feel subsistence is impacted in some way, we welcome your testimony at that time.

Following a public hearing, a finding may be revised to "will not significantly restrict" based on changes to

Page 53

alternatives, new information or new mitigation measures resulting from the hearings. If the finding of "may significantly restrict subsistence uses" is not revised or the impacts cannot be mitigated, a three-part determination must be made before the action can be authorized.

So what do those findings mean under ANILCA? An 810(a)(3) determination section is to be prepared only when there is a finding of "may significantly restrict subsistence uses" for the selected alternative or action. The determination will separately address each of the three required items under 810(a)(3) and state why the proposed action is necessary and how the action complies with each requirement.

And the three items required in the determination are: Why such a significant restriction of subsistence uses is necessary and how it is consistent with sound management principles for multiple use of public lands; how the proposed activity will involve the minimal amount of public lands necessary to accomplish the purposes of the Act; and what reasonable steps would be taken to minimize adverse affects upon subsistence uses and resources resulting from the project. After compliance with the 810 process, a manager can proceed with the action.

Page 54

So today when commenting or giving testimony, whether in writing or during our hearing or during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement public testimony time related to subsistence, please consider what additional specific information about how the proposed mine would affect abundance and/or availability of subsistence resources important to you or how it would affect access to subsistence resources important to you.

And you can also send comments to us directly at the BLM if you would like. Bruce Seppi, the biologist there at our office in Anchorage, we can receive them by email directly to him. That comment period is going to end on April 30th in conjunction with the comment period on the draft EIS but, like I said earlier, you are welcome to provide testimony today, either comments to the draft EIS or testimony to us during our hearing that we are going to hold in a little while.

So thanks for coming out today. We appreciate it, and we would like to hear from you. Thanks.

MR. KEITH GORDON: Thank you, Alan. So I mentioned earlier that the Corps of Engineers has 11 cooperating entities, federal, State, tribal, that are assisting us in the development of the Environmental Impact Statement. We have a third-party contractor that is an international engineering and environmental analysis

Page 55

firm that is primarily drafting the EIS and, therefore, drafting the draft analyses and draft conclusions.

That firm is AECOM, and they have a number of staff here with us today who have participated in development of the draft EIS, as I mentioned, the analyses and the conclusions. Those folks are available to give you some additional information on their role in the project to date and give you some information on the information contained in these posters or potentially to address other questions you have.

So I introduced myself as an employee of the Army Corps of Engineers, and Mr. Bittner introduced himself as an employee of the Bureau of Land Management. We have a representative from Donlin here. And at this time I'd like Mr. Taylor Brelsford of AECOM to introduce the AECOM staff who is here and their roles in the project, as well as the posters they will be dealing with.

MR. TAYLOR BRELSFORD: Thank you very much. So we are going to move to the poster session in just a few minutes. And these are clustered together. So I'd like to start by introducing Jessica Evans who will stand over here [indicating] and talk about the posters on the project, more details about the pipeline or about the mine site. Jessica Evans.

Then let's see. Nancy Darigo will be standing and

Page 56

talking with you about the physical environment. She's a geologist by training and a specialist in things like seismic risk and so on. She will be standing over in this corner [indicating] and available to talk with you about water flow or air quality, water quality, hazardous chemicals.

Then Dave Every is here, and he's the biology lead for our team. He will be standing back here [indicating] with the posters on fisheries impacts and barge traffic, and they are kind of tied together. Barge traffic may affect fisheries, so that's Dave's area.

And I'll stand with the socioeconomics and the subsistence posters. My background is as a social scientist.

I also want to really highlight the work that Donne Harris Fleagle does for us. So Donne is from the region, grew up in McGrath, works as our primary outreach lead with the communities. I don't know, dozens of meetings, maybe more, over the last several years with tribal councils, with communities in tribal conferences to extend the communication, kind of bring home questions, bring back answers to people in the community. So Donne has been really an essential part of what we have been about. I think I got everybody.

Mary Vavrik is the court recorder, and I think Keith

Page 57

has emphasized that this is a chance to really listen carefully to what you say. So Mary will be taking a word-for-word record of what you have said, and then that allows us to analyze and review your comments really accurately. That's the purpose of having a court recorder here.

MR. KEITH GORDON: Thank you very much, Taylor. So as Taylor mentioned, before we go to the poster session, when we come back to take your comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and when we take your testimony in regards to potential subsistence impacts for the 810 hearing, Mary will be documenting your comments verbatim.

So what we are going to ask is that before you make comments or give testimony, you state your name clearly so she has it in the record. If you have any formal affiliation with any group, entity, et cetera, that you state that so we know, if you are representing someone, who you are representing. And then we will capture your comment to make sure we address it adequately in the EIS.

So because Mary has the most difficult job in the room, she has to pay attention to everything all the time. If she needs any of us to repeat anything, stop talking so she can catch up, et cetera, she can interrupt any of us just to get what she needs.

Page 58

So at this point in time, we will take a break and go to the poster session. And we usually set aside 30 to 45 minutes for this, but it can be shorter or longer; whatever you all prefer. So just take a look at whatever posters you would like to look at, and we will reconvene when you are ready and start taking your comments.

Thank you.

(Off the record.)

MR. KEITH GORDON: We will go ahead and start the comments session on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. And as I mentioned, Ms. Mary Vavrik from Midnight Sun Court Reporters will be capturing your testimony. And Mr. Brelsford will bring the microphone around so you all can make comments. You don't have to use the microphone, but that assures that Mary has the best chance of hearing your comments clearly.

Again, please state your name, if you have any formal affiliation with any group or entity, and then just go ahead and give us your comments. Who has No. 1?

MR. NATHAN ELSWICK: I got No. 1. Good afternoon. My name is Nathan Elswick. I'm a representative for the Anvik Tribal Council. I really didn't have a comment at this time. I think the lady I spoke with was very helpful on answering my questions.

I had a few things on dust, potential impacts on the

Page 59

dust, and especially when we get high winds and possible -- where the dust is going to be landing.

Another one was what will happen maybe with the potential problem with a big earthquake, but it sounded like we are only maybe on one fault line. And I had one more, but I can't think of it at the time, so --

MR. KEITH GORDON: Okay. If you do have any comments you would like to make, the conversation you had to address your comments is not part of the record. So if there is anything you had in that conversation that you would like us to make part of the record and respond to, you could go ahead and make those comments. Or if you got your questions answered, then that's fine if you don't have anything else you would like to say.

MR. NATHAN ELSWICK: Thank you.

MR. KEITH GORDON: Okay. No. 2? Donne, how many numbers do we have out there? Okay. Is there anybody else who would like to make a comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement? Is there anybody on the phone who would like to make a comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

MR. RONALD DEMIENTIEFF: Right here. I will.

Hello. Good afternoon. This is Ronald Demientieff. I would like to -- I'm curious about the drainage in your

Page 60

bedrock. I notice you are split between Crooked Creek and the headwaters of the Iditarod River. So as we all know, water seeps down through the cracks and comes out to the headwaters of each spring. How are you going to prevent your holding water that you have contaminated from seeping through cracks of these streams at the headwaters? And kind of like if we do end up with a summer of rain -- like a few years back it rained July, August, September, we had flood waters. So how are you going to really pump all of that waste if you have enough water all around you that you have to contend with?

Also I notice lately we have been having extremely warm weather, but who is to say when it's going to turn around and act like winter again and freeze you solid. And then what do you do with your wastewater? Or where would you get water to operate your gold mine? Most headwaters in all tributary creeks that lead to any river are very important spawning grounds for all types and kinds of salmon, fish, mink, otter, beaver, everything indigenous people have been living on here for 10,000 years.

So we have quite an issue here if something does happen. We can't just walk away. We can't turn our head back to whatever happens. We have to look at every aspect of what might happen. This is our future. This is our --

Page 61

this is our way of life. And I doubt -- you damage it, I doubt we will ever get it back. So we need to address this very carefully. And I'd like to see that tended to.

Thank you.

MR. KEITH GORDON: Thank you very much. Is there anybody else who would like to comment on the draft EIS? Okay. At this point in time, we will take a couple of minutes while Mary closes out the file for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement comments and opens a file for the BLM 810 ANILCA hearing. And Mr. Alan Bittner with the Bureau of Land Management will start the hearing and give you the opportunity to make some -- give some testimony in regard to subsistence impacts of this potential project.

Please note that the comments -- you can still make additional comments on the draft EIS through April 30 through the various means I noted earlier. You can make comments to BLM on ANILCA 810 subsistence impacts through April 30th. And please note that when you are making comments on the EIS or the 810 ANILCA subsistence impacts, we will share those comments back and forth, the comments and testimony, and use them for either one, whichever they are applicable to. But we will make sure we get them addressed.

(Proceedings adjourned at 3:23 p.m.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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

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

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

_____
MARY A. VAVRIK,
Registered Merit Reporter
Notary Public for Alaska

My Commission Expires: November 5, 2016